
CITY OF SUSANVILLE
66 N. Lassen Street • Susanville CA
Melanie Westbrook, Chair
James Merchant, Vice Chair
Wayne Jambois • Tony Ardito • Rod DeBoer

Susanville Planning Commission
Regular Planning Commission Meeting • City Council Chambers 66
N. Lassen Street, Susanville, CA 96130
Tuesday, October 25, 2022 - 5:30 PM

CALL TO ORDER
ROLL CALL

1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

- 2. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR:** *Any person may address the Commission at this time upon any subject on the agenda or not on the agenda within the jurisdiction of the City of Susanville Planning Commission. However, comments on items on the agenda may be reserved until the item is discussed and any matter not on the agenda that requires action will be referred to staff for a report and action at a subsequent meeting.*
Presentations are subject to a five-minute limit.

- 3. CONSENT ITEMS:** *All matters listed under the Consent Calendar are considered to be routine by the Planning Commission. There will be no separate discussion on these items. Any member of the public or the Planning Commission may request removal of an item from the Consent Calendar to be considered separately.*

3.A Receive and file minutes of the August 23, 2022 meeting

4. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

- 4.A Consider Resolution No. 22-1120, approving presentation of Ordinance No. 22-1037, Electric Vehicle Charging Stations to the City Council.

5. NEW BUSINESS:

- 5.A Oral presentation providing the Planning Commission with statistical data of the City of Susanville Code Enforcement effort for quarters 1, 2, and 3 of 2022.
- 5.B Informational/Training presentation by staff regarding Zoning, General Plan, California Environmental Quality Act, and Roles and Responsibilities of Planning Commissioners.

6. CORRESPONDENCE:

7. COUNTY REFERRALS:

8. ADJOURNMENT:

***The next regular meeting of the Susanville City Council will be held on November 8, 2022 at**

5:30PM.

The Planning Commission's action on Use Permit (including Planned Development Use Permits) and Variance items may be appealed to the City Council within 5 business days of action. The Planning Commission's action on Tentative Subdivision items may be appealed to the City Council within 10 business days of action. Appeals of the Planning Commission's action must be made in writing on the form provided by the City and must be accompanied by a fee adopted by the City Council. Appeals of Planning Commission actions must be based on comments made known (either through written or verbal comment) at the Planning Commission Meeting. Please contact the Community Development Department for more information regarding appeals.

ACCESSABILITY: *An interpreter for the hearing-impaired may be made available upon request to the City Clerk seventy-two hours prior to a meeting. A reader for the vision-impaired for purposes of reviewing the agenda may be made available upon request to the City Clerk. The location of this meeting is wheelchair-accessible.*

I, Ruth McElrath, certify that I caused to be posted notice of the regular meeting scheduled for October 25, 2022 in the areas designated on October 21, 2022.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 3.A
Action Item

SUSANVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA ITEM

Submitted By: Ruth McElrath, Building & Planning Division

Action Date: October 25, 2022

SUBJECT: Receive and file minutes of the August 23, 2022 meeting

PRESENTED BY: Ruth McElrath, Building Permit Technician

SUMMARY: Staff is presenting minutes from the August 23, 2022 meeting

FISCAL IMPACT: None

ACTION REQUESTED: Receive and file minutes of the August 23, 2022 meeting

ATTACHMENTS:
[8.23.22_min..pdf](#)

SUSANVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION
Regular Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
TUESDAY, AUGUST 23, 2022 – 5:30 PM

CALL TO ORDER Chair Westbrook calls meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

ROLL CALL Rod DeBoer, Wayne Jambois, and Melanie Westbrook. Absent: James Merchant and Tony Ardito.

1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

Moved by Wayne Jambois; seconded by Rod DeBoer to approve agenda as submitted.

Motion: 3 - 0

Voting For: Wayne Jambois, Rod DeBoer and Melanie Westbrook

Voting Against: None

Absent: James Merchant and Tony Ardito.

2. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR: NONE

3. CONSENT ITEMS:

3.A Receive and file minutes of the July 12, 2022, meeting.

Receive and file minutes of the July 12, 2022, meeting.

[P.C. 7.12.22 min.pdf](#)

Moved by Rod DeBoer; seconded by Wayne Jambois to approve the July 12, 2022, minutes.

