

LAKE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING

May 11, 2017

Commission Members

P John Hess, District I
A Bob Malley, District II
P Eddie Crandall, District III
P Matt Levesque, District IV
P Daniel Suenram, District V

Staff Members

P Robert Massarelli, CDD Director
A Michalyn DelValle, Principal Planner
P Byron Turner, Principal Planner
P Shanda Harry, Deputy County Counsel
P Danae Bowen, Office Assistant III

9:03 a.m. CALL TO ORDER

Pledge of Allegiance was led by Eddie Crandell .

Comm. Hess moved, 2nd by Comm. Suenram to approve the minutes from March 9, 2017
Comm. Suenram moved, 2nd by Comm. Hess to approve the minutes from March 23, 2017.

9:05 a.m. CITIZEN'S INPUT – None

**9:06 a.m. Public Hearing on consideration of a Major Use Permit (UP 17-01).
The project applicant is CLEAR LAKE LAVA, INC., proposing
concrete batch plant operations, septic tank manufacturing
operations, and bulk storage of aggregate materials and related
activities; and development of stone products and building materials
retail yard. The project is located at 18875 State Highway 29,
Middletown and further described as APN 014-270-64. (Peggy
Barthel)**

Peggy Barthel, Resource Planner, provided background information and a power point presentation of the project application.

Richard Knoll, Planning Consultant, introduced the applicant Don Van Pelt and presented a power point presentation and reviewed the history of the project application.

Comm. Hess asked the applicant when he expected to be up and running.

Don Van Pelt, the applicant said that they hoped to be running by the end of July 2017.

9:19 a.m. Opened Public Hearing

Fletcher Thornton, Middletown resident, spoke in favor of this project application and was anxious for them to be open and running.

Clark Brown, Hidden Valley Lake resident of Hidden Valley Lake and member of Middletown Area Town Hall (MATH) spoke in favor of the project.

Both Comm. Hess and Suenram were in favor of this project application and hoped that it would help in the reconstruction of Middletown.

Comm. Hess moved, 2nd by Comm. Levesque that the Planning Commission find on the basis of the Initial Study (IS 17-01) prepared by the Planning Division and the mitigation measures and conditions of approval which have been added to the project, that the use permit and design review as applied for by the Clearlake Lava will not have a significant

effect on the environment and therefore a mitigated negative declaration shall be issued with the findings listed in the staff report dated April 27, 2017.

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION 4 Ayes 0 Noes (1) Absent (Comm. Malley)

Comm. Hess moved, 2nd by Comm. Levesque that the Planning Commission find that the Major Use Permit (UP 17-01) applied for by Clearlake Lava on property located at 18875 State Highway 29, Middletown does meet the requirements of Section 51.4 of the Lake County Zoning Ordinance and that the Planning Commission has reviewed and considered the Mitigated Negative Declaration which was adopted for this project and the Major Use Permit be granted subject to the conditions and with the findings listed in the staff report dated April 27, 2017.

MAJOR USE PERMIT 4 Ayes 0 Noes (1) Absent (Comm. Malley)

Comm. Hess moved, 2nd by Comm. Levesque that the Planning Commission find that the Design Review (DR 17-04) applied for by Clearlake Lava on property located at 18875 State Highway 29, Middletown does meet the requirements of Section 54.5 of the Lake County Zoning Ordinance and that the Planning Commission has reviewed and considered the Mitigated Negative Declaration which was adopted for this project and the Design Review be granted subject to the conditions and with the findings listed in the staff report dated April 27, 2017.

DESIGN REVIEW 4 Ayes 0 Noes (1) Absent (Comm. Malley)

Comm. Malley noted that there is a seven (7) calendar day appeal period provided by the Lake County Zoning Ordinance.

