<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>STANDING AGENDA ITEMS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Call to Order and Flag Salute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Roll call</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|      | 3. **Public Comment:**  
  This time is set aside for residents to address the Planning Commission on matters listed on items *not* included on the Regular Agenda. If your comments concern an agenda item noted on the regular agenda, please address the Commission when that item is open for public comment. **Each speaker is allocated three (3) minutes to speak.** Speakers may not cede their time. Comments should be limited to matters within the jurisdiction of the City. Commission discussion or action cannot be taken on items not listed on the agenda other than to receive comments. If you have documents to present to members of Commission, please provide a minimum of seven (8) copies to the note taker. |
| 4. | Meeting Minutes  
  a. Approval of Regular Planning Commission Meeting Minutes for September 17, 2019  
  b. Approval of Regular Planning Commission Meeting Minutes for October 15, 2019. |
| 5. | **1119 Ream Avenue Parcel Map – Public Hearing**  
  Background: An application for a Parcel Map was filed with the City of Mt. Shasta for the real property located at 1119 Ream Avenue (APN #057-621-080). The Applicant has filed a tentative parcel map to subdivide the parcel into two new parcels. The parcel map would separate the existing industrial building into two separate industrial condominiums.  
  Commission Action: Motion to adopt Notice of Exemption and approve parcel split with conditions. |
| 6. | **City Library Architectural Review**  
  Background: The City has entered into a contract with Mt. Shasta Engineering to prepare engineering and architectural documents for an addition to the City Library. A proposal for the architectural design for the building is seeking a first round of comments from the Planning Commission for presentation to the City Council.  
  Commission Action: Give direction |
| 7. | **Commission and Staff Comment** |
8. Future Agenda Items – Future items are topics brought to the Planning Commission from a public petition, city staff, Planning Commission member(s), and City Council for review and action. All dates refer to first introductions to the Planning Commission and can be altered due to time and priority level. **Items that are bolded correlate with the General Plan Revision Process**

a. **Land Use Element Urban Design Results** – 12/17/2019  

10. Adjourn – Next meeting scheduled for Tuesday, December 17, 2019 at 6:00pm

Availability of Public Records: All public records related to an open session item on this agenda, which are not exempt from disclosure pursuant to the California Public Records Act, that are distributed to a majority of the legislative body will be available for public inspection at City Hall located at 305 North Mt. Shasta Blvd., Mt. Shasta, CA at the same time the public records are distributed or made available to the members of the legislative body. Agenda related writings or documents provided to a majority of the legislative body after distribution of the Agenda packet will be available for public review within a separate binder at City Hall at the same time as they are made available to the members of the legislative body.

The City of Mt. Shasta does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, religion, age or disability in employment or provision of services. In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, persons requiring accommodations for a disability at a public meeting should notify the Deputy City Clerk at least 48 hours prior to the meeting at (530) 926-7510 in order to allow the City sufficient time to make reasonable arrangements to accommodate participation in this meeting.

Any writings or documents provided to a majority of the Planning Commission after distribution of the meeting Agenda Packet regarding any open session item on this agenda will be made available for public inspection during normal business hours within the binder entitled “Agenda Packet for Front Counter” located at City Hall at the desk on the right-hand side inside the front door.

Projects heard at this Planning Commission meeting may be subject to appeal. Please contact the Planning Department for information. Appeals must be submitted to the City Clerk’s office together with the appeal fee. If you challenge the environmental review of the project proposal in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues raised at the public hearing or in written correspondence delivered to the Planning Department on, or prior to, closing of the public comment period.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>STANDING AGENDA ITEMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Call to Order and Flag Salute –</td>
<td>Chair Findling called to order at 6:00 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2. Roll call | **Present:** Chair Findling, Commissioners, Beck, Higuera, Saryon, McDowell, and Kirby  
**Absent:** Commissioner Pardee |
| | *Note: Commissioner Pardee is absent due to a conflict of interest with action item 5 on the agenda. |
| 3. Public Comment: | None |
| 4. Meeting Minutes: | **A. Meeting Minutes for Regular Meeting July 16, 2019**  
**COMMISSION ACTION:** Motion to approve minutes with minor typo corrections  
**MOVED:** Commissioner Higuera  
**SECOND:** Commissioner Beck  
**AYES:** Chair Findling, and Commissioners Beck, Higuera, McDowell, and Kirby  
**NAYS**  
**ABSTAIN:**  
**ABSENT:** Commissioner Pardee |
| | **B. Meeting Minutes for Regular Meeting August 20, 2019**  
Request for clarification on NOE acronym which means Notice of Exemption under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).  
**COMMISSION ACTION:** Motion to approve minutes with name and typo corrections  
**MOVED:** Commissioner Beck  
**SECOND:** Commissioner Kirby  
**AYES:** Chair Findling, and Commissioners Beck, Higuera, McDowell, and Kirby  
**NAYS**  
**ABSTAIN:** Commissioners Saryon  
**ABSENT:** Commissioner Pardee |
| 5. Freeze Mini Storage and Car Wash Project – Public Hearing | City Staff: Presentation of staff report.  
Clarifying questions on project details and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) documentation. Question on monitoring of wastewater  
Jim Freeze, Applicant: Presentation of project, discussion and answering of Planning Commission questions. |
Public Hearing Opened at 7:47 PM
Francis Mangels: Discussion on biological and hydrologic report in CEQA study. Opposed to additional car wash
John Keyho: Concern for noise from the development. In favor of noise abatement options
Hilary Stewart: Neighbor opposed to the proposal. Noise and light concerns
Paul Lennon: Neighbor concerned with noise, traffic, snow storage, and landscaping.

Motion for recess at 8:00 PM
Resume Meeting at 8:08 PM
Wayne Huisman: Owner of other car wash. Discussion on difficulty to run the car wash in a profitable way. Not in favor of additional car wash.
Roslyn McCoy: Discussion on Big Lakes Project and concern over adequate waster pressure for fire.
Christina Casellic: Concerned over the loss of natural beauty near the trailhead. Not opposed to business but opposed to that location for it.
Stephen Layman: Neighborhood concerned with outdoor impacts of the development, specifically chemicals, odor, and hazardous waste storage.
Melissa Doyle: Neighbor concerned with traffic and lighting from the car wash. Believes car wash will add to the pollution of the area and the entrances of the development.
Rick Demarest: Concerned over traffic, noise, and maintenance of the roadway. Question on who polices the mitigations
Vickie Gold: Believes that the uses are not compatible and the environmental document is not adequate. Opposes the application.
Dale LaForest: Believes that the environmental study is not adequate regarding lighting, stormwater, and noise. Believes there is no adequate water pressure. Concerned about greenhouse gases and lighting.
Raven Stevens: Commenting on behalf of the Siskiyou Humane Society, concerned over traffic and sewer in the area.
Betty Kreeger: Discussion on noise and the General Plan. Concerned over noise of the car wash project.
Dan Nelson: Concern over the condition of the ground and previous development leaving Caltrans rubble. Opposes the mini-storage in the zoning.
Stan Swenson: In favor of the development and feels that all of the information is adequate. Concern over the development of Mt. Shasta and the tough processes.
Johanna Altofer: Concern about intangibles and the surrounding area. Discussion on timing of reviews. Discussion on future development and need for priorities.
Applicant: Discussion on project and address questions concerning the viability of the business, different uses for the property, and odor of the car wash not existing.