Motion: 3- 0

Voting For: Rod DeBoer, Wayne Jambois and Melanie Westbrook Voting

Against: None

Absent: James Merchant and Tony Ardito

3.B Receive and file minutes of the August 9, 2022, meeting

Receive and file minutes of the August 9, 2022, meeting

[P.C. 8.9.22 min..pdf](#)

Moved by Rod DeBoer; seconded by Wayne Jambois to August 9, 2022, minutes.

Voting For: Rod DeBoer, Wayne Jambois and Melanie Westbrook Voting

Against: None

Absent: James Merchant and Tony Ardito

4. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

4.A Consider Second 1 Year Extension for UP#18-006

Rescind Resolution No. 19-1073 and Revoke UP#18-006.

Public hearing opened at 5:35 p.m.

Mr. Mumper explained UP 18-006 is for an ARCO am/pm gas station and car wash at 2650 Main St. It has been three years and two months since the original project was approved through the

Planning Commission, and the applicant has experienced a range of issues commencing the project.

The proposed project was approved June 25, 2019 and has already received a one-year extension. The property has become an attractive nuisance and the property owner failed to abate prior to the weed abatement deadline.

Mr. Mumper continued that on May 31, 2022, the owner paid for demolition and gas canopy permits, but work hasn't started. At that time, the owner assured the City Planner and Code Enforcement Officer he would clean up the property, demolish the buildings and secure the property. A fence was installed, but it has since been knocked over.

If the Commission rescinds the project, it is exempt from CEQA, under section 15270.

Mr. Mumper explained the proposed project is still consistent with the Susanville Municipal Code and General Plan. The Planning Commission may approve, disapprove, or defer the decision to City Council. If the Planning Commission approves the extension, the conditions of approval are outlined in Resolution 22-1119 and only have minor changes from the original adopting resolution.

If the Planning Commission approves the rescinding resolution, the applicant can appeal to the City Council. In the interest of the property being sold to a more suitable developer, staff recommends adopting rescinding Resolution in 21-1119. Should the applicant be in a more suitable position to pursue the project in the future, the City of Susanville will be happy to accept a new Use Permit and Architectural review application.

Mr. Mumper added a parcel map application was done as part of project and was divided into two. Commissioner Jambois asked about the status of property.

Mr. Mumper responded everything in his staff report stands, with the addition that City staff has abated most of the weeds. Staff hasn't received promising progress, and it was staff's hope the entire site would have a fence so people couldn't access either parcel, but that hasn't happened.

Mr. Jambois noted if someone does park a vehicle on the property, it is quickly removed.

Mr. Mumper agreed, and said it is a coordinated code enforcement effort and the property owner has given permission to enforce such things.

Commissioner Jambois asked what the communication level has been between the applicant and the City.

Mr. Mumper responded the correspondence in the packet does a good job capturing the whole of the correspondence.

Mr. Loflin distributed a letter of notice of violation. He explained the Fire Department took the lead on weed and rubbish abatement and issued a 10-day notice back in June. City staff has gone out to do some of the work, and he along with other staff members spent four hours on Saturday, and three hours and 15 minutes on Sunday focusing on abating weeds and picking up trash. Work is not complete, and it will take several dump trips to dispose of the trash. Estimated staff wages are \$613.85, and does not include equipment, gasoline, administrative charges, dump fees or other costs to fully abate.

Since the buildings were going to be demolished, the recommendation is to have them demolished, or at least secure the old shop building on Parcel 2 to mitigate transient activity, Mr. Loflin said. We are here to assist the applicant with code enforcement efforts, but we are

at the point we need to see some compliance in cleaning up the property, especially since it's going through the weed abatement process with the use of staff time.

Sukhminder Singh, applicant, explained this is the first time he saw the weed violation. Notices were sent to his old address, which he just updated, so now he will receive them in a timely manner. It's not an issue to clean up the property, and he will pay the fees. He has spent money cleaning up the property the last four years. He put fencing up, and he thought it did help a little. He also allowed the use of the lot during the Dixie Fire and has been very cooperative.

Chair Westbrook commented the project was approved three years ago, and asked Mr. Singh what his intent is to develop the property.

Mr. Mumper noted Mr. Singh provided written correspondence to the Commission.

