

Siskiyou County Planning Commission
Special Meeting
June 3, 2026

The Siskiyou County Planning Commission special meeting of June 3, 2026, was called to order by Vice Chair Danielle Lindler at approximately 9:00 a.m. in the Siskiyou County Meeting Chambers, 311 Fourth Street, 2nd Floor, Yreka, California.

Present: Commissioners Fowle, Hart, Veale and Vice Chair Lindler

Absent: Chair Melo

Also Present: Hailey Lang, Director, Community Development Department; James Phelps, Deputy Director of Planner; William Carroll, Assistant County Counsel; and Katie Howell, Commission Clerk

Unscheduled Appearances: None

Conflict of Interest Declaration: None

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

Right of Appeal Statement: The Vice Chair read the Right of Appeal Statement.

Changes to the Agenda: None

New Business:

Agenda Item 1: General Plan – Title 10 Zoning Code Update (Presentation and Study Session)

Consultant presentation of the Title 10 Zoning Code update. This meeting is for discussion purposes only. Public input will be accepted through submitted written comments or during the designated public comment period. The study session is not a project approval and is not subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No action will be taken at this environmental review, as required by CEQA.

Staff Report:

Deputy Director of Planning James Phelps introduced the County's zoning-code consultants and explained that the special meeting was intended to give the Planning Commission a detailed working review of the draft before it moved into the broader public-review process.

Presentation of Consultants:

Presentation provided by Michael Gibbons, Zoning Code Lead, Mintier Harnish, a planning consulting firm located in Sacramento, CA. Also in attendance was Brent Gibbons, AICP, Project Director, Mintier Harnish.

Planning Commission Meeting
June 3, 2026

Commission Discussion:

The consultant began by explaining the relationship between the General Plan and the zoning code. The General Plan establishes the County's long-range land-use policies, while the zoning code is the primary regulatory tool used to implement those policies on individual properties. The presentation reviewed the basic structure of zoning, including zoning districts, allowed and conditionally allowed uses, development standards, administrative procedures, and definitions. The consultant emphasized that the update was intended to modernize and reorganize Title 10, improve consistency with current State law, provide clearer procedures, and preserve reasonable flexibility for property owners. Commissioners were advised that the material being reviewed was still a working draft and had not yet been released as the formal public-review draft.

Commissioner Veale asked that the consultants provide a clear delineation of items that were state mandated zoning requirements versus the ones that were allowed to be altered.

The consultant continued the overview of the proposed code organization and explained how the revised Title 10 would consolidate regulations that are currently spread throughout the County Code. Discussion included how zoning districts and use tables would identify whether a particular land use is permitted by right, requires administrative approval, requires a Planning Commission use permit, or is not allowed in a particular district. The consultant also discussed the importance of making the code easier for property owners and applicants to navigate without changing the underlying policy unless a change was specifically intended.

Commissioner Fowle was particularly concerned that the code not be written as though the Countywide General Plan was the only controlling planning document. He noted that areas such as Scott Valley have land-use planning documents that residents rely upon and asked that those plans continue to be recognized.

The consultants discussed using broader terminology so that the code expressly recognizes applicable General Plans, specific plans, area plans, community plans, or land-use plans rather than inadvertently omitting an adopted local plan.

Commissioner Fowle reiterated that residents should be able to see a direct connection between the zoning regulations and the land-use plan applicable to their area. The consultant agreed that additional language could be added to clarify that consistency is not limited to the Countywide General Plan and may include previously adopted specific or area plans.

Vice Chair Lindler then focused on the purpose-and-intent language in the draft. She questioned the use of subjective terms such as "morals," "comfort," and "panic" when describing the purposes of zoning regulations. Her concern was that zoning standards should be tied to objective governmental purposes such as public health, safety, and welfare and should not depend on subjective reactions that could vary from person to person. The consultant explained that some of the wording had been

Planning Commission Special Meeting
June 3, 2026

carried forward from older zoning language and that jurisdictions sometimes include broader police-power terminology. The discussion moved toward simplifying the provision and removing language the Commission considered unnecessarily subjective.

The Commission completed its discussion of the purpose-and-intent section. Vice Chair Lindler recommended removing the more subjective references and retaining clearer language tied to public health, safety, and welfare. Commissioner Fowle agreed with the concern and supported striking language that did not provide an objective or enforceable zoning purpose. Commissioner Hart also indicated agreement.

