

**Siskiyou County Planning Commission
Regular Meeting
June 17, 2026**

The Siskiyou County Planning Commission meeting of June 17, 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 (late arrival), Veale and Vice Chair Lindler

Absent: Chair Melo

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

Approval of Minutes: April 15, 2026

Vice Chair Lindler and Commissioner Fowle stated that the minutes had not been included with the emailed or online packet and that the Commission therefore had not had an adequate opportunity to review them.

Voted Commissioner Fowle moved to table the April 15 minutes until the July regular meeting; Commissioner Veale seconded, and the motion carried.

Unscheduled Appearances: None

Conflict of Interest Declaration: None

Presentation of Documents; Availability of Public Records; Public Hearing Protocol; Right of Appeal Statement: The Chair read these items as presented on the agenda.

Changes to the Agenda: County Counsel Bill Carroll disclosed that he had not formally reviewed Agenda Item No. 1 before publication. Vice Chair Lindler asked whether the Commission could proceed and make any action subject to counsel's review. Carroll explained that the Commission could proceed or delay the matter. Commissioner Fowle stated that he had compared the item with prior double-frontage projects and found the language consistent. Community Development Director Hailey Lang advised that, for a routine matter without an identified legal concern, the Commission could use its discretion and proceed

New Business:

II. New Business

Agenda Item 1: Tatom BLA-25-23 / Categorically Exempt

The applicant is requesting boundary line adjustment approval to reconfigure two existing parcels into one 16.88-acre parcel and one 14.47-acre parcel with double frontage. The project is zoned Single-Family Residential (RES-1) and Rural Residential Agricultural, 2.5-acre minimum parcel size (R-R-B-

Planning Commission Meeting
June 17, 2026

2.5).

Staff Report:

Associate Planner Bernadette Cizin explained that the proposal would reconfigure two existing McCloud-area parcels into approximately 14.47-acre and 16.88-acre parcels. Because the resulting parcels would have double frontage, Planning Commission approval was required.

Cizin reported that the project was consistent with the General Plan and zoning, qualified for a California Environmental Quality Act categorical exemption as a minor lot-line adjustment, and created no new parcels.

Agency Input: None

Vice Chair Lindler opened the public hearing. Edward Pearson of Anderson, CA spoke on behalf of the property owner. Mr. Pearson stated he would be available to answer any questions the Commissioners might have. The public hearing was closed.

Commission Questions/Discussion:

Commissioner Fowle asked for clarification regarding the frontage and ingress/egress. Planner Cizin reported that the frontage would be determined at time of development, and stated that the narrow 60 foot wide portion that touches Hall Road would no likely be considered frontage. Commissioner Fowle stated he has no issue with the project.

Motion: Commissioner Veale moved to adopt Resolution PC 2026-007 approving the categorical exemption and the boundary line adjustment; Commissioner Fowle seconded, and the motion carried by voice vote.

Voted Motion carried unanimously voice vote.

Ayes: Commissioners Fowle, Veale and Vice Chair Lindler

Noes:

Absent: Commissioner Hart, Chair Melo

Abstain:

Old Business:

Agenda Item 1: Title 10 Zoning Code (Continued Study Session and Public Hearing)

Continued discussion regarding the Draft Title 10 Zoning Code Update following the June 3, 2026, Planning Commission study session. Title 10 contains the County's planning, zoning, subdivision, and land use regulations. The draft update is intended to modernize the Zoning Code, improve consistency with the 2050 General Plan Update, simplify permit procedures, update zoning districts and use regulations, and improve overall clarity and usability

Planning Commission Meeting
June 17, 2026

Vice Chair Lindler called for a break at approximately 9:14 a.m.

Vice Chair Lindler called the meeting back to order at approximately 9:30 a.m.

