

LAKE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING

April 22, 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

P Scott DeLeon, CDD Director
A Toccarra Thomas, Deputy Director
P Eric Porter, Associate Planner
P Victor Fernandez
P Sateur Ham
P Nicole Johnson, Deputy City Counsel
P Kerrian Marriott, Office Assistant III

REGULAR MEETING

9:00 a.m. CALL TO ORDER

Pledge of Allegiance lead by Comm. Brown

9:01 a.m. ACTION ON MINUTES

Comm. Hess motioned to approve the minutes from the April 8, 2021 PC Hearing seconded by Comm. Price.

5 Ayes, 0 Nays -- Motion Carried

9:02 a.m. Scott DeLeon made an announcement regarding item number two (UP 19-46) Applicant/Owner: Stuart Spivack. Item recommended to continue until May 13th, 2021.

Nicole Johnson stated that the item would still need to be read and a continuation suggested at the time the item is scheduled on the agenda. Which would be when a continuation date would be determined.

9:05 a.m. Public Hearing to consider MAJOR USE PERMIT (UP 19-47) on Thursday, April 22, 2021, 9:05 a.m., in the Board of Supervisors' Chambers, 255 N. Forbes Street, Lakeport, California. Due to the COVID-19 crisis, meetings of the Lake County Planning Commission will be available for participation virtually via Zoom and in the Board Chambers subject to social distancing requirements. Owner/Applicant: Work Right Building LLC. Proposed Project: (1) Type 6 "Non-Volatile Cannabis Manufacturing License", (1) "Cannabis Processor License" and (1) Type 11 "Cannabis Distributor License" consisting of 48,100 square feet of processing area, 690 square feet of manufacturing area, and 1,810 square feet of distribution area located within an existing 60,000 square foot building. Location: 4615 Work Right Circle, Lakeport, CA; APN: 008-032-51. Environmental Evaluation: Categorical Exemption (CE 21-06).

Victor Fernandez Planner gave a visual and verbal presentation of proposed project.

Comm. Hess commented on a minor correction to staff's report, pg. 2 referenced 2-6 deliveries must state per day or per week cannot be for the entirety of peak season.

Alicia Russel Director of Operations Work Right LLC for ProFarms gave an introduction to the company, a historic review of the ProFarms building while providing employment information and benefits for Lake County Resident. Ms. Russel spoke on the inclusivity of their employment package, as well as their involvement with the Community. Listed a few local programs that the organization is involved with.

9:26 a.m. Public Comment –

Bill Burnetti spoke highly of Pro Farms and the repurposing of the building along with the company bringing jobs to the county. Mr. Burnetti stated that he hadn't experienced an odor issue, he lives within close proximity to the site location and wanted to show his support.

Nancy Ruzicka, Spoke on her the personal history with the prior owners of Work Right, the company originating in Lakeport. Ms. Ruzicka was there to show her support for the project.

Pamela Harpster with Management connections, a local staffing agency stated that she had visited the ProFarms site and was impressed with the overall appearance and working conditions for the employees and is showing her support for the project.

Mark Ruzicka stated he supported the project thus far ProFarms has done what they've said they would do in regards to community support.

Joe Perdu lives in close proximity to site and is in support of the project. Mr. Perdu referenced another agenda item that he had concerns about, both Comm. Price and Comm. Hess clarified that his concerns were for a later item on the agenda.

9:40 a.m. Public Comment Closed.

Comm. Price stated that she is a resident of Lakeport and remembered the building, she was happy that the building was going to be revitalized and that she supported the project.

Comm. Hess agreed with Comm. Price and added that it was important that products produced in the county should be processed within the county, stated that he believed this was a missing component.

Comm. Williams stated his excitement about the start of the day, has heard great things about ProFarms.

Comm. Price Moved to Motion. Seconded by Comm. Chavez find that the Categorical Exemption (CE 21-06) applied for by Work Right Building, LLC on property located at 4615 Work Right Circle, Lakeport, CA and further described as APN: 008-032-51 will not have a significant effect on the environment and therefore a Categorical Exemption shall be approved with the findings listed in the staff report dated April 12, 2021.

5 Ayes, 0 Nays -- Motion Carried

Comm. Price Moved to Motion. Seconded by Comm. Chavez find that the Major Use Permit (UP 19-47) applied for by Work Right Building, LLC on property located at 4615 Work Right Circle, Lakeport, CA, further described as APN: 008-032-51 does meet the requirements of Section 51.4 and Article 27, Section (aaa), (au), (av), and (ax) 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 April 12, 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.

9:44 a.m. Public Hearing to consider MAJOR USE PERMIT (UP 19-46) on Thursday, April 22, 2021, 9:10 a.m., in the Board of Supervisors' Chambers, 255 N. Forbes Street, Lakeport, California. Due to the COVID-19 crisis, meetings of the Lake County Planning Commission will be available for participation virtually via Zoom and in the Board Chambers subject to social distancing requirements. Applicant/Owner: Stuart Spivack. Proposed Project: Applicant is applying for a total of 28,012 square feet canopy area within a total of 28,252 square feet of cultivation area and facilities including (2) 120 square feet accessory structures and water tanks. Location: 1027 Watertrough Road, Clearlake Oaks, CA; APN(s): 628-100-10. Environmental Evaluation: Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS 19-65).

Scott Deleon Community Development Director stated staff had received significant public input as late as the evening prior and staff was unable to put together a comprehensive response for the items received. Staff is recommending that item be continued to the next available Planning Commission Meeting.

Comm. Hess stated that he supported the suggested continuance.

Comm. Williams stated that he would second the motion.

Comm. Hess asked legal counsel if public comment could be opened.

Nicole Johnson Deputy City Counsel responded that public comment could be opened but the public would be commenting on a report that would be different when presented on the continuation date.