Mr. Singh explained he has a franchisee ARCO am/pm in Vacaville. The sales were up, and he was approved for a new site. When he started the project, there were excellent numbers. All loans are based on predicted sales and population. Unfortunately, after COVID, the situation changed. People were quoting him almost double prices. He is really struggling to complete the project because prices and supplies are not stable. He can start demolition, but it will come out of his pocket. He spent \$1.5 million on property. He is hopeful if given a one-year extension, he will complete this project.

Public hearing closed at 5:52 p.m.

Commissioner Jambois compliments staff in putting together a comprehensive packet. He also appreciates Mr. Singh travelling from Vacaville to present his case. He continued this project has gone on a long time. The fact it is now going through an abatement concurrent with another request for extension deeply troubles him. It is obvious the applicant has some financial problems that's not going to get rectified anytime soon. If the Commission grants an extension, it is not going to be helpful for the applicant, and he will be back here again at the end of one year. Building supplies are in a state of flux, any builder will tell you it is difficult to come up with supplies.

He was strongly leaning on rescinding the application and let the applicant come back at a future date for another Use Permit and Architectural Review. If applicant feels so moved, he can appeal that to the City Council.

He continued that what bothers him, is the lack of communication with City staff. He does not detect a lot of effort on Mr. Singh's part, trying to communicate their problems and working with staff to accomplish something. If there had been communication all along, we wouldn't be here tonight.

Chair Westbrook asked that if the property happens to switch ownership, will the new owner have to come back for new permits.

Mr. Mumper confirmed that would be the case.

Commissioner DeBoer said someone has to start moving on the place, unless they come up with the plan, he would refuse it.

Chair Westbrook encouraged applicants to come back and work with staff on new plans, or any options to sell.

Mr. Mumper advised Mr. Singh he had five days to appeal the decision to the City Council.

[19-1073.pdf](#)

[22-1119 Approving Extension .docx](#) [22-1119 Rescinding.docx](#)

[Project Timeline.pdf](#)

Moved by Rod DeBoer; seconded by Wayne Jambois to approve rescinding resolution for 22- 1119.

Motion Carried: 3- 0

Voting For: Rod DeBoer, Wayne Jambois and Melanie Westbrook

Voting Against: None

Absent: James Merchant and Tony Ardito

5. NEW BUSINESS:

- 5A. Presentation for Commissioners regarding the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Zoning, General Plan Designations, and overview of Commissioner Roles and Responsibilities.

No Action Required. Informational Item.

Commission tables item until all members are present.

6. CORRESPONDENCE:

7. COUNTY REFERRALS:

8. ADJOURNMENT:

Motion to adjourn at 6:02 p.m. by Rod DeBoer, seconded by Wayne Jambois. Motion carries.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 4.A
Public Hearing

SUSANVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA ITEM

Submitted By: Kelly Mumper, Building & Planning Division

Action Date: October 25, 2022

SUBJECT: Consider Resolution No. 22-1120, approving presentation of Ordinance No. 22-1037, Electric Vehicle Charging Stations to the City Council.

PRESENTED BY: Kelly Mumper, City Planner

SUMMARY: Electric Vehicle Charging Stations are now being mandated by the State of California. AB 970 (2021) will codify permitting timelines and parking considerations. AB 970 will be effective for small jurisdictions (population of 200K and less) starting January 1st, 2023. In other words, this is a state mandate and the City of Susanville is required to comply and or adopt the proposed Ordinance to remain in compliance with State Law.

FISCAL IMPACT: None.

ACTION REQUESTED: Motion to approve Resolution No. 22-1120, approving submission to City Council.

ATTACHMENTS:
[PC Staff Report.docx](#)
[Electronic Vehicle Charging Station Ord. 22-1037.docx](#)
[PC_22-1120.docx](#)

CITY OF SUSANVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION
STAFF FINDINGS
October 25, 2022

APPLICANT	City of Susanville
OWNER	City of Susanville
REPRESENTATIVE	Kelly Mumper, City Planner
REQUEST	Recommend approval of Ordinance No. 22-1037, to City Council to comply with California State Law regarding the newly adopted Electric Vehicle Charging Station legislation pertaining to AB1236 and AB 970.
ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NO	N/A
PARCEL SIZE	N/A
LOCATION	Susanville City Limits
EXISTING ZONING	N/A
SURROUNDING ZONING	N/A
SURROUNDING LAND USE	N/A
GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION	N/A
ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION	Exempt pursuant to Section 15061(b)(3)

COMMENTS RECEIVED:

1. **Building Department:** None.
2. **Fire Department:** None.
3. **Police Department:** None.
4. **Public Works Department:** None.

