

Mt. Shasta Regular Planning Commission Meeting Agenda

City Park Upper Lodge 1315 Nixon Rd.
Mt. Shasta Tuesday, December 17, 2019; 6:00 p.m.

Page	Item	STANDING AGENDA ITEMS
		1. Call to Order and Flag Salute
		2. Roll call
		<p>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.</p>
Pg 3		<p>4. Meeting Minutes a. Approval of Regular Planning Commission Meeting Minutes for November 17, 2019</p>
Pg 8		<p>5. 2019 Annual Progress Report Background: The City of Mt. Shasta is required to report to the Governor's Office of Planning and Research and the Department of Housing and Community Development on planning and housing efforts in the City. The 2019 Annual Progress Report will include a review of building permits closed in 2019, ordinances approved, and upcoming planning activities in 2020. Commission Action: Motion to approve 2019 Annual Progress Report for City Council consideration.</p>
Pg 10		<p>6. General Plan Land Use: Urban Design Workshop Background: The Planning Department has collected public input on urban design preferences. The data will be presented to Planning Commission for discussion. Input will be included in the General Plan Land Use Element. Commission Action: Give input</p>
		7. Commission and Staff Comment

	<p>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</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. General Plan: Economic Development Element – 1/21/2020 b. Golden Eagle Charter School Parcel Map, Conditional Use Permit, and Architectural Design – 2/18/2020
	<p>9. Adjourn – Next meeting scheduled for Tuesday, January 21, 2020 at 6:00pm</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>

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.

Mt. Shasta Regular Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

City Park Upper Lodge 1315 Nixon Rd.
Mt. Shasta Tuesday, November 19, 2019; 6:00 p.m.

Item

STANDING AGENDA ITEMS

1. Call to Order and Flag Salute – Chair Findling called to order at 6:00PM

2. Roll call

Present: Chair Findling and Commissioners Kirby, Beck, Higuera, Saryon, and Pardee

Absent: Commissioner McDowell*

*Excused for conflict of interest on item 5

3. Public Comment:

Kathleen Hansen: Discussion on survey received in the mail regarding cannabis. Not in favor of survey questions and feels it is intrusive.

Johanna Altofer: Discussion on Golden Eagle School project and wetlands

4. Meeting Minutes:

A. Meeting Minutes for Regular Meeting September 17, 2019

Commissioner Beck: Identification of typos

COMMISSION ACTION: Motion to approve with correction of typos.

MOVED: Commissioner Higuera

SECOND: Commissioner Kirby

AYES: Chair Findling and Commissioners Beck, Saryon, Kirby, and Higuera

NAYS:

ABSTAIN: Commissioner Pardee

ABSENT: Commissioner McDowell

B. Meeting Minutes for Regular Meeting October 15, 2019

Commissioner Beck: Identification of typos and clarification on Commissioner Saryon discussion

COMMISSION ACTION: Motion to approve with amendments

MOVED: Commissioner Higuera

SECOND: Commissioner Saryon

AYES: Commissioners Beck, Saryon, Pardee, and Higuera

NAYS:

ABSTAIN: Chari Findling and Commissioner Kirby

ABSENT: Commissioner McDowell

5. 1119 Ream Avenue Lot Split– Public Hearing

City Attorney: Clarification that the item on the agenda is a lot split. What is not before the Planning Commission is the use of the property. Suggestion that use is needed is incorrect.

Findling: Question on if the Commission can discussion or make a decision.

City Attorney: You can take action on the item on the agenda. And you should not be discussion on an item not on the agenda

City Planner: Presentation of Staff Report

Public Hearing opened at 6:48 PM:

Tom Scovill: Discussion on cannabis use as part of the parcel split application. Discussion on City Attorney interpretation of the state buffer distance and buffer.

Betty Kreeger: Discussion on perceived staff report faults. Discussion on state 600-foot buffer zone.

Project Applicant, Reny Townsend: Represents Shasta Property LLC. Discussion on limited amount of industrial type land, reasoning on lot split application, and

Susan Brown: Discussion on economic development and small businesses in rural cities. Discussion on manufacturing uses and Siskiyou County economy.

Carol Kihm: Reads letter from Steve Hillman discussing “I AM” School lawsuit. Lists series of requests concerning schools, buffer zones, and proposed application.

