MENDOCINO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES FOR THE MEETING HELD ON:	**September 15, 2016**
LOCATION:	Mendocino County Board of Supervisors Chambers 501 Low Gap Road, Room 1070 Ukiah, California
COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:	Little, Krueger, Nelson, Warner, Holtkamp, Hall, Ogle
COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:	None
PLANNING & BLDG SVC STAFF PRESENT:	Steve Dunnicliff, Director Andy Gustavson, Chief Planner Mary Lynn Hunt, Senior Planner Adele Phillips, Planner II Adrienne Thompson, Commission Services Supervisor
OTHER COUNTY DEPARTMENTS PRESENT:	Matthew Kiedrowski, Deputy County Counsel Geoff Brunet, Department of Transportation

1. Roll Call.

The meeting was called to order at 9:02 a.m.

2. Planning Commission Administration.

2a. Determination of Legal Notice.

The Clerk advised the Commission that all items had been properly noticed.

3. Director's Report and Miscellaneous.

Mr. Dunnicliff presented a verbal Director's Report and noted that the Mendocino Town Plan would be heard by the Coastal Commission at a local meeting on October 5 through the 7th at the Ukiah Valley Conference Center. He noted that the Coastal Commission would be reviewing "friendly modifications" to the plan and no formal action was anticipated.

Commissioner Holtkamp asked if staff could email the agenda when it was received.

Commissioner Little discussed a fire chief meeting regarding the preliminary comments to the Cannabis Cultivation ordinance.

Mr. Dunnicliff noted that an early consultation notice had been circulated, which was a less formal process, and stated that Andy Gustavson could provide a more detailed update during the Matters from Staff.

4. Matters from Public.

No one was present from the public who indicated a desire to address the Commission.

5. Consent Calendar.

None.

6. Regular Calendar.

6a. CASE#: UM_2014-0007

DATE FILED: 9/2/2014
OWNER: REDWOODS ABBEY
APPLICANT: DENNIS THOMPSON, DMTA ARCHITECTURE
REQUEST: Modification to Use Permit #U 7-2014 for the expansion of a 10,000 square foot Church complex known as "Redwood Abbey". The expansion will consist of a 1,270 square foot addition to the main church and dining hall to consist of an entry hall, book store/gift shop and restrooms.
ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION: Categorically Exempt - 15301-Class 1(e).
LOCATION: 10± miles northwest of Piercy, lying on the west side of Briceland Rd (CR 435) straddling the Mendocino/Humboldt County line, located at 18300/18104 Briceland Rd, Whitethorn; APN 051-110-01.
STAFF PLANNER: MARY LYNN HUNT
RECOMMENDED ACTION: Approve project as recommended.

Commissioner Little noted he would have to leave for an appointment and would miss the first item, but would return around 11:00 am.

Andy Gustavson, Chief Planner, introduced Mary Lynn Hunt.

Mary Lynn Hunt, Staff Planner, discussed the staff report and location of the project. She noted the request was exempt from the CEQA process, as it was a minor alteration to an existing structure and would be adding only 1270 square feet to the dining hall and welcome center. She noted staff was recommending approval of the project.

Sister Kathy Devico, owner, noted the property straddled the Humboldt/Mendocino County line.

Dennis Thompson, Architect, stated the addition was not adding to the church building, but would link the 2 buildings together. He displayed an illustration for the Commission.

The public hearing was declared open.

Sister Kathy thanked County for their support and noted the development was intended to make guests more comfortable, to provide a small gift shop for the Sisters to sell their crafts at, as well as provide a more accessible restroom facility.

The public hearing was declared closed.

Upon motion by Commissioner Holtkamp, seconded by Commissioner Hall and carried by the following roll call vote (6-0), IT IS ORDERED to approve the project and make the recommended findings and conditions of approval contained in Exhibit A of the Resolution.

AYES: Krueger, Nelson Warner, Holtkamp, Hall, Ogle
NOES: None
ABSENT: Little

6b. CASE#: MS_2014-0010/U_2015-0003

DATE FILED: 12/16/2014
OWNER/APPLICANT: MARIETTA HOPLAND LLC
AGENT: BEN KAISI
REQUEST: Minor Subdivision of a 269± acre parcel to create 4 parcels of 40±, 44±, 133± and 52± acres, respectively. A use permit is also requested to implement a Planned Development (PD) on the subject property.
ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION: Mitigated Negative Declaration
LOCATION: 3.9± miles northeast of Hopland, lying on the east side of Old River Road (CR 201), 3± miles north of its intersection with University Road (CR 116B), located at 9801, 10275 and 10501 Old River Road; APN 047-310-09, 047-310-05, and 047-37-011.
STAFF PLANNER: MARY LYNN HUNT
RECOMMENDED ACTION: Approve project as recommended.

