

SISKIYOU COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
MAY 17, 2017

The Siskiyou County Planning Commission meeting was called to order by Vice Chair Veale at 9:00 a.m. in the Board of Supervisors' Chambers, Siskiyou County Courthouse, 311 Fourth Street, Yreka, California.

PRESENT: Commissioners Jeff Fowle, Blair Hart, Mike McMahon, and Dusty Veale

ABSENT: Tony Melo

ALSO PRESENT: Allan Calder, Director; Randy Chafin, Interim Deputy Director of Planning; Britt Dveris; Senior Planner; Vurl Trytten, Executive Secretary; Natalie Reed, Deputy County Counsel; and Jerry Lemos, Senior Environmental Health Specialist

MINUTES:

MOTION: It was moved by Commissioner McMahon, seconded by Commissioner Hart, to approve the minutes of February 15, 2017, as presented.

VOTED upon and the Vice Chair Veale declared the motion carried unanimously.

PRESENTATIONS FROM THE PUBLIC: None

CONFLICT OF INTEREST DECLARATIONS: None

PUBLIC HEARING PROTOCOL: Vice Chair Veale reviewed the protocol for conducting the Planning Commission meetings.

RIGHTS OF APPEAL STATEMENT: Vice Chair Veale advised that projects heard at this Planning Commission meeting may be subject to appeal within ten calendar days. He directed interested individuals to contact the County Clerk's Office for information. He advised that if you challenge the environmental review or the project proposal in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues raised at the public hearing or in written correspondence delivered to the Planning Department at, or prior to the public hearing. Vice Chair Veale apprized the Commissioners and audience that appeals must be submitted to the County Clerk's Office together with the appeal fee of \$1250.

Mr. Allan Calder Director of Community Development introduced himself and said that before coming to Siskiyou County he had worked for Bechtel on industrial projects in Africa and Indonesia. He said that he had also worked in California, Michigan, Alaska and Washington and was interested to be here. He said that after living in the San Francisco Bay Area, it was a pleasure to be in a rural setting and that he was getting to know staff.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:**MCCLOUD PLANNED DEVELOPMENT ZONING REVISION Z-17-01**

The proposed project is to rezone approximately 54 contiguous acres of private land located north of State Route 89 and immediately east and west of Haul Road in the unincorporated community of McCloud, Siskiyou County, California from Planned Development (P-D)/Single-Family Residential (RES-1) and Planned Development (P-D)/Rural Residential Agricultural (R-R) to Single-Family Residential (RES-1) and Rural Residential Agricultural (R-R). The project area includes the following parcels (APNs): 049-051-280; 049-062-120; 049-062-130; 049-062-150; 049-062-180; 049-062-190; 049-062-200; 049-062-210; 049-062-240; 049-062-470; 049-062-510; 049-062-520.

**MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION
ZONE CHANGE****CONTINUED
CONTINUED****STAFF REPORT:**

Vice Chair Veale disclosed that he had visited the project site.

The previously circulated Staff Report was reviewed by the Commission and a presentation of the project was provided by Senior Planner Britt Dveris.

Mr. Dveris presented the staff report that included a power point presentation. He informed the Commission that the proposed re-zone was initiated by the county for 54 contiguous acres in McCloud. He described the location of the project along Haul Road in McCloud and showed the location on the map. He explained that the proposed re-zone would eliminate the Planned Development (PD) overly zoning and leave the underlying zoning. He showed the zoning on the displayed power point map. Vice Chair Veale confirmed that the MH zoning in the project map was the old mill site to the east of the project area. Commissioner McMahan asked if there was an on-going oversight of the mill site and particularly the old ponds and the reclaimed log area. He mentioned that the Roseburg Mill site area had to put in a wall around the site. Mr. Dveris responded that the project was only to eliminate PD zoning overlay, and there is no development proposal in the project. Vice Chair Veale confirmed that the area of the rezone is all private land and the various parcels are owned by 11 different property owners. Mr. Dveris showed the assessor's map and explained that division of land and boundary line adjustments that have taken place in the area, and as a consequence the GIS parcel layer is out of date; but the GIS parcel layer is being updated. He further explained that the land division and boundary line adjustments that have occurred recently, have rendered the PD zoning moot. He said that eliminating the PD overlay would allow unencumbered tentative parcel map projects to take place.