Comm. Hess Moved to Motion. Seconded by Comm. Price that the item be continued to the following Planning Commissioners hearing on May 13th, 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.

9:51 a.m. Public Hearing to consider MAJOR USE PERMIT (UP 20-03) on Thursday, April 22, 2021, 9:15 a.m., in the Board of Supervisors' Chambers, 255 N. Forbes Street, Lakeport, California. Due to the COVID-19 crisis, meetings of the Lake County Planning Commission will be available for participation virtually via Zoom and in the Board Chambers subject to social distancing requirements. Applicant: Freddie Alvarez. Owner: Alvarez Ignacio Trustee. Proposed Project: Applicant is applying for 131,000 square feet of outdoor canopy area and 500 square feet indoor canopy within a 600 square feet metal building. It will take place over four site locations totaling up to 3.6 acres of cultivation area within the property. Location: 12990 Spruce Grove Road, Lower Lake, CA; APN: 012-067-40. Environmental Evaluation: Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS 20-33).

Sateur Ham Planner gave a verbal and visual presentation on proposed project.

Comm. Williams asked if applicant was early activated last year.

Sateur Ham responded that the applicant had received an Early Activation permit last year for outdoor grow.

Freddie Alvarez applicant spoke on his history with Lake County as a resident and believed his project would add to local employment. Also stated his intentions of being actively involved with the Community.

Comm. Hess asked how many employees would be on staff during the year.

Freddie Alvarez responded that he had four current staff members, spoke on possibilities of unionizing which is where he intended to get his employees during peak season.

Comm. Hess asked about public access to the site. Spoke on a letter received from attorney William Painter representing Maureen and Servanto Garcia who voiced concerns regarding the use of the easement for commercial use. Comm. Hess asked if Mr. Alvarez had made contact with neighbors and if an arrangement or understanding had been made.

Freddie Alvarez stated that he had several points of communication with Mr. and Mrs. Garcia and both have come to an arrangement.

Comm. Hess referenced photos submitted by Mr. and Mrs. Garcia regarding concerns of the road use.

Freddie Alvarez stated that the he had legal rights to fix the easement of the road, both himself and Mr. and Mrs. Garcia with an attorney present had reached an agreement that they were both satisfied with.

Comm. Williams asked if applicant was Early Activated did applicant grow with a state license.

Freddie Alvarez stated that he did not cultivate. No plants were currently on the property, Mr. Alvarez stated that he was waiting for a license from Cal Cannabis.

Public Comment –

William Painter an attorney in Sonoma, representing the owner of the property that the easement traverses through Mr. and Mrs. Garcia. Mr. Painter stated his clients had made no arrangements with applicant, they have objected and a cease and desist was sent to applicant last year (2020) and applicant ignored the request. Mr. Painter shared is clients concerns as it related to the use of the road easement and shared his client's objection to the project.

Marg Levenson stated that she was unable to hear anything via zoom starting from 9:49 a.m.

Comm. Hess asked council regarding technical concerns if there was anything to do.

Nicole Johnson stated parts of the presentation could be requested for staff to repeat if it was during the current item. However if the item was already voted on it would be difficult to revisit.

Comm. Hess addressed public speaker Marg Levenson that the item had already been voted on.

Nicole Williams spoke in support of the proposed project. Ms. Williams spoke on her 20 year background in Cannabis and her perception of the Alvarez's farm cleanliness and their integrity.

Maureen Garcia spoke of her displeasure with the project. Mrs. Garcia stated that there had been no arrangements made with the applicant. The easement road goes directly through her property and she objects to the project.

Leanne Nakashima stated her support for the project. Ms. Nakashima stated she had not seen a cleaner facility and the applicant was working with the Lake County Fire Department for fire preparedness. Ms. Nakashima also spoke of the applicants wage and employment plans for Lake County Residents. Ms. Nakashima spoke on the applicants Sonoma location and its current success.

Freddie Alvarez invited Mr. Painter and Mrs. Garcia for dinner to further discuss concerns.

Comm. Chavez asked applicant if he had a plan to address Mr. and Mrs. Garcia easement concerns.

Comm. Hess stated that he would like to add to Comm. Chavez's question stating that the Garcia's had several options to resolve their concerns i.e. an appeal could be submitted as well as legal action could be pursued. Comm. Hess stated that it was not the role of the Commissioners to order the applicant and the Garcia's to come to an agreement.

Nicole Johnson agreed with the Comm. Hess in regards to the Commissioner's role as it pertained to the enforcement of an easement. Ms. Johnson also stated that the Commissioners could vote yes or no on a project if the findings did not support the use.

10:30 a.m. Public Comment Closed

Comm. Hess Moved to Motion, Seconded by Comm. Chavez find that the Major Use Permit (UP 20-03) applied for by Alvarez Family Farm, Inc. (Freddie Alvarez) on property located at 12990 Spruce Grove Road, Lower Lake, CA, further described as APNs: 012-067-40 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 April 22, 2021.

5 Ayes, 0 Nays, - Motion Carried

Comm. Hess Moved to Motion, Seconded by Comm. Chavez find that the Major Use Permit (UP 20-03) applied for by Alvarez Family Farm, Inc. (Freddie Alvarez) on property located at 12990 Spruce Grove

Road, Lower Lake, CA, further described as APNs: 012-067-40 does meet the requirements of Section 51.4 and Article 27, Section 1(at) [i, ii] 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 April 22, 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.

