

Siskiyou County Planning Commission
Regular Meeting
February 17, 2021

The Siskiyou County Planning Commission meeting was held on February 17, 2021. This meeting was conducted pursuant to California Governor Newsom's Executive Order No. N-29-20 dated March 17, 2020. The public was allowed to participate via teleconference only.

The Siskiyou County Planning Commission meeting was called to order by Chair Melo at 9:00 a.m.

Present: Commissioners Lindler, Fowle, Veale and Melo were present in the Board Chambers. Commissioner Hart appeared via telephone (due to technical difficulties, he joined the meeting approximately 12 minutes after the meeting started)

Absent: None

Also Present: Rick Dean, Community Development Director, Kirk Skierski, Deputy Director of Planning; Rachel Jereb, Senior Planner; Bernadette Cizin, Assistant Planner; Shelley Grey, Assistant Planner; Dan Wessell, Senior Environmental Health Specialist; William Carroll, Deputy County Counsel; Janine Rowe, Clerk

Minutes: It was moved by Commissioner Lindler, seconded by Commissioner Veale, to approve the Minutes from the January 20, 2021, Planning Commission meeting as presented.

Voted upon and the Chair declared the motion carried unanimously by those commissioners present.

After approval of the January 20, 2021, Minutes, the Clerk realized she did not include Commissioner Hart in roll call. Staff reviewed the list of Zoom callers and he was not on the list.

Unscheduled Appearances: None

Conflict of Interest Declaration: None

Presentation of Documents: None

Public Hearing Protocol: The Chair reviewed the protocol for conducting the Planning Commission meetings.

FEBRUARY 17, 2021

Rights of Appeal Statement: The Chair advised that projects heard at this Planning Commission meeting may be subject to appeal within ten calendar days of today's meeting (if the 10th day falls on a weekend, the appeal must be received the following business day). He directed interested individuals to contact the County Clerk's Office for information. He advised that if you challenge the environmental review or 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 at, or prior to the public hearing. The Chair apprised the Commissioners and audience that appeals must be submitted to the County Clerk's Office together with the appeal fee of \$1,250.

Changes to the Agenda: None

Old Business: None

New Business:

Agenda Item 1: Zuma FLP Use Permit (UP20-15) / Categorically Exempt

Proposed conditional use permit to convert an existing single-family dwelling, residential use, into a vacation rental. The project site is located at 325 Quincy Avenue in the community of McCloud on APN: 049-202-090; Township 39N, Range 3W, Section 1, MDB&M; Latitude 41.254°, Longitude - 122.138°.

**Categorically Exempt
Use Permit**

**Adopted
Approved**

Staff Report:

The previously circulated Staff Report was reviewed by the Commission, and a presentation of the project was provided by Ms. Cizin.

Ms. Cizin told the Commission that the applicant, James Belt, is requesting use permit approval to allow short-term rental use of an existing single-family dwelling at 525 Quincy Avenue in the community of McCloud. The two-story, approximately 1,840 square foot residence is located on an approximately .14-acre parcel. The property is within the single-family residential zoning district which allows short-term rentals upon issuance of a use permit, and the project is consistent with the General Plan and zoning for its area. The home passed inspections by both the Building Department and Environmental Health Department. Three bedrooms are proposed as sleeping quarters, and up to 11 guests could be accommodated based on the square footage of the bedrooms. However, this number is greater than the amount allowed by code which limits vacation rentals to a maximum of ten guests at any one time. Four parking spaces are required for this proposed rental which are accessed via Quincy Avenue and the alley. This project is proposed to be exempt from CEQA per Section 15301 as it is an existing facility and there are no unusual circumstances or future activities that might reasonably result in this project having a significant effect on the environment. Environmental Health, Cal Fire and the Treasurer-Tax Collector commented on this project regarding their requirements. Two public comments were received for this project. One is included in the staff report, and the other was received after the

FEBRUARY 17, 2021

staff report was published and was provided to the Commissioners prior to this meeting. Both comments were in opposition of the project with some concerns being that there are already several permitted and unpermitted short-term rentals in that area, and the shortage of available standard lease or rental properties in McCloud.

Agency Input: None

Commission Questions: None

The Chair opened the Public Hearing.

Public Input: None

There being no comments, the Chair closed the Public Hearing.

Discussion by Commission: The Commissioners briefly referenced previous discussions about vacation rentals in McCloud.