Mr. Gustavson introduced the item and noted that John Speka had left the department and Mary Lynn Hunt would be moving the project forward.

Mary Lynn Hunt, Staff Planner, reviewed the previous hearing with the project and noted the Commission had originally recommended denial of the project and continued the hearing to allow staff time to make findings in support of that recommendation; however the applicant and requested to revise the application to address the Commission's concern in hopes that a revised project could be approved. She noted that the revised project was before the Commission and all minimum lot sizes would meet the 40 acre minimum of the zoning district, and the applicant had designated an area along the Russian River on Parcel 1 to preserve the habitat area that would be recorded on the final map. Ms. Hunt also noted that a condition had been added to the project stating no development could occur on the habitat area of Parcel 1. She continued with the previous concerns of the Commission and noted that the flag lot had been eliminated and a new 40 foot access easement had been added by Parcel 3. Ms. Hunt stated staff was recommending approval of the revised project description.

Commissioner Ogle asked if the easement would also include public utilities and noted another concern of hers was the water tank and property lines between Parcel 3 and Parcel 4 and proof of water for Parcel 4.

Ms. Hunt was not sure of the easements use and deferred to the applicant. She also noted that only a single proof of water was required for a subdivision and the availability of water for Parcel 4 would be determined at the development stage.

Commissioner Krueger recalled another issue had been the setback to the property lines for an agricultural use and noted they appeared to have been adjusted.

Commissioner Ogle noted the acreage on the memo was different from the acreage on the map.

Ms. Hunt noted the map was probably correct versus the memo language.

Scott Bilbro, owner, noted he agreed with the staff memo felt the concerns of the Commission had been addressed. He noted that the parcel line between Parcel 3 and Parcel 4 was to keep the water tank on the same parcel as the vineyard it served and noted the topography also supported the proposed lines. He thanked the Commission for allowing him time to revise his application.

Commissioner Ogle asked about the discrepancy in the acreage and if the easement would provide for utilities.

Mr. Bilbro stated he would agree that the map was correct and deferred to his agent regarding utilities.

Ben Kaisi, agent, noted there were several options for utilities and the easement would be used for access and utilities.

The public hearing was declared open, seeing no one come forward, the public hearing was declared closed.

Mr. Gustavson noted that staff had provided the Commission with a revised Resolution and Exhibit A for approval, as well as a staff memo with corrections.

Commissioner Nelson commented that he didn't like to see ag parcels broken into smaller sizes, but he would support the subdivision.

Commissioner Holtkamp noted her concern for the riparian area had been addressed.

Chair Warner also noted the setbacks to ag use had been rectified.

Upon motion by Commissioner Hall, seconded by Commissioner Nelson and carried by the following roll call vote (6-0), IT IS ORDERED approve the project and certify the mitigated negative declaration as proposed in the Revised Resolution and as recommended by staff.

AYES: Krueger, Nelson Warner, Holtkamp, Hall, Ogle
NOES: None
ABSENT: Little

6c. CASE#: U_2015-0009/V_2015-0001
DATE FILED: 3/20/2015
OWNER: FAIZAN CORPORATION
AGENT: L. S. MITCHEL ARCHITECT, INC.
REQUEST: (A) a Minor Use Permit to establish and operate a retail service station ("Automotive and Equipment-Gasoline Sales" per Mendocino County Code §20.024.025(D)), comprising: a 3,000 sf office and convenience store, 6 fueling pumps under a 4,000± sf fueling canopy, and a 30k gal. underground fuel storage tank; and, (B) a setback Variance for a fueling canopy, allowing a 2 ft. front yard setback where 20 ft. is required; and, (C) a parking Waiver to reduce the required 37 off-street parking spaces to 30 spaces.
ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION: Mitigated Negative Declaration.
LOCATION: 2± miles northwest of Redwood Valley town center, lying on the northeast side of North State Street, (CR 104), 0.1 mile southeast of its intersection with Highway 101. Located at 9621 N. State Street, Ukiah; APN 162-100-58.
STAFF PLANNER: ADELE PHILLIPS
RECOMMENDED ACTION: Approve project as recommended.