11:11 a.m. Public Hearing to consider MAJOR USE PERMIT (UP 20-28) on Thursday, April 22, 2021, 9:20 a.m., in the Board of Supervisors' Chambers, 255 N. Forbes Street, Lakeport, California. Due to the COVID-19 crisis, meetings of the Lake County Planning Commission will be available for participation virtually via Zoom and in the Board Chambers subject to social distancing requirements. Applicant: Gustafson Farms, LLC (Joseph Gustafson) Owner: Walter Stryker. Proposed Project: Applicant is applying for a total of 111,620 square feet canopy (89,620 square feet outdoor and 22,000 square feet mixed-light) area within a total of 237,220 square feet of cultivation area and facilities including 50,000 square feet processing facility, 24,000 square feet of greenhouse for nursery, 50,000 square feet for drying facility, (3) storage sheds, and 23,000 square feet of greenhouse structures for mixed-light canopy. Location: 4440, 4460, 4520, 4550 George Road, Lakeport, CA; APN(s): 008-031-48, 008-031-60, 008-032-43, and 008-032-44. Environmental Evaluation: Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS 20-33).

Sateur Ham gave a verbal and visual presentation on proposed project. Ms. Ham added an additional condition of approval stating the permit will have no effect until ordinance 3103 May 20, 2021 be in effect. Should ordinance 3103 not go in effect the permit shall be void.

Comm. Hess asked when the applicant was issued an Early Activation Permit.

Nicole Johnson County Legal Counsel stated that ordinance 3103 which goes into effect May 20, 2021, 30 days after its adoption. Ms. Johnson stated that permits approved today would fall under the current ordinance unless a condition was added to adopt the new ordinance.

Comm. Hess referenced a letter from the CDFW regarding a site visit to the applicant's project in July of 2020 which inspired his question to confirm the applicants Early Activation date.

Joseph Gustafvson applicant stated that he was available for questions.

10:53 a.m. Public Comment –

Steven Hajik AG Commissioner spoke to his opposition of the project. Mr. Hajik stated that the applicant had broken numerous regulations i.e. operating an outdoor grow in zoned AG land, two visited hemp sites which tested positive for Cannabis and numerous concerns brought forth by the Fish and Wildlife Department.

Joe Purdue Neighbor spoke on the access road to applicant's site which was by his house. Mr. Purdue had concerns with increased traffic, although a speed limit sign was added it was rarely observed. Mr. Purdue also shared his concerns with the increase of garbage, dust and noise from the proposed project.

Bill Burnetti a Neighbor stated that the proposed project was not compatible with the area. The area although an AG area, was still well populated. Refereed to a letter received from the applicant to the surrounding neighbors after a petition was completed with approximately 100 signatures, letter referenced odor control, the word ultimately was utilized which Mr Burnetti stated gave the occupant an abundance of time to complete. Mr. Burnetti spoke on the overpowering smell he experienced from another neighbor's property. Mr. Burnetti also spoke on his concern regarding the increase in traffic.

Brandy Parley Neighbor to applicant's site shared her concerns with the increased traffic, trash and concerns regarding water usage.

Sarah Parley Neighbor to applicant's site shared her traffic concerns and her opposition to the project.

Don Dukker former Planning Commissioner and Neighbor to the project site stated he had a copy of the Early Activation which had 33 conditions, prior to cultivation, many of the required conditions were still not in compliance. Mr. Dukker stated that the applicant no longer had any credibility. Mr. Dukker stated a performance review requirement was not met and he was certain a compliance review was not completed

Comm. Hess asked Mr. Dukker what date he had on the Early Activation permit for the applicant.

Don Dukker responded that it was dated May 27th, 2020.

Diane Dukker stated that she wrote a letter that was hand delivered to Staff but she did not see it attached to the agenda item, stated she would like it on the record.

Comm. Hess stated that he had read Ms. Dukker's letter.

Brenna Sullivan with the Lake County Farm Bureau stated that the applicant's site was not isolated from farm land, the project had required an agreement to grow within a hoop house prior to transitioning to a greenhouse. Ms. Sullivan stated this project could make use of the Sunset Clause but staff report was unclear. Ms. Sullivan stated that the project should not be approved as proposed. Ms. Sullivan stated Applicant was currently not in good standing with the State and local ordinance.

Comm. Hess asked for clarification regarding hoop houses and greenhouses. Comm. Hess referenced article 27 stating hoop houses are prohibited

Comm. Williams asked if hoop houses were prohibited for personal use.

Comm. Hess responded that the article just stated prohibited.

Trey Sherrell consultant to licensed cannabis cultivators, offered to speak on article 27 as it pertained to hoop house which is only mentioned in sections of personal cultivation but not in commercial cultivation.

Joseph Gustafson applicant addressed his neighbor's stating that any CDFW violations were 50 year old culverts that had since been mitigated. Mr. Gustafson stated that he was currently in good standing with the State, has graveled road to site entry but plans on paving if the project is approved. Has had several agency visit, but is only staging in preparation of licensing or project would be shut down. Intentions are to grow outdoor for one year prior to transitioning to a greenhouse. Mr. Gustafson stated he was not opposed to going to greenhouses this grow season. Also addressed garbage concerns, spoke on traffic concerns during peak season. Mr. Gustafson reiterated that all his violations had been cleared and referenced his other grow locations and number of employees.

Comm. Hess referenced an email from staff and water board, which staff was informed that as of February 24, 2021 the applicant was still under scrutiny, violations still existed and applicant's site was considered a tier 2 high risk violation site with the Central Valley Water Board. Comm. Hess asked Mr. Gustafson if all violations had been resolved

Joseph Gustafson stated that yes all his violations had been cleared. Stated that the property had several violations, he admitted to placing a

pipe in an incorrect location which resulted in a violation but states that the others came with the property at the time of purchase.

Comm. Hess asked for clarification on violation on Mr. Gustafson's Spruce Grove properties.

Joseph Gustafson stated that the properties were still listed as having violations. Mr. Gustafson stated the process of having violations remedied, i.e. obtaining a mitigation plan and an engineer, along with all the fees required prior to an apt being scheduled for a field study.

Nicole Johnson County Legal Counsel responded to Comm. Hess's question regarding hoop houses and article 27 stating that hoop houses restrictions were mentioned for private use but was not referenced for commercial use.