Public Hearing Closed at 9:03 PM

Beck: Discussion on property history and compatibility of the use and the surrounding area. The Car Wash is not suitable for the area. Mini-storage is more compatible. Not in favor of a noise wall. Consider a compromise of striking the car wash and keep mini-storage. Not in favor of another car wash and the impact it could have on the surrounding area.
Saryon: Attempt to balance concerns. Not feasible to keep lot empty due to zoning. There is mini-storage and car wash in C-2 but built before this area and this is a different situation. Development would impact the residences the most. Concern over the car wash portion concerning the noise, traffic, and surrounding uses. Not comfortable with approving the Car wash. Would support EIR to ensure concerns are addressed.
Higuera: Not in favor of the car wash. Undecided on mini-storage. Concern over lighting. In favor
McDowell: Not in favor of the car wash use. Not decided on mini-storage and needs more information.
Kirby: In favor of growth and business development. Believes that the car wash does impact people. Not opposed to either development. Not necessarily in favor.
Findling: Find that the two portions of the projects are different. Feels that noise mitigations is satisfactory. Traffic impacts and cumulative impacts needs to be considered. Inclined to the deny the car wash. Concerned about grading, storage of hazardous chemicals in storage, and lighting of the mini-storage area. Wants lighting, grading, dust during construction, and more architectural information.

COMMISSION ACTION: Motion to request additional information from City Staff regarding grading, stormwater, additional architectural design information, lighting plan, dust control, storage of hazardous chemicals in mini-storage, and odor from car wash.
MOVED: Commissioner Beck
SECOND: Commissioner Kirby
AYES: Chair Findling, and Commissioners Beck, McDowell, Saryon, Higuera, and Kirby
NAYS
ABSTAIN:
ABSENT: Commissioner Pardee

COMMISSION ACTION: Motion to deny the car wash portion of the application.
MOVED: Commissioner Higuera
SECOND: Commissioner Saryon
AYES: Chair Findling, and Commissioners Beck, Saryon, and Higuera
NAYS: Commissioners McDowell and Kirby
ABSTAIN:
ABSENT: Commissioner Pardee

COMMISSION ACTION: Motion to table mini-storage portion of the application until additional information is received
MOVED: Commissioner Saryon
SECOND: Commissioner Higuera
AYES: Chair Findling, and Commissioners Beck, Saryon, Higuera, McDowell, and Kirby
NAYS:
ABSTAIN:
ABSENT: Commissioner Pardee

6. Commission and Staff Comments
Higuera: Discussion and question on traffic control at Berryvale crosswalk
City Staff: Discussion on lack of funding for traffic lights at crosswalk
McDowell: Discussion on Alma Street Construction and Farmer’s Market conflict
Beck: Discussion on crosswalks and pedestrian interaction with vehicles. Students crossing near Sisson. Discussion on sound and noise ordinance related to live music.
Saryon: Question on previous ordinances passed by Commission and action by City Council
9. **Future Agenda Items** – Future items are topics brought to the Planning Commission from a public petition, city staff, Planning Commission member(s), and City Council for review and action. All dates refer to first introductions to the Planning Commission and can be altered due to time and priority level. **Items that are bolded correlate with the General Plan Revision Process**

**Announcement that the Special Meeting scheduled for September 24, 2019 is cancelled due to posting error.**

a. Off-Street Parking Requirements – 10/15/2019  
b. Roseburg Specific Plan Revision – 10/15/2019  

10. **Adjourn** – Adjourned at 10:03 PM
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>STANDING AGENDA ITEMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Call to Order and Flag Salute –</td>
<td>Vice-Chair Beck called to order at 6:01PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Roll call</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present:</td>
<td>Commissioners Beck, Higuera, Saryon, and Pardee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent:</td>
<td>Chair Findling and Commissioners McDowell, and Kirby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Public Comment:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Scovill:</td>
<td>Discussion on Jefferson Soul location, cannabis buffer length, and cannabis regulations in the City. Support for enforcing regulations regarding cannabis operations and subdivision regulation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Hillman:</td>
<td>Discussion on Jefferson Soul cannabis industry application. Discussion on 600-foot buffer and measurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johanna Altofer:</td>
<td>Discussion on the Golden Eagle project. Looking for compromise on school location. Concerned about road location and noise of the project. Discussion on preferred alternative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert C:</td>
<td>Discussion on potential use at 1119 Ream Avenue. Concerned about proposed retail non-storefront and concerned for traffic and the increase in retail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Blomberg:</td>
<td>Discussion on cannabis facility near the “I AM” school. Discussion on safe school campuses instead of just the school. Believes the City is making up provisions to allow cannabis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin:</td>
<td>Discussion on cannabis use and 600-foot buffer. Request for denial of agenda item 5 due to having a cannabis use. Oppose Jefferson Soul lot split and location of cannabis location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Kim:</td>
<td>Discussion on lot split and the location of the cannabis business near the school. The City should include the whole school campus in the 600-foot buffer instead of just the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ally:</td>
<td>Resident of “I AM” school residence. Discussion on the smell of cannabis in the area and against having the use at the facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Hialman:</td>
<td>Discussion on City politics and permitting. Discussion on lawsuits and does not want the City to get into a lawsuit. Discussion on [California Environmental Quality Act] CEQA and not getting the City into a lawsuit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olivia:</td>
<td>Discussion on 600-foot buffer of cannabis businesses and against having a cannabis business near the “I AM” School. Discussion on youth access to Juul and vaping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estee Davis:</td>
<td>Lives at the “I AM” residence. Discussion on cannabis smell in the air and the smell waking up them up in the house. Discussion on smell and where is it coming from. Concerned about the location of the cannabis business and safety of children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke Tunis:</td>
<td>Discussion on vaping and Jefferson Soul production of vaping products. Concerned about the production of THC vape products by Jefferson Soul in Mt. Shasta. Questions about why...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the City is helping Jefferson Soul, why is the City leading with Jefferson Soul at the economic
development strategy.

Barbara Rodriguez: Discussion on City Council and Planning Commission role. Discussion on
violations that are being committed.

John Duncan: Questions about application completeness for Item #5. Concerned about possible
hazards and health to kids. Question about 5 jobs and is that worth it.

4. Meeting Minutes:
   A. Meeting Minutes for Regular Meeting September 17, 2019
      COMMISSION ACTION: Tabled due to lack of quorum of members present

5. 1119 Ream Avenue Lot Split– Public Hearing

City Staff: Presentation of staff report.

