

LAKE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING

March 25, 2021

Commission Members

P John Hess, District I
P Everardo Chavez, District II
P Batsulwin Brown, District III
P Christina Price, District IV
P Lance Williams, District V

Staff Members

A Scott DeLeon, CDD Director
P Tocarra Thomas, Deputy Director
P Eric Porter, Associate Planner
P Nicole Johnson, Deputy City Counsel
P Kerrian Marriott, Office Assistant III
P Trish Turner, Office Assistant

REGULAR MEETING

9:00 a.m. CALL TO ORDER

Pledge of Allegiance lead by Comm. Brown

9:01 a.m. ACTION ON MINUTES

Comm. Price motioned to approve the minutes from the March 11, 2021 PC Hearing seconded by Comm. Williams.

5 Ayes, 0 Nays, - Motion Carried

9: 02 a.m. CITIZEN'S INPUT - NONE

Any person may speak for three minutes about any subject of concern, provided that it is within the jurisdiction of the Planning Commission, and is not already on today's agenda or scheduled for a future public hearing. Total time allotted for Citizen's Input shall be fifteen minutes. Speakers are requested to complete a simple form (giving name, address and subject) available in the Community Development Department office, prior to 9:00.

Agendas of public meetings and supporting documents are available for public inspection in the Lake County Courthouse, Community Development Department, Third Floor, 255 North Forbes Street, Lakeport, California

Request for Disability-Related Modification or Accommodation: A request for a disability-related modification or accommodation necessary to participate in the Planning Commission meetings should be made in writing to the Planning Commission Assistant at least 48 hours prior to the meeting.

9:06 a.m. Public hearing to Consider a Major Use Permit (UP 19-11) to consider approval of a commercial cannabis cultivation project on a 99± acre property, and consideration of adopting a Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS 19-22). Applicant / Owner: Jinchun Agriculture LLC. Proposed Project: Four (4) A-Type 3 medium outdoor cannabis cultivation licenses requesting 260,000 sq. ft. of cannabis cultivation area and one (1) A-Type 13 self-distribution license. Location: 16740 Daly Place, Middletown, CA; APN: 013-013-51.

Eric Porter, Associate Planner, gave a verbal presentation, which included the staff report, site plans, location and requirements. Staff has determined that the proposed project complies with the Major Use Permit findings. No adverse comments.

Comm. Hess Clarification requested on the mention of South Shore fire Protection.

Eric Porter Responded Clarification correct, it is North Shore, Calfire to be exact.

Max Hopkins – Representing Applicant was available to answer any questions.

Comm. Williams had a question regarding comments from CDFA, did site have a botanist study or a biologist visit?

Max Hopkins responded, report was submitted with Major Use Application.

Comm. Hess stated he is not a fan of shipping containers as it pertains to distance from water. Comm. Hess also inquired if the applicant had chosen a method of screening the containers i.e. false siding and false roof.

Max Hopkins replied that they had planned to screen with vegetation

Comm. Hess questioned if Applicant had clarified with Mr. Porter the shipping containers would have Fence and false siding and a false roof.

Eric Porter does not believe vegetation alone would be an effective screening method.

Max Hopkins stated that he had envisioned a trellis with tall vegetation but if not enough is willing to make necessary changes.

Eric Porter recommended adding AES 1, which allows the applicant to propose a method of screening, no less than 6 ft. tall. Which can include fencing in conjunction with screening landscaping or false siding, false roof, both options would need to be on foundation.

Public Comment – NONE

Comm. Hess motioned, seconded by Comm. Price Regarding the Mitigated Negative Declaration that the Planning Commission find that the Initial Study (IS 19-22) applied for by Jinchun Agriculture LLC on property located at 16740 Daly Place, Middletown, and further described as APN: 013-013-51 will not have a significant effect on the environment and therefore a mitigated negative declaration shall be approved with the findings listed in the staff report dated March 25, 2021 and as amended today regarding shipping containers.

5 Ayes, 0 Nays, - Motion Carried

Comm. Hess motioned, seconded by Comm. Chavez that the Planning Commission find that the Use Permit (UP 19-11) applied for by Jinchun Agriculture LLC on property located at 16740 Daly Place, Middletown, and further described as APN: 013-013-51 does meet the requirements of Section 51.4 of the Lake County Zoning Ordinance and the Major Use Permit be granted subject to the conditions and with the findings listed in the staff report dated March 25, 2021 and as amended today.

5 Ayes, 0 Nays, - Motion Carried

NOTE: The applicant or any interested person is reminded that the Zoning Ordinance provides for a seven (7) calendar day appeal period. If there is a disagreement with the Planning Commission, an appeal to the Board of Supervisors may be filed. The appropriate forms and applicable fee must be submitted prior to 5:00 p.m. on or before the seventh calendar day following the Commission's final determination.

9:23 a.m. Public Hearing to Consider MAJOR USE PERMIT (UP 19-43) and a Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS 19-62). . Applicant / Owner: Cunningham Farms. Proposed Project: (1) A Type 3 (medium outdoor) commercial cannabis cultivation license, and (1) A-Type 13 'self-distribution' license. Location: 23131 Jerusalem Grade Road, Middletown; APNs: 013-015-39, 43 and 57 (formerly lots 34 and 35 recently merged).

Eric Porter, Associate Planner, gave a verbal presentation, which included the staff report, site plans, location, and requirements. Staff has determined that the proposed project complies with the Major Use Permit findings. One adverse comment received, unfortunately they provided no means of contact.

Comm. Hess commented on the use of South Shore fire protection district

Comm. Williams asked staff "What is the well capacity how much does it produce and was this an EA from last year?"

Eric Porter does not recall the productivity of well. Staff stated that it was not a concern as the well produces over 10 gals per minute.

Comm. Williams commented that he would have concerns if the parcel was larger due to well production.

Public Comment – NONE

Comm. Chavez motioned, seconded by Comm. Hess that the Planning Commission find that the Initial Study (IS 19-62) applied for by Cunningham Farms on property located 23131 Jerusalem Grade Road, Middletown, and is APNs: 013-015-39, 43 and 57 (formerly lots 34 and 35 recently merged) will not have a significant effect on the environment and therefore a mitigated negative declaration shall be approved with the findings listed in the staff report dated March 25, 2021.