Commissioner Fowle raised a practical boundary and setback issue based on roads in Scott Valley where the roadway is maintained for public travel, but portions of the underlying road property remain privately owned. He questioned how setback measurements and access requirements would operate in those circumstances and whether a property owner could be required to obtain an encroachment permit when the County did not own the underlying road.

Community Development Director Hailey Lang and the consultant discussed the distinction between public access, County maintenance, right-of-way boundaries, and private ownership. The discussion emphasized the need for the zoning code to avoid creating requirements that conflict with the legal status of existing roads and recorded property boundaries.

The Commission also discussed references to grading regulations. Commissioners expressed concern about inserting language that could be interpreted as establishing a broad new County grading ordinance without a separate policy discussion. Vice Chair Lindler noted that grading regulation can significantly affect private property and agricultural activities and should not be adopted indirectly through the zoning-code update. Commissioner Fowle shared concerns about unintended consequences, particularly for agricultural work. Staff explained that the draft language could be removed from the Planning Commission version and, if the Board of Supervisors wished to pursue a grading ordinance later, the issue could be addressed separately with clear parameters.

Commissioner Hart stated that he was not necessarily opposed to grading standards but believed legitimate agricultural activities would need to be clearly separated from development-related grading. Staff discussed the difficulty of defining exemptions broadly enough to protect normal agricultural work while still addressing situations that could create drainage, erosion, or development impacts.

Vice Chair Lindler stated she remained cautious about opening the door to a Countywide grading program through the zoning update. Community Development Director Lang suggested striking the grading provisions for purposes of the current draft and allowing the Board of Supervisors to have the larger policy discussion if it wished to pursue the issue.

Commissioner Hart asked how much information the Board of Supervisors had received about the

Planning Commission Meeting
June 3, 2026

zoning-code work to date. Deputy Director Lang explained that the Board had been kept informed at a high level regarding the schedule, deliverables, future workshops, and environmental-review process, but that the detailed policy work was intentionally occurring first with the Planning Commission. The Commission then returned to the permit-processing presentation, including CEQA review and appeal procedures.

Vice Chair Lindler called for a break at approximately 10:30 a.m.

Vice Chair Lindler called the meeting back to order at approximately 10:35 a.m.

The consultant summarized the standard Planning Commission use-permit process, including public notice, a public hearing, appeal rights, and the relationship to environmental review. The presentation then addressed the vacation rental activity permit, including application requirements, review authority, operational standards, inspections, enforcement, revocation, and renewal. The consultant explained that these provisions are intended to address potential conflicts involving noise, parking, public safety, and neighborhood impacts while establishing a clear enforcement mechanism.

Commissioner Fowle questioned language stating that a vacation-rental applicant could not possess another active vacation-rental activity permit in the unincorporated County. He interpreted the draft literally as limiting an individual to one vacation rental anywhere in the County and said he did not recall such a restriction being adopted. Director Lang explained that the intended limitation was one vacation rental per parcel, not one permit per owner countywide. Vice Chair Lindler agreed that the wording, as written, appeared to impose a countywide one-per-owner restriction. Staff agreed that the provision should be corrected or clarified. Commissioner Fowle also confirmed that the three-year vacation-rental renewal cycle had already been adopted by the Board of Supervisors; Lang explained that the recurring renewal allows periodic inspection and confirmation of continued compliance.

Commissioner Veale asked how the vacation-rental provisions would apply when a property is subject to a private restrictive covenant prohibiting commercial or business activity. CDD Director Lang explained that the County treats operation of a vacation rental as a business activity for this purpose; therefore, a covenant that prohibits business activity could prevent the property from qualifying for a vacation-rental permit. The discussion used areas with private restrictions as examples of why applicants must certify that the proposed vacation rental is not prohibited by an applicable covenant.

Deputy Director James Phelps returned to the one-per-owner language and confirmed that the existing Article 61 wording could be read to prohibit a property owner from holding more than one vacation-rental permit. Lang indicated that this appeared to be an incorrect carryover rather than the intended policy. Commissioner Lindler noted that she was aware of owners with multiple vacation rentals and supported clarifying the provision. The Commission then moved into other permit-processing provisions, including application filing, completeness review, and references between the permit chapters and later zoning/use tables.

Planning Commission Special Meeting
June 3, 2026

Vice Chair Lindler asked for clarification regarding when the Planning Department may determine that an application is not complete or may decline to accept an application for processing. Director Lang explained the distinction between an application that lacks required information and a proposal that cannot legally be processed because the requested use is not allowed. She also explained the Permit Streamlining Act requirement that the County make a completeness determination within the applicable statutory period. The Commission clarified that this deadline concerns determining whether the application contains the required information; it is not a requirement that the County approve or deny the project within that same period.