Shelly Blomberg: Believes City Attorney and Planner are biased and advocating the cannabis industry. Believes the City is applying loopholes to the application. Discussion on cannabis application and “I AM” School lawsuit. Requests Planning Commission consider use in the parcel map application. Requests for the rejection of Class I CEQA exemption.

Public Commenter: Believes City Attorney and Planner are advocating for cannabis industry by avoiding environmental review. Request for rejection of Class I CEQA exemption

Janet Hillman: Discussion on City Attorney position on definition of “school” and application of 600-foot buffer for schools in relation to cannabis uses. Believes City Planner and Attorney are advocating for the cannabis industry. Discussion on parking for the proposed parcel split. Discussion on sublet to ju jitsu business

Michael Huffman: Discussion on lot split expanding the property’s use. Requests City to create a full environmental document. Discussion on City Planner and Attorney as advocates for cannabis and the applicant. Discussion on vested rights and lot split application. Believes the applicant lied at the October meeting about reasoning for lot split. Requests that the Planning Commission reject the Notice of Exemption Determination

Robert Kihm: Discussion on cannabis licenses not being complete to state requirements. Request the Planning Commission reject the Notice of Determination for the parcel split. Discussion on the Employment Center Uses and what a hazardous substance is.

Aaron Bruser: Discussion on Jefferson Soul cannabis application to the City. Discussion on missing

state required documents for cannabis application. Discussion on City Planner recommendation for not discussing the 600-foot buffer. Believes City Planner and Attorney is advocating for the cannabis industry. Request to deny the notice of exemption.

Aden K: Discussion on lot split purpose to allow a cannabis use. Discussion on school use and the measurement of the buffer. Request to maintain the 600-foot buffer zone.

Olivia: Discussion of how to measure the property line.

Justin: Request to measure the 600-foot buffer from property line to property line. Discussion on referendum. Request to keep the school safe from cannabis.

Claudia Praxton: Discussion on the cannabis purpose of the lot split. Discussion on the buffer zone and cannabis business getting a business license from the City. Requests to give priority to the school rather than the cannabis business.

John Duncan Sr.: Discussion on the buffer zone for the other schools. Believes the City is using two different methods of measurements. Discussion on method of measurement for the buffer zone.

Public Hearing closed at 7:31 PM:

Commissioner Pardee: Question on cannabis use review by the Planning Commission. Discussion on future use not being a part of a lot split. Doesn't believe we can deny a lot split that is presented and meets the rules.

Commissioner Saryon: Question on attempt to appeal the Staff report. Discussion on letters received on the lot split and the items they discussed. Feels pushed into a corner since some of the issues cannot be addressed and feels this is an unusual situation. Feels that the approval of the parcel map would be an approval of the cannabis business at 1119 Ream Avenue. Believes that an approval of the parcel map would signify a position on the measurement of the 600-foot buffer. Believes that Planning Commission should move forward with approval of the parcel map with an added condition that any cannabis use on the lots would need to be brought to the Planning Commission. Would like the public concern addressed on a more formal manner.

City Planner: The state process is in the state's court. The City does not know or play a role in how

Commissioner Beck: Concerned about the comments from the City Attorney. Discussion on the inclusion of "use" in the consideration of lot splits. Discussion on meeting with other city officials, city staffers, etc. Discussion related to public comment related to subdividing the property. Discussion on pending cannabis license application. Discussion on state 600-foot state buffer as a factor in his approval. Agrees with Commissioner Saryon on requiring a condition that if a cannabis use is proposed then it needs to come to Planning Commission.

Commissioner Kirby: Question about the state denying a potential future cannabis use due to the buffer distance. In support of moving forward and letting the state deny if it is within the 600-foot buffer.

City Attorney: Yes, the state could deny the cannabis license application for being within 600-feet of a school.

Commissioner Higuera: Question about appealing a cannabis use. Discussion on property rights issue, and that the issues of cannabis and a cannabis buffer are not on the table. Believes the school has a right to protest a cannabis industry and that is not in front of the Planning Commission. Discussion on the improvement of the parking lot, addition of ADA bathroom, and physical infrastructure.