5 Ayes, 0 Nays – Motion Carried

Comm. Chavez motioned, seconded by Comm. Price that the Planning Commission find that the Use Permit (UP 19-43) applied for by Cunningham Farms on property located 23131 Jerusalem Grade Road, Middletown, and is APNs: 013-015-39, 43 and 57 (formerly lots 34 and 35 recently merged) does meet the requirements of Section 51.4 of the Lake County Zoning Ordinance and the Major Use Permit be

granted subject to the conditions and with the findings listed in the staff report dated March 25, 2021.

5 Ayes, 0 Nays – Motion Carried

NOTE: The applicant or any interested person is reminded that the Zoning Ordinance provides for a seven (7) calendar day appeal period. If there is a disagreement with the Planning Commission, an appeal to the Board of Supervisors may be filed. The appropriate forms and applicable fee must be submitted prior to 5:00 p.m. on or before the seventh calendar day following the Commission's final determination.

9:34 a.m. PUBLIC HEARING to Discuss and Consider Zoning Text Amendment (AM 20-02) to Article 27 of the Lake County Zoning Ordinance pertaining to the Cultivation of Commercial Cannabis. The applicant is the COUNTY OF LAKE. Carried over from February 25th, 2021 PC Hearing.

Tocarra Nicole Thomas, CDD Deputy Director gave a verbal and visual presentation on the zoning text amendment for Article 27 guidelines. Ms. Thomas shared that this was an agenda item that was continues from the February 25th hearing. Ms. Thomas continued on to give an oral presentation of the continued item which included language to change the plant count and acreage minimum after staff completed a more in-depth review. The discussion primarily centered around the question from the previous planning commission meeting about whether the license types can be changed from a strict plant count and acreage maximum to a Percentage ratio system versus adopting the language from the CDFA regulation. It was reported on that the CDFA adopted the plant counts and acreage language directly from State Statue Prop 64. The decision to adopt the plant counts and sizes was left up to the local jurisdiction. Staff continued on to report that there could be negative impact/ consequence on land use if the license types were changed to adopt a ratio/percentage system. Staff recommended to either adopt the CDFA regulation language to be consist with State language or to adopt a percentage ratio system for the amount of plants based on property size after a review.

Discussion was then opened to the Planning Commissioners

Comm. Williams was open towards adopting the State language as the language changes on a regular basis. Comm. Williams stated that due to consistent change it would be in the Planning Commissioners interest to mirror the state.

Comm. Hess asked staff if percentages would be less restrictive.

Tocarra Nicole Thomas, CDD Deputy Director stated it would depend on details, it would be a case by case determination. It would be difficult to say if a percentage basis would be less or more restrictive at this time.

Comm. Williams reiterated the meeting points – changing plant numbers but also looking at changing looking at 20 acre minimum to 2 acre minimums. A discussion is needed on type 2A and 3A indoor, Look at individual license to determine if percentages can be done. Comm. William suggested that the board discuss other license type i.e 20 acres would give you 2 acres that is how the percentages should be calculated.

Comm. Hess had no objections to harmonizing with the state language but it always changes, other counties are considering percentages. A certain percentage based on land size.

Tocarra Nicole Thomas, CDD Deputy Director stated if the county language for permitting is not adopted from the State it might make it a bit more difficult to obtain a license from the State, not impossible. The county has the authority to adopt new language which could include percentages based on license type.

Comm. Williams reiterated that he would like to follow the state regulations, as the state changes we can mirror. Comm. Williams shared concerns regarding the adoption of the Farmland Protection Zones which would further impact the cut. He stated that decisions are being made that would force people to cut their growing space in half if in farmland protection zone, in terms of greenhouse applicants. 20 to 2 acre minimum for indoor, change the greenhouse rules for every 20 acres you can have 2 medium permits.

Comm. Hess referred to item 4 and was in agreeance with Comm. Williams.

Comm. Williams Reiterated his concern for cannabis applicants who would have to conform to greenhouses because of the new Farmland Protection Zones and have their grow size cut in half which is currently what is being proposed.

Comm. Price agreed with both Comm. Williams and Comm. Hess in regards to mirroring the State guidelines.

Public Comment –

Julia Jacobson from Aster Farms agreed with Comm. Williams statements and stated that there should be relief from increased size for the mixed light.

Bobby Dutcher agrees with Comm. Williams, specifically for those that have already vetted their project. The financial aspect of having to move the product into greenhouses under this new proposed language seems really unfair.

Ben Gresso agreed with what everyone was saying, startup cost are expensive. Would like to lend support to Comm. Williams approach.

Brenna Sullivan Lake County Farm Bureau stated that in regards to the Farmland Protection Zone, the requirement to grow in a greenhouse was already existing, due to early activation permits which allowed applicants to start a grow outdoors. No land added to greenhouse requirement.

Tocarra Nicole Thomas, CDD Deputy Director shared current motions to be voted on today the proposed zoning ordinance to adopt the changes for License type 1A, 2A and 3A to directly match State Regulations for consistency after reviewing license types and sizes as well a resolution of intention as the formal adoption and approval of these zoning ordinance text amendments.

Comm. Williams believed that item 1 would work but does not want to miss out on a discussion on item 4. Believes that 20 acres should get the applicant 2 type medium greenhouse or mixed light license. Reiterated what Brenna Sullivan had stated. Asked what percentage of applicants were growing outside when they were supposed to have greenhouses.

Tocarra Nicole Thomas, CDD Deputy Director asked Comm. Williams for clarification regarding the percentage of EA's that should be operating in a greenhouse. Unfortunately that information was not readily on hand.

Comm. Williams would like to know the percentage, there is currently no list. Would like to see what those projects were proposed as. Recommended to complete the current motions and revisit the grandfather clause.

Comm. Hess agreed that Comm. Williams's concern could be addressed during the grandfather language discussion.

Comm. Price motioned, seconded by Comm. Hess that the Planning Commission recommend approval of proposed Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment, AM 20-02 Finding Number 1 which was continued from the 2/25 meeting, to adopt the changes for License Types 1A, 2A and 3A to directly match the State Regulation for consistency after reviewing license types and size applied for by the County of Lake for the reasons listed in the staff report dated February 25, 2021.

5 Ayes, 0 Nays, - Motion Carried

Comm. Price motioned that the Planning Commission render its final decision on proposed Ordinance text amendments within ten (10) days of said final decision, in the form of a Resolution of Intention to the Board of Supervisors recommending the formal adoption and approval of the Zoning Ordinance Text Amendments, AM 20-02 as outlined in the Staff report dated February 25, 2021.