Commissioner Fowle asked about an applicant's ability to appeal a determination that an application is incomplete and questioned how the appeal fee and procedure would operate. Staff and the consultant discussed the administrative nature of completeness determinations and the importance of giving applicants a defined process to challenge a determination. The broader discussion emphasized that the revised code should make the steps, decision-maker, notice requirements, and appeal route clear so applicants and the public can understand the process without having to interpret multiple disconnected code sections.

The presentation transitioned into Part Three, general development standards. Topics included building height, setbacks, parking, loading areas, landscaping, fences and walls, signs, and performance standards. Commissioner Veale asked about circumstances in which the required number of parking spaces could be reduced. Staff explained that the draft provides an administrative mechanism for a reduction when the standard parking requirement is unnecessary or impractical and the proposed arrangement can still function safely.

Vice Chair Lindler noted that rigid parking standards can be difficult to apply in older unincorporated communities where existing buildings and lots were developed before modern parking requirements. Commissioner Fowle then raised agricultural loading areas, using cattle loading chutes and similar ranch facilities near property lines or roadways as an example. He wanted to ensure that existing agricultural facilities would not suddenly become unlawful under new setback or loading standards. CDD Director Lang explained that existing facilities would generally be treated under the nonconforming-use and nonconforming-structure provisions and could continue, with improvements evaluated under those provisions. Phelps further clarified that agricultural uses that do not require a use permit are not being assigned conventional commercial parking-space requirements.

Discussion continued regarding nonconforming uses and how the County would enforce newly written development standards against conditions that already exist. Commissioner Hart questioned how the County would handle the large number of existing properties that may not meet a newly adopted standard. Commissioner Fowle emphasized that an existing lawful condition should not be treated the same as a new violation simply because the code changes after the fact. Staff agreed that legally established existing uses and structures must be addressed through the nonconforming provisions

Planning Commission Meeting
June 3, 2026

and said they would confirm how the current code and proposed language interact.

The Commission then reviewed fence and wall standards. Vice Chair Lindler questioned a proposed three-foot limitation in certain locations and stated that a four-foot fence appeared more practical while still protecting sight-distance and safety concerns. Commissioner Fowle commented that a three-foot barrier is often decorative rather than functional and also favored a more usable standard. Staff agreed to compare the proposed height with other jurisdictions and review whether four feet would better meet the County's needs without creating visibility problems.

The Commission moved into sign regulations. Vice Chair Lindler asked several questions regarding window signs, murals, illumination, and how sign-area percentages would be calculated. She questioned whether the proposed limitation on window coverage was unnecessarily restrictive for small businesses and whether the calculation would apply to each individual window or to the total window area of a storefront. Commissioner Fowle raised examples such as service stations and other businesses that commonly display multiple signs and questioned whether the draft would unintentionally make ordinary existing signage nonconforming.

The consultant explained that some window-sign limitations are based on maintaining visibility into and out of buildings and referenced crime-prevention and safety concepts. The Commission also discussed murals and the proposed percentage limitation on mural coverage. Vice Chair Lindler questioned why a mural should be limited to a percentage of a wall when it is not functioning as a conventional advertising sign. Discussion of illumination focused on avoiding glare, flashing distractions, and light spill while still allowing practical lighting. Commissioners distinguished between legitimate roadway/public-safety concerns and aesthetic restrictions that could be unnecessarily burdensome in rural areas.

The Commission continued reviewing landscaping, maintenance, lighting, and sign-related provisions. Vice Chair Lindler questioned requirements that could force replacement of dead or damaged landscaping when the original landscaping may no longer be appropriate or necessary. Commissioner Veale observed that some of the standards appeared more typical of municipal development, while Chairman Fowle stressed that the Planning Commission is writing regulations for unincorporated Siskiyou County and cautioned against creating standards that resemble homeowners-association rules. Staff acknowledged the concern and discussed tailoring the provisions to the County's rural context rather than automatically importing urban standards.

Additional discussion addressed accessibility and building-code issues associated with parking and agricultural or commercial uses. Commissioner Fowle asked whether the absence of a zoning parking requirement would itself trigger ADA parking or restroom requirements. Staff and the consultant explained that building-code and accessibility requirements are separate from the zoning code and would continue to apply where legally required. The Commission asked that cross-references be clear so the zoning code does not imply that it replaces building-code requirements.

