

From: [Monica](#)
To: [Brad Rasmussen](#); [Helen Owen](#); [Bruno Sabatier](#); [Eddie Crandell](#); [Jessica Pyska](#); [Lake County Clerk of the Board](#)
Cc: [Mary Claybon](#); [Mireya Turner](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Item 6.9 - 10am Public Hearing Lampson
Date: Monday, April 13, 2026 12:29:51 PM

To: The Honorable Lake County Board of Supervisors

From: Monica Rosenthal, District 1 Planning Commissioner and concerned Lake County citizen

RE: Item # 6.9, 10am Public Hearing - Consideration of an Ordinance adopting Zoning Map Amendment (PL-25-101) to bring three parcels into compliance with the existing Industrial General Plan Designation, Kelseyville Area Plan, and Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan; located at 4325, 4375, 4425 Highland Springs Road, Lakeport (APNs 008-031-17, 20, and 44)

This item was heard by the Planning Commission on February 12, 2026 at which the Planning Commission did not make a recommendation.

However, after additional consideration and as a concerned citizen of Lake County, I respectfully offer the following comments:

There is no error.

The zoning map does not need to be corrected.

The unchanged zoning map with regard to these parcels was intentional and with good reason. The parcels do not need to be brought into compliance at this time because these parcels are NOT out of compliance.

I recommend that the BOS deny the request to rezone the parcels noted above.

Policy T-3.6 clearly states when a zoning change should be considered and states the **criteria to be met BEFORE the Zoning Map is to be amended, ie before parcels should be changed from Agriculture (A) to Planned Development Commercial (PDC).**

Policy T-3.6 acknowledges that the Land Use Map for the parcels located North of Lampson Field has been designated INDUSTRIAL on the Land Use Map.

POLICY T-3.6 Lampson Field Commercial Development: The area along the north side of Lampson Field has been designated industrial on the Land Use Map and **may be considered** for airport-related or airport dependent industrial /manufacturing development **provided the following criteria are met:**

- 1. Proposals include a rezone from “A” to “PDC” , along with General and Specific Plans of Development**
- 2. Development of sites includes construction of a north taxiway, which is offered for dedication to the County.**
- 3. Proposed structures and land uses are compatible with the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan.**

Criteria #1 — restated in my words, says that a proposal for a zoning change must include a PROJECT that can be evaluated to make sure it is in compliance with communities vision for

development near or around the airport.

This Policy is written with specific criteria that provides ‘leverage’ or ‘insurance’ for airport-related development in the vicinity of Lampson Field.

The criteria was established to uphold the communities vision or “airport related” development IF the parcels are to be converted from “A” to “PDC”.

If this request to rezone these parcels is approved now, without a project proposal, the leverage or insurance for the planned or envisioned development of these parcels disappears. Any proposed project would no longer be tied to the obligations found in the narrative of Policy T-3.6.

New planning department staff, newly elected BOS, newly appointed planning commissioners all interpret verbiage written in our County’s documents differently. It is easy for the original intent to get lost in today’s changes. But in this case, the narrative/criteria clearly states the intent. As a Planning Commissioner today and as a Planning Commissioner in 2008 when the 2008 General Plan was reviewed, evaluated and approved, I can attest to the commitment of a previous Community Development Department Director to uphold the vision of the community by inserting policies similar to Policy T-3.6.

The detail found in Policy T-3.6 is somewhat similar to the specific criteria found in the Special Study Area in the Middletown Area Plan which eventually led to the approval of the Guenoc Valley Project development. Project presented, reviewed and evaluated followed by General Plan amendment/rezone.

While it is true that the 2008 General Plan EIR analyzed the potential rezoning of the parcels located north of the Lampson Field. BUT that analysis was based on the CRITERIA and specifications for development provided in policies found in the 2008 General Plan including Policy T-3.6 pertaining specifically to Lampson Field.

As stated in the staff report, it is also true that there are goals and policies aimed at growth and development, industrial development and economic development. **However, the base zoning of the parcels noted above does not need to align with the land use designation found in the General Plan NOW in order to fulfill those goals and policies for economic development. The zoning can be aligned WHEN a viable project proposal is submitted, along with the rezone request, that aligns with the criteria of policy T-3.6 and the intent of the community vision.**

I submit that the inconsistency in the land use designation and the zoning was intentional. The narrative of Policy T-3.6 explains the inconsistency and establishes criteria for moving forward with economic development.

County staff clearly states, “There is no proposed project development associated with this zoning map amendment.”

Per Policy T-3.6 there should be a proposed project attached to the rezone request.

Furthermore, this proposal to change the zoning on these parcels should come from a developer, not from the Community Development Department. There was NO error made by CDD when the 2008 General Plan was adopted or following the adoption of the 2008 General

Plan.

Policy T-3.6 is an intentional and deliberate planning approach to control and direct the specific type of development the community envisioned to occur at Lampson Field and to happen in accordance with a process that combines a plan for development with a rezone request.

In conclusion, I request that the BOS deny the Rezone request (PL-25-101). There was no error, nothing to correct.

As a planning commissioner, I wish I had had more time to thoroughly investigate this request before the PC hearing date of Feb. 12, 2026.

Thank you for your consideration.

Monica Rosenthal

District 1 Planning Commission and concerned Lake County citizen