5 Ayes, 0 Nays, - Motion Carried

NOTE: The applicant or any interested person is reminded that the Zoning Ordinance provides for a seven (7) calendar day appeal period. If there is a disagreement with the Planning Commission, an appeal to the Board of Supervisors may be filed. The appropriate forms and applicable fee must be submitted prior to 5:00 p.m. on or before the seventh calendar day following the Commission's final determination.

10:02 a.m. PUBLIC HEARING to Discuss and Consider Approval of Text Amendments to Article 27SEC. 21-27 USES GENERALLY PERMITTED Commercial Cannabis Cultivation with a Resolution of Intention submitted to the Board of Supervisors: Proposed Amendments to Zoning Ordinance (AM 21-01) Categorical Exemption (CE 20-16). Carried over from February 25th, 2021 PC Hearing.

Tocarra Thomas, CDD Deputy Director gave a verbal and visual presentation. Ms. Thomas reiterated that there are no changes being made to the Farm land Protected Zones. Fully permitted projects in affect today will not be impacted however, if permittees made any changes to their permits they would have to come in compliance with the new ordinance. Staff will recommend that applicants reach out to Calfire and UC Davis as they have a composed list of less flammable vegetation if it applies for projects that would have to implement vegetative screening. License 3 B concerns min 20 acres lot size requires 100 ft. setback from farm land protected zones. 22000 Maximum canopy area, 200 ft. setback from offsite residence.

Public Comment –

Steven Hajik Agriculture Department fully supports the 500 ft. buffer and expressed concerns regarding potential impact cannabis will have on wine grapes. Mr. Hajik stated that he had spoken to several buyers who would refuse to purchase from vineyards with close proximity to cannabis grow.

Sarah Bodner of Kindness farms in Lakeport supports the grandfather language.

Crystal Keesey of Golden State Herbs spoke on Mr. Hajiks comments. Crystal stated that Cannabis is the cleanest crop. Ms. Keesy also spoke on pesticide drift and its negative effects on Cannabis farms.

Brenna Sullivan of Lake County Farm Bureau agrees with Mr. Hajik, pesticide drift is illegal. A 500 ft. buffer would protect both agriculture industries.

Comm. Hess asked Ms. Sullivan for clarification – Regarding the grandfather language, EA permits approved before Dec. 2020 should already be growing in greenhouses that are within the protected zones.

Brenna Sullivan responded with a clarification of the Early Activation permits and process as it pertains to the Grandfather language.

Comm. Hess asked Ms. Sullivan her thoughts on more mixed light cultivation in greenhouses that would not necessarily have to put concrete on land.

Brenna Sullivan stated she had no comments at that time in regards to Comm. Williams proposition of doubling capacity on 20 acres of indoor grow. Outdoor cannabis is not allowed at this time on Ag land and buffers are set in place in protected zones.

Comm. Williams asked Ms. Sullivan what she would like to see accomplished today in regards to the Sunset language and the Grandfather language. Comm. Price would also be interested in Mr. Hajik's comments.

Brenna Sullivan responded to Comm. Williams, she stated that there was EA confusion on limitations based on interpretation and would like to see EA outdoor grows phase out and a transition to greenhouses happen.

Steven Hajik responded in agreement with Ms. Sullivan.

Comm. Williams referred to Kindness farm as an example, will they need to go into greenhouses? Comm. Williams also asked for the zoning designation of Kindness Farms. Referred to Ms. Thomas and suggested a break.

Tocarra Thomas, CDD Deputy Director referred to Article 27 in response to questions/concerns regarding the EA permits. Ms. Thomas also referred to Resolution 2020-184 and Ordinance 3101 which resolved any confusion for applicants cultivating outdoors. Ms. Thomas also commented that applicants deemed complete would have up to three years to come into compliance with the new ordinance.

Comm. Hess expressed concern regarding the numbers involved, how many applicants would be affected by the grandfather and Sunset Language being discussed today?

Sarah Bodnar with Kindness Farm responded that they are located in the Farmland Protection zone and was given an EA, deemed complete and that the Grandfather language would allow them the time to transition to greenhouses.

Julia Jacobson shared a study conducted in Colorado that concluded that outdoor cultivation had greater benefits than indoor/greenhouse cultivation relating to green-house gases. She urged the Commissioner to consider the environmental impact of growing indoors or in greenhouses.

Chelsey Garrett Senior Director of Human Resources at Sunshine Farms is in support of the Grandfather language.

Christina Torres Stella Green Farms had questions regarding her specific application and current standing.

Comm. Hess requested that applicants do not ask specific questions about their applications, and continued on to ask Staff about how many applications would be affected.

Comm. Williams Agreed With Comm. Hess that this hearing was not to hear individual cases and what mistakes might have occurred years past. Reiterated that if a project was an EA, they were supposed to be in greenhouses once deemed completed and were approved their MUP.

Comm. Brown agreed with Comm. Williams. But stated that it was difficult to streamline specific application questions.

Nicole Johnson responded that a review of individual applications could not be done today. Also agreed with Comm. Brown, that it is difficult to screen applicants from asking specific questions as it relates to their project.

Tony Ford is a third generation grape grower and has had no experience with a refusal of purchasing grapes grown next to a cannabis grow. Spoke on his own project delays and concerns in relation to the grandfather language.

Steven Hajik asked for clarification on the Grandfather language as it pertains to grows outside the farmland restrictive zones or does it only pertain to the 500 ft. buffer outside the protective zones?

Comm. Williams responded to Mr. Hajik, his interpretation of the Grandfather clause is that it only affects applicants inside the zone with the buffer requirements.

Tocarra Thomas, CDD Deputy Director clarified to Mr Hajik that if a project was deemed complete by Dec 15, 2020, the grandfather language would give that applicant three years to come in to compliance with the new ordinance.

Comm. Williams asked Ms. Thomas to share the Sunset language and the Grandfather Language for everyone.

Julia Jacobson asked for clarification on deemed complete?

Tocarra Thomas, CDD Deputy Director responded that if CEQA was not complete the project is deemed incomplete.

eComments – Were Read Into The Record

To whom it may concern,

I would like to start by saying that this letter is not intended to express any frustration toward any particular person. However, I received some news about my project that it could potentially be delayed or be recommended for denial due to the new resolution to the ordinance. So, I would like to start by expressing my concerns and frustration through the planning process from my perspective and I believe many other cannabis cultivators feel the same.