Planning Commission Special Meeting
June 3, 2026

Vice Chair Lindler called for a lunch break at approximately 12:19 p.m.

Vice Chair Lindler called the meeting back to order at approximately 1:30 p.m.

Director Lang discussed afternoon scheduling and noted that the consultants would need to leave at approximately 5:00 p.m. She suggested that the Commission evaluate its progress as the afternoon continued and consider carrying the remaining sections to the next regular meeting or to another special meeting rather than rushing through the most substantive land-use provisions. Vice Chair Lindler agreed and suggested reassessing progress around 4:00 p.m.

The consultant resumed with specific land-use standards, including accessory uses, home occupations, and related residential or small-business activities. Commissioner Fowle asked how the proposed home-occupation provisions relate to the County's cottage-food or cottage-industry rules and whether the two regulatory systems would overlap. Staff explained that cottage-food rules are directed primarily at food preparation and health requirements, while home-occupation zoning standards address the land-use impacts of operating a business from a residence. The Commission also discussed daycare and similar uses and whether they would be regulated separately rather than being forced into the general home-occupation category.

The Commission continued reviewing home occupations and other specific-use standards. Discussion focused on distinguishing low-impact activities that can occur within a residence from uses that generate customers, employees, traffic, outdoor storage, noise, or other effects more appropriately reviewed through a permit. Commissioners repeatedly emphasized that ordinary rural activities should not be converted into discretionary land uses simply because the code uses a broad definition. Staff and the consultant explained that the intent was to create thresholds so genuinely low-impact uses can be handled administratively while more intensive activities receive additional review.

The presentation also addressed emergency shelters and other uses for which State law limits local discretion. The consultant identified areas where the County must comply with State-mandated standards and explained that some provisions are included because the County is legally required to provide a particular approval path. Commissioners asked questions aimed at separating State requirements from County policy choices so that the final code would not appear to impose discretionary County restrictions where the language was actually mandated by State law.

Commissioner Hart raised questions about existing event venues and how new special-event standards would affect facilities that already operate under County approvals. He asked whether an existing venue would be required to return for a new permit simply because the zoning code changes. Staff explained that an existing valid use permit generally runs with the land and would not automatically be invalidated by adoption of new regulations. A permit holder seeking to expand beyond the scope of an existing approval, however, could be required to modify the permit and comply with applicable current standards.

Planning Commission Meeting
June 3, 2026

The Commission also discussed the proposed duration for temporary or special events. Chairman Fowle questioned whether allowing an event to operate for as many as fourteen consecutive days without a more substantial review was excessive and suggested that a shorter period, such as seven days, might better distinguish a temporary event from a more permanent or intensive land use. Staff and the consultant discussed the need to accommodate legitimate temporary activities while retaining a permit mechanism for events with greater duration, attendance, traffic, or site impacts.

Discussion moved to temporary emergency facilities and the circumstances under which temporary structures or facilities could remain during a declared emergency. Commissioner Fowle asked questions with an eye toward future wildfire or disaster response and whether the code would provide enough flexibility for emergency operations. Vice Chair Lindler focused on language requiring removal of temporary facilities and restoration of the site within thirty days after termination of a declared emergency. She pointed out that formal emergency declarations can remain in effect for years after the actual emergency facility has left the site, meaning the proposed trigger could unintentionally delay restoration for an extended period. Staff acknowledged the issue for revision.

Before leaving the section, Deputy Director Phelps explained a change to vacation-rental standards in South County. Rather than maintaining an absolute prohibition on vacation rentals on parcels smaller than 2.5 acres, the draft would allow those applications to come before the Planning Commission for site-specific review. Vice Chair Lindler supported that approach because it gives the Commission the ability to evaluate whether a smaller parcel can accommodate the use instead of denying it solely based on acreage.

Commissioner Veale left at approximately 2:31 p.m.

Commissioner Fowle raised a concern with the definition of a special-event facility where the language referenced agricultural operations. He used a working ranch arena as an example: an arena may primarily exist for cattle work but occasionally host a ranch-horse or cow-horse clinic. He argued that the occasional clinic should not automatically transform an accessory ranch facility into a special-event facility requiring a separate land-use entitlement. His concern was directed at distinguishing a facility constructed and operated principally as an event venue from an ordinary agricultural facility that occasionally hosts an activity related to the ranch.