Commissioner Fowle returned to an issue from the June 3 special meeting concerning the use of streets and alleys as zoning-district boundaries where the underlying road may be an easement rather than fee-owned public property. County Counsel Carroll had prepared clarifying language stating, in substance, that using a street or alley as a zoning boundary is only for designation of the zone and does not alter underlying property lines, easements, or possessory interests. Commissioner Fowle said the language resolved his concern, Vice Chair Lindler supported it, and Deputy Director James Phelps confirmed that the language had been sent to the consultants for inclusion.

Commissioner Veale asked what practical effect the clarification would have. Commissioner Fowle used Highway 3 and East Callahan Road in Scott Valley as examples where the public road is located on an easement and private ownership may extend to the road centerline. He explained that the amendment would prevent the zoning-boundary description from being interpreted as changing ownership. The Commission then resumed its line-by-line review of the zoning use tables.

Commissioner Fowle asked whether 'racetracks for motor and non-motor vehicles' was intended to include radio-controlled vehicles, noting an existing radio-controlled track near Fort Jones. The discussion focused on avoiding unintended regulation of small recreational radio-controlled uses while still regulating true vehicle racetracks and similar intensive uses. The Commission also reviewed animal-racing terminology and the appropriate level of permitting for potentially higher-impact uses.

The Commission continued reviewing the agricultural and Timber Production Zone (TPZ) use table. Vice Chair Lindler focused on distinctions among accessory dwelling units, guest houses, caretaker units, and employee housing. Community Development Director Lang explained that a guest house generally lacks full kitchen facilities, while an accessory dwelling unit functions as an independent dwelling. Caretaker units are tied to a business or site where the occupant is present for the operation, while employee housing is governed by a different framework. Vice Chair Lindler questioned why some housing forms were allowed in TPZ while others were not and asked that the table and definitions be internally consistent.

The Commission also discussed whether various utility and energy-related uses should be permitted, administratively approved, or require a Planning Commission use permit. Commissioner Fowle favored a distinction between commercial-scale facilities and private facilities serving the property itself. Lang noted that the newer administrative use permit process can provide a streamlined review while allowing an item to be elevated to the Planning Commission if scale or impacts warrant. The discussion emphasized that routine facilities serving agricultural or timber operation should not be treated the same as a commercial utility-scale project.

Planning Commission Meeting
June 17, 2026

Commissioner Hart arrived at approximately 9:45 am.

The Commission examined solar energy facilities on agricultural land. Commissioner Fowle and Vice Chair Lindler distinguished commercial solar farms from solar installations used to power an agricultural or private operation. Commissioner Hart strongly opposed requiring a use permit for solar equipment used to operate irrigation pumps or otherwise support a ranch, describing a Shasta Valley project in which solar power was used to relocate a diversion and pump water for habitat and irrigation purposes. He argued that landowners should not face an additional County discretionary permit merely for using solar energy to maintain an agricultural operation.

Deputy Director of Planning Phelps clarified that the draft definition of a solar farm was aimed at commercial electricity generation and that private or agricultural-use solar was not intended to be treated as a commercial solar farm. Lang agreed that the commercial-versus-private distinction was key and referenced approaches used in agricultural counties that clearly separate utility-scale conversion of productive land from energy systems serving the underlying operation. The Commission's direction was to preserve a use-permit requirement for commercial solar farms while ensuring that private/agricultural systems were not unnecessarily burdened. The Commission then moved into related cold-storage and accessory-structure questions, with Vice Chair Lindler asking how shops and other buildings necessary to manage TPZ land would be treated.

The discussion shifted to timber and wood-processing uses. Commissioner Hart asked for a clearer definition so ordinary firewood cutting, small portable sawmills, and landowner-scale processing would not automatically trigger a use permit. Vice Chair Lindler agreed that the intent was not to hinder ordinary forestry activity or small operators. Phelps explained that the term 'facility' was intended to capture a more established manufacturing operation, but the Commissioners noted that the line between a portable mill, a small commercial sideline, and an industrial wood-processing facility could be unclear.