9:28 a.m. Public Hearing on consideration of a Major Use Permit (UP 16-08). The project applicant is MICHAEL DONYGAN proposing agricultural processing of Lavender and Chamomile within a barn and construction of four greenhouses with a total use area that will exceed 10,000 square feet. The project is located at 8959 Wight Way, Kelseyville and further described as APN 007-036-02. (Mark Roberts)

Mark Roberts, Associate Planner, provided background information and a power point presentation of the project application. Mr. Roberts noted staffs modifications to condition 1 of the use permit conditions.

Michael Donygan, the applicant, said he was present for questions and he was satisfied with the presentation from staff. He submitted two letters into the record for the Planning Commissions review.

Comm. Hess asked the applicant if it was his intent at some point to grow cannabis on-site.

Mr. Donygan said it was his future intent.

Comm. Suenram expressed his concerns with the easements and right-of-ways. He said that it crosses three properties and asked if the easements could be moved.

Mr. Roberts said the Deed states that he has the right to access along the southerly line and give points and interests, which describes the easements going throughout the properties. He said he did not check the other parcels and Mr. Donygan has right-of-way access easement and there are no restrictions.

Comm. Suenram asked if it was written with the other parcels that this is where the easement lays exactly in that spot. He said there are no limited restrictions, and was it initially intended as a private easement for access to a residence.

Byron Turner, Principal Planner, said that there are not any restrictions on it as far as what the easement is used for.

Comm. Suenram referenced the California State Real Estate Law, and spoke to assumed easements. He said if you grant someone a residential easement, there are assumptions that could be possibly made, as far as limiting it from commercial access. He said that was the concern he had as far as any commercial operations, especially getting heavy equipment in and the dust that it will create.

Mr. Turner said some easements have state restrictions, but this is not one of them.

Comm. Levesque said that if someone had an easement across his property he would want them to be able to access it if it was in a residential area, but if they were going to start running trucks through it he might think a little differently. He added that this is much more complex below the surface than on the surface, based on where we are at with the cultivation of cannabis and what lands will be allowed to grow cannabis, assuming that we approve any lands for the growing of cannabis. He said he was not opposed, but this is one of those issues that would have to be looked at on the face and what it means in a larger holistic sense.

Mr. Roberts said that the delivery trucks for incoming and outgoing deliveries would be of the smaller variety.

Comm. Hess spoke to traffic issues and pointed out in the agency comments that there was one comment that said it appears to have a private easement to the property, so hopefully the neighbors will not have a problem with an increase in traffic. He asked the applicant if he had conversations with the neighbors about traffic.

Mr. Donygan said he has approached all of his neighbors and spoke to each of them separately addressing their concerns about traffic speeds on the dirt road and said he had instructed everyone who goes there on a regular basis not to exceed five miles per hour, and added that delivery trucks will be instructed to contact him for pick-up or drop-off. He said it will be a small operation that will not require traffic or workers.

9:52 a.m. Opened Public Hearing

Rick Reynolds, neighboring property owner, provided a power point presentation on the farm project and spoke to his major concern with the pond on his property. He said up until today, he did not know it was Mr. Donygan's intent to grow cannabis at some point and shared his concerns with fertilizers in his pond, local aquifers being drained, springs that feed his pond drying up and impacts to local wildlife. He said this operation is inappropriate for this area.

Comm. Hess asked Mr. Donygan if he has applied for a Water Board Permit.

Mr. Donygan said that he is in the process of getting a biological report, which takes four months and should receive it in September of this year.

Comm. Suenram asked if he has put in application for the Irrigated Lands Regulatory program for a commercial agricultural operation.

Mr. Donygan said he has not. He spoke to the process and timing of growing of lavender and the reasons why the greenhouses are necessary.

Mark Borghesani, neighboring property owner, pointed out that he had a conversation with Mr. Donygan in his office and they spoke to the condition of the easement on his property and some minor repairs that can be fixed with gravel in potholes near the easement through his property and he said he was fine with that. He said when it changes to a commercial use it will be a concern. He said his driveway is just before Mr. Donygan's and said he plans on putting up a fence and a gate to make sure the entrance into his property is controlled. He said he is a concerned neighbor and not in favor of this project.