In November 2019, I attended a pre-application meeting where I was told by a previous planner about what to expect during the permitting process and timelines, however, the planner seems fairly new and likely did not fully understand the process themselves. I went forward and worked on the application packet. My initial project proposal was to phase into all greenhouses after year one of the outdoor canopy area. Under the zoning ordinance Article 27, at the time states:

"The permitting authority may allow outdoor cultivation outside a greenhouse if the prime farmland, farmland of statewide importance, unique farmland, and farmland of local importance are isolated areas that are not connected to a large system of such lands."

In March 2020, I submitted a COMPLETE application incorporating an outdoor cultivation area within an area designated as "grazing land". There was a valid point that I can state that my project would be isolated enough to cultivate outdoors with the setback from the Lampson Airport as the divider between important farmland and isolated segments. The project site is situated on the outskirts of important farmland and Lakeport. The planner informed me that this proposal can be determined at the planning commission hearing.

In November 2020, I contacted my planner and asked about my project. The planner assigned had told me that an initial study was being prepared and noted due to the high volume and being understaffed in the Community Development Department that it is likely to be delayed.

In December 2020, the Board of Supervisors passed a resolution to prohibit outdoor cultivation in areas located as important farmland. I was not aware of this and when I found out, I attempted to contact the Community Development Department and did not receive any response and no guidance on the location of the areas.

In January 2021, I was given a timeline that I was able to work with to understand how I will be able to cultivate this year. I was also told that the initial study was being submitted and that my planner would prepare for the planning commission hearing.

Just recently, I received a call from my planner stating that there is a possibility for another delay due to the new resolution and my project scope or to be recommended denial due to the ordinance change. I anticipated for a year now to have my project to be brought to the hearing. This doesn't end there—because I am not sure if you understand the detriment, financial burden, and hardship it had created for me. I have several projects going on throughout Lake County at once and they had or probably will be impacted by these sudden changes. So let me express my experience as a cultivator with many projects and how these impacts greatly affected me:

- I owned and leased various properties throughout Lake County—some are dilapidated or useless properties that I am attempting to make better use of it. Each month for individual property costs me approximately \$2,000-10,000 per month to maintain to start the cannabis operation.
- Each property I acquired had problems on the properties that likely had violations in the past or recently had violations for damages I was not aware of—I understand that when I buy the land, I am buying the problem. I was willing to spend thousands of dollars to fix the violation and problems—and I have spent thousands of dollars to improve both the property, the roads, and the waterways. Instead, I was strategically singled-out for investigation due to these issues and because I acquired so many properties and want to operate all at once. My project was strategically delayed because of this.
- Improvements on the property costed me \$10,000-60,000 per properties just to comply with all the regulations and requirements
- Water Quality Control Board costs \$600-1000. Additional charges were made for violations that I was not aware of when I obtained the property but was subject to additional cost ranging from \$1,000-2,000 for some of my properties.
- A biological survey conducted costs \$3,800-4,200 for each survey
- A cultural report conducted costs over \$1,800 for each property
- A cannabis consultant is \$4,000-6,000 per project
- To produce a set of site maps costs \$6,000 per set and to produce new ones because of the lack of guidance due to expectations from both local and state, additional costs can range up to \$2,000 for new sets just to add minor changes to the site maps that can be expressed in writing such as adding the dimension of the parking area.

These are individual costs for EACH project I had submitted. This is the detriment of my business experience with the County of Lake and the hardship that I had to endure through the cannabis application process. I had poured so much money out for improvements throughout the County, added new information from all of these assessments on the property, and paid so much in taxes and fees. I had never felt completely betrayed by the obstacles and challenges that were put on me after investing so much for this county only to feel strategically singled-out for all of my projects and further delay it. I still have some hope and want to continue moving forward on time, or this is a complete loss.

Rent and properties 500K + a year
for two of my spots alone!

[Crystal Keeseey](#) at March 25, 2021 at 11:08am PDT

The Terpene Taint study in Santa Barbara was performed between CANNABIS and grapes, not hemp as FB Director Brenna Sullivan indicated.

County of Lake Planning Commission
255 N. Forbes St
Lakeport, CA 95453
March 24, 2021

Dear Honorable Commissioners,

Thank you, as always, to County Staff and the Planning Commission for its on-going cannabis regulation efforts. There has been much confusion around land designations, and I was hoping that this hearing would clarify some of the rules around each category. For clarity's sake, I hope that the County can create a succinct set of parameters in an easily accessible format for all current and future applicants. With today's specific changes, I ask for consideration of the following.

1. Due to the lengthy Use Permit process, the "Grandfather Clause" is essential for those applicants that have been deemed complete yet find themselves still waiting for a Use Permit hearing. These significant changes could not be foreseen 2-3 years ago, and these projects should not be penalized for being early adopters that have been operating in compliance and good faith. While I find the requirement to transition to the new standards to be punitive, I do appreciate that this must get passed so that these applicants can move forward. Additionally, I feel that this "Grandfather Clause" should be considered for all substantial changes that may occur in the future that could affect a project that has been deemed complete.

2. Additionally, I would like the Commission to consider cannabis farms with existing Use Permits be given the same benefits as other "active agriculture". It should not be the burden of the existing cannabis farm to relocate its canopy or screen its existing operation should someone choose to plant a different crop on a neighboring parcel.

3. Studies have been performed in both Sonoma and Santa Barbara Counties, and the scientific data does not support the theory of "terpene taint" in wine grapes thus these egregious setbacks are akin to "crying wolf." Wine grape contracts and product quality can be very subjective, and this claim is merely a new tactic for buyers to lower the acquisition price of grapes. With

this in mind, I would like the Commission to consider exceptions to the setback when the affected neighbor submits an affidavit of agreement to a lesser setback. The conflicts between neighboring crops seem to be isolated and perhaps we are creating a false sense of solution for a problem that does not exist. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Jennifer K. Smith

3/25/21

Agenda Item 4 Questions & Comments

I have a few questions and comments related to the Farmland Protection Zone and Farmland Designations changes that I hope can be addressed today to provide a bit more clarification to scenarios that will come up once the changes are implemented:

1. If a property is outside of the Farmland Protection Zone and is proposing cannabis cultivation within 500 feet of an active Ag garden that is within a farmland designation, can the cannabis applicant obtain a letter from the neighbor(s) with the Ag garden to allow for outdoor cultivation closer than 500 feet?