Commissioner Fowle described small Scott Valley mills where landowners process otherwise unmarketable logs and sometimes barter lumber for fuel, hay, or other goods. Vice Chair Lindler discussed state-level rules affecting commercial timber products and low-volume retailers but emphasized that the County should not inadvertently create a local permitting trigger for customary small-scale activity. Commissioner Hart likewise gave examples of firewood processors that can operate at different scales and in different settings, noting that a residential neighborhood may warrant controls that would be unnecessary on agricultural or timber land. The Commission directed that the definition be refined so ordinary firewood and small-scale/portable processing are distinguished from an industrial wood-processing facility.

The Commission continued through the agricultural/TPZ use table, reviewing accessory structures, mining-related entries, agricultural processing, and other uses. Phelps repeatedly updated the working document to reflect Commission direction for transmission to the consultants. Commissioners

Planning Commission Meeting
June 17, 2026

stressed that accessory buildings needed to carry out an allowed primary agricultural or timber use should generally be allowed as accessory structures rather than treated as separate commercial projects.

Discussion also covered airstrips, aviation-related uses, and the difference between routine ranch or agricultural activity and uses that could create off-site impacts. Commissioners raised practical examples to test the draft language and asked staff to avoid definitions that would unintentionally capture customary rural operations. The review remained focused on making the new Title 10 tables understandable to landowners and enforceable without creating unnecessary discretionary permits.

The Commission discussed drone and aircraft-related language, including how new technology fits within older zoning terminology. Commissioners considered whether the code should regulate a private operational use differently from a commercial facility or activity open to the public. Commissioner Fowle and Commissioner Hart continued to test the proposed categories against real-world ranch and rural examples, while Phelps and Lang explained how the administrative use permit and use-permit processes could address scale and neighborhood impacts.

The Commission also revisited educational and recreational uses on agricultural land. Commissioner Fowle referenced vocational and Regional Occupational Program-type classes historically conducted on ranches and supported allowing agricultural or trade instruction through an administrative process rather than treating it as a conventional school campus.

Director Lang explained that the draft distinguishes primary/secondary schools from trade or vocational instruction. The Commission supported maintaining that distinction and removing obsolete or duplicative categories where another permitting or California Environmental Quality Act process already addresses the issue.

Vice Chair Lindler focused on equipment and material storage on TPZ land. She explained that forestry equipment may remain at a landing or work site for extended periods, including over winter, without the site becoming a commercial storage yard. Lang read the draft definition, which described limited, incidental storage compatible with surrounding agricultural or rural uses and excluded contractor yards, commercial storage operations, industrial storage, and intensive heavy-equipment staging. Based on that definition, Deputy Director Phelps indicated that permitted status could be appropriate. Vice Chair Lindler agreed, emphasizing that normal seasonal storage by small timberland owners should not be prohibited.

Commissioner Fowle then revisited construction of levees and dikes, noting prior direction that these be permitted by right in agricultural zones. The Commission favored a similar practical approach where state or federal requirements would still apply. The discussion moved into TPZ parcel-size and forest-practice provisions, with Commissioners asking how state minimums, existing parcels, and County standards interact. The recurring theme was to avoid adding County barriers where other

Planning Commission Meeting
June 17, 2026

agencies already regulate the activity.

The Commission examined agricultural and TPZ development standards, including setbacks from roads and property lines. Vice Chair Lindler noted that many existing rural fences and improvements are much closer to road centerlines than the draft setbacks would allow and questioned whether a new setback would create unnecessary nonconformities when fences are replaced. Deputy Director Phelps suggested that the front setback might serve a road-safety purpose, but the Commissioners discussed the practical reality of County road easements crossing privately owned land. Commissioner Fowle favored simplifying the standards and removing setbacks that did not make sense for customary agricultural improvements.