Scott Deleon CDD Deputy Director stated that hoop house were introduced at the board as a temporary structure, they provided protection and a barrier for the plants and should only be used as a transition to greenhouses.

Brenna Sullivan agreed with Comm. Hess, hoop houses were not qualified as a greenhouse under Farm Land Protection. Hoop houses were to get through the transitional period.

11:36 a.m. Public Comment Closed

Comm. Williams inquired if applicant had open violations with fish and game. Comm. Williams also requested Legal Counsels recommendation on how to proceed with a vote should applicant still have existing violations.

Nicole Johnson answered Comm. Williams stated that the added language to the applicants conditions of approval the permit would not be effective until Ordinance 3103 went into effective. If Ordinance is challenged, the permit would be void. If applicant does work prior to permit being in effect, the permit could be revocable. Ms. Johnson continued by stating that staff could be requested to provide additional information for clarity but the Commissioners can approve or disapprove, if they thought an applicant didn't meet the requirements.

Comm. Price thanked the public, stated that she had visited the proposed site location. Comm. Price confirmed the entry to site being a dirt road and asked applicant about his discussion with his neighbors and their concerns with the increase in traffic. Comm. Price acknowledged that applicant would be open to paving the dirt road and fixing the culverts.

Comm. Price mentioned her main concern would be the increase in traffic and its effects on the neighbors.

Comm. Hess suggested that applicant repurpose his agreement and adjust his application for an indoor grow.

Comm. Price agreed with Comm. Hess, asked if violation had been cleared.

Comm. Williams agreed with fellow commissioners, unless staff can provide documents that violations had been cleared.

Scott Deleon CDD Deputy Director referenced an email received by staff that morning which stated that the applicant still had outstanding violations. CDFA stated that applicant was working on violations but they are still there with fish and wild life.

Joseph Gustafson responded that violations had not been cleared but up to date, just needed the agency to complete a site visit. Mr. Gustafson stated that he could not get a State Permit without a Use Permit.

Comm. Williams asked Scott Deleon for clarification if applicant could not obtain a state license without a Use Permit.

Scott Deleon Confirmed, state does require a local permit prior to issuing a permit.

Comm. Chavez stated that he believed applicant had good faith in regards to applicant's willingness to work with neighbors.

Comm. Brown commented that good faith was important but had concerns regarding neighbors' concerns. He would prefer a stronger commitment from the applicant and that he was still hesitant to support project.

Comm. Hess shared Comm. Brown's reservations, stating that he believes the applicant to be supremely optimistic that the agency will sign off on the violations after their visit.

Comm. Price agreed with Comm. Hess.

Comm. Williams agreed with both Comm. Hess and Comm. Price stating that there would be a path forward if applicant changed his land use and if staff was also able to confirm violations were clear. Comm. Williams proposed a continuation without a set date, giving applicant time to have a better status of current violations.

Comm. Price asked applicant if he had considered using Matthews's road as an access point.

Joseph Gustafson answered that he could utilize Matthews Road and would instead utilize George Road as a fire use only. He would be willing to conform if necessary and to work with his neighbors.

Comm. Brown recommended a continuation on the item for another date.

Comm. Price asked if 30 days would be sufficient time for applicant to get all the information to staff.

Joseph Gustafson asked if the commissioners would consider adding conditions for an approval.

Comm. Hess stated he was not in support of an outdoor grow but was in support of a continuation.

Comm. Williams stated that he was in support of a continuation in addition Ordinance 3103 would be in effect, so applicant would need to be in greenhouse or temporary hoop houses. Comm. Williams requested clarification from council.

Nicole Johnson confirmed new ordinance takes affect prior to applicants continuation date.

Comm. Price Moved to Motion, seconded by Comm. Williams to continue item to a date certain of May 27th. 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.

12:09 p.m. Break until 12:30 p.m.

12:32 p.m. Public Hearing to consider a Rezone (RZ 19-02) and General Plan Amendment (GPAP 19-02) to change the zoning of a property from R-3 High Density Residential to R1 Low Density Residential; to change the General Plan designation of a property from High Density Residential to Low Density Residential, and consideration of a Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS 19-41) on Thursday April 22, 2021, 9:25 a.m., in the Board of Supervisors' Chambers, 255 N. Forbes Street, Lakeport, California. Applicant/Owner: Richard Siri. Proposed Project: Rezone and General Plan amendment on a property presently zoned R3. Location: 4436 Lakeshore Boulevard, Lakeport, CA; APN: 029-141-22. Environmental Evaluation: Mitigated Negative Declaration.

Eric Porter gave a verbal presentation on proposed project. Motions provided in staff report was updated the revised version submitted the prior week. First of four zoning plans proposed for current year. The project had no boundary change request and no adverse comments were received. Mr. Porter also stated a few minor corrections to the conditions of approval.

1:19 p.m. Public Comment – None

Comm. Price Moved to Motion, Seconded by Comm. Chavez find the General Plan Amendment (GPAP 19-02) and Rezone (RZ 19-02) applied for by Richard and Beverly Siri on property located at 4436 Lakeshore Blvd., Lakeport further described as APN: 029-141-22 adopts the mitigated negative declaration (IS 19-41) based on the findings set forth in the staff report dated April 22, 2021.

5 Ayes, 0 Nays. Motion Carried

Comm. Price Moved to Motion, Seconded by Comm. Hess find that the General Plan Amendment (GPAP 19-02) applied for by Richard and Beverly Siri on property located 4436 Lakeshore Blvd., Lakeport further described as APN: 029-141-22 does meet the requirements of Section 47.22 and Article 10 of the Lake County Zoning Ordinance and the General Plan Amendment be granted subject to the findings listed in the staff report dated April 22, 2021.