Comments: It sounds like the implementation of the 500' setback from the active Ag garden is to protect the agricultural owner, therefore would it be allowed for the Ag property owner to provide consent to allow the cannabis applicant to cultivate closer than 500 feet if they choose to? If the proposed cannabis property is within 500 ft of multiple Ag gardens on farmland designation, the applicant would be required to provide unanimous proof from all neighbors.

2. How will a property be determined if its Ag garden is active or if it abandoned? Will it be on the applicant or the CDD to determine if the Ag use is active?

Comments: There are quite a few abandoned walnut orchards that still remain on properties but are not actively farmed. Is ariel imagery such as GIS going to be the only form of verification?

3. Will the grandfather language also apply to the Farmland Designation change for the 500 ft. setback from ag garden to cannabis garden and the vegetative screening requirements?

Comments: The grandfather language definition only identifies Farmland Protection Zones provisions, but I am assuming the grandfather language would also apply to the rest of the Farmland Designation changes as well.

4. If a property has Farmland Designation on it, but is outside of the Farmland Protection Zone and does not have any neighbors with an active Ag garden, will the cannabis applicant be able to propose outdoor cultivation directly on that Farmland Designation?

Comments: Currently the ordinance reads as though it would still be up to the permitting authority review to determine if a Farmland Designation is connected to a larger system, to then decide if an applicant can cultivate outdoors directly within that area.

5. If an applicant is proposing an outdoor cultivation license within a greenhouse/hoop-house or other similar structure that does not have any light deprivation, will the applicant still be required to apply for a mixed-light or indoor license if it falls within one of the restrictive zones?

Comments: The definition for a mixed-light license, both at the county and state level, are based upon the amount of light deprivation that is occurring. If an applicant does not have light deprivation or artificial lighting, the applicant can apply for an outdoor cultivation license. Therefore, if an applicant is applying for an outdoor license, where cultivation will take place inside of a structure without the use of any light deprivation, can an air filtration system be installed in order to allow for an outdoor license to be within the Farmland Protection Zone and any Farmland Designation?

The current ordinance reads that farmland designation areas “*shall be limited to indoor, mixed light, and greenhouses that are equipped with filtrations systems that prevents the movement of odors, pesticides, and other air borne contaminates out of or into the structure.*”. Based on these definitions it would be my understanding that an applicant would not necessarily need to change to mixed-light or indoor cultivation, effectively losing half of their canopy area, but could maintain an outdoor cultivation license if they chose to be within a structure that is equipped with an air filtration system and no light deprivation.

6. Will there be any case-by-case review for projects that were unable to be deemed complete prior to December 15th, 2020 due to a lapse in processing time?

Thank you for your attention to these comments,
Hamouda

Lake County Planning Commission
255 North Forbes St.
Lakeport, CA 95453
March 10, 2021

Re: Agenda item: Farmland Importance Zoning Text Amendment (AM21-01) to Article 27 of the Lake County Zoning Ordinance

Dear Honorable Commissioners,

We are Michael Rodriguez and Christina Torres of Stella Green Farms LLC. We researched and specifically chose Lake County for our professional cultivation and proudly submitted our Major Use Permit Application No.: UP 20-01 to the County of Lake on January 4, 2020.

We completed our Site Inspection on February 28, 2020, received our Early Activation on April 15, 2020 and the County circulated the CEQA Notice via U.S. Mail on February 3, 2021. We have complied with all County requirements and have all necessary State agency permits including the Waterboard, CDFW and CDFA. Michael, Sufyan Hamouda, our consultant, and myself have been patiently waiting for the County to process our application in a timely manner and schedule our Planning Commission hearing.

Anticipating to receive our Planning Commission hearing date any day, we were shocked on February 8, 2021, when we were informed of the new Farmland Protection Zone and how it would dramatically change the scope of our 10 year 1-acre outdoor cultivation project. We have invested all of our resources, finances, time, labor, hopes and future in Lake County. The new proposed Farmland Protection Zoning Ordinance will devastate our long awaited project for our family business. Had our Use-Permit been issued timely; our project would not be affected.

As applicants to Lake County, we respectfully propose the following:

1) We propose that all applicants, such as ourselves, in good standing with the County and the State be entirely exempt from compliance with the Farmland Protection Zone if the project was not processed within the appropriate timeline of CEQA guidelines.

2) We propose an expedited process for applicants, such as ourselves, in good standing to be provided an urgent Planning Commission hearing date in order to timely complete the Use-Permits. We suggest multiple Planning Commission hearings be scheduled and heard per each session prior to the fast approaching cultivation season.

We respectfully propose the suggestions above for the protection of all good acting Lake County applicants like ourselves. We look forward to the growth and benefit of our entire community by building together.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best,

Michael Rodriguez

Christina Torres

Stella Green Farms LLC

[Luci Nelson](#) at March 25, 2021 at 8:15am PDT

I highly recommend this business be allowed to remain as is. The Kindness Farm not only provides much needed employment for Lake County, it also provides much needed tax revenue! When families have a member with good job for a good employer they will stay with the company and not be a drain on the county Social Services, something that should be strongly taken into consideration! Besides that point, everyone knows that employed persons bring revenue into their communities via

purchases with businesses etc...
Kindness Farms has an excellent reputation with the
Employees. A true "family" environment with successful teammanship
efforts! This is simply a Win Win for all!

[Mary Hang](#) at March 25, 2021 at 7:08am PDT

Support

Due to the pandemic, it has been difficult for me to find a job but I was lucky enough to get the opportunity to work at Kindness Farms this summer. Working at Kindness Farm have helped me so much as in being able to support my family.

I urged that you allow Kindness Farm to operate so that I can continue on having a job and many individuals who had worked at the farm

[Jeremy Hunter](#) at March 24, 2021 at 4:24pm PDT

I live in the area and work at Kindness Farms. It's been difficult to find jobs up here. I was happy when I found a position at a cannabis company near my house and would like Kindness Farms to be grandfathered in so I can keep my job and many others who work at the farm, can maintain their livelihoods. I have a grandfather who doesn't have much time left due to a disease called Lou Gehrig's and it makes it easier for me to spend the last bit of time he has left with him working closer to home and in lake county. He's the one who raised me which is why I enjoy being able to be closer at home. And working in Lake County has given me the opportunity to do so. Thank you

[Donte Smith](#) at March 24, 2021 at 4:02pm PDT

Support

Kindness farms has shown me nothing but respect and I would love to work there again this year if it is possible at all

[Meggan Bahm](#) at March 24, 2021 at 2:16pm PDT

Support

I was very fortunate to get an opportunity to go work at Kindness Farms this summer! The energy and the atmosphere of the employees there was amazing! I will gladly work there again this year if they'll have me! The location is really nice for me, working close to home is always nice.

