

Siskiyou County Planning Commission
Regular Meeting
March 19, 2025

The Siskiyou County Planning Commission meeting of March 19, 2025, was called to order by Chair Fowle at approximately 9:00 a.m. in the Siskiyou County Meeting Chambers, 311 Fourth Street, 2nd Floor, Yreka, California.

Present: Commissioners Melo, Lindler, Veale and Fowle

Absent: Commissioner Hart

Also Present: Rick Dean, Director, Community Development Department; Hailey Lang, Deputy Director of Planning; Rachel Jereb, Senior Planner; Bernadette Cizin, Associate Planner; William Carroll, Assistant County Counsel; Janine Rowe, Commission Clerk

Minutes:

February 19, 2025: It was moved by Commissioner Veale, seconded by Commissioner Melo, to approve the February 19, 2025, Planning Commission Minutes as presented.

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

March 5, 2025: It was moved by Commissioner Melo, seconded by Commissioner Lindler, to approve the March 5, 2025, Planning Commission Minutes as presented.

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

Unscheduled Appearances: None

Conflict of Interest Declaration: Commissioner Lindler recused herself from hearing the Allen Use Permit (UP-23-11) project because they are clients and colleagues.

Presentation of Documents; Availability of Public Records; Public Hearing Protocol: The Chair instructed those present to refer to the Agenda for these items.

Right of Appeal Statement: The Chair read this Agenda item.

Changes to the Agenda: None

Old Business:

Agenda Item 1: Pine Place Road Exception Request (SP-24-04) / Categorically Exempt

The project is located along the entire length of Pine Place Road (approximately 1,176 feet) in the Indian Creek Subdivision, north of the unincorporated community of Happy Camp; Township 17N, Range 7E, §22, HB&M; 41.8449°, -123.3853°. An exception request to the 50-foot centerline setback was previously heard and approved by the Planning Commission on November 20, 2024.

Subsequent to that public hearing, it was determined that an exception to the building setback line that is twenty (20') feet distant and parallel to the property lines facing Pine Place Road should be considered as well, which is the subject of this public hearing. However, approval of this proposed exception request does not affect a 25-foot building setback line shown on the subdivision map that created the Indian Creek Subdivision (Town Map Book 3, Pages 1 and 1-A).

**Categorically Exempt
Setback Exception Request**

**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 reminded the Commission that this project was heard at the November 2024 Planning Commission meeting at which time the exception to the 50-foot centerline setback was approved. Following that approval, a property owner on Pine Place Road had their property surveyed and discovered that a proposed garage addition would encroach on the 20-foot front property setback line. As a result, staff is requesting that the Commission approve an exception which would reduce the required front setback from 20 feet to 10 feet.

Ms. Jereb said the project is exempt from CEQA under Section 15305, Class 5. She said one neighboring property owner inquired about the project but did not object. Ms. Jereb told the Commission that staff was recommending approval of the exception request.

Agency Input: None

The Chair opened the Public Hearing.

Public Comments: None

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

Commission Questions/Discussion:

Discussion was held about where setbacks are located, and that Pine Place is the front of the property being discussed.

Commissioner Lindler asked what was on the other side of the five-foot setback. Ms. Jereb responded that she noted in the staff report that the map contained some errors. For example, the surveyor had a five-foot setback along Indian Creek Road which was incorrect. What was not mentioned in the staff report was that the parcels shown are two separate parcels and the rear setback of the parcel in question is actually 20 feet for single family dwellings or one foot for accessory structures which was not shown on the map. The surveyor incorrectly showed a 20-foot setback on the southern parcel that is a separate parcel and doesn't touch Pine Place Road.

The Commission discussed streamlining the process for future projects so similar projects can be handled administratively in order to simplify the rebuilding process for homeowners following major catastrophes.

Chair Fowle wanted it noted that there was a typographical error on page 2 of the Staff Report in the Discussion section. The word *incorrected* should be changed to *incorrectly* before moving the project forward to the Board of Supervisors.

Motion: Following discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Melo, seconded by Commissioner Veale, to Adopt Resolution PC 2025-003, A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the County of Siskiyou, State of California, Approving an Exception of Pine Place Road from the Twenty-Foot Setback Requirement Along County Roadways to a Reduced Ten-Foot Setback (SP-24-04).