City Attorney: Cannot add the condition to require a conditional use permit for a parcel split because that would amend the zoning code improperly. Once a decision on the cannabis license is made then it can be appealed at this time.

Chair Findling: Very sorry that there is a school in the Employment Center zone. There are too many conflicting uses for the school to be part of the zone. Feels the ordinances were well done and that the enforcement of these facilities is done well. Feels the City takes the topic of cannabis seriously. Question to staff on the volleyball use in the employment center zone and if it within the Conditional Use Permit. In support of the lot split as a way to make a building accessible to businesses. Question on if the decision will create precedence on future land use decisions.

City Planner: Request for the emails to be forwarded to the City to keep an accurate record.

City Attorney: Discussion on the importance of the City having a record of the emails related to any planning commission item. You cannot impose a special use requirement where it is not required in the zone.

COMMISSION ACTION: Motion to adopt Notice of Exemption for Parcel Map Application

MOVED: Commissioner Pardee

SECOND: Commissioner Higuera

AYES: Chair Findling and Commissioners, Pardee, Kirby, and Higuera

NAYS: Commissioners Saryon and Beck

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT: Commissioner McDowell

COMMISSION ACTION: Motion to approve tentative parcel map with staff recommended conditions

MOVED: Commissioner Higuera

SECOND: Commissioner Kirby

AYES: Chair Findling and Commissioners, Pardee, Kirby, and Higuera

NAYS: Commissioners Saryon and Beck

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT: Commissioner McDowell.

Recess at 8:11PM

Return to meeting at 8:15PM

6. Library Façade Review

City Planner: Presentation of the Staff Report

Mt. Shasta Engineering, Nick Riddle and Thomas: Discussion on project architectural design packet.

Pardee: Support for the design and the facades. Questions on the faced changes based on public input. Question on hanging different material like natural stone instead of veneer. Support for inclusion of natural systems for the use in drainage system.

The stone entryway is a flat roof system to avoid shedding snow on the walkway. Entryway is engineered to take added snow load. The upper entryway will be able to hold the snow. Roof drainage would be a sectioned down spout system. The intention of the stormwater plan is to divert the water into bioswales and underground system.

Higuera: Flat roof issues are leaves and who will maintain the roofs.

Widen the sidewalk on the West sidewalk for shared space.

Beck: maintenance of the shingled siding. The shingles are panel and not individual. Concern for maintenance of paint.

7. Commission and Staff Comments

City Planner: General Plan update

Saryon: Golden Eagle project update request. McCloud Avenue and Alma Street re-pavement from project.

Higuera: Discussion on Gateway Phase II

Beck: biodegradable plastic requirement for restaurants and businesses

Findling: Solid waste rates. The survey that was received from Tom Scovill not the City. The survey is inappropriate and feels uncomfortable with format and questions.

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. Golden Eagle Charter School Parcel Map, Conditional Use Permit, and Architectural Design – 1/21/2019

10. Adjourn – Adjourned at 9:26 PM

Agenda Item # 5

Staff Report

Meeting Date: December 17, 2019
To: Planning Commission
From: Planning Department
Subject: 2019 Annual Progress Report

	Regular
	Consent
	Closed
	Presentation

Recommended Action:

Motion to approve 2019 Annual Progress Report for City Council consideration

Background:

The Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) and the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) require all jurisdictions to report annually on housing development and planning progress related to the City's General Plan. The City of Mt. Shasta is still in the General Plan revisioning process.

Housing:

California requires all counties and cities to have Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) that they should be trying to achieve in an eight year period. The City has not closed any new housing units this year. There are approximately 4 building permits out for housing that should be completed in the next year.

General Plan:

The General Plan 2045 process is about 9 months behind schedule due to funding and resource allocation. The Planning Department is now working solely on the update and applications.

No major goals have been completed in the 2007 General Plan.

Ordinances:

The City of Mt. Shasta ratified three ordinances in 2019.