5 Ayes, 0 Nays. Motion Carried

Comm. Price Moved to Motion, Seconded by Comm. Chavez find the Rezone (RZ 19-02) applied for by Richard and Beverly Siri on property located at 4436 Lakeshore Blvd., Lakeport further described as APN: 029-141-22 does meet the requirements of Section 47.22 and Article 10 of the Lake County Zoning Ordinance and the Rezone be granted subject to the findings listed in the staff report dated April 22, 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.

12:19 p.m. Public Hearing to consider MAJOR USE PERMIT (UP 19-08) on Thursday April 22, 2021, 9:30 a.m., in the Board of Supervisors' Chambers, 255 N. Forbes Street, Lakeport, California. Applicant / Owner: Golden State Herb. Proposed Project: (1) A Type 3 (medium outdoor) commercial cannabis cultivation license; (4) A-Type 2 small outdoor commercial cannabis licenses, and (1) A-Type 13 'self-distribution' license. Location: 8550 Highway 175, Kelseyville, CA; APN: 011-055-06. Environmental Evaluation: Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS 19-14).

Eric Porter Associate Planner gave a verbal presentation on proposed project a continuation from January 14, 2021 Planning Commission hearing. Mr. Porter stated that the application qualified under the new Ordinance 3103 and can transition from hoop houses to greenhouses within a period of time. Applicant would need a revision showing reduction of overall grow sq. ft.

Nicole Johnson assisted Mr. Porter with legal language proposed, which stated that the permit would not be in effect until ordinance 3103 was in effect on May 20th, 2021. Should ordinance 3103 not go in affect, the permit would be void. Any work completed by the applicant prior to the permit being in effect could lead to revocation. Ms. Johnson also asked Mr. Porter to speak on the transitional activities under CEQA.

Mr. Porter responded it would require a revision to site plan and CEQA analyst and possibly another Hearing.

Comm. Price stated that she visited site and was impressed with property.

Nicole Johnson voiced her concern with activities not approved under CEQA. Ms. Johnson asked what activities were being approved under the permit. Ms. Johnson stated that she does not recommend an open ended permit.

Mr. Porter responded that the applicant will need to amend scope of project to comply with Ordinance 3103. A new CEQA analyst would be needed. Due to the Sunset Clause within Ordinance 3103 there would be a limited duration to the outdoor aspect of the permit, staff would require modified staff plans i.e. might require less water, how tall the greenhouses structures will be.

Comm. Williams stated that he did not consider the permit open ended, as he understood it, the applicant would have to conform to greenhouses with a new CEQA analyst and building plans after the three year time allotted.

Comm. Hess stated that he believed that staff had added enough content and clarity and he was comfortable moving forward.

Crystal Keesey Applicant spoke on the duration of the process as she fought her own health battle. Ms. Keesey expressed her gratitude to Staff and Commissioners.

12:48 p.m. Public Comment – None

Comm. Price Moved to Motion, Seconded by Comm. Williams find that the Initial Study (IS 19-14) applied for by Golden State Herb on property located at 8550 Highway 175, Kelseyville, and further described as APN: 011-055-06 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 April 22, 2021 and as amended here today.

5 Ayes, 0 Nays. Motion Carried

Comm. Price Moved to Motion, Seconded by Comm. Hess find that the Use Permit (UP 19-08) applied for by Golden State Herb on property located at 8550 Highway 175, Kelseyville, and further described as APN: 011-055-06 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 April 22, 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.

1:12 p.m. Public Hearing to take place on Thursday, April 22, 2021 at 9:35 a.m. in the Lake County Courthouse. Applicant/Owner: WeGrow LLC / Zarina Otchkova. Proposed Project: Fifteen (15) A-Type 3B mixed light commercial cannabis cultivation licenses; one (1) A-Type 1C 'specialty cottage' (greenhouse) license, and one A-Type 13 'Self Distribution' license. The applicant is proposing thirty (30) 90' x 125' greenhouses; one (1) 90' x 112' greenhouse; four (4) 90' x 125'

nursery greenhouses; four (4) 50' x 100' drying buildings; one (1) 200 sq. ft. shed; four (4) 2,500 gallon water tanks; one (1) 6-foot tall galvanized woven wire fence covered with privacy mesh to screen the greenhouses from public view. Total proposed cultivation area is 400,405 sq. ft. (roughly 9 acres). Location: 16750 Herrington Road, Middletown, CA (cultivation site); 17610 Sandy Road, Middletown, and 19678 Stinson Road, Middletown consisting of 309+ acres. APNs: 013-060-40 (cultivation site); 013-014-03 and 013-014-11. Environmental Evaluation: Mitigated Negative Declaration IS 20-25.

Eric Porter gave a verbal presentation on proposed project. Cultivation would be completed inside 15 greenhouses requested. The site is heavily treed. Mr. Porter spoke on 80 opposing letters from neighbors. Mr. Porter also stated that the applicant had verbally agreed to obtain a 5000 gl. Metal water tank with fire department connection hoses.

Comm. Price stated that she completed a site visit and was pleased with spruce grove entry location and the distance from neighbors but does understand the concerns of the neighbors and the sites visual impact.

Eric Porter stated that the sites outer boundary was approximately 1000 ft. outside of the 1000 ft. setback and was approximately a half a mile from the first parcel in Hidden Valley Lake.

Comm. Hess asked Mr. Porter about the energy usage portion of the conditions of approval inquiring that if PG&E and other traditional sources were not available, solar would be considered but under no circumstances were the applicants could the applicants use generators as a substitute.

Eric Porter Stated that he wanted the cultivator to come up with an alternate energy solution and that generator was not to be used.

Comm. Hess stated that he was a resident of Hidden Valley Lake, believes that the proposed site will be visible and would request eight ft. fence elevations in some areas.

Comm. Williams stated he could support an eight ft. screening.