Motion: Following discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Veale, seconded by Commissioner Lindler, to adopt Resolution PC-2021-004, A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the County of Siskiyou, State of California, Approving the Zuma FLP Use Permit (UP2015) and Determining the Project Exempt from CEQA.

At approximately 9:12 a.m., Commissioner Hart was able to connect to the meeting via teleconference and joined in the unanimous vote to approve the Zuma Use Permit.

Voted upon and the Chair declared the motion carried unanimously by those Commissioners present.

Agenda Item 2: Fernandez Use Permit (UP20-14) / Categorically Exempt

The project is a proposed conditional use permit to convert an existing single-family dwelling, residential use, into a vacation rental. The project site is located at 17309 Blocker Court, Weed; APN: 107-240-320; Township 42N, Range 5W, Section 12; latitude 41.4994°, longitude -122.3761°.

**Categorically Exempt
Use Permit**

**Not Adopted
Denied**

Staff Report:

The previously circulated Staff Report was reviewed by the Commission, and a presentation of the project was provided by Ms. Jereb.

Ms. Jereb advised the Commission that Marisa Fernandez applied for a use permit to allow short-term vacation rental use of a single-family dwelling located at 17309 Blocker Court in the community of Lake Shastina. The property is located on a .044-acre parcel in the single-family residential RES-1 zoning district. The approximately 1600-square-foot single-story house contains three bedrooms that are a suitable size for occupancy and based on the square footage of those three bedrooms and Siskiyou County Code, a maximum of ten individuals may be accommodated at this proposed rental. Four parking spaces are required for this property,

FEBRUARY 17, 2021

and they are located on the driveway in front of the garage. The house passed building and environmental health inspections. The project is consistent with the General Plan and zoning for its area and is proposed to be exempt from CEQA pursuant to Section 15301 as it is an existing facility. Nine comment letters were received as a result of the public hearing notice published in the Siskiyou Daily News on February 3, 2021. Three of those comments, including one from Richard Thompson, the general manager of the Lake Shastina Property Owners Association, were received early enough to be included in the packet for this project. Six more were provided to the Commissioners prior to the start of this meeting. All of the letters were in opposition to this project and specify that short-term rentals are prohibited in the community CC&Rs. Mr. Thompson's letter detailed the Fernandezes' failed attempt to get permitted by the property owners association for short-term rental use of the property. Siskiyou County Code Section 10-6.1502(h)(8) states that the Planning Commission's action shall consider the decision of the duly recognized property owners association concerning the establishment of vacation rentals within the jurisdiction. Staff recommends determining the project categorically exempt and approving the use permit for this project.

Agency Input: None**Commission Questions:**

Discussion was held about when the Lake Shastina Property Owners Association CC&Rs became effective. Discussion was held about both the County Code and that private CC&Rs should be considered by the Planning Commission.

The Chair opened the Public Hearing.

Public Input:

Richard Thompson, General Manager of the Lake Shastina Property Owners Association (LSPOA), spoke in opposition of the project. Mr. Thompson told the Commission that the original CC&Rs became effective in 1968 and were revised in 2014. The requirement for use of a single-family home was included in the original CC&Rs in 1968. Legal counsel for LSPOA opined that the single-family residential use only does effectively prohibit short-term rental use. He said Ms. Jereb told him there were five permitted vacation rentals in the LSPOA. He said any complaints made about vacation rentals in the LSPOA would go through their own police department, and they have instituted a system where they are keeping track of complaints. They are actively pursuing existing vacation rentals that are not permitted by the CC&Rs and sending them complaint letters. He went on to say that if the Fernandezes' use permit is approved, the LSPOA would be pursuing a violation.

Gabriel Fernandez, the project applicant, spoke and stated that when they purchased the house, they tried to talk to Mr. Thompson and the LSPOA Board about whether or not they could use the property as a vacation rental. He said they were told they had to get on the agenda before their request could be decided, and they waited three months for the LSPOA Board to determine that they could not operate a vacation rental. Mr. Fernandez said that the golf resort has vacation rentals, and he does not understand why the LSPOA wants to deny them.

FEBRUARY 17, 2021

John Soletti of Lake Shastina spoke in opposition of the project. He said he believes his neighbors would like to keep their neighborhood quiet and peaceful, and he does not believe vacation rentals are allowed by the CC&Rs. Mr. Soletti wondered what having a vacation rental in the neighborhood would do to property values and expressed concern as to what might happen if the County usurped the authority of the LSPOA and their CC&Rs.