Mr. Dveris informed the Commission that the purpose of the PD established in 1998 was to eliminate curbs, gutters and sidewalks. He said that the 1998 PD Development Plan included a street and lot layout and these, along with the PD zoning and a tentative map, were approved; but the Tentative Subdivision Map was never recorded and has since expired. Consequently, the PD zoning designation took effect immediately after adoption of the ordinance and has remained in place ever since, while the configuration of the PD-zoned parcels never changed. He said that the Rhodes tentative parcel map application in the area of the PD zoning brought to

the attention of staff that this needed to be cleaned up in order to process the tentative parcel map. He explained that any proposed BLAs, TPMs, or TSMs would have to be consistent with the Development Plan, or the Development Plan would have to be revised to be consistent with any proposed BLAs, TPMs, or TSMs. He added that with the Rhodes tentative parcel map application staff realized that there would likely be other property owners wanting to submit a tentative parcel map application, so the County initiated a rezone to rescind the PD zoning overlay and leave in place the underlying RR and RES-1 zoning.

Mr. Dveris assured the Commission that all permitted and conditional uses allowed on the subject properties under current zoning would be allowed under the proposed zoning. He said that prior to initiating this rezone, staff had contacted all of the property owners in the area to ask whether they had any objection to the proposed rezoning and no opposition has been received. In addition, he said that the owners of property in the project area as well as adjacent property owners were sent notice regarding the public hearing today. He said that notice had been sent to state and local agencies, but no comments have been received.

Mr. Dveris informed the Commission that staff had analyzed the project and found it to be in compliance with the General Plan, and the future uses allowed under RES-1 and RR zoning would be compatible with existing and future land uses on adjacent property. He further informed the Commission that there was adequate roadway access and there would be no significant environmental impacts on or off site. Mr. Dveris showed the surrounding zoning districts.

Mr. Dveris said that the Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration had been circulated to state and other reviewing agencies for a 30 day public review, and that the potential environmental impacts identified in the Initial Study could be reduced to a less-than-significant level with the adoption of mitigation measures. He said that staff recommended that the Commission recommend that the Board of Supervisors adopt the Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration and, approve the rezone.

Planning Commission questions: none

AGENCY INPUT: None

Vice Chair Veale opened the Public Hearing.

PUBLIC INPUT:

Nita Still came forward to ask if the project site would become a park. Mr. Dveris explained that approval of the project would remove the PD zoning. Nita said staff was coming from the bay area, and wanted to turn it into a park. She also mentioned a project in Dunsmuir.

There being no further input, the Vice Chair closed the Public Hearing.

Discussion by Commission:

Commissioner Fowle said that there were three Commissioners who had been on the Commission when the prior zoning project came before the Planning Commission for approval. He said that only one sheet of Squaw Valley estates was included, but the map shows more PD

zoning than was approved in 1998. He said that he looked over the notes from years ago, and the old maps did not show the same area for the PD zoning.

Commissioner McMahon said that there was an adjustment to the PD zoning that was before the Commission in the early 2000s. Commissioner Hart said that the project had been reviewed by the Commission three times, and the PD zoning area seems to encompass more than was approved in 1998. Commissioner Fowle said that he was uncomfortable with the project, because the staff report says that it was approved in 1998, and staff needs to make sure the project site includes only the land put into PD in 1998.

Mr. Dveris explained that the idea of taking away the PD zoning is to allow tentative parcel maps to be processed unencumbered by the Development Plan. He further explained that there had already been subdivision since 1998; which had been done without any observation of the Development Plan.

Commissioner Hart said the 1998 project was very contentious and the issue had been with the sidewalks and curbs that the developer did not want to be saddled with. Commissioner Hart said that the issue that was contentious was that Champion owned Haul Road and there was a break-away gate on it. He said that the reason the Planning Commission approved the PD zoning was because emergency services and snow removal were in the Planned Development.

Commissioners Fowle and Hart stated that Nestle still owns Haul Road, and Frontage Road did not happen. Vice Chair Veale commented that there is construction going on now on the east side of Haul Road.

Commissioner McMahon commented that he was used to property that was individually rezoned, but this rezoning proposal is initiated the county. Commissioner Fowle said he does not recall one before. Mr. Chafin responded that there may not have been one, but the county can initiate a rezone. Commissioner McMahon commented that the last county initiated project was not a good memory. Commissioner Fowle mentioned that the McCloud Community Services District (CSD) was involved in the original rezone, and he remembered that the McCloud CSD had said that they would not provide snow removal on Haul Road, and the county said they would plow that road.