Mr. Gustavson introduced Adele Phillips and noted that the next two use permits were for gas stations. He noted that the current project had been submitted before the creation of the Redwood Valley MAC (RVMAC); however, staff was able to send a referral and receive comments back prior to the meeting.

Adele Phillips, Staff Planner, reviewed the staff report and provided an overview of the project. She noted the Commission had received a larger map prior to the meeting and presented a power point of the project. She discussed the three tiers of development including, the use permit, request for gas sales, and an office/convenience store. She also noted that the applicant had requested a variance to the setback requirements and waiver to reduce parking. Ms. Phillips noted the parking locations available around the building, which had multiple tenants, and stated that the Department of Transportation would prefer to have only a single encroachment onto the County Road. She continued with her presentation and read the letter submitted by the RVMAC.

Mr. Gustavson commented that staff could go through the letter and respond to each comment if the commission preferred or respond at the end of the comments.

Chair Warner asked to go through each comment one by one.

Mr. Gustavson responded to RVMAC's request for an electric vehicle charging station and noted that the County did not have a regulation to require such a station. He noted it would be good public policy for the Commission to explore, but stated there must be some nexus for the requirement.

Chair Warner added that there were General Plan policies regarding Air Quality, such as RM45, which could provide some basis for the requirement.

Mr. Gustavson noted the General Plan policy would be a catalyst to begin the deliberation on crafting a policy to require electric vehicle charging stations.

Ms. Phillips continued her review of the RVMAC's comments and discussed the potential for an off sales liquor license. She noted staff did not have an issue granting the waiver for reduced parking, if the adjacent parking plan was approved. She noted the application was not subject to the Formula Business moratorium, as gas stations were exempt, and stated the use permit had been scheduled for Planning Commission rather than the Zoning Administrator to allow for greater public involvement and review. Ms. Phillips noted that Caltrans had submitted comments concerned with turning from North State Street to the southbound freeway lanes or crossing to Uva Drive and had asked for a traffic impact study. She noted that, based on the analysis of the traffic study, Caltrans was requesting that turning be limited, and an Ordinance Amendment be approved by the Board of Supervisors restricting left turns.

Mr. Gustavson also noted that the Department of Transportation had jurisdiction over the County right of way.

Chair Warner noted, from the map, it appeared that cars could cross from Uva Drive straight to North State Street, but not the opposite direction.

Commissioner Holtkamp asked the alternative route cars would take when leaving the gas station and trying to cross over the freeway.

Ms. Phillips noted cars could use the West Road overpass to reach Uva Drive. She also noted that Darren Hill, from Caltrans, was available to speak to the Commission.

Commissioner Nelson was confused by the possible prohibitions on traffic and asked how the safety restrictions would be created.

Darren Hill, Caltrans, noted the County Department of Transportation would place signs on the County road noting the traffic restriction. He also noted the striping on the road would change.

Commissioner Nelson was concerned about "old habits" of drivers causing accidents.

Mr. Hill noted the markings on the road would be difficult to miss and a driver would intentionally have to cross traffic; in event of a collision, the driver crossing the freeway would be at fault for making an illegal movement.

The Commission discussed the painted island with Mr. Hill.

Chair Warner asked about the statistics of accidents.

Mr. Hill discussed the statistics that there would be a fatal accident at the intersection every 217 million cars, or 1 car in every peak hour.

Commissioner Ogle was concerned with traffic at the intersection and felt that all cross traffic should be restricted. She also felt that turning into the northbound lane and accelerating uphill should have a longer lane.

Geoff Brunet, Department of Transportation (DOT), explained that the applicant would submit the signs to DOT to install for road access, and if approved, they would be installed and the roads restriped.

Commissioner Ogle asked if the Board would need to approve the ordinance first.

Mr. Brunet stated that the first step was to receive approval from the Board of an Ordinance Amendment. Also, studies would be reviewed to determine the correct culvert size for stormwater runoff on site and best management practices. He stated engineered plans were generally required.

Chair Warner thought it would be better to have only 1 encroachment into the project and asked staff about the need for a sediment pond.

Mr. Brunet noted most projects don't need detention ponds, and was not sure if it would be considered for this project.

Commissioner Krueger clarified that the applicant had requested 2 encroachments, but staff had written the condition to allow only 1 driveway; however the site plan appeared to have only 1 encroachment shown.