Staff and the consultant discussed revising or clarifying the language so the code evaluates the actual character and primary use of the facility rather than capturing incidental agricultural activities. The Commission continued to stress that definitions need to work in the context of Siskiyou County's working farms and ranches and should not create permit requirements for customary agricultural practices merely because members of the public or outside instructors occasionally participate.

The Commission reviewed additional agricultural and resource-use provisions, including utility connections, accessory structures, and affordable-housing references. Commissioner Fowle

Planning Commission Special Meeting
June 3, 2026

questioned language restricting utility connections to certain accessory structures and noted the practical inconsistency between structures that may be allowed on agricultural property and State building requirements that apply if those structures are used differently. Staff explained that the utility limitation is intended in part to prevent an applicant from obtaining approval for a nonresidential accessory building and later converting it into an unpermitted dwelling.

Vice Chair Lindler raised a broader concern about the term “affordable housing,” noting that projects labeled affordable do not always appear affordable to local residents. Director Lang explained that the zoning code must use the applicable State definition and that the County does not have unlimited discretion to redefine State housing categories. The discussion again distinguished policy concerns the Commission may have from definitions and approval standards imposed by State housing law.

The Commission turned to agricultural uses in the AG-1 and AG-2 districts. Commissioner Lindler revisited issues raised at an earlier Commission meeting involving animals and agricultural classifications, including situations that do not fit neatly within traditional livestock definitions. Staff discussed how certain activities may be addressed through other County regulations rather than through the zoning code itself. The Commission’s focus was on ensuring that the use tables and definitions do not inadvertently exclude legitimate rural activities or force them into an unrelated permit category.

The discussion also touched on kennels, animal facilities, and the distinction between commercial animal businesses and other animal-related uses. Staff reviewed draft definitions and considered whether a zoning clearance or another administrative review would be sufficient for lower-impact activities. Commissioners emphasized that the code should provide an enforceable path for genuine commercial impacts without treating every rural animal activity as a commercial kennel or similar regulated facility.

Commissioner Fowle raised concerns about agricultural storage and the draft use table. He noted that wholesale storage and sales appeared not to be permitted in AG-1 and required a use permit in AG-2, even though hay and grain storage is a routine part of farming throughout the County. He questioned whether existing agricultural barns would become nonconforming and whether a farmer would need a land division, rezone, or discretionary permit simply to construct adequate storage. Commissioner Hart referenced the County’s history of agricultural pole-barn exemptions, and staff discussed the difference between zoning treatment and building-permit exemptions.

Commissioner Fowle also questioned the practical effect of square-footage limitations on agricultural barns. He argued that one larger barn may occupy less agricultural land and function better than several smaller buildings constructed solely to remain under an exemption threshold. Director Lang read the draft definition of wholesale storage and sales, and staff observed that the wording appeared aimed at commercial merchandise rather than storage of commodities produced as part of an agricultural operation. The Commission directed attention toward making that distinction clearer.

Planning Commission Meeting
June 3, 2026

The Commission examined the definition of “agricultural enterprise.” Staff read the draft definition, which included cultivation, growing, harvesting, processing, agricultural sheds and warehouses, storage or sale of agricultural products and supplies, and repair or storage of agricultural equipment, while separately excluding certain intensive livestock operations. Commissioner Fowle observed that, except for the reference to “supplies,” the definition essentially described ordinary farms and ranches throughout Siskiyou County. Deputy Director Phelps suggested removing or revising the wholesale-storage-and-sales component so normal agricultural enterprises could remain permitted by right rather than being unintentionally treated as commercial uses.

Commissioner Fowle then asked whether the new small-scale agricultural-processing category would allow a farmer to use or construct a small barn for activities such as cleaning grain or seed, bagging it, and selling the finished agricultural product. Director Lang read the definition, which includes cleaning, sorting, grading, drying, curing, fermenting, milling, pressing, packaging, and storage where a substantial portion of the product comes from the subject property or local agricultural area and the operation remains compatible with surrounding rural uses. Commissioner Fowle indicated that this approach addressed his concern and then asked for clarification of the separate “commercial feed yard” definition.

Discussion continued regarding commercial feed yards and the point at which feeding animals becomes an intensive commercial operation requiring discretionary review. Commissioner Fowle asked whether bringing in animals owned by other people and feeding them to market weight would qualify. Staff explained that the intent was to distinguish large-scale or intensive operations from ordinary ranching. When the discussion turned to an existing large operation, staff explained that a legally established operation could continue as an existing/nonconforming use, while a significant expansion could trigger additional review. Commissioners questioned how the County would identify an expansion if an operator did not seek a permit, highlighting the practical enforcement limitations of any zoning standard.