Mr. Chafin explained that the original project map was not recorded; and because of this there is no Planned Development document to amend, information is sketchy and now the situation is an impediment to development. He further explained that Planning was trying to rectify the confusing PD zoning overlay that no one seems to want to abide by and that has been violated by prior parcel maps that did not abide by the PD zoning, He added that staff is trying to eliminate the PD zoning to remove the impediment to other projects.

Discussion was held regarding the rezone. Ms. Reed re-stated and confirmed that the project is regarding rezoning the Planned Development area. Mr. Chafin confirmed with Commissioner Fowle that the concern was to be sure that the stated project area is all within the 1998 PD rezone project, particularly showing that the addition of the western and northern portion of the PD as the maps in the staff report do not agree.

Through the Vice Chair, Lon Tatom came forward to the microphone to comment on the project and to clarify the situation. He said that his son had done a Parcel Map and a zone change

project, and there have been Boundary Line Adjustments in the area. There was a discussion regarding zoning between Commissioner Fowle and Mr. Tatom. Mr. Chafin explained that it is the underlying zoning that would allow lot sizes not the PD.

Discussion was held regarding further subdivision and development along Haul Road, Mr. Tatom said that he owns the larger 28 acre parcel and has no intention of subdividing it.

Commissioner Fowle said that he was concerned that there was a lengthy discussion regarding the layout of the roads regarding emergency traffic, snow removal, and ingress and egress issues. Mr. Dveris said that there likely would have been a master development plan associated with the subdivision, but that subdivision map was approved but was never recorded. He reiterated that the PD zoning is in place, but the Tentative Subdivision Map is not in place. He added that people could not subdivide according to the Tentative Subdivision Map because it expired before being recorded and the plan was abandoned. Commissioner Fowle clarified if he owned a parcel it would have to be done under the PD standards and the parcel would not have the limitations of the Subdivision Map because it expired. He confirmed that the PD zoning map still exists because it was passed with the zone change to PD, but the Subdivision Map expired.

In response to a question from Vice Chair Veale, Mr. Dveris confirmed that the PD zoning map is still in effect. He then showed the Commission a recent split without observance of the Development Plan that accompanies the PD zoning. He said that the Rhodes did not want to be subject to the PD; and it seems that the presence of the PD zoning hinders development goals, because property owners do not want to adhere to the Development Plan's lot configurations. Mr. Dveris explained that that the master subdivision plan conventional street configuration did not happen because the Subdivision Map never recorded. Vice Chair Veale confirmed that the issue is the zoning and the development plan. Mr. Dveris responded that if the PD goes away, the development plan map would also go away, and the lots would be governed by the zoning in the area.

Vice Chair Veale said that he sees the need to clean up the area. Commissioner Fowle said that he wants to be sure the PD zoning is indeed the area zoned PD in 1998 in order to have the area correctly go back to the underlying zoning that is in place.

Mr. Dveris said that it looked like more research into the archives was required. Commissioner Hart recommended Mr. Dveris to go back 1998 to 1996/97. He added that the original project was very contentious.

The Planning Commission asked staff to confirm that the PD zoning area shown in the staff report is indeed zoned PD. Commissioner Fowle said that the Commission needs to confirm what the land was zoned before the PD went into effect. Mr. Dveris confirmed the areas west of the Haul Road area are indeed in the PD.

Through the Vice Chair, Mr. Tatom commented that Lehman would not have any more information than what the County has. He added that Haul Road is not plowed by the county or by Hitchcock. He asked the Commission to remove the PD zoning and go back to the underlying zoning. He urged the Commission to decide, mentioning staffing issues.

Commissioner Hart said that the Commission had to make sure this is accurate and they want to know the chronology of the events. Mr. Tatom said will that it would come back to what staff was suggesting: to change the zoning back to the original zoning underlying the PD.

Commissioner McMahon wondered how many times pieces of property in the area have been misused or misrepresented because of the mix up in the zoning. .

Vice Chair Veale asked for confirmation that the project was to rezone only the parcels that are shown in the staff report. Commissioner Hart explained that what is there is not PD, or maybe it is zoned commercial, but it was initially CU and not RES or RR. Mr. Chafin explained they would consult the GIS zoning layer. Mr. Dveris commented that Planning needs a regular GIS person. Vice Chair Veale asked how to confirm the zoning. Mr. Dveris responded that staff needs to see what ordinances exist. He said he does not have complete confidence in the GIS, because Planning does not have a GIS person.