COMMUNITY CORRESPONDENCE:

The proposed Ordinance was published in the Modoc Record on Thursday October 13, 2022.

ANALYSIS:

AB 1236 requires all cities and counties to streamline Electric Vehicle Charging Station (EVCS) permitting by:

1. Adopting an EVCS permit streamlining ordinance with 7 key components
2. Posting EVCS permit checklists for both residential and non-residential applicants online (if a jurisdiction operates a website).

GO-Biz has been tracking the adoption status of every city and county in California laid out in AB 1236 (2015). **Per those records, the City of Susanville has not implemented AB 1236.** Also, AB 970 (2021) will codify permitting timelines and parking considerations. AB 970 will be effective for small jurisdictions (population of 200K and less) starting January 1st, 2023. In other words, this is a state mandate, and the City of Susanville is required to comply and or adopt the proposed Ordinance to remain in compliance with State Law.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION:

The Susanville City Planner finds that the adoption of this Ordinance is exempt from environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Section 15061(b)(3) because it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the activity in question may have a significant effect on the environment. The passage of this Ordinance is not a "project" according to the definition in the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"), and therefore is not subject to the provisions requiring environmental review.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

As proposed, Ordinance No. 22-1037 is consistent with the Susanville Municipal Code and the *City of Susanville General Plan, 1990-2010*. Staff recommends approval of Resolution No. 22-1120 recommending approval of Ordinance No. 22-1037, to the City of Susanville City Council at a future regularly scheduled meeting.

“EXHIBIT A”

ORDINANCE NO. 22-1037 AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SUSANVILLE ADDING CHAPTER 15.60 OF THE SUSANVILLE MUNICIPAL CODE RELATING TO ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGING SYSTEMS AND STATIONS

THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SUSANVILLE DOES ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

Chapter 15.60 ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGING SYSTEMS

15.60.010 Definitions.

(a) “Electric vehicle charging station” or “charging station” means any level of electric vehicle supply equipment station that is designed and built in compliance with Article 625 of the California Electric Code and delivers electricity from a source outside an electric vehicle into a plug-in vehicle.

(b) “Electronic submittal” means the utilization of one or more of either electronic mail, the internet, or facsimile.

(c) “Feasible method to satisfactorily mitigate or avoid the specific adverse impact” includes, but is not limited to, any cost-effective method, condition or mitigation imposed by the city on another similarly situated application in a prior successful application for a similar permit.

(d) “Specific adverse impact” means a significant, quantifiable, direct, and unavoidable impact, based on objective, identified, and written public health or safety standards, policies, or conditions as they existed on the date the application was deemed complete. (Ord. 2022-1037).

15.60.020 Purpose.

The purpose of this chapter is to promote and encourage the use of electric vehicles by creating an expedited, streamlined permitting process for electric vehicle charging stations while promoting public health and safety and preventing specific adverse impacts in the installation and use of such charging stations. (Ord. 2022-1037).

15.60.030 Applicability.

Section 65850.7 of the California Government Code provides that every city, county or city and county shall adopt an ordinance that creates an expedited, streamlined permitting process for electric vehicle charging stations.

(a) This chapter applies to the permitting of all electric vehicle charging systems in the unincorporated areas of the city.

(b) Electric vehicle charging systems legally established or permitted prior to the effective date of the chapter are not subject to the requirements of this chapter unless physical modifications or

alterations are undertaken that materially change the size, type, or components of an electric vehicle charging system in such a way as to require new permitting. Routine operation and maintenance or like-kind replacements shall not require a permit. (Ord. 2022-1037).

15.60.040 Electric vehicle charging system requirements.

(a) All electric vehicle charging systems shall meet the applicable safety and performance standards established by the California Electrical Code, the Society of Automotive Engineers, the National Electrical Manufacturers Association, and accredited testing laboratories such as Underwriters Laboratories and, where applicable, the rules of the Public Utilities Commission regarding safety and reliability.

(b) Installation of electric vehicle charging stations shall be incorporated into load calculations of all new or existing electrical services and shall meet the requirements of the California Electric Code. Electric vehicle charging equipment shall be considered a continuous load.