The Commission then reviewed a “scientific study site” category. Commissioner Fowle was concerned that the term could be read broadly enough to require an administrative permit for routine weather stations, monitoring wells, stream gauges, or other scientific data collection. Director Lang read the existing definition, which was actually focused on locations containing archaeological, anthropological, or historic artifacts or remains. Vice Chair Lindler questioned whether ordinary archaeological survey or site-recording work would be captured. Staff agreed that the category name and definition were mismatched and should be clarified or renamed so routine field research is not inadvertently regulated.

The Commission reviewed utility and resource uses, including solar facilities and uses within Timber Production Zone (TPZ) lands. Commissioner Hart discussed the economics of agricultural water pumping and noted that solar power may be used to make remote agricultural pumping feasible. Commissioners questioned whether the draft definitions and TPZ use table adequately recognize

Planning Commission Special Meeting
June 3, 2026

solar energy when other utilities such as electric, gas, water, and communications facilities are expressly referenced. Staff discussed how solar facilities should be categorized depending on whether they principally serve the property or function as a larger commercial power-generation use.

The Commission also discussed educational and instructional activities on agricultural and timber lands. Vice Chair Lindler described field tours and educational outings where students or members of the public are taken onto working forest or agricultural property for instruction. She wanted to ensure those activities would not require a discretionary land-use permit simply because an educational component is involved. Staff agreed that ordinary educational awareness tours that are incidental to the underlying agricultural or forestry use should not be treated as a separate institutional use requiring a permit.

Commissioner Fowle asked how the code would treat disc or frisbee golf, noting that it can be a very low-intensity outdoor recreation use compared with a conventional developed golf course. The Commission discussed whether a small course on agricultural or resource land should automatically be categorized as commercial outdoor recreation and require a discretionary permit. Staff and the consultant acknowledged that the impacts can vary substantially depending on the scale, facilities, traffic, and commercial nature of the operation and questioned whether the County needed to regulate very low-impact versions at all.

The Commission also reviewed hunting, fishing, camping, and agritourism uses. Commissioners distinguished hunting and fishing, which are principally regulated by the State, from a commercial camping or overnight operation that creates a separate land-use impact. Commissioner Lindler raised examples such as Hipcamp or glamping on timber or resource lands and questioned how those uses fit within TPZ-compatible-use restrictions. The discussion recognized that State law significantly limits allowable uses on TPZ lands and that the County should avoid creating a local authorization that conflicts with those restrictions.

Vice Chair Lindler returned to the agricultural and resource use table and requested clarification regarding growing and harvesting timber on AG-1, AG-2, rural residential, and commercial properties that contain forest land. She explained that timber harvesting and timberland-conversion requirements can apply based on the existence of commercial tree species and the nature of the proposed activity regardless of the County zoning designation. Her concern was that a dash in the County use table could incorrectly suggest that timber harvesting is prohibited on a parcel where State forestry law allows or regulates it. Deputy Director Phelps cautioned that simply marking timber harvesting as “permitted” could create the opposite misunderstanding by suggesting no State forestry permit is required. The Commission and staff discussed finding wording that makes clear the County is not imposing an additional zoning prohibition while preserving all State permitting requirements.

As the meeting approached 4:45 p.m., Commissioner Lindler noted that substantial sections concerning residential, commercial, and industrial districts remained. The Commission agreed it

Planning Commission Meeting
June 3, 2026

would be better to continue the detailed review than rush through the remaining material. The consultant explained the next steps after the working draft, including release of a public-review draft, community notice, collection of comments, virtual workshops and question-and-answer opportunities, return of public feedback to the Planning Commission, preparation of a hearing draft, environmental review, Planning Commission hearings, and ultimately Board of Supervisors consideration.

Vice Chair Lindler requested a motion to continue the item.

Motion: Chairman Fowle moved to continue Agenda Item No. 1, Title 10 Zoning Code Update, to the regularly scheduled June 17, 2026 Planning Commission meeting. Commissioner Hart seconded the motion.

Voted: Motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

Adjournment: The special meeting was adjourned at approximately 4:43pm

Respectfully submitted,

Signature on file

James Phelps, Secretary

Deputy Director of Planning

Community Development Department

\kh