Voted upon and the Chair declared the motion carried unanimously by those Commissioners present on the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Melo, Lindler, Veale and Fowle

Noes:

Absent: Commissioner Hart

Abstain:

Motion: Following discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Melo, seconded by Commissioner Veale, to amend the staff report as noted in Commissioner Discussion.

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

Commissioner Lindler recused herself from hearing the Allen Use Permit (UP-23-11) project and left the meeting at approximately 9:15 a.m.

New Business:

Agenda Item 1: Allen Use Permit (UP-23-11) / Categorically Exempt

The project is a proposed conditional use permit to host up to eight events per year on a parcel zoned Non-Prime Agricultural, 40-acre minimum parcel size (AG-2-B-40). The project site is located at 5701 E. Louie Road, approximately 10 miles north of the city of Weed, Siskiyou County California, on APN 020-240-010; Township 43N, Range 5W, Section 3, MDB&M (Latitude 41°36' N, Longitude 122°24'45" W).

**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 project proponent proposes to use 4.5 acres on East Louie Road as an outdoor event venue and would like to host up to eight events annually. Smaller one-day events would accommodate up to 25 guests, and larger multi-day events would allow up to 180 guests. The proposed project is located on a 398-acre parcel between Weed and Big Springs, and the venue will utilize the lawn area adjacent to the residence with adequate parking, including nearby gravel/dirt spaces.

Ms. Cizin said the project is consistent with the General Plan, zoning for the area, and the Williamson Act contract, with compatibility confirmed by the Ag Preserve Administrator as it does not displace agricultural uses.

Ms. Cizin said the project is exempt from CEQA under Section 15301. She said public comments received were fully supportive, and that the applicant was present for questions. She said staff recommends adopting the categorical exemption and approving the use permit.

Agency Input: None

Commission Questions:

Commissioner Veale asked who chose the number of events per year, and Ms. Cizin said the applicant chose it.

A lengthy discussion was held regarding whether there is anything in the County's code, General Plan, etc., that limits the number of attendees as well as type and number of activities on one's agricultural property. Ms. Lang said there is nothing in the County code or General Plan, but CEQA has triggers on any type of proposed development on properties. She said the goal was to keep the project within the categorical exemption category, specifically Class 1 for existing facilities. The traffic count by Siskiyou County Public Works was used to quantify current usage and to estimate the threshold to stay within this exemption, thus avoiding the need for additional CEQA evaluation and minimizing extra costs for the applicant.

Discussion was held about the difference between having a paid event versus having a private event and that no permit is required for a private event.

Discussion was held regarding access to the project. Louie Road would be the primary access point and Mayten Road would be secondary. Ms. Cizin said the traffic count showed more traffic coming in on the A-12 end of Louie Road.

The Chair opened the Public Hearing.

Public Comments:

Mr. Ryan Walker, President of the Siskiyou County Farm Bureau, spoke in support of the project. He said the Farm Bureau has a strong interest in preserving right to farm rules as well as the Williamson Act and believes this project is fully compatible with both. He said it will promote agriculture through exemplary stewardship of Big Springs Creek. Mr. Walker thinks it aligns well with the County's General Plan and the neighborhood and does not anticipate traffic issues on the surrounding roads. He expressed concern about the lack of a countywide ordinance permitting incidental commercial activity on agricultural land, which would simplify the process for landowners. Mr. Walker said the project has strong support, and there is interest in developing an agricultural tourism ordinance to ease similar processes in the future.

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

Commission Discussion:

Discussion was held that attendance is limited to 181 and the number of cars is limited to 79 per event which was based on the traffic data provided by Public Works and the surveyor. An increase in traffic would trigger a different CEQA determination.

Chair Fowle asked the project proponent, Monet Allen, to talk about whether they were happy with the proposed vehicle and attendance numbers. Ms. Allen said the numbers are constraining, but they are trying to follow the rules so they can move forward.

Mr. Carroll said the staff report notes the request is to allow use of existing facilities with negligible expansion of former uses since events similar in size have occurred at the subject location so that would be a baseline consideration.

Ms. Cizin said the baseline traffic count considered 180 attendees as negligible based on existing usage. However, concerns arose when examining significant expansions, such as doubling or tripling traffic on a dirt road. She said the goal was to avoid excessive expansion to remain within CEQA guidelines and to prevent triggering an MND, per the applicant's request.