Zarina Otchkova applicant spoke on a letter submitted and on record, addressing neighbor concerns and plans of mitigating such concerns.

Comm. Hess asked about the water usage plan and replacement trees and why mitigation measures were not included in the report. Comm. Hess addressed the concern that the only well report provided was dated from 1997 and requested a recent report. Comm. Hess also requested that

applicant provide a more current report or he would request that it be added to the conditions of approval.

Sufyan Hamouda consultant for applicant stated that the secondary Biological report was completed in late spring, which accredited to it not being on the report. Mr. Hamouda also stated that two well reports were submitted, which shows the well recharge rate at eight with a 72 percent recharge rate and the other at 40 gall., with a 98 percent recharge rate within 30 minutes Mr. Hamouda stated that it would not be an issue if a request for more frequent well meter reads were added to the conditions.

Comm. Hess referred to a letter submitted by applicant in which she addressed road concerns from Tinilyn and Jaclyn and her proposed meditative approach. Comm. Hess also voiced his concerns regarding violations and addressed the communities concerns regarding stolen equipment from the proposed site.

Sufyan Hamouda stated they had reached out to CHP numerous times and was unable to obtain any information pertaining to the applicant or the property regarding any criminal activity. Mr. Hamouda stated that the applicant would be willing to reach out and financially assist with road repair if necessary,

Comm. Hess stated that he was able to obtain a report of the stolen items and the occurrence happened after applicant obtained property. Comm. Hess the asked why the equipment was on the property.

Sufyan Hamouda stated that the incident occurred a month after applicant had obtained the property and neither herself, nor her equipment was on the site.

Comm. Williams asked if there was a cannabis violation, were plants cultivated and was this site Early Activation.

Eric Porter stated that applicant did not qualify for an EA permit last year. Also mentioned that he was unaware of illegal activity on the site.

Sufyan Hamouda There was illegal cultivation on the property to the south of project site but it did not involve the applicant.

Comm. Williams confirmed that it was not on the applicants proposed project site.

Comm. Hess asked about current and past generator use as the community had voiced noise concerns.

Sufyan Hamouda stated that the noise concern might be from the drilling of a well being put in but no generators have been used.

Comm. Brown disclosed that he would have to leave the meeting at 2 p.m.

Comm. Price offered to proceed as acting chair.

1:27 p.m. Public Comment –

Scott Nickelson neighbor on the eastern boundary of project is opposed to the project. Mr. Nickelson expressed his concerns regarding water usage, access through a residential subdivision, Visual concerns and history of illegal activity, biological report he feels was inadequate. Mr. Nickelson stated that the proposed project was out of scale for area. Mr. Nickelson thanked staff for their responsiveness.

Thomas Lafton neighbor stated that he believed it was not the right time or right place for this proposed project. Mr. Lafton stated that although it is a rural area, it was still a residential area with a suburban feel. Mr. Lafton expressed his concern with water usage for 40 green houses as well as his concern for the increase in traffic.

Jeremy Pickens neighbor expressed his concern for water usage and for the safety of his family as it pertained to looters.

Olivia Cude neighbor stated that while she is not opposed to the legal growing of cannabis, she is opposed to grows in residential areas and had concerns regarding water usage. Ms. Cude also voiced her concern for visitors to the site and the mountainous terrain lack of sidewalks and street lights leading to Herrington would potentially place children in danger, drivers would have difficulty seeing small children. Ms. Cude also voiced her concerns of smell. Ms. Cude asked the commissioners to deny project at its proposed location.

Thomas Lafton stated that the proposed project was not the right time or the right place. Mr. Lafton voiced several concerns including water usage, an increase in traffic through a residential area and stated that he believed property values would decrease. Mr. Lafton stated he had concerns regarding noise with the drilling of the well and strongly opposes the project.

Doug Burman neighbor agreed with Ms. Cude's comment in reference to not objecting to the legal grow of Cannabis but voiced his concerns regarding the proposed site location and the affects the current year's drought would have on the surrounding properties. Mr. Burman suggested a revision to the cannabis exclusion map as the lines are drawn

very closely to population density areas. Mr. Cude stated his opposition to the project.

Dan Levine lives in shadow hills will have a clear view of the proposed grow site and compares the overall sq. ft. to that of 13 football fields asked how many generators would be needed to cover the acreage if power went out. Mr. Levine spoke of the residents that live on George road, whose lives had been negatively impacted. Referenced CEQA section 15021 and its provision for decent home and living environment for residents. Mr. Levine stated that the Initial Study was incorrect as the grow site exceeds its size limit based on the overall size of the property. Mr. Levine voice his concerns of road wear and asked who would be financially responsible for repairs.

Donna Mackiewicz opposes the project and spoke on the negative effects cutting down oak trees would have on the 100's of different types of bird species that call the Oaks home. Ms. Mackiewicz suggested a mitigation addition of nest boxes.

Misha Grothe resident opposes the project for several reasons. Ms. Grothe aquifer as well as how the drought will affect her well in the upcoming years. Ms. Grothe asked how the county could consider such a massive consumption of water at this time. Ms. Grothe stated her concerns for the usage of the road, the increase in traffic as well as air quality and odor concerns which would decrease home value.

Kelly Davis voiced her concerns for the damage and use of the road. Ms. Davis stated that she does not agree with the location of the proposed site. Ms. Davis Spoke on drought and evacuation concerns and asked about the projects security plan and stated her concern for her children's safety.

Jacob Watson stated that his property overlooks the parcel and that he had several concerns regarding access through a residential neighborhood, concerns of water usage, stated that he believes that the applicants do not care.

Ken Sherman resident stated that he agreed with all the comments made thus far, stated that the county was in a drought, stated that he had concerns with the applicant stating that he was unaware of illegal activity occurring on his land. Mr. Sherman requested commissioners to listen to community.

Mary Sullivan resident opposes project. Ms. Sullivan had several concerns including water restriction, Mr. Hamouda's unawareness of illegal activity on the proposed site and concerns of an increase in crime.

Carly Sherman lake county resident opposes the project. Ms. Sherman stated several concerns including the gallons of water needed to maintain project which did not include water needed for the screening of trees, fire concerns as it pertained to current drought, a contamination of water from chemicals used and road usage. Ms. Sherman stated that Susan Robinson the agent involved with the purchase of the proposed site is a colleague of Comm. Price and questioned the influence Comm. Price would have over the other Commissioners as it related to making a decision on the project.

Bart Robinson property owner, thanked neighbor for speaking out. Asked Commissioners to consider the community and the residents this proposed project would impact.

Dave Framer former member Board of Hidden Valley Lake Association, spoke on his concerns regarding water Well failure, stating the area is ground water based and does not have reservoir. Mr. Framer also stated that while road conditions and upkeep could be mitigated, the traffic could not.

Davis Palmer resident of Hidden Valley Road opposes the project. Mr. Palmer stated his concerns with inaccuracies on staff report as it related to distance between the proposed site and closest resident at an estimate of 600 ft. Mr. Palmer also voiced his concern for the current drought conditions and the usage of water, as well concerns for illegal activity and code violations on the part of the applicant.

Chris Taylor president of owners association of Rimrock ranch, vehemently opposes project. Would like the commissioners to consider that no one has spoken in support of the proposed project.

Wendi Campbell resident of Hidden Valley Lake stated that she was in agreeance with everyone's comments and opposes the project. Ms. Campbell stated that she created a petition "hell no we don't want to grow" which accumulated over 347 signatures.

2:22 p.m. Public Comment Closed. Break until 2:28 p.m.

Comm. Price stated that although her Next home colleague was involved with the project, she had no involvement in the transaction of the proposed project.

Comm. Hess stated that Comm. Price had made no attempts to sway the other commissioners on the proposed project.

Comm. Hess asked applicant about stolen heavy equipment on the site a month after property was acquired. Comm. Hess stated that he still had not received a clear answer on his concern.

Sufyan Hamouda stated that when prop was first purchased, applicant did not live on site and is unaware of any illegal activity.

Comm. Williams answered a comment made by the public regarding chemicals and stating that chemicals would not be utilized as the project was presented as an organic farming. Comm. Williams also addressed the perception of distance between the project site and residential lots stating that it would not sway a decision, greenhouses have to be covered, or a blackout system implemented. Mr. Williams stated that the recharge on the well did not scare him, the county has no rates on what is acceptable and is zoned correctly, outside the gates of the community with no set standard for admissible water.

Comm. Hess addressed the community's feelings, spoke on commissioners being a part of the community and nothing in proposed applications criteria to encourage opposing the project.

Eric Porter asked to clarify the amendments discussed which included an eight ft. tall fence, a monthly water usage report. Mr. Porter stated that the greenhouse condition b1 addressed the blackout screening concern and a verbal agreement from applicant that stated they would have at minimum a water storage tank of 5000 gal tank in addition to the 20000 gal. onsite storage required for fire suppression. Condition I2 would be amended to say monthly versus annually.

Comm. Hess stated that although the Commissioners could not enforce an agreement, the applicant seemed willing to financial assist with the repair cost of roads on Tinilyn and Jaclyn.

Comm. Williams voiced his concern about how to deal with water as he believes that this requirement in the conditions is the minimum amount needed and that different growth styles would determine what the minimum water usage would be. Comm. Williams asked staff if a biological study was completed in season? Comm. Williams stated that he would have liked to see a hydrologist report but understood that he could not ask for it now.

Eric Porter responded that a revision had been provided to staff, completed in season but was unable to greensheet for meeting.

Comm. Hess Moved to Motion, Seconded by Comm. Williams find that the Major Use Permit (UP 20-22) applied for by WeGrow LLC on property located at 16750 Herrington Road, Hidden Valley Lake, and further described as APNs 013-060-40, 013-014-03 and 11 will not have a significant effect on the environment and therefore a mitigated negative declaration shall be approved with the findings for approval listed in the staff report dated April 22, 2021 and as amended here today.

4 Ayes, 0 Nays

Comm. Hess Moved to Motion, Seconded by Comm. Williams find that the Major Use Permit (UP 20-22) applied for by WeGrow LLC on property located at 16750 Herrington Road, Hidden Valley Lake, and further described as APNs 013-060-40, 013-014-03 and 11 does meet the requirements of Section 51.4 and Article 27, Section 1 [i,ii(g),i(ii)] of the Lake County Zoning Ordinance and the Major Use Permit be granted subject to the conditions and with the findings for approval listed in the staff report dated April 22, 2021 and as amended here today.

4 Ayes, 0 Nays

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.

2:39 p.m. Continued from April 8th, 2021 PC Hearing. Public Hearing to consider a Major Use Permit (UP 19-40) to consider approval of a commercial cannabis cultivation project on a 77+ acre property, and consideration of adopting a Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS 19-59) on Thursday April 22, 2021, 9:40 a.m., in the Board of Supervisors' Chambers, 255 N. Forbes Street, Lakeport, California. Applicant / Owner: CUA Enterprises. Proposed Project: Three (3) A-Type 3 medium outdoor cannabis cultivation licenses requesting 104,800 sq. ft. of cannabis cultivation area and one (1) A-Type 13 self-distribution license. Location: 25252, 25322, 25372 & 25312 Jerusalem Grade Road, Middletown, CA; APNs: 013-017-92, 013-017-74, 013-017-36 and 013-017-31 . Environmental Evaluation: Mitigated Negative Declaration.

Eric Porter stated that the project was continued from prior Planning Commission Hearing due to legal concerns when proposed project site is surrounded by BLM land and a self-distribution permit had been requested. Legal Counsel gave an indemnification letter which Mr. Porter read into the record.