Marisa Fernandez, the project applicant, spoke and stated that they contacted LSPOA before purchasing the property, and she wishes LSPOA had consulted with their lawyers before the Fernandezes finalized the purchase. She said they were very clear about their intention to use the property as a vacation rental. When they were denied, they already paid for their use permit application so they decided to proceed to see if it would be approved.

Lynne Anderson of Lake Shastina spoke in opposition to the project. She said the golf resort is a separate property owners association. She said she would call the police if she had to put up with noise from a party house. She said there is a housing shortage in Siskiyou County, and because there is already a family living in the Fernandezes' home, they would be displaced if it becomes a vacation rental. She expressed concerns about excessive traffic.

Mr. Fernandez spoke again and said he does not think there is any difference between a permanent resident having a party and someone renting their home on a short-term basis having a party. He also said they approached the golf resort about renting their home to golfers and were told the resort would be happy to do so.

Mr. Thompson spoke again and said when the Fernandezes contacted the LSPOA, the LSPOA told the Fernandezes that the Association could not prevent them from renting their property, but they discussed that it could not be used as a vacation rental. He added that the LSPOA is not associated with the golf resort.

Mr. Soletti spoke again and said no one in the neighborhood was aware that the Fernandezes intended to use the property as a vacation rental. He reiterated that the CC&Rs needed to be upheld.

There being no further comments, the Chair closed the Public Hearing.

Discussion by Commission:

Discussion followed among members of the Commission about whether a vacation rental would be considered a business use that the CC&Rs would prohibit. County Counsel William Carroll did not want to offer any legal opinion but said the CC&Rs is a private document between private parties and believed the Commission would have to accept the LSPOA Board's interpretation of its CC&Rs and proceed accordingly. Planning Director Kirk Skierski said the County generally does not enforce private agreements, and the County Code allows short-term rental use of single-family homes or duplexes.

Discussion was held clarifying that use permits for vacation rentals go with the property and do not expire if the property is sold. The conditions of approval require that if a property changes hands, the new owner must contact the County to update their records. As far as expiration of

FEBRUARY 17, 2021

the use permit is concerned, for any uses that are deemed abandoned by the County Code, the County is responsible to go through a revocation hearing to revoke the use granted from the former approval. If a revocation hearing has not taken place, that property may continue with the short-term vacation rental use.

Discussion was held that the County Code states that the Planning Commission can consider a property owners' association's CC&Rs but they are not bound by it.

Motion: Following discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Veale, seconded by Commissioner Fowle, to deny the Fernandez Use Permit (UP2014).

Voted upon and the Chair declared the motion carried unanimously by those Commissioners present.

Agenda Item 3: West Tentative Parcel Map (TPM20-03) / Categorically Exempt

The project site is located at APN 020-030-120 on Louie Road, 1.5 miles east of Interstate 5 on APN 020-030-120; Township 43N, Range 5W, Section 18 MDBM; Latitude 41.576°, Longitude -122.471°.

**Categorically Exempt
Use Permit**

**Adopted
Approved**

Staff Report:

The previously circulated Staff Report was reviewed by the Commission, and a presentation of the project was provided by Ms. Jereb.

Ms. Jereb told the Commission that John West is requesting approval of a tentative parcel map to subdivide an existing 420-acre parcel into four parcels of 47.81, 47.46, 123.15 and 53.73 acres with a remainder parcel of 155.17 acres. The subject parcel is located at 2201 East Louie Road, northeast of Gazelle. It's within the AG-2-B-40 zoning district which allows a minimum parcel size upon division of 40 acres. All surrounding parcels are also zoned for non-prime agricultural uses and are 40 acres or larger. All four parcels plus the remainder would be accessed from Louie Road, which is a public road. The four proposed parcels have approved septic sites. Water for the four sites is proposed to be provided by an existing agricultural well which would require a shared well and maintenance agreements to be recorded. The remainder parcel would continue to be served by an existing domestic water well. The project is consistent with the Subdivision Map Act, General Plan and zoning for its area. The project is proposed to be exempt from CEQA pursuant to Sections 15061(b)(3) and 15304 because they are no unusual circumstances or future activities which might reasonably result in this project having a significant effect on the environment. No public comments were received for this project before the staff report was posted. Environmental Health, Cal Fire, and the Treasurer-Tax Collector commented on this project regarding their requirements, and Staff recommended that the Commission determine that the project is categorically exempt and approve this tentative parcel map.