- CCO-19-01 Formation of the Mt. Shasta Industrial Development Authority

- CCO-19-02 Amendments to Chapters 5.70 “Cannabis Retail License and Standards”, 5.80 “Cannabis Industry License and Standards”, & 18.91 “Cannabis Industry Land Use”
- CCO-19-03 Creation of Chapter 15.42 “Water Efficient Landscaping”

2020 Anticipated Planning Projects

- Completion of the 2045 General Plan
- Amendments to the Accessory Dwelling Unit Ordinance
 - Changes to the state regulations required amendments to the ordinance

Agenda Item # 6

Staff Report

Meeting Date: December 17, 2019
To: Planning Commission
From: Planning Department
Subject: General Plan Land Use Element: Urban Design Input

Recommended Action:

Give input on Urban Design section of General Plan

Background:

“There is magic to great streets. We are attracted to the best of them not because we have to go there but because we want to be there. The best are as joyful as they are utilitarian. They are as entertaining as they are open to all. They permit anonymity at the same time as individual recognition. They are symbols of a community and of its history; they represent a public memory. They are places for escape and for romance, places to act and to dream. On a great street we are allowed to dream; to remember things that may never have happened and to look forward to things that, maybe, never will.” - Allan Jacobs, Urban Designer

Urban design is an important factor in how people use and feel in a space. The City of Mt. Shasta relies on the architectural design guidelines to help shape the physical environment of the City. The type of guidelines and direction is determined by the vision the City has for itself. The vision for the physical space of the City does not have to be exactly aligned with the General Plan vision but may include key pieces to move the City toward that vision.

The 2045 vision approved during this process is as follows

The City of Mt. Shasta is a diverse, innovative, and walkable small town surrounded by breathtaking natural beauty that is easily accessible from a vibrant downtown full of strong locally-owned businesses.

The City takes pride in the ability of its residents to connect with each other as well as its own capacity to support local industry and provide cutting edge infrastructure while preserving the rich, natural environment.

Out of this vision statement we can take out the pieces that can be achieved through changes to the physical environment of the City. Walkable, places for residents to connect with each other, and preserving the natural environment can be translated into design guidelines.

The other input we have from the visioning survey is what the public defines as “small town”.

A Small Town is...



From the input above, we can plan the urban environment to include more park opportunities, incorporation of more natural spaces, walkable, safe, and clean.

Additional public engagement was complete to help identify urban design elements that should be incorporated or avoided in the design guideline and General Plan update.

Public Engagement:

The Planning Department utilized storyboards, social media, and one-on-one conversations with the general public to identify urban design details to update the City’s architectural design guidelines and establish urban design concepts for the City. The storyboards feature four distinct architectural styles to gauge public sentiment. The four styles chosen were modern alpine, traditional chalet alpine, western frontier, and prairie school style. The four styles were chosen based on the existing architectural design direction of the City and previous public input. Within each board there is a style description, design features, and landscape themes.

The public did not favor one specific style over another, but a trend did emerge from the input. The positive comments focused on integrating the building facades with the natural environment; favoring wood and stone materials over others. The Traditional Alpine Chalet garnered the most support with comments focusing on timber planking, harmony with nature, balconies, and landscaping that favors vividly colored, native flowers and stepped gardens. The Western Frontier style also scored well with the public specifically the wood facades, container gardening, large patios and outdoor seating, and covered boardwalks.

The negative comments were associated with flat or hipped roofs illustrated in the prairie school style and “commercial” looking modern alpine buildings. The public were strongly against flat

roofs due to the perceived issue with snow accumulating during the winter season. Other negative comments were associated with the faux alpine facades that exist in the downtown area.

Online Engagement

Examples of other cities were promoted on the General Plan Facebook page to gather public input. There was low participation in this engagement tool, but the sentiment of the limited responses were similar to the storyboards. People gravitated toward natural materials and urban design that supported large outdoor seating/entertainment areas.

Landscaping

In addition to the Planning Departments efforts to collect landscaping preferences, the Beautification Committee hosted a Parker Plaza event in which they asked attendees what types of landscaping they would like to see more of in Parker Plaza and around town. The public were interested in seeing more drought resistant and pollinator gardens with vibrant colors. The input also favored trees over low height shrubs and the integration of public art.

The landscaping pieces of the storyboards were all received well. The public favored native plantings, evergreen trees, and container gardening for downtown business with little space for landscaping. The only landscaping theme that receive some negative input was the inclusion of rock gardens as a landscaping element.

Design Standards and Guidelines

The goal of this process is to develop a better sense of the design of the community and incorporate those elements into the City's design standards, guidelines, and General Plan.