Discussion was held regarding the number of events per calendar year which was also a consideration based on going beyond the proposed exemption.

Further discussion was held that increasing the amount of traffic and attendees would trigger CEQA. Another consideration would be impact to the septic system. Mr. Dean said staff aimed to identify the lowest common denominator to ensure the project stays within CEQA requirements. Based on this direction, a plan was developed to remain within the comfort zone. Increasing the limit to 300 would exceed this threshold, necessitating a traffic study. Ms. Cizin added that the Allens opted not to do one due to the expense.

Ms. Lang also added that use permits are classified as discretionary permits, and according to the law, any discretionary permit approved by the Planning Commission or the Board must undergo a CEQA review. Unlike ministerial permits, such as building permits which are exempt from CEQA, discretionary actions like zone changes, use permits, and tentative parcel maps require environmental evaluation under CEQA regulations.

Mr. Tristan Allen, project proponent, said they wanted to avoid unnecessary CEQA costs and considers them to be a waste of money in the current economic climate. He said they are committed to keeping project impacts within limits, and if the threshold of 181 is exceeded, they plan to manage it without incurring additional charges or complications. Ms. Allen said the traffic study would have cost \$75,000 which is why they refused to do one.

Chair Fowle asked Ms. Lang to note for the upcoming General Plan revision that the process needs to be simplified as to what is allowed by right under the zoning code. Ms. Lang said her hope for the General Plan is that after the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is complete, thresholds will be established as far as special events are concerned. She said it is the hope that similar projects in the future can be simplified and would not have to be presented to the Planning Commission.

Discussion was held about what is considered to be food preparation. Barbecuing meat over a charcoal grill would be allowed but food preparation such as cutting vegetables, etc., is not allowed. The proponents intend to have their events catered.

Discussion was held regarding the Conditions of Approval. It was decided that Condition of Approval 11 could be stricken. Condition of Approval 14 would be revised to specify that fire can only be used within cooking apparatus.

Chair Fowle asked about Condition of Approval 16 and why there was a difference in the ratio of chemical toilets between employees and guests. Mr. Wessell said it is based on wastewater flow numbers from the state. Mr. Dean added that that is how it is written in the regulations.

Motion: Following discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Melo, seconded by Commissioner Veale, to Adopt Resolution PC-2025-007, A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the County of Siskiyou, State of California, Approving the Allen Use Permit (UP-23-11) and Determining the Project Exempt from CEQA, *with the omission of Condition of Approval 11 and the addition of language in Condition of Approval 14 to say “unless otherwise contained within cooking apparatus.”*

Voted upon and the Chair declared the motion carried unanimously by those Commissioners present, with Commissioner Lindler abstaining.

Commissioner Lindler returned to the meeting at approximately 10:02 a.m.

**Agenda Item 2: Pfeiffer Zone Change (Z-24-02) and Tentative Parcel Map (TPM-24-01) /
Categorically Exempt**

The applicant is requesting approval of a zone change of 13.72 acres from Non-Prime Agricultural (AG-2) to Rural Residential Agricultural, 5-acre minimum parcel size (R-R-B-5) and a tentative parcel map to subdivide an existing 13.72-acre parcel into two parcels (6.86 acres, each). The project site is located at 9222 North Old Stage Road, west of the city of Weed; APN: 021-640-070; Township 41N, Range 5W, Section 15, MDBM; 41.3985°, -122.4174.

**Categorically Exempt
Tentative Parcel Map
Zone Change**

**Recommending Adoption
Conditionally Approved
Recommending Approval**

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 the proposed project involves a zone change to support a tentative parcel map which would divide the land into two 6.86-acre parcels. The property is located west of the city of Weed, and the site is partially developed with residential uses and surrounded by parcels zoned R-R-B-5 and AG-2 as well as a parcel to the south split zoned for AG-1 and AG-2 uses.

Ms. Jereb said the applicant suggested naming the private road Meadow Brook Lane, with Meadow Wood Lane as an alternative.