(c) Anchorage of either floor-mounted or wall-mounted electric vehicle charging stations shall meet the requirements of the California Building or Residential Code as applicable per occupancy, and the provisions of the manufacturer's installation instructions. Mounting of charging stations shall not adversely affect building elements.

15.60.050 Duties of the chief building official.

(a) All documents required for the submission of an electric vehicle charging system application shall be made available to the public on the city's website.

(b) The planning and building services department shall make a checklist of all requirements with which electric vehicle charging systems shall comply to be eligible for expedited review available to the public on the city's website.

(c) The chief building official shall allow the electronic submittal of the electric vehicle charging station application. (Ord. 2022-1037).

15.60.060 Permit review requirements.

(a) Review of the permit application shall be limited to the chief building official's review of whether the application meets local, state, and federal health and safety requirements. The application shall be administratively reviewed by the chief building official as a nondiscretionary permit.

(b) The city shall not condition approval of an application on the approval of an association, as that term is defined by Civil Code Section 4080.

(c) An application for an electric vehicle charging station shall be deemed complete and the permit available for issuance, when the chief building official determines that the application satisfies all requirements found in the checklist and is consistent the provisions of this chapter.

(d) If an application is deemed incomplete, a written notice will be provided to the applicant within ten (10) working days, detailing all deficiencies in the application and any additional information or documentation required to be eligible for expedited permit issuance.

(e) Notwithstanding the foregoing, the chief building official, in consultation with the city planner and building services department, may require an applicant to apply for a use permit if the chief building official finds, based on substantial evidence, that the electric vehicle charging station could have a specific, adverse impact upon the public health or safety. Any such use permit shall be submitted and will be considered in accordance with 17.116.030 (Zone district land use interpretation) of this code.

(1) The chief building official's determination that a use permit is required may, within thirty days after such determination, be appealed to the planning commission by filing a written appeal with the planning and building service department and paying the fee established by the city council for appeals to the planning commission.

(A) Public Hearing. Within sixty days of duly filing an appeal with the planning and building services department, the appeal shall be scheduled for public hearing before the planning commission. Notice of the hearing shall be given by publication at least one time in a newspaper of general circulation, and by mail or delivery to the subject property owner and applicant and to all record owners of property immediately adjacent to the subject property, at least ten days prior to the hearing. If there is no newspaper in general circulation, the notice will be posted in at least three public locations, as determined by the director of the planning and building services department. Any appeal hearing shall be de novo.

(B) Appeal to the City Council. Any interested party not satisfied with the planning commission's decision may appeal to the city council within ten days of the planning commission's final determination regarding the appeal. Such an appeal shall be submitted in writing to the city clerk, along with the appropriate fee established by the city council for appeals and shall detail the basis for the appeal. Whenever possible, the city council shall hold a public hearing on the appeal within sixty days of receipt by the clerk. Notice of the hearing shall be given by publication at least one time in a newspaper of general circulation, and by mail or delivery to the subject property owner and to all record owners of property immediately adjacent to the subject property, at least ten days prior to the hearing. If there is no newspaper in general circulation, the notice will be posted in at least three public locations, as determined by the director of the planning and building services department. Any appeal hearing shall be de novo.

(f) If a use permit is required, the application for the use permit may be denied if the planning commission, or city council on appeal, makes written findings, based on substantial evidence in the record, that the proposed installation would have a specific, adverse impact upon the public health or safety and there is no feasible method to satisfactorily mitigate or avoid the specific, adverse impact. Such findings shall include the basis for the rejection of potential feasible alternatives for preventing the specific, adverse impact. (Ord. 2022-1037).

RESOLUTION PC 22-1120
A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF SUSANVILLE
RECOMMENDING TO THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL OF ORDINANCE NO. 22-1037,
AMENDING MUNICIPAL CODE TITLE 15 (BUILDING), TO ADD CHAPTER 15.60, TO
REGULATE AND STREAMLINE ELECTRICAL VEHICLE CHARGING STATIONS WITHIN
THE CITY OF SUSANVILLE ZONING DISTRICTS AND ESTABLISHING
STANDARDS FOR THEIR USE

WHEREAS, Section 65850.7 of the California Government Code provides that every city, county or city and county shall adopt an ordinance that creates an expedited, streamlined permitting process for electric vehicle charging stations; and