Clarifying questions on parking and the concern over the parking onsite, shared parking agreement,
changes in use of property, square footage of the building, Notice of Exemption description
language, 600-foot buffer for cannabis uses, and conditional use permit and uses.

Project Applicant, Reny Townsend: Discussion on the project application and tentative uses,
improvements of water and sewer lines, ADA Bathroom in the facilities, and reasoning for parcel
split.

Public Hearing opened at 7:03 PM:

Tom Scovill: Discussion on “cherry picked” regulations for consideration of use. Discussion of
regulations and time limits. Discussion on illegal activities and allowing for this illegal action to take
place. Feels more information is needed to decide. Asks for postponement of the public hearing.

Andrew Montgomery: Discussion on “I AM” School public comment letter. Disagrees with the City
Planner’s application. Discussion on existing and former use. Discussion on expansion of use and
the application of state law and court cases.

Steve Hillman: Discussion on CEQA process and feels an environmental analysis is required. Feels
the CEQA review is wrong and should include the 600 foot buffer of the school.

Michael Huffman: Discussion on CEQA process and regulations. Feels there are cumulative effects
and impacts to the surrounding properties. Believes the school should have been noticed in this
process.

Eric Price: Continues the comments of Andrew. Believes there is collusion. Discussion on
application. Asks for deferment to City Council.

Betty Kreeger: Believes that there are no transparency and fully informed people. Discussion on
general application, General Plan information, and municipal code information. Discussion on ad
hoc change of the requirements. Discussion about missing information and application is not
Peggy Risch: Believes that the City Staff is ignoring the information tonight. Asks that the Planning Commission look at the uses. Believes the application letter is incomplete. Does not feel this project is not exempt from CEQA. Asks for Planning Commission to deny the application. Believes that City Staff is not being transparent.

Robert Kim: Concerned with parking. Feels that the property is inadequate for the parking situation. Feels that the parking needs to be considered more.

Shelly Blomberg: Feels that the application needs a CEQA analysis of impacts. Feels that the application does not include enough information. Discussion on CEQA and application. Feels the application will lead to more development and property owners doing the same thing. Asks for CEQA review.

Jane Hoffman: Concerned about parking on the property and the lack of property downtown. Discussion on cannabis referendum and Jefferson Soul using the backdoor.

Public Hearing closed at 7:32 PM:

Commissioner Pardee: Question on the 600-foot buffer and the proposed buffer. Question on the 600-foot buffer distance measurement. Discussion on the general application requirements and the municipal code section.

Commissioner Saryon: Discussion on the lot split and no issues in general. The owner/applicant is also a cannabis business owner. The point of measurement should be for the campus instead the school property. The larger map in the CUP is a larger area. There is no building on the lot and there may or may not be used in the future. Feel the existing is changing and there are cumulative impacts. Proposes to setback and reassess the legality and look at the application items.

Commissioner Higuera: Discussion on measurement of the buffer zone is done appropriately. A lot split is a good business move due to the ability to sell a smaller scale industrial building. The CEQA aspect is confusing. The people against the project are using CEQA as a point of contention. The 600-foot buffer is set, and the person is splitting the lot. Feels the lot split is legitimate.

Vice-Chair Beck: Discussion on the original cannabis ordinance. Discussion on manufacturing facility, cannabis use, and 600-foot buffer. Discussion on cannabis regulations. Concerned with the measurement of the 600-foot buffer and wants the buffer on the tentative parcel.

Commissioner Higuera: Discussion on requesting more information about parking and CEQA. Does not feel CEQA will favor the

COMMISSION ACTION: Motion to table to a future meeting with additional information related to:
- The 600 foot buffer in relation to the proposed project
- Information on square footage for parking
- CEQA notice of exemption
MOVED: Commissioner Pardee  
SECOND: Commissioner Saryon  
AYES: Commissioners Beck, Pardee, Saryon, and Higuera  
NAYS:  
ABSTAIN:  
ABSENT: Chair Findling and Commissioners Kirby and McDowell.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Housing Element Workshop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussion on housing topics that should be included in a future housing workshop. Topics suggested were short-term rentals, City of Weed success in building housing, incentives or subsidies to encourage more housing, discussion on smaller units, and use of City lots for housing projects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Commission and Staff Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| City Staff: Discussion on traffic sign in cross walk and transportation planning grant  
Higuera: Discussion on odor from cannabis facilities is not an issue. The odor experienced is from outdoor grows at homes. Worried about odor growing outdoor gardens.  
Saryon: Question on report of cannabis odor. Question on Golden Eagle application.  
Beck: Discussion on vaping and issues that have been experienced. Discussion on retail licensing.  
Discussion on sign placement at Castle Street for the “No Smoking” Sign. Request to switch the sign to face the pedestrian side. Concern about skateboarding and biking on the sidewalk.  
Discussion on the noise ordinance and the need to address the live music scene. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9. Future Agenda Items – Future items are topics brought to the Planning Commission from a public petition, city staff, Planning Commission member(s), and City Council for review and action. All dates refer to first introductions to the Planning Commission and can be altered due to time and priority level.</th>
<th>Items that are bolded correlate with the General Plan Revision Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Announcement that the Special Meeting scheduled for September 24, 2019 is cancelled due to posting error.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion on adding noise ordinance to the future agenda items.

| 10. Adjourn – Adjourned at 8:30 PM |
Agenda Item # 5

Staff Report

Meeting Date: November 19, 2019

To: Planning Commission

From: Planning Department

Subject: 1119 Ream Parcel Split and Condominium Conversion: Public Hearing

Recommended Action:

1. Open and Close the Public Hearing

2. Motion to adopt Class I Notice of Exemption for 1119 Ream Parcel Split.

3. Motion to approve parcel split and condo conversion application with conditions.

Project Description:

The City received an application for a parcel split and condominium (condo) conversion of the building at 1119 Ream Avenue. The proposed lot split would result in the creation of two new parcels from an existing parcel. The proposed split would follow the center of the existing interior building wall and along the existing roof ridge line.

Parcel “A” will consist of the southerly portion of the existing building and lot. Parcel “B” will include the northernly portion of the existing building and lot. The proposed building split would result in the creation of a new sewer and water connection for one of the units. The existing connection would be preserved.

Parking

The current property has unmarked parking but can fit approximately 10 vehicles at one time. There are no handicap parking spaces. The proposed tentative parcel map indicates that there will be at least one handicap parking space available to each parcel ensuring Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accommodations. Parcel “A” has three parking spaces available in addition to the ADA space and seven shared parking for both Parcel “A” and “B”. An easement for shared parking is proposed to ensure continued parking availability. Parcel “B” has two parking spaces in addition to the ADA space. There will be no expansion of the surface area of the existing parking area.
The proposed parking spaces could satisfy Chapter 15.44 “Off-Street Parking Requirements” through a shared parking agreement. The current gym use has a minimum parking of one space per 300 sq. ft. gross floor area, up to and including 5,000 sq. ft., then one space per 500 sq. ft. gross floor area. The gym is approximately 3,800 sq. ft. which is a minimum parking of 12 spaces, which can be met by the proposed parking arrangement and shared parking agreement. The gym use is not considered a constant use due to the scheduling of classes and personal training session; therefore, we can anticipate that all 13 spaces would not be filled for a full day.