[Somchai Thao](#) at March 24, 2021 at 2:16pm PDT

Support

I like working at kindness farm because of the clean and friendly environment. Also, kindness farm have supported me by being able to help around with my family during this pandemic.

[Jose Perez Ramirez](#) at March 24, 2021 at 1:17pm PDT

Support

Now a days its very difficult to find a job to keep supporting a family of 3 or more especially in lake conty. Kindness Farms provides employees with a great opportunity in life. It has good benefits and it encourages us to do better at life. Therefore, I please ask you to please keep this future going foward and let us have a brighter future.

[Emmanue De Leon](#) at March 24, 2021 at 12:58pm PDT

Support

I want to be part of this cause because Kindness Farms has provided us their support by giving us the chance to join their team. I want this cuse to continue because I enjoy working in a positve working autmosphere. I please urge you to let us continue with this [Carlos Montanez](#) at March 24, 2021 at 12:43pm PDT

Support

I fully support this cause. As you may already know it has been very difficult to find a job specially a good one. Before i started with Kindness Farms i was struggling to find a job to have my famliiy stabled. I please ask that we can continue with this busness to have a success future. Thank you! amazing journey. Thank You

[Jorge Amador](#) at March 24, 2021 at 12:37pm PDT

Support

As you may already know the COVID pandemic took many jobs away from us including mine. Last year I had the chance of working with Kindness Farms. The work atmosphere is great. Coworkers are united and it has been one of my best opportunities and i would like us to keep moving forward. Thank you in advance

[Justiano Miranda](#) at March 24, 2021 at 12:25pm PDT

Support

Today I want to join and succor this cause. I have been struggling to get employed and kindness Farms brought light to me and the ones that hold on to me. For this reason i urge you to please let us continue with this job opportunity. Thank You for your understanding.

[Oscar Alberto Flores Ramirez](#) at March 24, 2021 at 12:14pm PDT

It was especially hard to find work this summer due to the pandemic. If it wasn't for my job with Kindness Farms this summer, I would not have had work. I really hope I can continue to work there this summer.

[Bobby Dutcher](#) at March 24, 2021 at 8:37am PDT

Support

There seems to be confusion among the public and staff over the new Farmland Protection Zones. it seemed clear that this would define where outdoor cultivation would be allowed (outside FPZ's) and not allowed (inside FPZ's and 1,000 ft buffer). Staff still seems to feel outdoor cultivation is not allowed on the 4 farmland importance zones without permitting authority approval. After this, the ordinance needs to be updated to reduce confusion. It has not been updated since 2019, so an interested citizen would need to download County Code, then attempt to summarize the revisions made since that time. County staff even seems unclear as to how to interpret these changes. This still lacks a definition of "agriculture not related to cannabis". Timber production, livestock grazing, and hay production could be considered agriculture by an unhappy neighbor wanting to interfere with a neighbors cannabis project.

[Annje Dodd](#) at March 23, 2021 at 3:48pm PDT

This comment is in regards to the Grandfather Language - Will this language apply to ALL applicants within the Farmland Protection Zone that were deemed complete but have not received a Use Permit before December 15, 2020 regardless of the Farmland Designation?

[Marco Rico](#) at March 23, 2021 at 10:52am PDT

Support

I enjoyed working at Kindness Farms, I urge you to allow this farm to operate - there are many people whose livelihoods depend on this.

[yeng xiong](#) at March 23, 2021 at 10:38am PDT

Support

I worked at Kindness Farms last year in Lakeport. Finding a job has been difficult and I was thrilled to be hired last summer by the company. I was able to have a steady income and provide for my family. Like most farm workers, I was laid off after the season but am planning to work this coming summer. If the farm is not allowed to operate, I am extremely nervous about what that means for my family. I urge you to allow this farm to operate - there are many people whose livelihoods depend on this.

Public Comment Closed

Comm. Williams stated that he would like to change the order that the items are being discussed. Would like everyone to have a full understanding of what is being passed.

Comm. Hess asked Comm. Hess for clarification on his question, should public comment be reopened?

Comm. Williams and Comm. Hess conversed back and forth.

Comm. Brown suggested a lunch break

Comm Williams suggested a break, giving Toccarra Thomas, CDD Deputy Director time to address questions that came in via eComment.

Toccarra Thomas, CDD Deputy Director Reiterated her understanding of the questions she needed to research and respond to.

11:15 am. Break

11:45 a.m. Return from Break

Toccarra Thomas, CDD Deputy Director stated that there are 5,000 parcels within the Farmland Protected Zones where outdoor cannabis cultivation is expressly prohibited. There are a total of 53 outdoor commercial cannabis cultivation permit applications for properties within

Farmland Protection Zones; only 5 are deemed complete. There are 46 commercial cannabis cultivation applications for properties within Farmland Designation currently only 1 is deemed complete. There are currently 31 applications for Early Activation Permits.

Comm. Hess asked for clarification on if current EA request are within the Farmland protected zones or general?

Tocarra Thomas, CDD Deputy Director responded with a visual on an exclusion zone map, updated the previous night by the GIS department. Ms. Thomas also did a demonstration on which areas are recommended for indoor and outdoor cultivation. Ms. Thomas also reiterated the agenda items and answered questions regarding Farmland Protection zone and the 500 ft. buffer, if there was a way around it. Ms. Thomas gave an example of an applicant who was able to do so. Additional questions were asked as to the determination of an active or abandoned Ag garden and who would be responsible to make that decision. Ms. Thomas responded that both Staff and Applicant would have to research and a site visit would be required. Ms. Thomas also responded to questions regarding to the grandfather language and how it applies to Farmland designated zone, Ms. Thomas's response to that question was no. Ms. Thomas continued to give her responses to questions regarding Farmland Designation and Farmland Protected zones, greenhouses and Mixed lighting.

Comm. Williams requested clarification of deemed complete and incomplete and where the Sunset clause would go into effect.

Comm. Hess Inquired about the process of handling the 43 applicants deemed incomplete as of Dec 15, 2020.