Mr. Brunet discussed a second site plan that showed 2 encroachments around either side of the drainage swale.

Mr. Gustavson suggested adding the word single to Condition #30, in the second line of the sentence to read, and provide a "single" commercial driveway approach.

Commissioner Holtkamp asked how the runoff from the gas station would be treated, since she assumed it would be dirtier than run off from someone's front yard.

Mr. Brunet noted the applicant would prepare a drainage plan and multiple departments would be involved in review of the document; including Environmental Health, Planning and Building and the Water Agency.

[Break 10:20 AM – 10:28 AM]

Larry Mitchell, agent/architect, responded to comments from the RVMAC letter and discussed the location of potential signs in the right of way. He noted the owner was working on an agreement to share a driveway with the neighboring building and discussed site runoff requirements from the Low Impact Development (LID) manual and California Green Building Code. He discussed ways in which the runoff could be dealt with, such as plants, rain gardens and bioswales. He also noted that the current business did not intend to sell liquor, but in case the tenant changed, they would prefer not to be limited by conditions that did not allow liquor sales.

Chair Warner asked if an electric charging station would be considered.

Mr. Mitchell noted that having a charging station was a requirement of the green building code over a certain dollar amount and might be required for this project, but was not certain.

Commissioner Holtkamp was unclear of the access to the back parking lot.

Mr. Mitchell was not sure of the legal standing of access to the parking lot.

Brian Momsen, attorney for the owner, discussed landscaping in front of the project and hoped this business would be an "anchor tenant". He noted the Board of Supervisors would decide on the traffic related issues and appreciated the concerns of the Commission. He requested that Condition #30 not be modified and allow the applicant to work directly with the Department of Transportation. He responded to the RVMAC letter regarding the number of fuel pumps in Redwood Valley and felt this location would serve Highway 101.

The public hearing was declared open.

Kathleen Spring noted she owned the property northeast of the project and had been meeting with the Faizan Corporation for improvements. She was willing to allow future signs to be placed on her parcel and was also amiable to allowing a second entrance. She was in support of the project and felt there was adequate parking and stated the business would be a positive influence and provide stability for the neighborhood.

Christine Boyd, Chair of the RVMAC, discussed traffic restrictions for the project. She noted that Redwood Valley was a rural community and hoped to maintain the character of the town. She was concerned with preserving the night skies and hoped the lighting would be kept to a minimal amount and was also concerned with gasoline spills. She felt secondary containment should be addressed and noted the location of a creek to the southeast of the project. She noted that the RVMAC was supportive of the project overall.

The public hearing was declared closed.

Chair Warner noted there were policies regarding lighting that would be enforced.

Ms. Phillips noted Condition #12 dealt with lighting and Condition #9 was related to signage and illumination.

Commissioner Ogle asked if Condition #30 should be modified or left as is.

Mr. Gustavson commented that it would not be crucial to change the condition as it required approval from DOT. He noted there was a substantial issue with access; however related to the adjoining property and stated that prior to commencement of use, the property owner must demonstrate an easement for access to construct improvements. He noted it would be awkward to approve a use permit that relies on access across private property that the owner had not been granted legal use of or access to and noted the three locations on the site plan.

Chair Warner discussed Condition #30 for access.

Mr. Gustavson noted that the current neighbor was supportive of an access agreement, but if the owners changed, then access may be disallowed by a new property owner. He stated that driveway access should be perfected now with a legal access easement in case of future property sales.

The Commission agreed that they would prefer a condition requiring an access easement to protect future use. They also felt Condition #30 could be left as is so that the applicant could work with the Department of Transportation as needed.

Mr. Gustavson commented staff would prepare language for a special condition requiring proof of access and also noted that the asterisks were missing from Conditions #22 and #24.

Mr. Momsen discussed the proposed special condition and noted that if the property owners could not come to an agreement, they would not have a valid permit and asked that the condition only refer to ingress/egress and landscaping.

Mr. Kiedrowski stated that landscaping was required and already defined in a condition; however parking had not been addressed as the rear access was not dedicated for ingress/egress. He suggested the following language as a special condition "Prior to the issuance of any building permit or commencing the use as approved the owner shall submit to the county for review and approval and subsequently record, 1. easements to allow access and landscape improvements over the adjoining properties and 2. a parking agreement to allow and show reciprocal or shared parking with neighboring commercial properties."