Judy Bennett, neighbor to Mr. Donygan, said most of the easement that Mr. Donygan uses is on her property and they have property on both sides of the easement. She said she has horses on her ranch and teaches riding lessons and they have children out there all of the time. She said up until the property was sold, there was minimal traffic and there was not a problem with the children using the road as a trail and they have been free to go wherever they wanted. She said she can easily see traffic from their home and there have been a number of times when there has been delivery trucks going through at a high speed. She said she has chased them down to explain that it was a driveway, not a road and there are children, pedestrians and horses on this rural ranch property. She said having a commercial business there is a concern for her, when it has to go through her property for it to function and be used. She said when it becomes a cannabis business; she has concerns with the odors from the plants.

Patti Long, Kelsey Creek Drive resident, shared her concerns with water usage with a commercial endeavor. She said she was concerned with fertilizer and pesticide use that would run through her property, which would get in her water table and her concerns with her property staying in an organic arena. She addressed light pollution from the greenhouses and noise associated with running generators for the greenhouses in an area that is black in the night and quiet.

Michal Green, said he did not have a horse in this race, but pointed out that it appears that the applicant is basically being treated as guilty of something before being considered as innocent. He said it is valid that the concerns being raised by the neighbors, would be raised whether it is lavender or cannabis, but it is also important right now that the application before the Commission has to do with the application for the proposed land use and the conditions that are put on this particular application, specifically say, no cannabis, with the understanding if he is going to move forward with the cannabis cultivation, it will be a brand new use permit application and you will go from there.

Mr. Green said if you deny this permit application on the cannabis basis, you are going above and beyond not only his application, but also your own staffs recommendations. He said it sounds like there are issues to be worked out with the neighbors, but you cannot just say any commercial use would not be appropriate there, because it is farm land and they do not have a restriction on that easement. He said at this point in time the cannabis is not part of the permit application, and he would hate to see the permit denied on something that is not technically before the Commission right now.

Mr. Donygan said he would appreciate if these two things are separated. He said what he is applying for today is for a lavender farm and he is not applying for cannabis, but has stated his intentions of doing so. He said at that point in time, he will apply for a license like everyone else.

Mr. Donygan addressed the drone pictures taken by Mr. Reynolds in his power point presentation, in which he flew his drone over his property at a low altitude, scaring his workers. He said the law is that you cannot operate a drone like this without having a visual of the person, and this was operated from somewhere with sophisticated equipment, which at some point could be a problem, because people could put weapons on drones like that. He said he will address this with his lawyer. He said he is a business man and has made significant investments in Lake County and like everyone else; he should be able to make money on his investments.

Mr. Donygan spoke to this business as being legitimate. He said he is Bulgarian and noted that Bulgaria is one of the biggest lavender producers in the world. He said his family is in the business and he does have family and a team for consultation. He said he has submitted two letters to the Commission, one was Sheriff Martins request for unwarranted inspections, and the other one is about the pots that were noted in the pictures. He spoke to doors and security that will be needed, because the room that will be used for the extraction of lavender oil is a level 2 or 3 clean room and only certain people equipped with suits are allowed in there, which aids in eliminating contamination. Comm. Hess asked Mr. Donygan once the cannibus comes into play, will he still be growing lavender and chamomile and what was his long range plan.

Mr. Donygan said that the lavender will always be his first priority and cannabis would be his side business.

10:29 a.m. Closed Public Hearing

Robert Massarelli, Community Development Director, pointed out that what needs to be focused on is the application in front of us today and noted that cannabis is specifically prohibited. He said there is recommended language about complying with Article 72, however as of today, you cannot grow marijuana in a collective on “RL” land. He said they will be looking at that in two weeks for expanding it to “RL” land based on the Board of Supervisors direction, but as of today it is not allowed.