The Commission also revisited maximum building height for agricultural accessory structures. Commissioner Fowle noted that modern barns and equipment buildings can exceed older height limits simply because of the clearance needed for trucks, stacked hay, and roof peaks. Lang clarified that the discussion concerned accessory agricultural buildings. The Commission's direction continued to favor a 50-foot height allowance for appropriate agricultural accessory structures, consistent with the prior June 3 discussion.

The Commission moved from agricultural standards toward rural residential zoning. Commissioners discussed the proposed Rural Residential (RR), Rural Low Density (RL), and Rural Mixed Density (RM) categories and how parcel sizes should correspond with the intensity of uses allowed in each district. Commissioner Fowle proposed a structure in which RR would generally cover larger rural-residential parcels, RL would cover intermediate parcels, and RM would cover smaller/higher-density parcels. Vice Chair Lindler agreed with the logic because the use permissions had been organized from lower to higher intensity.

Deputy Director Phelps and Director Lang cautioned that many existing parcels would become nonconforming if the new minimums and maximums were applied without care. Vice Chair Lindler specifically raised large timbered parcels currently carrying rural-residential zoning. Director Lang explained that existing parcels could remain nonconforming while the new standards guide future zoning and subdivision decisions. The Commission worked through suggested acreage ranges and asked that confusing septic-related parcel-size language be removed or clarified.

The Commission continued refining RR, RL, and RM development standards, including lot dimensions, density, and the relationship between parcel size and allowed uses. Commissioner Veale questioned whether minimum square footage alone was sufficient without minimum width or depth standards. Deputy Director Phelps cautioned that rigid dimensions can be problematic because terrain and parcel configuration vary throughout the County. Commissioners generally favored standards that prevent impractical lots without eliminating flexibility needed in rural areas.

The discussion also addressed emergency shelters in rural residential zones. Commissioner Fowle

Planning Commission Meeting
June 17, 2026

referenced rural fire conditions and the possibility that a permanent emergency shelter could be appropriate in an area such as Kidder Creek. Director Lang confirmed that staff notes already contemplated allowing emergency shelters in RR. Deputy Director Phelps recommended a use permit because facility size could vary significantly and a large shelter could have substantial impacts.

Vice Chair Lindler called for a lunch break at approximately 12:00 p.m.

Vice Chair Lindler called the meeting back to order at approximately 1:00 p.m.

The Commission resumed the rural residential use tables. Commissioner Fowle first asked about cottage food operations and whether an administrative use permit was sufficient. Lang described the process as streamlined, and Deputy Director Phelps noted that Environmental Health would still review applicable food-safety requirements. The Commission was comfortable with an administrative approach.

The Commission then examined older lodging terminology, including rooming houses, boarding houses, bed-and-breakfast establishments, short-term room rentals, and single-room occupancy uses. Lang and Phelps explained the draft definitions and the distinction between a residential boarding arrangement and short-term lodging. Commissioner Fowle questioned whether rooming/boarding houses needed a full use permit and suggested administrative review in some rural residential districts.

Vice Chair Lindler asked how stays of less than 30 days interact with vacation rentals and Transient Occupancy Tax requirements. Staff agreed that the terminology and tax/permitting relationship needed further review because some of the terms were carryovers from the older code.

The Commission continued its detailed comparison of lodging, vacation-rental, and residential-care categories. Commissioners questioned whether older terms should remain in the code when modern rental platforms and current housing types are regulated differently. Lang explained that the existing definitions had evolved over time and that the new code should avoid overlapping categories that create inconsistent treatment. The Commission discussed whether bed-and-breakfast facilities in lower-density residential areas should be permitted through an administrative use permit or a full use permit depending on size and intensity.

The discussion broadened to personal services, laundromats, retail uses, and other neighborhood-scale commercial activities in residential districts. Commissioners repeatedly asked whether an administrative permit would provide enough oversight while avoiding an unnecessary Planning Commission hearing. Deputy Director Phelps emphasized that an administrative use permit can be elevated when a proposal's scale or impacts warrant Commission review. The Commission used that mechanism as a recurring tool for lower-impact uses that might be appropriate in some rural residential settings but should not be permitted entirely by right.