Agency Input: None

FEBRUARY 17, 2021

Commission Questions: None

The Chair opened the Public Hearing.

Public Input:

Ms. Joan Thompson, who resides across the road from the property in question, spoke against the project. She said there is not sufficient water for irrigation and was concerned about the possibility of the property being sold to marijuana growers. She described crimes that have been committed in the area.

Mr. John Eiler, who resides near the property in question, spoke against the project. He was concerned about Louie Road needing to be improved if traffic increases. He was also concerned about there not being enough water for four parcels as well as illegal marijuana grows in the area.

Ms. Christiane Higbie, who has property across from the property in question, spoke against the project. She said she agreed with comments made by Ms. Thompson and Mr. Eiler. She was also concerned with illegal marijuana grows nearby. She was concerned about what development would be taking place on the property and wanted to know what it would be.

There being no further comments, the Chair closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Skierski offered to address some of the issues brought up through public comment. He said no development is proposed on the parcels and described the uses that would be allowed. The configuration of the tentative parcel map is consistent with the area. If any development were proposed, road standards and encroachment permits would need applicable building permit approvals which include encroachment permits from the County's Public Works Department. Concerns about illegal activities were valid but speculative at this point.

Mr. Dean added that there appears to be some discrepancy in that the plot map indicates an agricultural well with a production of 250 gallons per minute and a residential well of 50 gallons per minute.

Discussion/Questions by Commission:

Discussion was held about the possibility of further subdividing the parcels and the amount of water available.

Commissioner Fowle told Staff that he wanted to see Matt Parker, Natural Resources Policy Specialist for Siskiyou County, at the March Planning Commission to give a presentation on SGMA for the three basins.

Commissioner Hart said that the parcel where the project area is located has never been a profitable farm operation because it is on top of the slurry flow where Shastina last erupted. He also agreed that the proliferation of illegal marijuana grows is a problem and that crime is widespread.

FEBRUARY 17, 2021

Motion: Following discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Fowle, seconded by Commissioner Lindler, to adopt Resolution PC-2021-006, A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the County of Siskiyou, State of California, Determining the Project Exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act and Approving the West Tentative Parcel Map (TPM2003).

Voted upon and the Chair declared the motion carried unanimously by those Commissioners present.

Agenda Item 4: Miller Telecommunications Facility Use Permit (UP20-13) / Categorically Exempt

The project site is located at 17914 Big Springs Rd., west of the community of Lake Shastina on APN 109-160-010; Township 42N, Range 4W, Section 12, MDB&M; Latitude 41.508°, Longitude -122.362°.

**Categorically Exempt
Use Permit**

**Adopted
Approved**

Staff Report:

The previously circulated Staff Report was reviewed by the Commission, and a presentation of the project was provided by Mr. Skierski.

Mr. Skierski told the Commission that the applicant, Cal-Ore Communications, is requesting use permit approval to allow an after-the-fact siting of a new 45-foot wooden telecommunication pole and facilities within the AG-2-B-40 zoning district. Mr. Skierski said that the County Code has a broad definition for telecommunications facilities, which covers broadband internet, radio and cellular services, and things of that nature, and use permit approval is required to have any of those facilities. The existing telecommunications facilities at the project site are for broadband internet services. Staff received some public comments relating to concerns of 5G cellular services, which is not currently provided by this facility. It is Staff's understanding that Cal-Ore does not offer those types of services, and the existing facility would need to be significantly upgraded before it could operate as a cell tower. Those significant changes would also require use permit approval, so if this facility is updated or proposed to be updated for cellular services in the future, it would likely come back to the Planning Commission for approval of that amendment. The project site is located at 17914 Big Springs Road, west of the community of Lake Shastina. Mr. Skierski went on to say that the regulation of wireless telecommunication facilities (which includes broadband internet services, towers, and antennas) is largely governed by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) and by the Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996. The Act and the FCC rules have significantly constrained local regulatory authority regarding these facilities. Therefore, local governments like Siskiyou County are significantly limited in their authority in reviewing these types of facilities. The primary focus of the use permit being requested is compatibility of the proposed telecommunications facility, the site, and the surroundings. Siskiyou County Code allows telecommunication facilities in all zoning districts, with a few being allowed outright with others requiring use permit approval. Staff reviewed the proposed project and found it is consistent with the General Plan, code and zoning

FEBRUARY 17, 2021

and have recommended that the Commission consider approval of the facility along with determining the project exempt from CEQA. No public comments were received prior to the publication of the staff report. One joint public comment was received after the staff report was published, and they raised concerns about 5G and the radio frequency emissions along with potential health effects that are associated with 5G. Mr. Skierski reiterated that is not occurring at this property or this facility at this time.