Mr. Massarelli explained that the zoning of this property allows for many uses and it is not strictly a residential area and it allows for agricultural uses including crops. He said the application that is before the Commission is an allowed use and you would expect truck traffic, just as in any other agricultural operation in the area. He said the easement issues are a private matter between the property owners and the easement is unrestricted and it needs to be recognized that people are allowed to have access to it.

Mr. Massarelli pointed out the concerns brought up about water use and noted condition G2 in the Major Use Permit conditions, in which the applicant shall submit an irrigation plan for a review and approval. Mr. Massarelli said staff will be getting a plan to show how efficient irrigation is and the applicant shall have onsite wells metered and submit an annual monitoring report to the Community Development Department, which is a new requirement, that staff is requiring on all applications. He explained that the irrigation plan is a requirement to help staff understand how the water is efficiently being used and what the impacts would be on water quality to people who live downstream. He also pointed out condition B5, which references that Engineered Drainage Plans will be submitted to the Community Development Department for review and approval prior to issuance of Building Permits and conditions E1, 2 & 3, which deals with Best Management Practices (BMPs) during construction and post construction to protect water quality. He said water quality is not something that is ignored and there is an operation and management plan that will be required to be submitted and staff will be focusing on inspections. He also commented on the night sky and lighting and said staff takes that very seriously.

Mr. Massarelli pointed out minor grammar/punctuation changes in the general conditions on page 2 of 6 in the bulleted section of item 6 there should be a comma after: “...production and/or manufacturing of essential oils(,) ”... and in the same paragraph: “If the manufacturing and/or extraction of cannabis, including *its* (not it)...” He said with those two slight adjustments, staff does recommend approval of the Initial Study and the Use Permit for this project.

Comm. Hess asked staff about the proposed condition from Sheriff Martin and asked if this is not yet an issue before us.

Mr. Massarelli said they have discussed Sheriff Martin’s request at length with County Counsel and Ms. Grant advised that it violates the Constitution. He said you cannot just show up unannounced on someone’s property and the ability to do that is extremely limited. He said that is why we have the condition of having an annual inspection and reasonable notice has to be given.

Comm. Crandell said he senses that the public feels that the applicant misled the future intent of this project with the addition of cannabis cultivation in the future.

Comm. Suenram said he has concerns with the whole operation. He said he has been a member of the community for thirty-eight years and his whole family has been here for many years. He said it is people like that who have built this community into the great community that it is. He said they have all come together and have shared interests and that he did not appreciate that some people come in with other ideas and they expect all of us to just change our whole community into something that is not what we would like.

He said he is not against the cultivation of cannabis, and felt that people should be able to do what they want on their property, however when it affects your neighbors, you are affecting their rights as well. He said the concerns he had when he initially looked at this, is that it is a huge operation as far as just the chamomile and lavender and looking at the background that is mentioned here for Mr. Donygan and his co-founder, he did not see anything in farming as far as hands on management of farming. He said he has been around farming his whole life and has toured all over the U.S. looking at commercial farming operations and for someone to just come up with this giant idea, which looks great on paper, but it is the implementation of it that generally hits rough spots through the years. He said his concern is that this project is starting out so huge initially. He said he appreciates staffs recommended changes, that it could possibly starts out smaller initially, with fewer greenhouses.

Mr. Massarelli said if it is the intent of the Commission to deny this application it is important to look at page 16 of 19 of the staff report, which is: The Findings Required for Approval. He said that the Commission needs to articulate very clearly what the findings are for denial, because if this is appealed, it will go to the Board of Supervisors.

Comm. Suenram said he agrees with the recommendations on the Initial Study and the second portion is where he has some disagreement, especially where it says it does meet the requirements of Section 51.4 of the Lake County Zoning Ordinance.

Comm. Suenram said on page 18 of 19 of the staff report section B: Approve Major Use permit (UP 16-08) for the following reasons, there are six sections and he finds that it only meets one of those. He read number 1 into the record: *“That the establishment, maintenance, or operation of the use applied for will not under the circumstances of the particular case, be detrimental to the health, safety, morals, comfort and general welfare of the persons residing or working in the neighborhood of such proposed use, or be detrimental to property and improvements in the neighborhood or the general welfare of the County.”* He said obviously it will affect the morals of the neighborhood.