Vice Chair Veale said the Commission needs to clarify what it wants from staff. Commissioner Hart and Fowle responded that staff needs to make it clear as to what the parcels were zoned before the PD zoning and when all the property became PD. They added that they are not opposed to the rezone; they just need to be clear as to what the zoning was prior to the PD, to avoid any possible mistakes in zoning for property owners if it is not accurate. Mr. Dveris confirmed that the intent was to put the zoning back to what it was prior to the PD zoning.

Commissioner Fowle explained that his recollection and notes indicated that the PD approved in 1998 was all to the West of Haul Road, and that there was nothing to the East of Haul Road. Mr. Chafin confirmed that the Planning Commission wanted staff to return with a report of the chronological actions that established the Planned Development zoning, and secondly the boundaries that were established by the approved 1998 PD rezone project. Commissioner Fowle added that the Commission wanted a clear picture of the zoning of the land over which the PD zoning was established..

Mr. Chafin informed the Commission that he could not be sure how quickly staff will be able to come back to the Planning Commission.

Commissioners Fowle and McMahon suggesting continuing this item until Planning has accurate information. Discussion was held and it was determined that the Commission would continue the matter to the June 21 Planning Commission meeting.

Vice Chair Veale asked if staff was clear on what they needed to do to bring the project back to the Commission.

Further discussion was held regarding what was in the original 1998 PD.

Ms. Reed commented that the Planned Development does need to be removed due to the problems with the PD that are preventing other development projects.

Through the Vice Chair Mr. Tatom said that he had purchased all of the land from the Hurleys and they were the ones that did the Planned Development. He said that the only parcels in the Planned Development are the parcels he purchased from the Hurleys.

Commissioner Fowle said that if the Planning Commission was going to approve the PD rezone, they needed to make sure everything that was changed to PD in 1998 is changed to the prior zoning when the entire PD blanket is taken off.

MOTION: Following discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Hart, seconded by Commissioner Fowle to continue the matter of the McCloud PD rezone to the June 21, 2017 Planning Commission meeting with direction to staff to bring back further documentation regarding the zoning underlying the PD zoning, so that the Commission could be sure that once the PD zoning layer is removed, all the underlying zoning is correct.

VOTED upon and the Vice Chair declared the motion carried unanimously with Chair Melo absent.

Commissioner McMahon left the meeting at 10:34 a.m.

Vice Chair Veale called for a five minute break at 10:34 and called the meeting back to order at 10:40.

ITEM FOR DISCUSSION:

AGRI-TOURISM ZONING – CONCEPTUAL OUTLINE DISCUSSION.

Mr. Chafin presented this item and explained that this is a County initiated issue simply for a discussion and there is no formal application.

Mr. Chafin explained that the County has received questions regarding activities and uses that are not specifically outlined in the zoning districts. These inquiries could be called agri-tourism. He said that the people have asked about extended stay rodeos, dude ranches, selling farm products, wedding events. He said that the purpose of this item was to start a dialogue of the phenomenon. He explained that there would be no official motion as he was simply looking for information and input. He explained what is currently allowed in the zoning code and that anything not in the code would have to come before the Planning Commission under a use permit application with no confidence that the project had a chance of being approved. He said that staff seeks comments and discussion before drafting of zoning text. He said that this could be referred to the Board of Supervisors with comments and concerns or could be referred to the Board of Supervisors to have an ad hoc advisory committee convened to look into it.

He said that Siskiyou County has great natural beauty and there is a trend for tourists to be attracted to seeing and experiencing agricultural operations. He explained that the challenge was how to define what agri-tourism is; what are its benefits to the county, to the tax base, to the visitors, and to agriculture. Additionally, the challenge is to address concerns regarding interference with agricultural operations on adjacent properties, pesticides, sufficient roadway, sufficient sewer and water, whether to restrict time of day or year, preserving primacy of the underlying agricultural operation, and that it must not degrade the agricultural industry. He further explained that there are decisions to make as to what to allow with conditions and under what circumstances, and under what circumstances to require a use permit. He added that decisions would need to be made on what range of activities to allow as some would be benign while others could involve a lot of people and result in environmental impacts or land use incompatibility issues. He said that other questions to answer would be: could allowing agri-

tourism inhibit productivity on agricultural properties or adjacent agricultural lands; could it interfere with nonagricultural activities on adjacent properties; in what zoning districts would it be allowed; and would it be acceptable in some zoning districts with limitations. Finally, he said that due to the significance of such a zoning change and wide public interest, should there be an ad hoc committee to look into it.