Ms. Jereb said comments were received from Environmental Health, CAL FIRE, Siskiyou County Public Works, California Department of Fish & Wildlife (CDFW), and the Ag Commissioner. She said the Building Department submitted a comment after the staff report was printed. The comments prompted conditions of approval including recording the onsite septic area, compliance with 4290, riparian setbacks, no disturbance zones, and building permit requirements for the partially constructed dwelling. No public comments were submitted.

Ms. Jereb told the Commission that the project is consistent with the Subdivision Map Act, General Plan, and zoning for the area. Ms. Jereb recommended adopting the resolution to conditionally approve the tentative parcel map portion of the project and recommend that the Board of Supervisors determine the project exempt from CEQA and approve the zone change, including adding the line *with the amendment of Condition of Approval 10* to the end of the suggested motion.

Agency Input: None

The Chair opened the Public Hearing.

Public Comments: None

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

Commission Questions/Discussion:

In response to Commissioner Lindler's questions about the comments about bumble bees from CDFW, Ms. Jereb said the property owner hired Quercus Consultants to conduct biological and riparian studies because of a seasonal creek that exists on the property. She said CDFW recommended including mitigation measures on the recorded map, which staff also supports. Commissioner Lindler said she had a problem with the recommendation and asked if there was a timberland conversion permit (TCP) submitted for the project. Ms. Jereb said the project applicant is not the original builder of the property and because historical records were lost in a fire, staff cannot do any research on the property. She added that CAL FIRE did not submit any comments regarding requiring a TCP.

Commissioner Lindler said there is supposed to be a TCP on the property since they're converting timberland into a non-timber use such as residential. She said she disagrees with recommendations to leave snags and vegetation because such practices contradict modern fuels management science, and vegetation can be responsibly disturbed while managing for wildlife and bees. She said from a public health and safety perspective, requiring surveys during the nesting season for migratory birds sets an unreasonable precedent for residential development.

Ms. Jereb responded that vegetation removal conditions have traditionally been included in subdivision parcel map projects and are not unique to this proposal. She pointed out that the comment regarding dead trees specifies they should remain standing unless they conflict with fire hazard policies or public safety considerations.

Chair Fowle said he also has major issues with the conditions and that it is unreasonable to require a project proponent to have so many restrictions.

Commissioner Lindler expressed concern that the recommendations, while suitable for large landowners and commercial projects, could overly restrict construction in smaller projects. She highlighted potential conflicts with Section 4291, which is critical for maintaining insurance coverage. She questioned whether the Migratory Bird Act applies to properties like this.

Chair Fowle said bullet point 4 should be stricken in its entirety because it is unnecessary.

After discussion, the Commission directed staff to delete bullet point 4 of Condition of Approval 6 contained in Exhibit A-1 Notations and Conditions of Approval.

Regarding Condition of Approval 7, Commissioner Lindler said she was concerned about recommendations related to bumble bee habitat and land use for small landowners. Specifically, the restriction against disturbing any suitable habitat from March 1 to October 1 makes construction feasible only during winter. She said this approach works for large landscapes and poses significant challenges for small landowners and suspects these recommendations came from CDFW or a biologist from Querkas and thinks the guidance is counterintuitive.

Chair Fowle said it is beyond counterintuitive and leaves only the month of February for the project proponent to build a house and proposed striking Condition of Approval 7 in its entirety.

After discussion, the Commission directed staff to delete Condition of Approval 7 in its entirety.

Commissioner Lindler remarked that Condition of Approval 8 talks about a 50-foot no disturbance buffer. She said under forest practice rules, the creek in question is considered a class 3 creek which requires a 25-foot equipment limitation buffer to prevent machinery from operating in the area, which is not an exclusion zone for vegetation. She said she strongly disagrees with the recommendation of a 50-foot no disturbance buffer because it would hinder necessary fuels treatment within that zone.

Chair Fowle added that he recalls that this exact language has been in two projects in the past, specifically down near Happy Camp, and he struck them both times. He proposed that Condition of Approval 8 be stricken.

After discussion, the Commission directed staff to delete Condition of Approval 8 in its entirety.

Discussion was held regarding Finding 5 listed under Government Code Section 66474.

Commissioner Lindler said it is important to ensure that landowners have the ability to conduct necessary fuel treatments and was concerned that the language involving exclusions makes it difficult for them to carry out this work.

Chair Fowle said there is an intermittent seasonal stream on the property and under the current definition of waters of the US, the wetlands delineation was triggered.