Mr. Massarelli pointed out that this may be appealed and County Counsel will need to have clarification on the findings for denial.

Comm. Suenram said he felt this project would bring the moral of the neighbors down. He said that is what he has interpreted from the public comments received. He further discussed the findings for denial, regarding the moral, comfort and general welfare of people residing in the neighborhood.

Mr. Massarelli clarified moral and said this is not how people feel, but it is the conviction and values and not just because it will make people unhappy.

Comm. Suenram addressed easements and traffic safety.

Mr. Massarelli said if increased traffic on the road is going to be a safety hazard to the residents of the area that would be an appropriate finding.

Comm. Suenram said he is recommending denial for these various reasons:

- Concerned with safety issues with increased traffic, which could be detrimental to the neighborhood and the harm it may cause to the residents of the area.
- The streets and highways are partially inadequate, because of delivery trucks and conflicts with pedestrians.
- That access is a problem for fire trucks.

Comm. Crandell asked staff that even though Comm. Levesque has read the documents before the meeting he would not have a vote in this matter, because he left the hearing for thirty minutes.

Mr. Massarelli said the purpose of a public hearing is to gather public input and to weigh the input, and because Comm. Levesque was not in the room for the full discussion he could not give adequate balance or weight to the testimony, so therefore he cannot participate in the decision.

Comm. Crandel asked what happens if there is no second when there is a motion for denial.

Mr. Massarelli said that Comm. Suenram could make the motion, but with a lack of a second the motion would die.

Comm. Suenram moved, 2nd by Comm. Hess to deny the project for the findings as discussed today.

USE PERMIT DENIAL 2 Ayes 1 Noe (Comm. Crandell) 1 abstention (Comm. Levesque) 1 absent (Comm. Malley)

No action taken. Three Ayes or Noe votes are needed with a quorum.

10:58 a.m. Break

11:09 a.m. Back to Order

9:40 a.m. Public Hearing on consideration of a Major Use Permit (UP 17-02). The project applicant is LAWRENCE JOHNSON proposing construction of two greenhouses totaling +/- 2,440 square feet. The project is located at 11322 Bottle Rock Road, Kelseyville and further described as APN 011-068-67. (Mireya Turner)

Mireya Turner, Associate Planner, provided background information and a power point presentation on the proposed project.

11:24 a.m. Opened Public Hearing

Judson Eden, neighbor, said he does not have any problems with this project application.

11:26 a.m. Closed Public Hearing

Comm. Levesque wanted to know why the greenhouse is 2440 square feet, which is 60 feet smaller than what would require a Major Use Permit.

Ms. Turner said the Major Use Permit in this situation is because it is within the Scenic Combining Overlay, and all green houses, no matter what size if they are in the Scenic Combining District, triggers a Major Use Permit. Ms. Turner said because it was under 2500 feet that was the reason why it is categorically exempt, rather than doing an initial study.

Comm. Suenram asked if they are not proposing electricity and if they will only rely on natural sunlight.

Ms. Turner said there will not be electricity in the greenhouses.

Comm. Hess asked if the property owner intended to grow cannabis.

Mr. Johnson, the applicant said he would possibly in the future incorporate cannabis in some part of the greenhouse. He added that the greenhouse will just be for sustainable living on his property on Bottle Rock Road.

11:27 a.m. Reopened Public Hearing

Alica Brisker, neighbor of Mr. Johnsons, said she was pleased that he applied for a permit, because living in an area where fire is prevalent it is nice to have someone to go through the proper process and procedures and hopefully that would mitigate any chance of fires starting. She said he has been an excellent neighbor and supports this project.