Upon motion by Commissioner Ogle, seconded by Commissioner Nelson and carried by the following roll call vote (6-0), IT IS ORDERED to adopt the proposed resolution approving the use permit and variance subject to the Board of Supervisors adoption of an Ordinance Amendment to limit turning movements, adding Special Condition #32 as suggested by staff and adding ** to Condition #22 and #24.

AYES: Krueger, Nelson Warner, Holtkamp, Hall, Ogle
NOES: None
ABSENT: Little

Commissioner Little returned to his seat at 11:23 AM.

[Break 11:23 AM – 11:31 AM]

6d. CASE#: U_2015-0015

DATE FILED: 8/5/2015
OWNER/APPLICANT: LORIN GEOFFRION/MARTHA BETZ
AGENT: TRANS TECH CONSULTANTS
REQUEST: Use Permit to establish and operate a retail service station ("Automotive and Equipment-Gasoline Sales" per MCC §20.024.025(D)) with 4 fueling pumps under a 2,200 sq. ft. canopy; two 12,000 gal. above-ground storage tanks; and the attendant lighting and signage, per MCC §20.092.015. Project also comprises a 4,480 sq. ft. combination retail store and restaurant, permissible by MCC §. 20.092.010. This is a single-phase project.
ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION: Mitigated Negative Declaration.
LOCATION: 0.5± miles north of Laytonville town center, lying on the west side of Highway 101 and just north of its intersection with Branscomb Road (CR 429). Located at 4550 N Highway 101; APN 014-020-67.
STAFF PLANNER: ADELE PHILLIPS
RECOMMENDED ACTION: Approve project as recommended.

Mr. Gustavson introduced Adele Phillips, Staff Planner.

Ms. Phillips reviewed the staff report and felt the request was a straight forward project for gas sales and a retail restaurant. She noted the location was surrounded by Williamson Act parcels on the north and west. She noted the prior use was for a RV/Mobile home park and discussed photos on the projector. She continued her presentation and reviewed the site plan, location of fuel tanks, existing leach field and location of parking. She noted staff was suggesting a 50 foot setback from agricultural preserve to protect resource lands from development and noted Caltrans was also present to discuss traffic concerns for the project. She noted that Caltrans had requested limiting the encroachments to the site to 1 and requiring a left turn lane for the northbound Highway 101. Ms. Phillips also noted that the last sentence on page 6 of the report referring to hours of operation could be stricken.

Commissioner Nelson commented that the Right to Farm language should be included in the conditions.

Commissioner Ogle noted that she agreed with adding a left turn lane, but asked if the applicant would have to pay for the construction.

Ms. Phillips believed the applicant would pay for the turn lane.

Lorin Geoffrion, owner, noted that the above ground fuel tanks had been recommended by Environmental Health and stated that he was installing an electric car charging station. He noted the store would be stocked with local organic foods and discussed the site plan, stating the project design was created to encourage visitors to get out of their cars and walk around. Mr. Geoffrion noted that the previous mobile home park had butted up against the property line and felt a variance to the ag setback was warranted for his project. He noted that if all the required setbacks were added together; he would lose 1.5 acres of his parcel. He stated that CalFire had agreed to a 20 foot setback and hoped the Commission would reduce his setback listed in Exhibit A of the Resolution. He also noted that his parcel was the northern most commercial property with several commercial properties to the south for sale.

Commissioner Ogle noted the site plan showed parking in front of the retail store.

Mr. Geoffrion noted the design had been changed due to the setback from the centerline of the roadway. He noted that he would also lose more property if the center turn lane was required.

The public hearing was declared open.

Mr. Geoffrion noted his letters of support.

Chair Warner noted the Commission had received the letters including Laytonville MAC's recommendation for approval.

The public hearing was declared closed.

Darren Hill, Caltrans, was available for questions.

Commissioner Little noted the potential for Laytonville's commercial area to develop and asked if Caltrans had any plans for development of the Highway; he preferred not to piecemeal the development.

Mr. Hill stated that Caltrans had not reviewed the Highway long term; only as projects were proposed.

Commissioner Little discussed an ability for cost recovery if the applicant developed the center turn lane and future development was approved without the need to provide such large scale improvements.

Mr. Hill was unaware of an avenue to recoup costs for the applicant. He noted the County may require a fair share for development, but it was not something that Caltrans offered.

Mr. Gustavson noted he had heard of a mechanism for shared cost of infrastructure improvements that had substantial capital value, but had not seen it used for this scale of improvement.