Agency Input: None**Commission Questions:**

In response to Commissioner Lindler asking Staff to confirm that the permit is being requested after the fact, Mr. Skierski said Staff received a complaint regarding upgrades to the existing tower and discovered the facility was constructed and in operation in 2012 without use permit approval.

The Chair opened the Public Hearing.

Public Input:

Mr. Keith Nelson of Cal-Ore Communications, the project applicant, said when they built the broadband site in Lake Shastina in 2012, planning staff at the time told them they did not need a use permit. He confirmed that Cal-Ore Communications does not offer 3G, 4G or 5G cellular communications from the tower in question. All their radios are licensed with the FCC and their radio emissions are regulated by the FCC.

Ms. Beverly Scholar of Lake Shastina spoke in opposition to the project. She was concerned that the tower was going to be 5G because she believes there are significant health risks and damage to the environment associated with 5G.

Ms. Annika Villanueva of Weed spoke in opposition to the project. She does not support 5G cell towers because she also believes there are significant health risks and damage to the environment associated with 5G.

Ms. Peggy Chitwood of Weed spoke in opposition to the project. She also does not support 5G because there are significant health risks and damage to the environment associated with 5G.

Mr. Bob Williams of Lake Shastina spoke in opposition to the project. He asked the Commission to deny the exemption under Section 15303(d) of the California Environmental Quality Act because he was concerned that it would open the door for anything to be installed on the tower.

Ms. Donna Gaus of Lake Shastina spoke in opposition to the project. She was also concerned about the effects of 5G technology on health and the environment. She does not believe the area needs 5G because she feels the service they have is sufficient.

Mr. Robert Miller, the property owner, spoke in favor of the project. He believes 5G service would be appreciated in the communities that have little to no cell or broadband service. He thinks the Surgeon General and other government agencies would not allow 5G if it were harmful.

FEBRUARY 17, 2021

Mr. Peter Mount Shasta of Lake Shastina spoke in opposition to the project. He said he does not have adequate cell coverage but was willing to forego better service because he believes there are significant health risks and damage to the environment associated with 5G.

There being no further comments, the Chair closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Skierski addressed the public comment regarding CEQA Section 15303(d). He said the proposed CEQA exemption is for the project currently before the Planning Commission, and any future development for modifications would have to go through CEQA again.

Questions/Discussion by Commission:

Discussion was held about the FCC, Siskiyou County's Code requirements and the different types of telecommunication facilities that may or may not require a use permit. Discussion was held that if any significant changes were to be made to the existing site, a new use permit would have to be acquired.

Commissioner Fowle made a motion to approve the project and Commissioner Veale seconded the motion. Chair Melo called for a voice vote at which time Commissioner Hart spoke up and said he had questions.

Commissioner Fowle made a motion to table the Motion to Approve the use permit, and Commissioner Veale seconded the motion, in order to allow Commissioner Hart to have his questions addressed, and it was unanimously carried by those Commissioners present.

Commissioner Hart said that at the time the Cal-Ore telecommunications pole was installed in 2012, it was for internet service. A second tower was installed on the west end of the Montague Water Conservation District dam, and Commissioner Hart asked the Planning staff at the time what the requirements were for those to be installed. He was informed that no use permit nor any CEQA process was required if there were no internet dishes. Discussion took place about why no use permit was required in 2012 and now they are. The Commission requested that Mr. Nelson of Cal-Ore Communications speak on that issue, and Mr. Nelson said he talked to his coworkers who worked for Cal-Ore at the time. They said that they were told by Planning staff that no use permit or building permit was required for what they were intending to build at the location in question. Commissioner Hart said he was concerned about the mixed interpretations from different Planning staff over the years.

Discussion was held regarding where and what types of telecommunication centers are permitted out right and which ones need permits.

Discussion was held about removing the phrase "An after the fact..." from Condition of Approval number 14.

After discussion, Commissioner Fowle made a motion to take from the table the Motion to Approve the Miller Telecommunications Facilities Use Permit (UP20-13) so it could be voted upon, and Commissioner Veale seconded the motion. The motion was carried unanimously by those Commissioners present.

FEBRUARY 17, 2021

Because Commissioner Fowle made the original Motion to Approve, he could not amend it so Commissioner Lindler made a Motion to Amend Condition of Approval number 14 by striking the words “after the fact,” with Commissioner Fowle seconding the Motion to Amend. The motion was carried unanimously by those Commissioners present.

Motion: Following discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Fowle, seconded by Commissioner Veale, to adopt Resolution PC 2021-003 as amended, thereby taking the following actions:

1. Approve the Miller Telecommunications Facility project (UP20-13) to allow an after-the-fact siting of an existing 45-foot wooden telecommunications pole and facilities including a 10-foot-by-8-foot concrete slab, equipment cabinet, and power pedestal within a 400 square foot lease area subject to the Conditions of Approval and based on the Findings; and
2. Determine the project to be categorically exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Section 15301, 15303(d) and 15304 of the CEQA Guidelines.

Voted upon and the Chair declared the motion carried unanimously by those Commissioners present.

Items for Discussion/Direction: None

Miscellaneous: None

Correspondence: None

Staff Comments:

Senior Planner Rachel Jereb provided the Commissioners with an update on the Sirois Use Permit (UP18-16). Ms. Jereb told the Commissioners that the project applicants updated the site map to show where the parking areas would be. She contacted the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and they responded that if an event is proposed to grow outside the previously established footprint, basic biological habitat botanical surveys should occur in areas to be occupied by event staff and attendees. CDFW also said that Lake Lure has the potential to be habitat for the Cascades frog, so either a setback should be established so the lake is clearly not part of the project, or a biological survey could be done to determine if the frog actually exists on the project site. The Department of Water Resources did not respond to Staff's request to provide a comment. Ms. Jereb said she was working with retired Cal Fire Siskiyou Unit Fire Chief Bernie Paul to provide recommendations as to occupancy and vehicle numbers. The project applicants revised their project description to reduce events to one per year and the number of attendees to 550. The applicants are also proposing to schedule the event earlier in the year to avoid the high fire danger season. Mr. Dean suggested that the applicants defer to the US Forest Service scale for fire danger. Finally, the applicants told Staff that insurance is still available for the event.

FEBRUARY 17, 2021

Assistant Planner Bernadette Cizin gave a presentation regarding Cal Fire's operation procedures when they receive a planning and/or building project. Ms. Cizin was advised that Cal Fire staff performs an in-office review of the package utilizing mapping and firsthand knowledge of the area. They make sure all the required information is there so they can evaluate the project and then determine if the project is within the State responsibility area. If there are any unusual circumstances or something about the project is unclear, they coordinate a site visit with the applicant. At that time, they determine if the project meets PRC Section 4290 standards. If it does not, they will work with the applicant to make changes to their proposal so it can meet those requirements or help them apply for an exception, also known as a variance. If a variance is needed, the Cal Fire inspector will do a pre-project inspection and post-project inspection to ensure the exception provides for substantial compliance with the minimum Section 4290 standards. Not all projects require a site inspection, and some types of projects would never require a site visit. If there are issues on neighboring properties, the inspector can address those issues with those property owners, although they would have no bearing on the applicant's project. Cal Fire will evaluate an entire neighborhood but not individual properties, and they work with the property owners to develop a plan to correct any violations. If after three inspections the property owner has not corrected the violation, they will be issued a citation. Of note is that Cal Fire responds to every project submitted even if they respond that they do not have a comment.

Commission Comments:

Commissioner Veale requested that Staff look into the possibility of delegating the responsibility for approving vacation rental applications that are in the jurisdiction of the McCloud Community Services District or the Lake Shastina Property Owners Association to their boards instead of bringing them to the Planning Commission. Staff responded they would look into it and report back to the Commission.

Commissioner Hart expressed concern about Cal Fire evaluating an entire community for potential problems on other people's properties.

Commissioner Fowle reiterated to Staff that he wanted Matt Parker to give a presentation on SGMA at the March Planning Commission meeting.

Adjournment: The meeting was concluded at 12:37 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kirk Skierski
Secretary