WHEREAS, the proposed chapter amendments applies to the permitting of all electric vehicle charging systems in the unincorporated areas of the city; and

WHEREAS, the City would retain the authority to determine the existence of a public nuisance for any issues that may arise with an electric vehicle charging station business facility and could take action pursuant to Chapter 8.16 (Abatement of Dangerous Buildings, Substandard Buildings and Public Nuisances); and

WHEREAS, it is the City's intention that nothing in these Chapters shall be construed to allow persons to engage in conduct that endangers others or causes a public nuisance.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Commission of the City of Susanville:

SECTION 1: Makes the following findings:

1. The proposed Text Amendment is consistent with the objectives, policies, general land uses, and programs of the City of Susanville General Plan and Zoning section of the City of Susanville Municipal Code.
2. The proposed ordinance is not subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15070 (Title 14, of the California Code of Regulations) because it does not have the potential for resulting in physical change to the environment, directly or indirectly. Individual facilities which are required to have a Conditional Use Permit will have additional environmental review for the specific facility proposed.

SECTION 2: Recommends to City Council adoption of Ordinance No. 22-1037 amending Title 15 of the Susanville Municipal Code as follows:

1. Addition of Chapter 15.60 Electric Vehicle Charging Stations
2. Addition of Chapter 15.60.010 Definitions.
3. Addition of Addition of Chapter 15.60.020 Purpose.
4. Addition of Chapter 15.60.030 Applicability.
5. Addition of Chapter 15.60.040 Electric Vehicle Charging System Requirements.
6. Addition of Chapter 15.60.050 Duties of the Chief Building Official.
7. Addition of Chapter 15.60.060 Permit Review Requirements.

SECTION 3. Government Code Section 65860 provides that zoning ordinances must be consistent with the City's general plan. The Planning Commission hereby makes a finding that the zoning ordinance is consistent with the General Plan as it furthers the following objectives and goals of the General Plan.

SECTION 4: The City of Susanville Planning Commission does hereby ordain that Chapter 15 is hereby amended as shown in **Exhibit A** attached hereto adding Chapter 15.60 Regulation of Electric Vehicle Charging Stations to the City's Municipal Code.

SECTION 5. If any section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, or portion of this Ordinance or its application to any person or circumstance is held to be invalid or unconstitutional by the decision of any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this Ordinance or its application to other persons or circumstances. The Planning Commission declares that it would have adopted this Ordinance and each section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase or portion thereof despite the fact that any one or more sections, subsections, sentences, clauses, phrases, or portions be declared invalid or unconstitutional and, to that end, the provisions hereof are hereby declared severable.

APPROVED: _____
Melanie Westbrook, Chairperson
Planning Commission

ATTEST: _____
Heidi Whitlock, City Clerk
Secretary to the Planning Commission

The foregoing Resolution No. 22-1120, was adopted at a regular meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Susanville, held on the 25th day of October 2022 by the following vote:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSENT:
ABSTAIN:

Heidi Whitlock, City Clerk
Secretary to the Planning Commission

AGENDA ITEM NO. 5.A
Discussion Item

SUSANVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA ITEM

Submitted By: Kelly Mumper, Building & Planning Division

Action Date: October 25, 2022

SUBJECT: Oral presentation providing the Planning Commission with statistical data of the City of Susanville Code Enforcement effort for quarters 1, 2, and 3 of 2022.

PRESENTED BY: Cody Loflin, Code Enforcement Officer

SUMMARY:

FISCAL IMPACT: None.

ACTION REQUESTED: Receive report from staff.

ATTACHMENTS:

AGENDA ITEM NO. 5.B
Discussion Item

SUSANVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA ITEM

Submitted By: Kelly Mumper, Building & Planning Division

Action Date: October 25, 2022

SUBJECT: Informational/Training presentation by staff regarding Zoning, General Plan, California Environmental Quality Act, and Roles and Responsibilities of Planning Commissioners.

PRESENTED BY: Kelly Mumper, City Planner

SUMMARY: This presentation will provide a semi in depth review of the City of Susanville Zoning Laws, General Plan, and how said Laws apply to the California Environmental Quality Act. In addition, this presentation will provide a structured overview of Planning Commissioner Roles and Responsibilities.

FISCAL IMPACT: None.

ACTION REQUESTED: Receive report from staff.

ATTACHMENTS: