



**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
OF THE
CITY OF CALIFORNIA CITY**

**TUESDAY, JANUARY 18, 2022
6:00 PM**

**VIDEO CONFERENCE/IN PERSON
21000 HACIENDA BLVD., CALIFORNIA CITY, CA 93505**

If you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the planning department at (760) 373-7141. Notification 72 hours prior to the meeting will enable the city to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting. (28 CFR 35.102-35.104 American Disabilities Act Title II).

Zoom

1. Public may join Planning Commission Meeting live via Zoom:
 - Link: <https://us06web.zoom.us/j/84550817736>
 - Meeting ID: 835 0934 2004
2. Public can dial into the Zoom line:
 - One tap mobile: +13462487799,,84550817736# US (Houston)
 - Dial the following number and enter the meeting ID: +1 346 248 7799 US (Houston)

Granicus

1. Agenda can be viewed via Granicus: https://californiacity.granicus.com/viewpublisher?view_id=1
2. Public may eComment on agenda items via Granicus

City Website

1. Agenda can be viewed on city website
2. Recording of this meeting can be viewed on the city website

LATE COMMUNICATIONS: Following the posting of the agenda any emails, writings, or documents that the public would like to submit to the Commission must be received by the Recording Secretary no later than 3:00 p.m. the day prior of the scheduled meeting.

Public is urged to listen to the meeting in a quiet place, to avoid background noise. We also request public to **MUTE** your audio device when not commenting to avoid disruption during meeting.

****At this time, please take a moment to turn off your cell phones****

CALL TO ORDER

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE/INVOCATION

ROLL CALL

Commissioner	Cantrell
Commissioner	Dunham
Commissioner	Welling
Vice Chair	Conry
Chair	Fleming

ADOPT AGENDA

Adopt Agenda: January 18, 2022

PLANNING SECRETARY REPORTS/LATE COMMUNICATIONS

DISCLOSURE OF SITE VISITS AND EX-PARTE CONTACTS

Disclosure by Commissioners of site visits and ex-parte contact for items on the agenda.

PUBLIC BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

Members of the public are welcome to address the Planning Commission only on items **NOT** on the agenda and within the subject-matter jurisdiction of the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission may not discuss details or vote on non-agenda items. Your concerns may be referred to staff or placed on a future agenda. Each member of the public will be given **(3) three minutes** to speak.

CONSENT CALENDAR

All items on the consent calendar are considered routine, non-controversial and will be approved by (1) one motion if no member of the Commission, staff, or public wishes to comment or ask questions. Public comments to be limited to (3) three minutes. Roll call vote required.

None

DISCUSSION ITEMS

- DI 1: Industrial Development Standards Review** update to Planning Commission. (By Contract Interim Planning Director Paul Junker)

- DI 2: Cannabis Microbusiness Regulations Update**, approved by City Council, update to Planning Commission. (By Contract Interim Planning Director Paul Junker)

- DI 3: Cannabis Overlay**, update to Planning Commission (By Contract Interim Planning Director Paul Junker)

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

This portion of the meeting is reserved for Planning Commissioners to present information, announcements and items that have come to their attention. Short staff responses may be appropriate. The Planning Commission will take no formal action. A Planning Commissioner may request to calendar an item for consideration at a future meeting or refer an item to staff.

Commissioner	Cantrell
Commissioner	Dunham
Commissioner	Welling
Vice Chair	Conry
Chair	Fleming

STAFF COMMENTS

ADJOURNMENT

AFFIDAVIT OF POSTING: This agenda was posted on all official City bulletin boards, the City's website and agenda packets were completely accessible to the public at City Hall at least 72 hours, special meetings 24 hours, prior to the Planning Commission Meeting. *Planning Staff*



Staff Report to the Planning Commission

Date: January 18, 2022

To: Planning Commission

From: Contract Interim Planning Director, Paul Junker

Subject: Industrial Development Standards Review

RECOMMENDATION:

Receive staff's update and provide comment.

BACKGROUND:

City staff is continuing discussions with the Developer Working Group to review and possibly amend Industrial zone development standards. The purpose of this effort is to consider amendments to improvement standards that would better match development standards with the needs for public infrastructure in Industrial zones. A second meeting with the Developer Working Group is scheduled for January 13 (after the final deadline for the Planning Commission packet). Staff will report on progress of these discussions at the Planning Commission meeting and will accept input on the process from the Planning Commission.



Staff Report to the Planning Commission

Date: January 18, 2022

To: Planning Commission

From: Contract Interim Planning Director, Paul Junker

Subject: Cannabis Microbusiness Regulations Update

RECOMMENDATION:

Receive staff's update.