ASSUMPTION OF RISK AND INDEMNIFICATION AGREEMENT

I, the undersigned, have applied for the issuance of ____ [permit number], a ____ [permit type/class] permit, for the purposes of cannabis cultivation and a ____ [permit type/class] for the purposes of distribution on and from the permitted property. The permitted property, located at _____, is, on all sides, surrounded by federally administered lands. Permit _____ [permit number] is accepted with the full understanding and acknowledgement of the risks associated with the cultivation, transportation, and distribution of a federally regulated Schedule 1 narcotic, as defined in the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970.

ASSUMPTION OF RISK

1. I understand that the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970 makes the manufacture, distribution, dispensing, or possession with intent to manufacture, distribute, or dispense controlled substances illegal.
2. I understand that individuals who cause resource damage (i. e. erosion or soil contamination) through illegal acts, including the cultivation of cannabis, to federally administered lands may be subject to federal criminal and/or civil action.
3. I understand that transporting of cannabis or other illegal materials across an existing right-of-way on federally administered lands, to access a private parcel, is illegal under federal law and violators could face federal criminal action.
4. In light of the expressed risks enumerated herein above, I understand the risks that can arise from my use of the above named ____ [number, type] distribution permit and ____ [number, type] cultivation permit for the purposes stated herein. Nevertheless, knowing and understanding the risks, I hereby agree to assume all risks associated with and related to my willing acceptance and use of the permit(s).

INDEMNIFICATION

5. I do hereby waive all claims and or causes of action against the County of Lake, its officers, employees and agents arising out of my participation in the permitted activity and hereby release, hold harmless, defend, indemnify and discharge the County of Lake, its officers, employees and agents from any and all losses, damages and liability, (including without limitation attorney's fees and other costs and fees of litigation) of every nature, whether for damage to or loss of property including, but not limited to properties of the County of Lake arising out of, or alleged to arise out of, or resulting from or in any way connected with the permitted activity or the issuance of this permit by the County, unless such damage or loss is caused solely by the negligence of the County of Lake.

I have carefully read this Assumption of Risk and Indemnity agreement and understand the terms used in it and their legal significance. I acknowledge that I am signing this agreement freely and voluntarily and intend by my signature that this agreement is a complete and unconditional release of all liability to the greatest extent allowed by law. I also understand that my signature of this document is intended to be binding on my heirs, representatives, and assigns.

Permittee:

Name: _____

Title: _____

Date: _____

Nicole Johnson County Legal Counsel stated that the indemnification letter was separate from the permit but she had added language to existing permit which required applicant to sign prior to permit becoming effective.

Eric Porter read the revised language for Condition A21.

2:49 p.m. Public Comment - None

Comm. Hess thanked applicants for their patience and with the addition of the indemnification letter, he had no objections to the project moving forward.

Comm. Williams asked if the applicant would have to sign indemnification letter now.

Eric Porter responded that the indemnification letter would be attached to the conditions of approval later signed by the applicant.

Comm. Hess Moved to Motion, Seconded by Comm. Chavez find that the Major Use Permit (UP 19-40) applied for by CUA Enterprises on property located at 25252, 25322, 25372 and 25312 Jerusalem Grade Road, Middletown, and further described as APNs 013-017-92, 013-017-74, 013-017-36 and 013-017-31 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 April 8, 2021 and as amended here today

4 Ayes, 0 Nays – Motion Carried

Comm. Hess Moved to Motion, Seconded by Comm. Chavez find that the Major Use Permit (UP 19-40) applied for by CUA Enterprises on property located at 25252, 25322, 25372 and 25312 Jerusalem Grade Road, Middletown, further described as APNs 013-017-92, 013-017-74, 013-017-36 and 013-017-31 does meet the requirements of Section 51.4 and Article 27, Section 1 [i,ii(g),i(ii)] 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 April 8, 2021 and as amended here today.

4 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.

2:53 p.m. Continued from PC Meeting April 8th, 2021. Public Hearing to consider a Major Use Permit (UP 19-31) to consider approval of a commercial cannabis cultivation project on a 333+ acre property, and consideration of adopting a Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS 19-39) on Thursday April 22, 2021, 9:45 a.m., in the Board of Supervisors' Chambers, 255 N. Forbes Street, Lakeport, California. Applicant / Owner: Badlands LLC. Proposed Project: Twelve (12) A-Type 3 medium outdoor cannabis cultivation licenses requesting 529,560

sq. ft. of cannabis cultivation area and one (1) A-Type 13 self-distribution license. Location: 21518 Bartlett Springs Road, Lucerne, CA; APN: 016-032-01. Environmental Evaluation: Mitigated Negative Declaration.

Eric Porter spoke on the continuation of the proposed project. Mr. Porter referenced a letter of support from Casey MacKraken. Project was continued from April 8th due to being surrounded by BLM land, the indemnification letter for item 8 (CUA) would apply to this applicant as well.

2:58 p.m. Public Comment –

Damien Ramirez applicant thanked the Commissioners and Staff.

2:59 p.m. Public Comment Closed

Comm. Chavez Moved to Motion, seconded by Comm. Hess find that the Initial Study (IS 19-39) applied for by Badlands LLC on property located at 21518 Bartlett Springs Road, Lucerne, and further described as APN: 016-032-01 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 April 8, 2021.

4 Ayes, 0 Nays – Motion Carried

Comm. Chavez Moved to Motion Seconded by Comm. Williams find that the Use Permit (UP 19-31) applied for by Badlands LLC on property located at 21518 Bartlett Springs Road, Lucerne, and further described as APN: 016-032-01 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 April 8, 2021.

4 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.

3:02 p.m. CITIZEN'S INPUT -

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

3:02 p.m. Untimed Staff Updates

3:02 p.m. Adjourned