Tocarra Thomas, CDD Deputy Director clarified that 24 projects in the FPZ which involves no outdoor cultivation in addition there are 5 projects in the FPZ that are deemed complete with a total of 24 projects in the FPZ. Ms. Thomas continued to explain that as to the FD there are 46 total projects and of that 46 only 1 is deemed complete.

Comm. Hess clarified that the Grandfather language would only apply to the 29 projects in the FPZ and the Sunset Language would only apply to the 24 applicant in the FPZ.

Tocarra Thomas, CDD Deputy Director further clarified that the 45 applicants in FD would need the 500 ft. buffer from existing Ag use or would need Vegetation screening up to 1 mile.

Comm. Williams requested clarification on projects deemed incomplete versus projects that were complete.

Toccarra Thomas, CDD Deputy Director reiterated the number of projects by zone.

Comm. Williams requested clarification on what deemed complete would mean for an applicant. Would it be complete prior to the CEQA process or after?

Comm. Hess requested clarification on whether the 46 projects on FD is there only 1 deemed complete and what status are the 45?

Toccarra Thomas, CDD Deputy Director stated that she would need to request that information from staff.

Comm. Hess asked of the 24 projects that would be affected by the Sunset clause are they currently in the same state of incompleteness?

Toccarra Thomas, CDD Deputy Director stated that she would need to request that information from staff.

Comm. Hess empathized with applicants that are far along in the application process who are now being informed that the finish lines has now been pushed further away.

Toccarra Thomas, CDD Deputy Director stated that she understood and reviewed upcoming Planning Commission hearings and the number of applicants up for Comm. Review. Also reiterated a few draw backs during the application process which included a lack of a complete biological assessment as well as delays due to applicants that changed the project description, those all lead to a delay in the approval process.

Comm. Williams stated that he was having an issue with the numbers presented concerning the deemed incomplete projects/applicants. Stated that the Grandfather language does not seem beneficial to allot of applicants. Made a suggestion that once the application is looked by planning we should be able to deem it as complete outside of the CEQA review.

Comm. Brown stated that he was in agreement with Comm. Williams. Decisions made today would have allot of impact.

Comm. Hess stated that he agreed with Comm. Williams and Brown. Referenced back to an earlier conversation in regards to applicants having to now do mixed lighting and losing acreage. Comm. Hess asked if the conversation only affected the 5 projects deemed complete. Who is now affected by the option of mixed light but to increase the acreage?

Tocarra Thomas, CDD Deputy Director responded that it would be determined on a case by case basis, there are different factors that come in to play i.e. license type requested, acreage size, zoning etc.

Comm. Hess clarified question, if a permit has been issued for an applicant to cultivate outdoors but now has to convert to mixed light which in essence reduces acreage would they be granted larger mixed light acreage.

Tocarra Thomas, CDD Deputy Director responded stating that the Grandfather Language would give up to three years for applicants to come in compliance. Applicant might consider changing their application license type request.

Comm. Hess stated that applicants would be cutting acreage in half which could have the potential to render a project unviable. Can applicants make up the outdoor cultivation loss with mixed lighting cultivation?

Tocarra Thomas, CDD Deputy Director stated that applicants have the potential to recoup some of the outdoor loss, applicants have three years to 22000 sq. ft. 3B mixed light or 100 acres.

Comm. Hess asked about the incentive. Is there a way to accommodate applicants with an increase of mixed light?

Tocarra Thomas, CDD Deputy Director referred back to previous comments of the 3B and increasing that acreage type.

Comm. Hess stated his empathy for applicants that would lose half of their acreage without an option to regain some of loss with mixed lighting.

Tocarra Thomas, CDD Deputy Director stated that it would be an immediate cut for applicants that fall under the Sunset language. Recommended that the conversation in regards to increased acreage for indoor grow should be revisited.

Comm. Price stated her concern in regards to applied in FPZ that are incomplete. Recommends an umbrella policy that would include more than just the 5 applicants deemed complete.

Comm. Williams agreed with Comm. Price. Comm. Williams stated that applicants with EA had already been given permission from the county to and that he was hopeful that the complete and incomplete percentage would be close.

Tocarra Thomas, CDD Deputy Director stated that due to lack of oversight from prior years, permits were issued but the process was not followed through on. Ms. Thomas stated that we are now working on streamlining the process.

Comm. Prices asked if the 45 including the 24 incomplete in the Farmland Protected Zone and offer those applicants a Statue of Limitations so they have a clean starting line?

Tocarra Thomas, CDD Deputy Director recommended that the grandfather clause could be expanded.

Comm. Hess stated that he would appreciate an expansion on the Grandfather language.

Tocarra Thomas, CDD Deputy Director discussed dates that the new process was in put in to effect.

Comm. Williams states that something has to pass to push the 6 that are deemed complete. However, he would also like to see something done for the incomplete applicants.

Comm. Brown stated that he is in support of the Grandfather Language expansion.

Tocarra Thomas, CDD Deputy Director presented the inclusion of new verbiage to the Grandfather language.

Comm. Williams stated that the feedback he has received from applicants that have completed their pre application appointment and feel that they are in good standing but are then informed otherwise.

Tocarra Thomas, CDD Deputy Director clarified what the purpose of the pre app meeting is. Ms. Thomas recommends that applicants should not cultivate until all necessary permits are obtained.

Comm. Hess asked what date would capture the 24 incomplete applications?

Nicole Johnson offered a legal perspective in regards to EA permits and MUP's. Ms. Johnson stated that an EA permit has an expiration date of 6 months and once the 6 month time frame expired the applicant is liable to all new zoning amendments and chances the ordinance. Nicole also mentioned that while an applicant is applying for an EA, they should also be in the process of applying for a Major or Minor Use permit. Once an Early Activation permit has expired a look into an applicants vested rights

as it pertains to the applicants Major or Minor Use Permit status was suggested.

Comm. Price asked is there a way to pull from the 24 incomplete to see if any were granted EA.

Nicole Johnson responded reiterating that the EA permit and Use Permits are different although in conjunction with one another. Staff would need to do a case by case analysis of each application to determine the investment in a project to make a decision.

Comm. Williams believes that applicants are vested once land has been purchased.

Nicole Johnson stated that risk are taken by applicants that have not received Use Permits but rely on an EA permit that has an expiration date. An applicant can be denied a Use permit although they were approved for an EA permit.