Commissioner Little commented that he had an issue with "piece-mealing" development; however there was a history of accidents on the highway and the requirement was being placed on the applicant in order to approve the project.

Chair Warner commented that the above ground tanks were not appealing to look at and thought screening should be required.

Ms. Phillips clarified that Environmental Health had not submitted comments; if the applicant had proposed underground tanks to Environmental Health there would have been comments in response.

Commissioner Little noted the previous use had backed up to the property line and felt the ag buffer could be reduced to match the CalFire buffer of 20 feet.

Commissioner Nelson commented the main reason for buffer increased ag buffers was in response to subdivisions and stated he was comfortable reducing the buffer, as long as this did not set a precedent to allow a reduced buffer to ag uses.

Mr. Gustavson stated the change in conditions would not set a precedent for future projects.

Commissioner Nelson also noted that a fence on the border would be helpful to keep garbage out of the adjacent parcel.

The Commission discussed the necessary setback for the fence and if the screening of the tanks should be vegetation or a solid fence.

Mr. Gustavson noted Condition #15 required a 50 foot setback to parcels under Williamson Act contracts, which if included in the motion, would be revised to 20 feet. He also suggested additional language be added to the Resolution on page 1 of the findings, 2c, that the proposed retail and services station will preserve the integrity of the zoning district and maintain a 20 foot setback from agricultural operations.

Commissioner Nelson also commented that the right to farm language should be added.

Mr. Gustavson suggested adding the language to Exhibit A of the Resolution as a Special Condition.

Commissioner Little noted the special condition for screening of the fuel tanks should be consistent with fire codes as necessary for compliance.

Mr. Gustavson commented that the fuel tanks shall be painted in a subordinate color to the landscape as applicable to State and Federal law.

Commissioner Little suggested language that the screening shall be consistent with the nature and character of the surroundings, either vegetation, or a structure, or wall that is compatible with the proposed building and landscape setting.

The Commission took a break to allow staff time to write the special conditions for review and consideration.
[Break 12:20 PM – 12:34 PM]

Chair Warner noted the special condition was on the projector.

Upon motion by Commissioner Little, seconded by Commissioner Holtkamp and carried by the following roll call vote (7-0), IT IS ORDERED to adopt the Revised Resolution and Exhibit A with the

addition of Special Condition #37, screening of the fuel tanks, Special Condition #38, right to farm language, an addition to finding #2c., and to modify Condition #15 to reduce the buffer from 50 feet to 20 feet.

AYES: Little, Krueger, Nelson, Warner, Holtkamp, Hall, Ogle
NOES: None
ABSENT: None

7. Matters from Staff.

Mr. Gustavson discussed the upcoming Coastal Commission Meeting, which was being held in Ukiah at the Conference Center on October 5 through October 7th. He reviewed the various changes to the Mendocino Town Plan that had been discussed with Commission staff. He noted that the link to the Coastal Commission agenda would be posted on the department's website as soon as it was available. He hoped to have action taken by the Coastal Commission in either December or January of next year. Mr. Gustavson also discussed the early consultation notice that was provided for the medical cannabis cultivation ordinance. He noted the responsible agencies had been solicited for comments and hoped to schedule a Planning Commission meeting in November to receive public comments and asked the Commission's availability for a meeting on November 3rd.

Commissioner Nelson noted he would be absent on November 17, 2016.

Commissioner Little noted he would also be absent on November 17, 2016.

Commissioner Ogle noted she would be absent on October 6th and asked how many members there were on the Coastal Commission.

Commissioner Little discussed the Heritage initiative.

Mr. Kiedrowski noted that the goal was to have an ordinance in place before the next outdoor growing season.

Commissioner Little asked what would happen if an EIR was required.

Mr. Kiedrowski introduced Michael Makdisi, Deputy County Counsel, who would also be helping with planning matters. He also stated there were 12 voting members and 3 non-voting members of the Coastal Commission.

8. Matters from Commission.

None.

9. Approval of the July 21, 2016 Planning Commission Minutes.

Commissioner Ogle submitted corrections by email.

Upon motion by Commissioner Holtkamp, seconded by Commissioner Ogle and carried by a voice vote of (7-0), the July 21, 2016 Planning Commission Minutes are approved as corrected.

10. Adjournment.

Upon motion by Commissioner Nelson, seconded by Commissioner Ogle, and unanimously carried (7-0), IT IS ORDERED that the Planning Commission hearing adjourn at 12:54 p.m.