Discussion was held that the statute was oddly written and that this one of those cases where the argument against this is presented first, and then the Commission must identify if there are any findings that would kill the project.

After discussion, the Commission directed staff to amend Finding 5 under Government Code Section 66474 which will read as follows:

The design of the subdivision proposes to create two parcels. The site is already improved with a partially constructed single family dwelling and accessory structures, a private road for ingress and

egress to both proposed parcels and approved septic sites. A biological analysis and wetlands delineation report were included as part of the package submitted by the applicant. The mitigation measures proposed as part of this project were incorporated as conditions of approval. Any development of the subject parcel is not likely to cause substantial environmental damage or substantially and avoidably injure fish or wildlife or their habitat due to those conditions of approval.

After discussion, the Commission directed staff to eliminate Notation 3.

Mr. Carroll reminded everyone that Condition of Approval 10 is amended in accordance with comments from the building official.

Motion: Following discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Veale, seconded by Commissioner Lindler, to Adopt Resolution PC 2025-006, A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the County of Siskiyou, State of California, Conditionally Approving the Pfeiffer Tentative Parcel Map (TPM-24-01) and Recommending that the Siskiyou County Board of Supervisors Determine the Project Exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act and Approve the Pfeiffer Zone Change (Z-24-02) by Adopting a Draft Ordinance Rezoning 13.72 Acres from AG-2 to R-R-B-5.

Before the motion was voted upon, Chair Fowle read the changes into the record: Elimination of Notation 3, elimination of bullet point 4 on Condition of Approval 6, amendment of Condition of Approval 10 as stated in the email from the Building Department, elimination of Conditions of Approval 7 and 8, and amendment to Finding 5, as follows:

- The design of the subdivision proposes to create two parcels. The site is already improved with a partially constructed single family dwelling and accessory structures, a private road for ingress and egress to both proposed parcels and approved septic sites. A biological analysis and wetlands delineation report were included as part of the package submitted by the applicant. The mitigation measures proposed as part of those documents were incorporated into the project as conditions of approval and include requirements for protection of nesting birds and/or raptors, bumble bees, and riparian areas. The mitigation measures proposed as part of those documents were incorporated in the project as conditions of approval. Any development of the subject parcels is not likely to cause substantial environmental damage or substantially and avoidably injure fish or wildlife or their habitat due to those conditions of approval.

Voted upon and the Chair declared the motion carried unanimously by those Commissioners present on the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Melo, Lindler, Veale and Fowle

Noes:

Absent: Commissioner Hart

Abstain:

The Chair called for a break at approximately 11:00 a.m.

The Chair called the meeting back to order at approximately 11:05 a.m.

Agenda Item 3: Bennett Zone Change (Z-24-03) / Categorically Exempt

The project is a proposed zone change for approximately 640 acres from Non-Prime Agricultural, 40-acre minimum parcel size (AG-2-B-40) and Rural Residential Agricultural, 40-acre minimum parcel size (R-R-B-40) to Timber Production (TPZ) in order to better align with the current use of the property as forest management for growing and harvesting timber. The project site is located Mill Creek Road, south and west of the city of Yreka on APNs 014-500-040 and 014-200-050; Township 44 North, Range 8 West, Section 1, MDB&M.

**Categorically Exempt
Zone Change**

**Conditionally Adopted
Recommending Approval**

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 this project involves rezoning 640 acres southwest of Yreka from Rural Residential Agricultural and Non-Prime Agricultural (with 40-acre minimums) to Timberland Production Zone (TPZ) to align with its timber production use. It complies with the General Plan, zoning ordinances, and the Z'berg-Warren-Keene-Collier Forest Taxation Reform Act of 1976. A timber management plan by a professional forester confirms it meets List C stocking level requirements under PRC Section 4561.

Ms. Cizin said staff recommends exemption from CEQA per Section 15264, timberland preserves. She said no public comments were received and Environmental Health, Air Pollution Control District, CAL FIRE, Public Works, and California Department of CDFW have no issues with the proposal.

Agency Input: None

The Chair opened the Public Hearing.

Public Comments: None

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

Commission Questions/Discussion:

Commissioner Veale asked if the applicant could sell off some acreage, and Ms. Cizin said they could.