Planning Commission Meeting
June 17, 2026

The Commission reviewed community farms, agricultural activities in residential districts, commercial kitchens, research and development uses, and special-event facilities. Commissioners distinguished small-scale activities compatible with a rural residential neighborhood from operations that generate substantial traffic, noise, or commercial activity. Commissioner Fowle and Vice Chair Lindler favored preserving opportunities for rural enterprise while ensuring that higher-impact uses could be conditioned.

The Commission also discussed how the code should treat accessory or incidental agricultural uses in residential zones and whether some activities should be permitted by right when they are clearly subordinate to the residential use. Staff continued making edits to the working table based on the Commission's direction, with the understanding that the consultants would incorporate the changes into the next draft.

The Commission moved into additional residential and commercial-use categories, including care facilities, schools, and institutional uses. Commissioners questioned whether the proposed permit levels were internally consistent and whether certain facilities should be allowed in lower-density residential districts. The discussion repeatedly returned to scale: a small home-based or neighborhood-serving use could be appropriate administratively, while a larger institutional use should receive a full use-permit review.

Commissioner Hart and Commissioner Fowle emphasized the need to avoid rules that look reasonable on a table but create impractical results in rural Siskiyou County. Vice Chair Lindler asked staff to keep definitions aligned with the use tables so a landowner can understand the permitting requirement without having to reconcile conflicting terms in different chapters.

Community Development Director Lang excused herself from the meeting at 2:07pm as she had another meeting to attend.

The Commission continued through commercial zoning tables and development standards. Commissioners discussed allowable parcel sizes, building height, setbacks, and the relationship between commercial districts and adjacent residential uses. Phelps explained the rationale behind several consultant recommendations, while Commissioners proposed changes where the standards appeared too restrictive or did not reflect existing County development patterns.

The Commission also examined residential-care and vocational-school uses in commercial zones. Commissioners supported allowing uses that are compatible with commercial areas but wanted adequate review for proposals that could create traffic, parking, or neighborhood impacts. The administrative use permit remained the preferred middle ground for many uses because it provides a documented review and the ability to elevate a project when necessary.

Discussion focused on commercial use classifications and the distinction between general retail,

Planning Commission Meeting
June 17, 2026

service businesses, and more intensive activities. Commissioner Fowle questioned why some uses that are typical of commercial districts were assigned discretionary permits rather than being permitted or administratively approved. Deputy Director Phelps explained that staff had often selected an administrative permit where a use could be appropriate but might need site-specific conditions.

Vice Chair Lindler and Commissioner Veale asked practical questions about how a business would be categorized and whether the draft could create uncertainty for existing or future operators. The Commission continued directing staff to simplify categories where possible, avoid duplicate regulation, and reserve full Planning Commission use permits for uses with a meaningful potential for off-site impacts.

The Commission progressed into heavier commercial and industrial-type uses. Commissioners reviewed which activities should be permitted by right in a district specifically intended for commercial or industrial operations. Commissioner Fowle argued that when the underlying zoning is designed for the use, the County should not automatically require a full use permit unless the scale or specific impacts justify additional review.

Deputy Director Phelps described the consultant/staff rationale for retaining administrative review for certain uses as a safeguard. Commissioner Veale and Vice Chair Lindler tested the categories against existing local businesses and land-use patterns. The Commission's direction generally favored administrative rather than full discretionary review for uses that fit the purpose of the zone but could require site-specific conditions.

The Commission began its industrial zoning review. Commissioner Fowle questioned permit requirements for canneries, slaughterhouses, tanneries, timber/wood processing, and greenhouse or wholesale nursery uses. He argued that industrially zoned land should accommodate genuinely industrial uses without routinely requiring a full Planning Commission hearing.