Parcel “B” is currently vacant, but has served as an alcohol distribution warehouse, mechanical service shop, and storage. The square footage of the building is 4,000 sq. ft. the building is not currently in use but is zoned Employment Center which includes the following uses:

“Professional and service offices, production studios not involving the use of significant amounts of hazardous substances, and not exceeding 10,000 square feet in floor area where all necessary public services and facilities are available, and the surrounding area is not environmentally sensitive. Manufacturing and warehouse uses not involving the use of significant amounts of hazardous substances, and not exceeding 10,000 square feet in floor area where all necessary public services and facilities are available and the surrounding area is not environmentally sensitive.”

(18.16.020 MSMC)

There is no specific minimum parking calculation for the uses, so we will rely on 1 space for every 300 sq. ft. Parcel “B” would require 13 parking spaces. Parcel “B” has three spaces onsite and access to the 10 shared spaces onsite. The combination of the parking requirements for both parcels would exceed the shared parking onsite. The total amount of parking for both uses would be 25 parking spaces. The property owner has developed and prepared to enter into an agreement with an adjacent property owner to provide 10 to 12 additional parking spaces at 1023 Ream Ave (Attachment 4). The spaces would be available to proposed Parcel “B”. The onsite parking improvements and the shared parking agreement with the adjacent property owner would meet Chapter 15.44 requirements.

There is no proposed expansion of the existing parking lot or removal of non-invasive plant species. The project application proposes to remove damaged parking lot areas and replace with a new parking lot surface. The replacement of the damaged parking lot would not result in the loss of trees or landscaping. The project Applicant does propose to remove the Himalayan Blackberry on the property, which is an invasive species. The Applicant has expressed interest in adding planter boxes to the edge of the buildings and parking lots. The proposed replacement of the parking lot would not trigger an Architectural Design review or environmental review.

Chapter 18.60 governs the Architectural Review process. Architectural review is required for new and altered commercial and high density residential developments; high-density residential
is one structure containing 5 or more housing units. The Applicant would be required to apply if there are significant changes to the façade or site. Section 18.60.055 lists the exceptions to filing an Architectural Design application which includes upkeep of the property, addition of landscaping, or other work which would not change the design of the structure. The replacement of the parking area with no increase in square footage, management of invasive species, and addition of planter boxes would not constitute the filing of an Architectural Review application at this time.

The parcels do not show bike parking spaces or stationary objects to accommodate bike parking. Section 15.44.130 requires that a stationary object shall be provided to which two adult bicycles may be attached for every 2,000 sq. ft. The proposed parcel split would trigger compliance with this section of the municipal code. A condition of approval shall be to install a minimum of two stationary objects per parcel, for a total of 4, to accommodate bike parking. The Applicant may place these objects in the shared parking area or inside the facility as long as the area is clearly designated bike parking.

Utilities

The tentative parcel map would require the purchase and construction of a separate connection for one of the new parcels. The Applicant has illustrated on Exhibit B the proposed new sewer and water connections. Parcel “B” will receive a new sewer line. Parcel “A” will receive a new water line. The Public Works Department has reviewed the tentative parcel map and new services and approves of the placement subject to minor changes. A final building permit, which would include a civil sheet, would be required prior to construction taking place to install the new sewer and water lines.

Project Location: 1119 Ream Avenue, Mt. Shasta, CA 96067
APN # 057-621-080

Surrounding Conditions & Uses:

The property is immediately surrounding by commercial and industrial uses to the north and east. The property is bordered by Union Pacific Railroad rail line on the west and southern sides of the property. The property on the other side of the rail line is vacant and zoned for Employment Center (industrial) uses. Within 300 feet of the property are a mixture of uses; residential, commercial, and industrial.

General Plan and Zoning Code Connection:

The parcel has a Land Use designation of Employment Center. The Employment Center land designation is for siting businesses that provide a product or service that generally does not require onsite customer traffic. These types of businesses include manufacturers, machine shops, automobile repair, administrative offices, lumber mills, and other industrial type uses. The General Plan standards for Employment Center include no persons per acre levels since residential is not
an appropriate use. The maximum lot coverage in the Employment center zone is 75% which includes the building footprint. Lot coverage does not include the parking areas.

The parcel has a zoning code designation of Employment Center as well. The Employment Center lot design prescribes a maximum building height for 45 feet and no required lot depth or width minimum. There are no building setbacks prescribed in the zoning code, but the buildings must comply with the Building and Fire Code. The requirements for building separation for a commercial condo conversion involve the installation of a fire wall between units that extends 30 inches above the roof. The fire wall is proposed to be gabled to match the slope and design of the existing roof. The tentative parcel map follows the site development standards of the zoning code. A condition of approval has been added to ensure compliance with Fire and Building Code standards.

The zoning code prescribes the density and intensity of a given lot. The maximum intensity, which is the building footprint, shall not exceed 75 percent of the lot coverage for either lot. Since the City is requesting the street be deeded to the City, the area of the street was subtracted from the parcel size. The proposed new parcels would have lot coverage of Parcel “A” is 38.15% and Parcel “B” is 45.28% coverage. Both parcels would be below the 75% lot coverage standard. There is no requirement for minimum parcel size.

**Environmental Review:**

This Project has been reviewed for compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The CEQA review process begins with the determination of whether the parcel map is considered a “project”. A “project” under CEQA is any discretionary action which could directly or indirectly impact the environment. The Planning Department determined that it is a project due to the discretionary nature of the parcel map.

The second stage of the review process is to determine if a CEQA exemption is available for the project based on the available categorical or statutory exemptions. The project could qualify for an exemption from CEQA under a Class 1 Existing Facilities Section 15301(k). The Class 1 exemption applies to a number of projects involving negligible or no expansion of use beyond that existing at the time of the lead agency’s determination. Subsection (k) applies to the subdivision of existing commercial or industrial buildings, where no physical changes occur which are otherwise exempt. The proposed physical changes to meet Fire and Building Code standards would not qualify as physical changes subject to CEQA.