11:28 a.m. Closed Public Hearing

Comm. Hess said that he supports medical and recreational use of cannabis and growing it and there is no reason for applicants to be coy about it anymore. He said he appreciates the honesty of the applicant and if the proper processes are gone through it is their right to do grow.

Comm. Suenram asked about the runoff from the greenhouse and how he plans to divert erosion.

Mr. Johnson said the area for the proposed greenhouses is on a flat grade and there will be gravel underneath, so the drainage should go straight down and there will not be any runoff. He added that he can put in a French drain for drainage.

Comm. Suenram moved, 2nd by Comm. Levesque that the Planning Commission find this Major Use Permit, (UP 17-02) is exempt from CEQA, because it falls within Categorical Exemption Class 3.

CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION 4 Ayes 0 Noes (1) Absent (Comm. Malley)

Comm. Suenram moved, 2nd by Comm. Levesque that the Planning Commission find that the Major Use Permit (UP 17-02) applied for by Lawrence Johnson on property located at 11322 Bottle Rock Road, Cobb, does meet the requirements of Section 51.4 of the Lake County Zoning Ordinance and that the Planning Commission has reviewed and considered the Categorical Exemption, which was adopted for this project and the Major Use Permit be granted subject to the conditions and findings listed in the staff report dated April 14, 2017.

MAJOR USE PERMIT APPROVAL 4 Ayes 0 Noes (1) Absent (Comm. Malley)

Comm. Malley noted that there is a seven (7) calendar day appeal period provided by the Lake County Zoning Ordinance.

11:35 a.m. Public Hearing on consideration of a Resolution of Intent to amend article 72 of the zoning ordinance. At the March 21, 2017 workshop, the Board of Supervisors provided direction regarding the regulation of cannabis in the county. Part of that direction was to expand Article 72 to include “RL” Rural Lands zoning district in addition to “A” Agriculture zoning district as to where the outdoor cultivation of medical cannabis would be allowed. The Board further directed the staff to amend Article 72 to include a self-certification of compliance program. The self-certification would be verified by a compliance monitoring inspection. In order to amend the zoning ordinance a resolution of intent must be adopted by the Board of Supervisors or the Planning Commission. (Robert Massarelli)

Robert Massarelli, Community Development Director, said the Resolution of Intent is to change the ordinance and authorizes the Board of Supervisors to set a date for the proposed amendment to be heard. He said staff recommends that this be put on the agenda for the next Planning Commission on May 25, 2017

Lloyd Gustivano, Deputy County Counsel, noted two corrections on the Resolution. He said on the sixth Whereas on the document it says: “~~Whereas~~ *the some of the definitions in Article 72 are inconsistent with definitions in other County documents...*” He suggested deleting the word “~~The~~”. He also suggested on the bottom in the signature field, there is an exclamation point after SO ORDERED and suggested that should be deleted as well.

11:36 a.m. Opened Public Hearing

Michael Green, Lake County Growers said his concerns are with the resolution representing the Board of Supervisors direction and what the resolution before you is actually going to do a slight tweak of the Article 72 to adjust to the “RL” lands, but then

there is still a comprehensive ordinance that is still in development, which is not covered by this particular resolution. He said he is in support of this, because they believe that something has to happen positively in terms of allowing growers to move forward with some sort of certainty, which we do not have right now.

Mike Mitzel, Gaddy Lane resident, said he was in support of adding “RL” to Article 72, and felt “APZ” should be included in the rewrite.

George Lolonis, Upper Lake resident, said that his land is approximately 40 acres in “RR” and “RL”. He said he is an organic vineyard farmer and was interested in grandfathering into the pilot programing. He said he would like to be able to conform and do what needs to be done to grow cannabis.

Lance Williams, Lake County resident, hoped that “RL” and “APZ” could be added to this document.

Bob Scala, Director of a Collective in Lake County, spoke to priority licensing treatment to entities that were operating in compliance as of September 1, 2016. He said it would be nice for people who are doing the things to be compliant with the State codes, to have the support from the County.