Deputy Director Phelps noted that some uses can be controversial or highly site-dependent, which was why staff had initially proposed use permits in several cases. The Commission discussed moving several industrial uses to an administrative use permit, while retaining the ability for staff to elevate a proposal. Commissioner Fowle specifically supported less restrictive treatment of timber and wood processing to encourage local industry. For greenhouse and wholesale nursery uses, Phelps explained that an administrative review could help ensure compatibility with surrounding heavy industrial operations, while Commissioners noted that large greenhouses and nurseries can logically fit industrial areas because of water, traffic, and infrastructure needs.

The industrial-use review continued with schools, daycare facilities, and other potentially sensitive uses. Vice Chair Lindler noted that daycare centers can face safety concerns when located near chemical or heavy industrial operations. The Commission distinguished between uses that should be protected from industrial impacts and uses that are themselves appropriate in an industrial district.

Planning Commission Meeting
June 17, 2026

Commissioners also discussed the concept of 'down-zoning' and the relationship among residential, commercial, light industrial, and industrial districts. Deputy Director Phelps explained that the categories are different use regimes rather than a simple hierarchy. The Commission continued editing permit levels for industrial uses and clarified that primary/secondary schools should not necessarily be treated the same as colleges, trade schools, or vocational facilities.

The Commission moved into general provisions and subdivision-related chapters. Commissioner Fowle identified language requiring compliance with County grading and erosion-control requirements and questioned how that provision could operate when Siskiyou County does not currently have a grading ordinance. Phelps explained that the draft had been written in contemplation of a possible future grading ordinance. Vice Chair Lindler agreed the provision should be highlighted, and Commissioner Hart stated that the Board of Supervisors ultimately needs to decide whether the County will adopt such an ordinance.

The discussion expanded to the Planning Commission's advisory role and the Board's final authority. Commissioners also referenced major grading occurring at Rain Rock as an example of why the issue is significant. Deputy Director Phelps explained that many subdivision provisions are dictated by the State Subdivision Map Act and that County staff are largely codifying state requirements rather than creating entirely new local rules.

The Commission reviewed subdivision procedures, road and engineering review, and the role of the Department of Public Works. Commissioner Fowle questioned whether Public Works should be more visibly involved in subdivision review. Phelps explained that engineering, utility, easement, and subdivision-improvement review often occurs on the back end and is incorporated into staff reports, although he agreed that greater participation at Planning Commission meetings could be helpful for larger projects.

The Commission also discussed groundwater and water-availability considerations, including the work of Groundwater Sustainability Agencies and ongoing mapping. Commissioner Hart explained that certain groundwater restrictions are directed at agricultural pumping and do not necessarily apply in the same manner to new development. Vice Chair Lindler emphasized that the Planning Commission needs clear information about applicable thresholds and restrictions when making land-use decisions. The Commission favored coordinating the zoning update with current mapping and agency work rather than codifying assumptions that could quickly become outdated.

Commissioner Fowle raised concerns about language requiring reasonable public access to public waterways when a subdivision fronts a public waterway, river, or stream. He questioned whether the language could be interpreted beyond subdivisions to force access across private agricultural land. Phelps initially noted that public-waterway access requirements derive from state law, while County Counsel Carroll expressed concern about reading the provision as a blanket dedication requirement.

Planning Commission Meeting
June 17, 2026

Commissioners discussed the difference between coastal-access cases and inland rivers such as the Scott, Shasta, and Salmon. Vice Chair Lindler located the relevant Government Code language requiring access in connection with certain subdivisions. Commissioner Fowle stressed that the County should be careful not to create a broader local obligation for parcel maps, boundary line adjustments, or other projects that are not subject to the same requirement. Deputy Director Phelps agreed to consult the relevant state statutes and the consultants so the provision could be placed and worded in the proper context. The Commission then continued through subdivision-map expiration, extension, monument, and procedural provisions, with Commissioner Fowle asking that the new language remain consistent with state law and the County's prior extension practices.