In addition, the re-pavement of the parking with no expansion of surface area and installation of utilities for the proposed parcels are considered physical changes that would also be exempt from CEQA. If the project applicant were to proceed with a re-pavement of the existing parking lot and installation of the utilities outside of a lot split application, those actions would be considered a Class 1 and Class 3 exemptions, respectively. Class 1 would cover the replacement of an existing facilities and the Class 3 would cover the installation of new construction related to water mains, sewage, electrical, gas, and other utility extensions of reasonable length to serve such construction.
Public comment does not agree with the application of a Class 1 exemption for the project. The main argument centers on the perceived expansion of use and application of “unusual circumstances”. The perceived expansion of use is predicated on the pending cannabis industry license application. First, the cannabis industry license is not an action item in front of the Planning Commission; therefore, it is not analyzed under CEQA in relation to this application. Previous Planning Commission and City Council decisions in 2017, authorized the siting of cannabis industry uses in a number of zones outlined in the zoning code. Chapter 18.91 outlines the permitted, conditional use, and not permitted zones for cannabis industry uses. The Employment Center zone allows for cannabis industry uses by right; therefore, there is no proposed expansion of use if the use remains within the permitted uses of the zone.

The second argument stated is that the proposed lot split fits in the “unusual circumstances” category. Unusual circumstances under CEQA refer to factors of the project which meet one of the exceptions listed in 14 CCR § 15300.2(c):

(a) Location. Classes 3, 4, 5, 6, and 11 are qualified by consideration of where the project is to be located - a project that is ordinarily insignificant in its impact on the environment may in a particularly sensitive environment be significant. Therefore, these classes are considered to apply in all instances, except where the project may impact on an environmental resource of hazardous or critical concern where designated, precisely mapped, and officially adopted pursuant to law by federal, state, or local agencies.

(b) Cumulative Impact. All exemptions for these classes are inapplicable when the cumulative impact of successive projects of the same type in the same place, over time is significant.

(c) Significant Effect. A categorical exemption shall not be used for an activity where there is a reasonable possibility that the activity will have a significant effect on the environment due to unusual circumstances.

(d) Scenic Highways. A categorical exemption shall not be used for a project which may result in damage to scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, historic buildings, rock outcroppings, or similar resources, within a highway officially designated as a state scenic highway. This does not apply to improvements which are required as mitigation by an adopted negative declaration or certified EIR.

(e) Hazardous Waste Sites. A categorical exemption shall not be used for a project located on a site which is included on any list compiled pursuant to Section 65962.5 of the Government Code.

(f) Historical Resources. A categorical exemption shall not be used for a project which may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.
The public comment argument incorrectly tries to apply exceptions (b) and/or (c) to this project application. Exception (b) looks at the cumulative impact of like projects in the area over time. There are no applications for other lot splits in the area nor inquiries related to lots splits. The statement that this lot split will lead to more lot splits in the area is speculative and not supported by evidence. The cannabis industry license application is not part of the project and the City has not received any interest or applications for other facilities in the area. Again, the statement that this lot split will lead to an increase in cannabis industry use applications is speculative and not supported by evidence.

Exception (c) focuses on “unusual circumstances”. A project with unusual circumstances “differs from the general circumstances of the projects covered by a particular categorical class exemption, and create an environmental risk that does not exist for the general class of exempt projects” (Citizens for a Better Environment, citing Azusa Land Reclamation Co v. Main San Gabriel Basin Watermaster (1997) 52 Cal. App. 4th 1165). The “unusual circumstances” definition and application are incorrectly used by the public commenters. The comments incorrectly assert that there is evidence to support an “unusual circumstance” but do not provide the evidence or speculate on the potential environmental impacts.

The Sixth District Court of Appeal’s decision in Aptos Council v. County of Santa Cruz (2017), 10 Cal. App. 5th 266; 216 Cal. Rptr. 3d 142, upheld a negative declaration under the “fair argument” standard.” In this case, the County of Santa Cruz adopted three ordinances, one of which would have removed density limitations and height limitations for hotels. Aptos Council challenged the Project, stating that the negative declaration did not take into consideration the environmental impacts that may ensue from future hotel developments.

The Court disagreed with Aptos Council’s analysis and found that the potential for future developments was too speculative to be reasonably foreseeable, even though evidence in the record indicated that the purpose of the Ordinance was to stimulate the development of hotels. The Court noted that Aptos Council did not point to anything in the record to demonstrate that increased development was reasonably foreseeable, rather than an “optimistic gleam in [the County’s] eye.” (Topanga Beach Renters Assn. v. Department of General Services (1976) 58 Cal.App.3d 188, 196.)

The Court referenced CEQA Guidelines, §15144, which states, “While foreseeing the unforeseeable is not possible, an agency must use its best efforts to find out and disclose all that it reasonably can” and concluded that, nonetheless, it need not consider impacts that are too speculative. CEQA Guidelines §15064(d)(3) states, “An indirect physical change is to be considered only if that change is a reasonably foreseeable impact which may be caused by the project. A change which is speculative or unlikely to occur is not reasonably foreseeable.”

In addition, in Aptos Council v. County of Santa Cruz, the Court noted that pointing to a lack of evidence in the administrative record does not by itself constitute substantial evidence of a significant environmental impact:

“An absence of evidence in the record on a particular issue does not automatically invalidate a negative declaration. The lack of study is hardly evidence that there will be a significant impact.” (Gentry v. City of Murrieta, supra, 36 Cal.App.4th at p. 1379.)
The public commenters assertion that there is evidence; therefore, the City must initiate an Initial Study process is not founded.

**Public Input:**

Public notice was posted as per Government Code Sections 65090 and 65091, which require specific posting requirements and noticing to property owners within 300 feet of the proposed parcel split. The notice went out in October and November of 2019 following these regulations. The general topics raised from the public input through the noticing process and public input form the October regular meeting were concerned with the completion of the project application, the measurement of a 600 foot state sensitive use buffer, use of the property, and CEQA. The CEQA comments have been addressed in the “Environmental Review” section of this report.

**Incomplete Application Complaint**

Public comments have been concerned with the Planning Department accepting an incomplete application. Chapter 17.10 of the Mt. Shasta Municipal Code outlines general proceedings for application procedures and fees. The process for projects follows three general steps: pre-application meeting, application submission, and fee payment. The information and fees associated with the project will differ depending on what the project involves. The Planning Director determines if the information presented for an application is complete or incomplete (MSMC 17.10.020). The comments presented disagree with the determination of completeness of the application, which is an opinion. The comments discuss the General Application form which is a tool to collect information related to a project. The General Application form is not a requirement.

What is required of a parcel map application is listed in Chapter of the Mt. Shasta Municipal Code. Section 17.12.020 states:

(A) Tentative parcel maps shall be prepared by, or under the direction of, a registered civil engineer or licensed land surveyor, but need not be based on a survey, and shall contain the following information:

1. The subdivision name or number, date, north point, scale and sufficient description to define the location and boundaries of the proposed subdivision;
2. Name and address of record owner or owners of the subdivision;
3. Name and address of the subdivider;
4. Name, business address and number of the registered engineer, or licensed surveyor, who prepared, or directed the preparation of, the map of the subdivision;
(5) Elevations or contours at intervals of five feet to determine slope of the land and the high and low points thereof;
(6) The locations, names, widths and approximate grades of all roads, streets, highways and ways, if any, in the proposed subdivision and along the boundaries thereof;
(7) The location and character of all existing or proposed public utility facilities in the subdivision or on the adjoining and contiguous highways, streets and ways;
(8) The approximate widths, location and purpose of all existing or proposed easements contiguous to the proposed subdivision;
(9) Approximate lot layout and approximate dimensions of each lot and each to be numbered or lettered;
(10) The outline of any existing buildings to remain in place and their locations in relation to existing or proposed street and lot lines;
(11) Approximate location of all areas subject to inundation or stormwater overflow and the location, width and direction of flow of all watercourses;
(12) When a public street is proposed as part of the subdivision, show typical street sections and detail.