Comm. Hess suggested a continuance on item 3 and tackling 1, 2 and 5 of the staff report. Comm.

Tocarra Thomas, CDD Deputy Director agreed with Comm. Hess's suggestion.

Comm. Williams reiterates that the 6 complete applications need a resolution today and that there has to be a way to capture more of the incompletes.

Comm. Price agreed with Comm. Williams regarding getting the 6 complete applications a sense of direction and would like to see some process with the incomplete applications.

Comm. Williams asked Tocarra Thomas, CDD Deputy Director if the 6 complete applicants could be taken care of today? Referenced the Staff report.

Tocarra Thomas, CDD Deputy Director recommendation is to adopt the language that is presented. Revisit item after staff has completed an analysis of where everyone is in the application process.

Nicole Johnson asked if the language would be presented to the board. Ms. Johnson stated that even if a decision was made, it would still need the Board of Supervisors approval. Recommends broadening the definition of deemed complete or adapt the language today with recommendation that it be changed.

Comm. Hess questioned if the option exist that the BOS can be presented with the Grandfather language with recommendations to address the current incomplete applications.

Nicole Johnson stated that it can be done with a few adjustments to the language. Would suggest that a recommendation to the BOS for a broader definition for deemed complete.

Comm. Williams agreed that the 6 complete needed to be taken care of but states that the language needs to be more inclusive.

Nicole Johnson stated that she does not recommend using EA as the standard for deemed complete.

Comm. Williams suggested a time frame in which a project should be considered deemed complete. Comm. Williams referenced the time a fee is paid to be considered.

Tocarra Thomas, CDD Deputy Director addressed the comment made by Comm. Williams in regards to what the fee amount covered and the time frame involved to complete an initial study or the other reviews that are necessary.

Comm. Hess stated that risk cannot be eliminated from the process of submitting applications but agrees that language can be passed and add language that addresses the concern of the incomplete applications.

Nicole Johnson spoke again on the language and definition of deemed complete.

Comm. Hess stated that he was under the impression that we were moving along with the language to the BOS with added verbiage with the request to expand the language of deemed complete with an analysis required by staff. Comm. Hess also asked what language could be used.

Comm. Williams reference item 4 as the language that would be presented to the BOS.

Comm. Hess asked how the newly added language would affect the 6 deemed complete applications.

Tocarra Thomas, CDD Deputy Director stated that the adaption of the Grandfather language would take care of the 6 complete applications and the addition of 4 would ask the BOS for direction on how to move forward with the incompletes.

Comm. Hess stated that he supports passing the language of item 3 in the staff report with the addition of item 4 as a way of addressing concerns regarding the incomplete applications.

Comm. Price motioned, seconded by Comm. Hess move that the Planning Commission find this Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment, AM 21-01 is Categorically Exempt (CE 21-01) from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines pursuant to 15061(b)(3).

5 ayes, 0 nays – Motion Carried

Comm. Price motioned, seconded by Comm. Hess. Move that the Planning Commission recommend approval of the proposed Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment, AM 21-01 for the reasons listed in the staff report dated March 25, 2021

4 ayes – Motion Rescinded

Comm. Williams interjected questioning that the motion being voted on was only item 3.

Tocarra Thomas, CDD Deputy Director requested a point of clarification as she was under the impression that the votes were for all items on staff report.

Comm. Williams stated that he would prefer one item at a time as this can become confusing and items are voted on without the adequate discussion.

Tocarra Thomas, CDD Deputy Director asked Comm. Williams for clarification

Comm. Hess while we have made a head way with item number 3, he believed that Comm. Williams does not feel that the other items were not discussed in its entirety.

Tocarra Thomas, CDD Deputy Director recommends on holding off on the motions.

Comm. Williams stated that he felt that the other items have not been discussed. Would like to discuss item one in its entirety.

Tocarra Thomas, CDD Deputy Director asked if the vote should be rescinded since there is an active vote on the floor

Price motioned to rescind previous action, seconded by Comm. Hess

5 ayes, 0 Nays Motion Carried

Comm. Brown has no issue with the language as it is presented.

Comm. Williams has no concerns with most of the language but his main concerns was with item number 1 and also stated that he had comments for item number 5 that he was not able to discuss.

Comm. Hess recommended working through item 1

Comm. William stated that item 1 needs further discussion and is recommending to table item 1 and pass a vote on the other items.

Comm. Brown comments on Comm. Williams statements.

Comm. Price commented that she is ok with tabling item 1, she feels that headway has been made on the other items brought forth.

Comm. Hess also agrees with tabling item 1. Comm. Hess also commented on the reason he feels that the BOS voted as they did on item 5 of the Staff Report.

Comm. Hess moves that item number 1 be continued and is asking to take action on the other items.

Comm. Hess motions to the continue item 1 and pass items 2 through 5 with the addition of Bottle Rock road being added to item 5.

Nicole Johnson requested to have Comm. Separate the motion into 2 items.

Comm. Hess amends motion to address only item 1 be continued to the next Planning Commission meeting, seconded by Comm. Price.

5 Ayes, 0 Nays – Motion Carried

Comm. Hess moves that item 2 through 5 be passed and submit their recommendations to the Board of Supervisors, seconded by Comm. Price.

5 Ayes, 0 Nays – Motion Carried.

Tocarra Thomas, CDD Deputy Director mentioned to that there are motions that still need to be addressed.

Comm. Price motions, seconded by Comm. Hess that the Planning Commission find this Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment, AM 21-01 is Categorically Exempt (CE 21-01) from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines pursuant to 15061(b)(3).

5 Ayes, 0 Nays – Motion Carried.

Comm. Price motions, seconded by Comm. Chavez that the Planning Commission render its final decision on the proposed Ordinance text amendments within ten (10) days of said final decision, in the form of a Resolution of Intention to the Board of Supervisors recommending the formal adoption and approval of these Zoning Ordinance Text Amendments, AM 21-01 as outlined in the staff report dated March 25, 2021.

5 Ayes, 0 Nays – Motion Carried.

NOTE: The applicant or any interested person is reminded that the Zoning Ordinance provides for a seven (7) calendar day appeal period. If there is a disagreement with the Planning Commission, an appeal to the Board of Supervisors may be filed. The appropriate forms and applicable fee must be submitted prior to 5:00 p.m. on or before the seventh calendar day following the Commission's final determination.

Untimed Staff Updates

1:53 p.m. Adjourned