The Commission continued reviewing subdivision chapters, including lot-line adjustments and reversions to acreage. Phelps confirmed that the draft had removed the double-frontage issue from the lot-line-adjustment chapter consistent with prior Commission direction. Commissioner Fowle asked whether reverting a subdivision to acreage automatically restores a prior zoning designation. Phelps explained that subdivision boundaries and zoning are separate; reversion changes the parcel configuration, while the existing zoning remains unless the owner separately seeks a rezone.

The Commission also discussed parcel maps, dedications, and other procedural requirements. Commissioners continued to flag language that might be copied from state law without sufficient context and asked staff to make the County ordinance clear about when a requirement applies. The review remained focused on avoiding unintended legal or property-right consequences while keeping the code consistent with the Subdivision Map Act.

The Commission reviewed mitigation-monitoring provisions. Vice Chair Lindler asked whether the County previously had a formal mitigation monitoring program. County Counsel Carroll explained that projects with a mitigated negative declaration or Environmental Impact Report have historically had project-specific mitigation reporting programs, but the process had not been codified in the zoning ordinance. Phelps explained that the new section establishes procedures to track mitigation measures imposed through the California Environmental Quality Act process.

Commissioner Fowle asked whether this section was related to periodic monitoring conditions previously discussed for vacation rentals. Deputy Director Phelps clarified that vacation-rental monitoring is a separate permit and enforcement process. The Commission accepted the distinction and continued reviewing definitions and administrative provisions. Commissioners emphasized that terms used throughout the ordinance should have one consistent meaning and that definitions should not create a second, conflicting regulatory standard.

The Commission completed its review of several definitions near the end of the draft. Commissioner Fowle questioned a definition of agricultural use that appeared to exclude dairies, feedlots, poultry operations, and hog-raising operations. He stated that these are agricultural uses even though commercial-scale operations may require additional permits from other agencies. Phelps agreed that

Planning Commission Meeting
June 17, 2026

the wording should be revised to distinguish scale or permitting requirements without declaring those activities non-agricultural. Commissioner Fowle also requested that the agricultural-enterprise definition expressly include agricultural 'services' in addition to products and supplies.

Items for Discussion/Direction

1. Ongoing Staff Updates regarding the General Plan Update

Deputy Director Phelps discussed the schedule for returning the revised zoning documents. Phelps explained that staff intended to incorporate the Planning Commission's changes, send the material through consultant and County Counsel review, and bring the refined documents back before advancing them to the Board of Supervisors.

Miscellaneous:

- 1. Future Meetings:** The next regular meeting of the Planning Commission was initially scheduled for Wednesday, July 15, 2026, at 9:00 a.m. according to the meeting agenda.

Phelps stated no planning projects were ready for the July meeting and Vice Chair Lindler had a conflict, the Commission discussed moving the next regular meeting to August 19, 2026.

Motion: Commissioner Fowle moved to schedule the next regular meeting for August 19, 2026, at 9:00 a.m.; Commissioner Veale seconded

Voted Motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

2. Correspondence: None

3. Staff Comments:

Deputy Director James Phelps informed the Commissioners that Associate Planner Bernadette Cizin had submitted her resignation. Commissioners stated that Planner Cizin would be greatly missed, especially related to her mining expertise.

4. Commission Comments:

Commissioner Veale asked about development activity and a 'coming soon' sign near Easy Street and Interstate 5, including rumors about a possible truck-stop-type development. Phelps confirmed that the referenced location is in unincorporated County jurisdiction, while the Commissioners discussed ownership and whether tribal status could affect jurisdiction. County Counsel noted that the contemplated project appeared to be a by-right type of project based on the discussion. Vice Chair Lindler reminded the Commission to avoid drifting too far into speculation about a potential future project.

Adjournment: The meeting was concluded at approximately 4:46 p.m.

Planning Commission Meeting
June 17, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

Signature on file

James Phelps, Secretary
Deputy Director of Planning
Community Development Department
\\kh