In the case of this parcel map application, the proposed parcels are developed and do not need to provide information regarding numbers (5), (6), (11), and (12). This information is needed for the Public Works Department and City Engineer when there is also a proposed development as part of the project. The tentative map has been reviewed by the Public Work Director and City Engineer. There was no additional information needed at this time.

The public comments discuss the collection of a 15% fee at the time of the pre-application meeting. The City has suspended this requirement for the past couple of years due to difficulty in determining the appropriate fees at the time of a pre-application meeting. Pre-application meetings are typically done during the conceptual phase of a development. The conceptual nature of the project makes it difficult to know what fees and information will be needed at the final submission. We do require that 100% of fees are collected at the time of application submission. City Staff do have plans to correct the Municipal Code to reflect current practices.

600 Foot State Use Buffer

As previously discussed in the October 15, 2019 Planning Commission meeting use is not a factor in the approval or denial of a parcel map application. The discussion surrounding the potential use of the property and the application of the state sensitive use buffer is inappropriate for this application discussion. The Planning Commission and City Council raised the issue of the application of a local sensitive use buffer during the amendments to the cannabis zoning ordinance Chapter 18.91 in early 2019. The decision was made by the City Council and subsequently rescinded due to a referendum. The result of the discussion and referendum is that there is no local buffer distance or method for measurement. The Planning Commission and City Council may not open discussion of a local buffer and measurement interpretation until May of 2020 due to the referendum process.

The second discussion piece is how to interpret the state regulations regarding the measurement of the state buffer. A letter from the City Attorney was prepared regarding the issue August 19,
2019 (Attachment 3). The letter is the City’s current position on the interpretation of the state buffer based on existing state regulations. It is not advisable for the Planning Commission to interpret state regulations. The state is the responsible legislative agency in this case and should correct the City if its interpretation is wrong.

Use of the Property

A number of comment letters are concerned with the potential use of the property. As discussed at the October 15, 2019 regular Planning Commission, the potential, actual, and speculated use of a property is not a factor in the determination of a parcel map application. Chapter 17.12 governs the tentative parcel map requirements and analysis of parcel maps of four or less lots. Section 17.12.030 states “The Planning Commission shall determine whether the proposed subdivision is in conformity with the Subdivision Map Act and this title, whether the size and shape of the proposed lots are in general conformance to City requirements, and whether all the proposed lots will have proper and sufficient access to a public street.” This review is analyzed and discussed in the “Analysis and Findings” section of this report. Use is not a factor in this application process.

Parking Lot and Landscaping

Public comment was received indicating that there would be an expansion of the parking lot and removal of landscaping to accommodate parking. As stated in the above “Parking” section of this report, there will be no expansion of the parking lot area or removal of non-invasive species.

As for the comment on parking lot orientation and safety, the Public Works and City Engineer have reviewed the proposed parking lot configuration and have no issue with the orientation.

Analysis & Findings:

Chapter 17.12 of the Mt. Shasta Municipal Code is the local regulation governing lot splits with less than four lots involved. The Planning Commission shall determine whether the proposed subdivision is in conformity with the Subdivision Map Act and this title, whether the size and shape of the proposed lots are in general conformance to City requirements, and whether all the proposed lots will have proper and sufficient access to a public street.

The Subdivision Map Act is the state regulation of parcel mergers, tentative maps, and parcel divisions. The Act requires an application to be filed with the City to the designate legislative body. The City of Mt. Shasta has designated the Planning Commission as the legislative body to review parcel maps. The state requires additional information for residential condominium conversions, but this application is exempt due to the commercial nature. There are no other requirements in the state code applicable to this application review.

There are several goals, policies, and implementation measures related to siting Employment Center land uses. The proposed parcel map would not change the land use designation; therefore, there is no conflict between the proposed parcel map and the General Plan. The lot design of the proposed parcels follows the zoning code development standards. Finally, the lot does have adequate access to the public street along Ream Avenue. There has been a condition added to
the approval for the City to obtain ownership of the public street which was constructed on the Applicant’s property.

**Recommendation Discussion:**

City Staff have conducted an environmental review under CEQA and determined that the application is a project under CEQA but can be considered exempt through the Class 1 categorical exemption discussion in the “Environmental Review” section of this report. City Staff recommend adopting of the Class 1 Notice of Exemption for the parcel split and condo conversion.

Based on the information presented, City Staff recommend approval with the following conditions:

- The parking lot be repaved and painted to reflect the parking spaces as shown on the tentative parcel map, prior to August 1, 2020. Applicant shall submit a quote for the work and bond in the amount of the cost to repave and paint the parking lot to the City prior to January 1, 2020. The bond will be used for the proposed work if the applicant cannot meet the August 1, 2020 deadline. The bond will be released once the condition is achieved.

- The Applicant shall enter into and maintain the shared parking agreement to provide 10 to 12 parking spaces on 1023 Ream Avenue as per the presented agreement or similar future agreement for the use of Parcel “B”. The agreement shall be entered into prior to final recordation of the parcel map.

- All proposed easements for utilities be recorded at the time of the parcel split recording to Siskiyou County

- The Applicant deeds over the portion of the property which includes the developed City Street. The deeded portion of the property shall be noted on the final parcel map and include all necessary documentation to properly deed the City street to the City of Mt. Shasta.

- The Applicant install a minimum of two stationary objects for each parcel (for a total of 4 stationary objects) to accommodate a minimum of 4 adult bicycles. The stationary objects may also be placed in the shared parking area for use of both parcels for bike parking. The stationary objects may also be mounted inside the facility in a protect area designated for bike parking. This condition shall be completed prior to August 1, 2020 in tandem with the parking lot improvements.

- The Applicant shall install the new sewer and water service lines prior to August 1, 2020. A building permit and City Engineer approval of the line details and placement shall be obtained prior to construction of the lines.
The Applicant shall obtain a building permit and install appropriate firewall and building measures to meet Building and Fire Code standards for building separation. This condition shall be completed prior to March 1, 2020.

The tentative parcel map is in conformance with the Subdivision Map Act, City’s General Plan, and City Zoning Code. The conditions of approval will bring the property into compliance with Chapter 15.44 and ensure proper building service separation is achieved in a timely manner. There is no legal basis for the denial of this application.