Richard Durham, Realtor, said he felt it was an obstruction to restrict certain zonings for farming. He said it was the Planning Commissions mission to keep the value of all properties and not to diminish one over another. He said let’s move the County forward, because it is the perfect place to grow cannabis.

11:52 a.m. Closed Public Hearing

Comm. Levesque said he is in support of this resolution and if we are going to do this for “RR” and “APZ”, he would like to do it once instead of multiple times.

Mr. Massarelli said Mr. Green is correct and we have two things going on parallel tracks and one is an amendment to Article 72, which proceeds what the direction of what the Board of Supervisors gave staff, which is to add “RL” to where medical marijuana cultivation is allowed. He said right now with the self-certification process, they do not have any idea of who is in compliance. He said parallel to that, what he is calling the replacement ordinance, where the entire system is going to be replaced with something new, and if your intention is to not just see “RL”, but “APZ”, “TPZ” and “RR”, based on the public hearing that will be here in two weeks, and you decide it should be expanded to include those, that can be the Planning Commission’s recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. He said just because the resolution limits it right now, and it is staffs intent right now, based on the public hearing it could change.

Comm. Levesque said if that is the case, then he suggested that we ask staff to provide recommendations for potentially including whether “APZ” is viable or likely. He said he heard someone wants “RR”, and would like to have guidance from staff for potentially other zoning designations for the conversation on May 25th.

Comm. Hess said he was in support of that also.

Mr. Massarelli said staff will be glad to provide a series of maps to show where each of these Zoning Districts are and give statistics and a comparisons of what uses are allowed in each and what the differences are between those and then you can use that information to decide what you want to recommend to the Board of Supervisors. He said his suggestion is to make it two motions, so as to keep the resolution clean and second is to direct staff to provide additional information regarding other zoning districts.

Comm. Levesque moved, 2nd by Comm. Hess to approve Resolution 17-01.

GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT APPROVAL 4 Ayes 0 Noes 1 Absent (Comm. Malley)

Comm. Levesque moved , 2nd by Comm. Hess made a motion to direct staff to provide additional information regarding the potential of other zoning districts for consideration for the purpose of the May 25, 2017 hearing.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FOR OTHER ZONING DISTRICTS 4 Ayes 0 Noes 1 Absent (Comm. Malley)

UNTIMED STAFF UPDATE

Robert Massarelli, Community Development Director, said that he had attended the American Planning Associations National Conference in New York City with Michalyn DelValle and Byron Turner. He said there were many interesting discussions and they will report some of the highlights to the Planning Commission at a future hearing. He added that he is looking into working with the American Planning Association (APA) in California for Commissioner training. He said as soon as he can find that opportunity, staff will certainly make that available to them.

Mr. Massarelli said that Guenoc Valleys mixed use project had an open house reception on April 29, 2017, to provide the public with an introduction of their project. He said he was authorized by the Board of Supervisors to look for an Environmental Impact Consultant and they have entered into an at cost agreement with Guenoc Valley to pay for all the costs for this report. He said this is a significant project and the Board of Supervisors has authorized the hiring of two new staff members to support the project. He added that a new Associate Planner, Eric Porter will be starting in late May.

Mr. Massarelli noted that Byron Turner, Principal Planner will schedule an item with the Board of Supervisors to get direction as to what their expectations are for the General Plan Amendment Update. He said that Mr. Turner is also working on the procedures for the Area Plan Amendments for the Cobb and Kelseyville Areas.

Mr. Massarelli spoke to the Zoning Ordinance Amendment and anticipates having that to the Planning Commission in early July and hoped to move forward with the major amendment at that time. He said in addition to the Guenoc Valley project, there are three other resort type projects for either rebuilds or new projects. He said there are many interesting things going on in the County right now and staff is busy and it looks like a positive future ahead.

ADJOURNED 12:06

Eddie Crandell, Vice Chair
Lake County Planning Commission

Respectfully Submitted,

By: _____
Danae Bowen
Office Assistant III