Commissioner Lindler wanted to know if the county has a requirement for timber production zones that is similar to the Williamson Act where a property owner has to show the property is being used for timber harvest in order to receive a tax break. Mr. Dean said the county's TPZ rules aren't well defined but do require a timber harvest plan which dictates how the property can be managed and that there are harvest intervals with it.

Commissioner Lindler was concerned that she didn't see any information regarding stocking metrics. A lengthy discussion was held about the management plan not requiring data to say the property is stocked. Discussion was held that it is not in the Planning Commission's purview to ensure that the property owner is following the stocking requirements under TPZ in order to do a zone change.

Mr. Carroll added that the criteria for the zone change are basically the general health and safety appropriate for the area and getting into the management and timetables are beyond the scope of the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Lindler said it is in the interest of the county to have a timber harvest plan in lieu of having a TPZ, but the management plan only states there are trees present. It does not include information about the condition of the trees, fails to acknowledge past events like a burn, and generally does not substantiate its claims. She said as a registered professional forester on the Commission, she wanted it noted on the record that the plan is very weak.

Motion: Following discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Melo, seconded by Commissioner Veale, to Adopt Resolution PC 2025-004, A Resolution of the Planning Commission of the County of Siskiyou, State of California, recommending that the Siskiyou County Board of Supervisors Determine the Project Exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act and Approve the Bennett Zone Change (Z-24-03) by Adopting a Draft Ordinance Rezoning 640 Acres (APNs 014-500-040 and 014-200-050) from AG-2-B-40 and R-R-B-40 to TPZ.

Chair Fowle noted that Commissioner Melo did not include the last zero on the last three numbers of the Assessor parcel number.

Voted upon and the Chair declared the motion carried on the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Melo, Veale, Fowle

Noes: Commissioner Lindler

Absent: Commissioner Hart

Abstain:

Items for Discussion/Direction:

1. Ongoing Staff Update Regarding the General Plan Update

Chair Fowle asked if the Planning Commission discussion at the March 5, 2025, special meeting had been relayed to the Board of Supervisors.

Staff Report: Ms. Lang told the Commission that the item is scheduled for presentation to the Board of Supervisors at the April 15, 2025, meeting. An updated short-term schedule from the consultants is expected next week, and staff will update the Commission on next steps next month. She said while there was a pause on the vision and guiding principles portion, some back-end work has been done but there is nothing significant to report. The next major focus is on the zoning code portion, which is the most critical and exciting part of the project.

Miscellaneous:

1. Future Meetings: The next regular meeting of the Planning Commission is scheduled for Wednesday, April 16, 2025, at 9:00 a.m.

2. Correspondence: None

- 3. Staff Comments:** Mr. Carroll told the Commission that their request to present to the Board of Supervisors an agreement with the federal government for the fire buffer zone cannot move forward. He said Ms. Reed advised him that it falls outside the scope of his role, which is primarily to provide advice to the Planning Commission based on government or county codes and exceeds his purview with the Planning Commission. Chair Fowle thanked Mr. Carroll and said he would meet with his district's Supervisor to work it out.

Mr. Dean told the Commission that the JH Ranch project was heard at the March 18, 2025, Board of Supervisors meeting, and the second reading is scheduled on April 15, 2025.

- 4. Commission Comments:** Commissioner Veale's asked about what projects would be coming to the Planning Commission, and Ms. Jereb said she would be presenting a Certificate of Correction on a property in the Indian Creek subdivision.

Ms. Lang said she and Mr. Phelps are working on bringing forward a package of minor zoning code updates related to housing element implementation, and they hope to have that ready for the May Planning Commission meeting.

Chair Fowle said when looking at revising the zoning code during the General Plan update, he thinks it will be important to address the issues that arose in today's meeting regarding what can and can't be done by right on agricultural property as well as the concerns brought up by Commissioner Lindler regarding what is required of the Planning Commission when converting non TPZ to TPZ. Ms. Lang said TPZ zone changes are elevated to the Assessor.

Commissioner Melo wanted to know why issues that are not relevant to Siskiyou County have to be taken into consideration when reviewing a project. He also questioned whether the city or county is dominant when it comes to spheres of influence.

Adjournment: The meeting was concluded at approximately 11:32 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Signature on file

Hailey Lang, Secretary