Attachments:

1. Tentative Parcel Map (Exhibit B)
2. Notice of Exemption
3. City Attorney Letter August 9, 2019
4. Proposed Shared Parking Agreement
5. City Attorney Letter November 14, 2019
Notice of Exemption

To: Office of Planning and Research
P.O. Box 3044, Room 113
Sacramento, CA 95812-3044

From: (Public Agency): City of Mt. Shasta
305 N Mt. Shasta Blvd.
Mt. Shasta, CA 96067

County Clerk
County of: Siskiyou
510 N Main St.
Yreka, CA 96097

Project Title: 1119 Ream Avenue Lot Split and Condo Conversion
Project Applicant: Reny Townsend

Project Location - Specific:
1119 Ream Avenue, Mt. Shasta, CA 96067 APN # 057-621-080
Project Location - City: Mt. Shasta Project Location - County: Siskiyou

Description of Nature, Purpose and Beneficiaries of Project:
Application by the Applicant to divide one parcel into two and divide the existing structure into two structures with a common wall.

Name of Public Agency Approving Project: City of Mt. Shasta
Name of Person or Agency Carrying Out Project: Reny Townsend

Exempt Status: (check one):
- Ministerial (Sec. 21080(b)(1); 15268);
- Declared Emergency (Sec. 21080(b)(3); 15269(a));
- Emergency Project (Sec. 21080(b)(4); 15269(b)(c));
- Categorical Exemption. State type and section number: Class 1, Section 15301(k)
- Statutory Exemptions. State code number:

Reasons why project is exempt:
Project is a subdivision of a commercial property which would not result in physical changes subject to CEQA.

Lead Agency
Contact Person: Juliana Lucchesi
Area Code/Telephone/Extension: 5309267517

If filed by applicant:
1. Attach certified document of exemption finding.
2. Has a Notice of Exemption been filed by the public agency approving the project? □ Yes □ No

Signature: ____________________________ Date: 11/20/2019 Title: City Planner

☐ Signed by Lead Agency ☐ Signed by Applicant

Authority cited: Sections 21083 and 21110, Public Resources Code.
Reference: Sections 21108, 21152, and 21152.1, Public Resources Code.
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August 19, 2019

Via email

Juliana Lucchesi, City Planner
City of Mt. Shasta
305 N. Mt. Shasta Blvd.
Mt. Shasta, CA 96067

Re: "I AM" School Buffer Zone

Dear Ms. Lucchesi:

Russell Davis, an attorney for Pacific Justice Institute sent the City a copy of a letter addressed to a Mr. Townsend who I assume is the applicant for a cannabis license for the Ream Avenue facility. Copies of the letter were given to various City recipients. The question has arisen as to whether the City should respond to this letter.

The letter was not addressed to the City and it is assumed that the letter was sent to the City as an informational item and as a courtesy. There is no requirement to respond to the letter. The letter does, however, contain an assertion regarding the calculation of the separation distance between a cannabis facility and a school. The City should be prepared to address this issue.

The author of the letter maintains that the 600-foot buffer required between the cannabis facility and the school is measured from the property line of the cannabis facility to the property line of the "I AM" School campus property. The author maintains that the school has a use permit that would allow other property to be used for school purposes. He equates the ability for the property to be used for school purposes with property already being used for school purposes. I believe this interpretation of the law is inaccurate. A "school campus" is not a "school".

The 600-foot buffer zone is set forth in Health and Safety Code section 26054 which incorporates the measurement of distance as set forth Health and Safety Code section 11362.768. This latter section measures the buffer zone as the "horizontal distance measured in a straight line from the property line of the school to the closest property line of the lot" where the cannabis use is permitted. It is noted that the reference is to the property line of the lot on which the school rests. Significantly, the school must be in existence at the time the license is issued. It is my understanding that the "school campus" includes a lot or lots on which no school presently exists. Section 26054 makes clear that the school must pre-date the issuance of the permit. Even if it is assumed that a school could be built on some other parcel included in the "school campus", if a school is not in existence at the time the license is issued, that lot would not be used as a point of measurement as set forth in section 26054.
August 19, 2019
Juliana Lucchesi, City Planner
Re: "I AM" School Buffer Zone
Page 2

When you have had an opportunity to consider this, please give me a call to discuss.

Very truly yours,

KENNY & NORINE

JOHN SULLIVAN KENNY
JSK.fw/3737

cc: Bruce Pope, City Manager

4814-7978-9473, v. 1
Shasta Properties Management, LLC
1119 Ream Ave.
Mount Shasta, CA 96067

November 4, 2019

Juliana Lucchesi
City Planner
305 N. Mt Shasta Blvd
Mount Shasta, CA 96067

Dear Juliana,

Chuck Ryan and I have reached a tentative shared parking agreement at 1023 Ream Ave. The shared parking agreement is contingent on the approval of our parcel split application.

To our best knowledge there would be 10 to 12 full size parking spaces included in the agreement. These parking spaces would solely be for use by the tenant of 1119 Ream Ave., Parcel B.

The leased parking lot would receive a new seal coat and paint delineating the parking spaces. The parking lot would be maintained by Shasta Properties Management, LLC.

Sincerely,

Reny Townsend
Member
Shasta Properties Management, LLC

Sincerely,

Chuck Ryan
MEMORANDUM

TO: Juliana Lucchesi  
   Planning Director  
   City of Mt. Shasta

FROM: John S. Kenny, City Attorney

DATE: November 14, 2019

RE: Objections to Parcel Map

1. CATEGORICAL EXEMPTION

The Planning Commission will be considering a parcel map which will divide one parcel into two. There is a structure existing on the present parcel. The structure is used for commercial use and is divided to permit two uses in the existing building. The applicant's proposal is to divide the parcel into two parcels and divide the existing structure into two structures with a common wall. The existing building is presently being leased for two commercial activities.

There are objections to the parcel split because it is believed that the purpose of the split is to allow one of the parcels to be used as a commercial cannabis operation. The property is presently zoned to permit a commercial cannabis business. The staff report recommends a categorical exemption pursuant to 14 CCR § 15301(k) which exempts from CEQA the subdivision of existing commercial buildings where no physical changes occur. The project is an appropriate subject for that categorical exemption. It could also be found to be exempt pursuant to 14 CCR § 15332 which exempts in full development projects. The categorical exemption applies to an in-fill project that is consistent with the General Plan and existing zoning regulations, is no greater than five acres, has no value as habitat for endangered or threatened species, will not result in any significant effects relating to traffic noise or air quality or water quality, and the site is adequately served by all required utilities and public services. It would appear that the Planning Commission could make these findings in this case.
The opponents maintain that categorical exemptions cannot be used for an activity where there is a reasonable possibility that the activity will have a significant effect on the environment due to unusual circumstances. (14 CCR 15300.2(c).) The opponents correctly state the requirements of section 15300.2(c), but misapply it. Categorical exemptions express a finding that the changes typically associated with the projects in the classes of categorical exemptions are not significant under CEQA even though it might be argued that there are potentially significant effects. The plain language of the section requires more than potentially significant effects. It requires that there is a reasonable possibility that the activity will have a significant effect on the environment due to unusual circumstances. If there are no unusual circumstances, the categorical exemption applies (Berkeley Hillside Preservation v. City of Berkeley (2015), 60 Cal.4th 1086). In the case of this parcel split, there appears to be no unusual circumstances. The fact that a commercial cannabis operation may be used in one of the structures should not be an issue. The property is zoned for cannabis uses. The property would be available for any of the permitted uses. If one use is chosen initially, there is no certainty that that use could not change. The effect of the parcel map would be to create two buildings each of which are subject to the existing zoning requirements. The present zoning requirements have been subjected to CEQA review in the General Plan and zoning process.

2. APPEAL FROM A STAFF REPORT

As stated above, the Planning Director previously prepared a staff report recommending that the Planning Commission find the project eligible for a categorical exemption. The opponents to the parcel split have at various times suggested that the Planning Director's staff report is subject to appeal under the provisions of Public Resources Code section 21151(c) and 14 CCR § 15061(e). Even assuming the Planning Director is a "non-elected decision-maker" and the act of preparing a staff report was discretionary rather than ministerial, it is not a "determination that the project is not subject to CEQA". San Diegans for Open Government v. City of San Diego (2016) 6 CA 5th 995. Hence, it is not appealable.

3. BUFFER ZONE

The opponents believe the parcel map should not be approved because the present intent of the applicant is to use one parcel for a commercial cannabis facility. Opponents maintain the parcel is within the 600-foot buffer zone that separates schools from cannabis facilities. There is a dispute as to how the buffer zone should be measured. That is an issue to be addressed when or if the applicant seeks a permit to operate a cannabis facility. The parcel map will allow any use permitted by zoning. The zoning permits more than one use. The parcel map results in two parcels. These will remain. The uses for each parcel may change. If a particular permitted use is objectionable, it is a zoning or licensing matter, not a consideration for the parcel map.
**Agenda Item # 6**

**Staff Report**

**Meeting Date:** November 19, 2019

**To:** Planning Commission

**From:** Planning Department

**Subject:** Library Addition Project: Façade Presentation

---

**Background:**

The City of Mt. Shasta hired Mt. Shasta Engineering to develop architectural and building drawings for an expansion of the City Library building. Mt. Shasta Engineering has worked with the contract Librarian, Courtney Laverty, to create an addition that meets the growing needs of the library while meeting City of Mt. Shasta Architectural Design Guidelines. Mt. Shasta Engineering has prepared recommendations for façade textures, colors, and preliminary site design for Planning Commission input.

**Architectural Design Review:**

The City of Mt. Shasta with Library Tax funds has retained Mt. Shasta Engineering to complete shovel ready building drawings to pursue construction funding. The contract with Mt. Shasta Engineering includes the creation of the architectural facades presented tonight, building plans, and preliminary site plans. The contract does not have landscaping, parking expansion, or trail relocation.

**Landscaping**

The City of Mt. Shasta Beautification Committee is charged with giving recommendations for the design of city owned properties and rights-of-way. The Committee met at the beginning of the project to discuss options for new landscaping designs for the building. The Committee ultimately recommended that the City create a Request for Proposal (RFP) to hire a landscape architect to develop a new landscape plan and vegetation management plan for the wetland portion of the property. The Committee did recommend keeping the existing heritage tree located north of the building. The heritage tree was relocated from the ranching area that is now Lake Siskiyou prior to the dam construction. The City has not moved forward with a RFP for landscape design, but will return to the Planning Commission and City Council when funds are identified.
Some landscaping has been added to the renderings to give a general feel of the building location and existing vegetation.

Parking Expansion and Circulation

The library parking lot is extremely limited in parking capacity due to the proximity of the school and site limitations. The City is in negotiation with the Mt. Shasta Union School District to obtain an easement to create more parking on the east side of the building. The easement would allow for the creation of approximately 10 to 12 parking spaces; depending on parking space orientation. The intent of the City is to create the addition spaces and earmark the back spots for staff parking. The City will return with an updated site plan with parking illustrated for Planning Commission review.

Trail Relocation

The orientation of the library addition will eliminate the trail connecting East Alma Street and the Rotary trail into Sisson Meadow. The preliminary site plan utilizes the trailhead as the new entryway for the library and will install a sidewalk around the building to the south-east side of the property. The current proposal looks at moving the trailhead to the southeast side of the property into the proposed easement. The pedestrian portion of the trail would be connected to the sidewalk and cyclists would be directed through the parking lot. Charros would be installed in the parking lot to notify cyclists and drivers.

The parking lot will be repaved and striped as part of the project to improve circulation. The City has already moved signage at the existing driveway to indicate an exit only. The shared driveway on the school property has been restriped to become an entrance.

Project Location: 515 E Alma Street
Mt. Shasta, CA 96067
APN# 057-321-080

Environmental Review:

The library addition is considered a “project” under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) due to the proximity of wetlands and the size of the addition. Mt. Shasta Engineer with subcontractors is developing an Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration at this time. The CEQA document and final approval of the project will be done at the City Council level due to the property being owned by the City.

Attachments:

1. Public Library Expansion Renderings
2. Proposed Traffic Circulation
City of Mt Shasta
Public Library Expansion

Street Side Rendering

Attachment 1

November 13, 2019
A. Horizontal Fiber Cement Lap Siding
B. Fiber Cement Shingle Siding
C. Stone Veneer
D. Standing Seam Metal Roofing
E. Painted Wood Trim
F. Covered Entry with Flat Roof & Parapet
G. Existing Horizontal Wood Siding

City of Mt Shasta
Public Library Expansion

City of Mt. Shasta Planning Commission
Regular Meeting November 19, 2019
A. Horizontal Fiber Cement Lap Siding
B. Fiber Cement Shingle Siding
C. Stone Veneer
D. Standing Seam Metal Roofing
E. Painted Wood Trim
F. Covered Entry with Flat Roof & Parapet
G. Existing Horizontal Wood Siding
H. Existing Stone Veneer

City of Mt Shasta
Public Library Expansion
Front Rendering

City of Mt Shasta
Public Library Expansion
Right Side Rendering

City of Mt Shasta
Public Library Expansion
Left Side Rendering

City of Mt Shasta
Public Library Expansion
Colors & Materials

City of Mt Shasta
Public Library Expansion

Fiber Cement Lap Siding:
James Hardie HardiePlank
Select Cedarmill or Equal with 7" Exposure.

Accent/Shingle Siding Paint:
Benjamin Moore CC-630 Backwoods

Standing Seam Metal Roofing:
ASC Building Products Design Span HP
Concealed Fastener, Striated.
Color: Weathered Copper
SRI: 34
LRV: 11

Accent/Trim Paint:
Benjamin Moore CC-32 Radicchio

City of Mt Shasta Planning Commission
Regular Meeting November 19, 2019

Note: Colors shown are approximate due to printing limitations.