BACKGROUND:

The Planning Commission considered a proposal to establish Microbusiness as an allowed cannabis business type on November 16, 2021. During that meeting the Commission made a recommendation to the City Council that Microbusiness not be identified as an allowed cannabis business type.

On December 14, 2021, the City Council conducted a public hearing to consider the proposed Microbusiness use. Following Council consideration and public input, the City Council voted to introduce an ordinance that would establish Microbusiness as an allowed commercial cannabis use. On December 28, 2021, the City Council adopted that ordinance and the new Microbusiness regulations will take effect on January 27, 2022.

Several key points were discussed by the City Council on December 14, 2021, including:

- Concerns were expressed that the Microbusiness designation would allow additional retail cannabis businesses in California City. It was noted that the Microbusiness regulations clearly state that this use type does not modify the City's numeric limitation on retail cannabis businesses and the City Council affirmed that the Microbusiness designation is intended to allow combinations of non-retail cannabis businesses under a single City approval.
- Cannabis operators shared information on the additional costs and reporting obligations associated with having multiple cannabis operations (cultivation, manufacturing and/or distribution) at a single location. The Microbusiness designation allows multiple uses under a single City permit and a single State license, thereby reducing State licensing costs and reporting obligations.
- There was considerable discussion of the relationship between Commercial Cannabis Overlay Zones and the Microbusiness designation. Following that discussion Council directed that references to the Commercial Cannabis Overlay District be removed from the Microbusiness regulations. If the City ultimately moves forward with Commercial Cannabis Overlay Districts the Microbusiness regulations can be revisited and possibly amended.

This is an informational item and no decision of direction from the Planning Commission is requested.



Staff Report to the Planning Commission

Date: January 18, 2022

To: Planning Commission

From: Contract Interim Planning Director, Paul Junker

Subject: Progress Report: Cannabis Overlay Zones

RECOMMENDATION:

Receive staff's update and provide comments, no formal action by the Planning Commission is requested.

BACKGROUND:

The Planning Commission considered a proposal for Commercial Cannabis Overlay (CCO) Districts on November 16, 2021. During that meeting the Commission discussed the merits of the proposal and, following deliberations, continued the item to the January 4, 2022, meeting of the Planning Commission.

Following the continuance of this item staff began a review of concerns expressed by members of the public and by the Planning Commission. This staff-level discussion is continuing and no further discussion of CCO Districts occurred at the continued hearing date. As such, this item must be renoticed before it can return to the Commission for consideration. While no action is requested of the Commission, staff wishes to report back and identify those items that are currently under consideration.

The sole benefit of the CCO District from staff's perspective is to allow commercial cannabis uses in areas not designated for such use without also allowing the full set of industrial uses that would be allowed under either the M-1 Light Industrial or M- Heavy Industrial zoning designations. An example of this could be a site remote from existing development on land zoned O-RA. In such a location, a commercial cannabis use might be determined appropriate, but the full range of industrial use might be incompatible.

Based on the November 16, 2021, meeting staff understands there are two primary concerns regarding the CCO District approach, including:

- Placing commercial cannabis uses too close to existing residential uses.
- Opening the entire City to commercial cannabis uses.

Staff would like to confirm with the Planning Commission that these are the specific concerns related to CCO Districts and discuss with the Commission how these concerns might be addressed.

The issue of placing a CCO District directly adjacent to residential can be addressed through additional guidance in the CCO District regulations that more specifically establishes required separation between commercial cannabis and existing residential uses.

The second issue of opening the entire City to commercial cannabis uses can also be addressed by more specific guidance on when a proposed CCO District should be approved and when it should be denied. Additional provisions that could be established include but are not limited to:

- Requirement that the CCO District application include a description of a specific commercial cannabis use, including type of uses, size and general character.

- Documentation for why the CCO District is appropriate for the proposed location, including compatibility with surrounding uses and unique circumstances associated with the location.

If the Commission is supportive of associating a new CCO District with a specific project, then the process of adopting CCO regulations would precede consideration of individual CCO Districts. Under this approach, if and when an applicant wishes to request a CCO District they would be required to provide a minimum level of information on the proposed project. The CCO regulations would describe the project information required in a CCO application.

Staff requests the Planning Commission share their thoughts on the benefits of the CCO District approach, the issues that staff has identified and whether the CCO District with adjusts described herein merits further consideration. Staff will report to the City Council on the Planning Commission's input and request direction on whether staff should continue to explore CCO District regulations.