Vice Chair Veale said that he was taking a class and had gone to 4 ranches: Belcampo, Hunter Orchard, and two others. He said that change was going on in rural America and there is a new crop out there to be considered.

There was a Commission comment regarding the Scott Valley Area Plan and that its policies and zoning would have to be considered for any agri-tourism zoning within the Scott Valley Area Plan.

Mr. Chafin said that once the concept of agri-tourism is agreed to, staff would devote time to preparing zoning text for consideration by the Commission. He pointed out that there are various approaches to an ordinance amendment that could be considered, including the use of an overlay zone that would allow agri-tourism only in certain geographical areas of the county.

VICE-CHAIR VEALE OPENED THE DISCUSSION TO PUBLIC COMMENT:

Nicki Brown Harris said that she is a member of the Economic Development Council and co-owner of two agricultural operations in Scott Valley. She said that she is interested in promoting private business in Siskiyou County and promoting economic activity, particularly agricultural businesses. She said that there is an emerging subsector of agriculture that could increase revenue per acre. She informed the Commission that in 2015 private lodging owners had established a tourism improvement district to self-asses a room-stay fee to promote Siskiyou County as a travel and tourism destination and to market Siskiyou County as a travel destination. She said that this approach has proven to have success in increasing heads in beds, and there will be more travel to Siskiyou County. She informed the Commission that nitch audiences have been increasing, and it would be better for the county to be prepared to entertain new businesses that could come with agri-tourism. She said as co-owner of an agricultural business, she is in support of digging in deeper into the opportunities of agri-tourism.

Nita Still commented on water rights not being respected, logging being curtailed, and that 19 lumber mills were closed. She said that the project might affect roads and water. She commented on parasites, and said that farms should be allowed to do what they need to do to protect their crops.

Nicole Stewart from Hunter Orchards commented that she echoed what Nicki said. She said that Hunter Orchards has had a pumpkin patch for years, so she brings to the table experience agri-tourism. Commissioner Fowle asked if the county told her that she needed any special permit to do the pumpkin patch. Ms. Stewart responded that because it was in furtherance of the agricultural operation, she was told that she did not need any additional permits or licenses. She added that she did need a Tax ID and a sales tax number.

Mr. Chafin informed the Commission that he had received one comment letter from Anne Marsh. [Note: Copies of the comment letter from Ann Marsh were provided to the Commission before the meeting.]

Mark Klever said that he was a private consultant, ranch operator, and is working with the College of the Siskiyous in starting an agricultural program. He said thank you to Planning Commission for looking into agri-tourism, and said that he has been experiencing it when he tours the farms with his students, and his students get a more intimate look at agriculture from touring the farms. He said that he loves living on agricultural land with his family. He commented that by choosing to be open to agri-tourism, it may give agriculture the option and ability to keep agricultural land and hand it off to the next generation. He said that he would like to be involved in an ad hoc committee, and he understands that there is a lot more to it because some things require permitting and others do not.

Commissioner Hart commented that he could name operations where this activity is taking place with no regulation, and said if you do not need to regulate this, why regulate it? Vice Chair Veale commented that there are operations that need to be regulated. Commissioner Hart responded that he wants a fair and level playing field.

Mr. Chafin explained that Planning has not received any complaints, but there are operations going on that are not in compliance with the zoning regulations. Mr. Chafin and Ms. Reed further explained that the zoning ordinance is a permissive ordinance, what is allowed is listed, but if it is not listed then it is not allowed.

Commissioner Hart commented that he does not want the liability for agri-tourism.

Mr. Chafin said it would be a good idea to recognize agri-tourism in the zoning ordinance, as this would have the dual benefit of potentially encouraging such uses and would provide a basis for applying an approach level of regulation, where appropriate. He pointed out that certain agri-tourism uses would likely be so benign that no permit or oversight would be needed. However, larger operations might warrant Planning Commission review through the use permit process.

Vice Chair Veale pointed out it is the land owner that causes land use incompatibility that demands regulation. Mr. Calder commented that a use by right in the zoning ordinance would encourage new applicants to come, and such would not preclude agri-tourism use on agricultural property. Mr. Chafin said that the applicants would have a better understanding of what their chances were of approval for their project if there was recognition of agri-tourism in the Zoning Ordinance, as opposed to the current situation wherein one applies for a use permit and takes a chance as to whether the project would be approved or denied. Commissioner Fowle commented that caution should be taken as to how agri-tourism is defined. He said, that what has gone on for generations, such as simply selling eggs in a stand or pumpkins, or having people come over who want to buy a hog or beef should never require a permit. He added that if you want to build a specific building as a market place, and sell t shirts and hats that would require a business license and sales tax, then that would require oversight. He said he does not ever want to need a permit to sell hay from his barn.

Mr. Chafin responded that the intent was not to create unnecessary regulation; rather, the intent would be to provide a framework that would allow benign uses and activities to occur by right and more intensive activities and uses to be regulated in an appropriate manner. He explained that there could be different levels of review, including administrative review, and Planning Commission review with different levels of oversight. He said that part of the initial effort would

be to define terms, and types of uses that need oversight. He added that Planning was trying to accommodate both existing uses and accommodate future agri-tourism uses.

Vice Chair Veale mentioned farm trails. Commissioner Fowle commented that Sonoma County is a really unique beast in terms of its regulation of agriculture. He said that there is an equestrian center and horse rescue operation that moved there, and they have volunteers who work there. He said that his wife does had previously conducted tailgate safety meetings for them, but she can no longer go down there to the horse rescue operation and teach them safety, because she would need do so because the County now requires a use permit to conduct the safety meeting.

Commissioner Hart commented that he does not want the Planning Commission to be involved in enforcement. He also said that he does not want the agricultural community to be subjected to additional unnecessary regulation.

Commissioner Fowle commented that he could recommend to the Board of Supervisors that they appoint an ad hoc committee to discuss the idea and come back to the Commission with a proposal. Commissioner Fowle said that it could be an opportunity to influence people politicians and regulators and in Sacramento.

Mr. Calder commented that the ad hoc committee could draw on best practices as part of their research. Mr. Chafin said that the committee could consult with Nicki, with planning others engaged in agriculture, and colleagues planning departments in other rural counties, they. Planning staff would do not need to start from scratch. Mr. Chafin said that he recognizes that Siskiyou County has unique aspects, but it could be done with a sufficiently wide umbrella that would not create a new inappropriate layer of bureaucracy. He added that nothing in the current Zoning ordinance speaks to agri-tourism, and if there is no approval from the county, there could be a zoning violation. Commissioner Fowle commented that what it comes down to is to review allowable uses on agricultural and timber production land to see what can be added to the allowable uses. He added that no hindrance should be placed on agricultural operations or on Williamson Act contacted land. Vice Chair Veale added that the county needs to keep agriculture profitable, so that it is not subdivided.

Commissioner Fowle said to stay as far away from any permitting and environmental review requirements as possible. He said that amending the Zoning ordinance to permit agri-tourism could potentially open the door to additional state and federal oversight. He said that they need to be very careful to expand the definitions of allowable uses in agricultural zoning districts to allow agri-tourism to flourish in those districts where permits would not be an issue.

The Commissioners directed staff to bring Agri-tourism back as an action item.

MISCELLANEOUS:

1. **FUTURE MEETINGS** - The next regular meeting of the Planning Commission is scheduled for Wednesday, June 21, 2017.
2. **CORRESPONDENCE:** In response to Vice Chair Veale, Mr. Chafin said that the only correspondence was from Ms. Marsh and had been presented to the Commission with the agri-tourism discussion item.
3. **STAFF AND COMMISSION COMMENTS**

Commissioner Fowle requested that Ms. Reed return at the next meeting with a report regarding the potential conflict of interest issue for the agri-tourism matter, because the Commission would be voting on a possible recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Chafin said that staff would try to bring the McCloud rezone back to the Commission for their decision and the agri-tourism item back for the Commission's recommendation.

Commissioner Fowle mentioned that there might be mapping available in the Nestle project draft materials.

In response to a question from Vice Chair Veale about building permits, Mr. Chafin explained that there is a backlog of Building permit applications related to low staffing, but business permit processing is continuing, and the department is talking about ways of getting through the backlog to timely address new applications.

Commissioner Hart asked about comments on Crystal Geyser. Mr. Chafin responded that the consultant AES is responding to comments received.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:35.

Respectfully submitted,



Allan Calder
Secretary

vt