



Planning Commission agenda item 25-1064 June 26, 2025

From LINDA CAMPBELL <lcampbell03@comcast.net>

Date Wed 6/25/2025 11:18 AM

To Planning Department <planning@edcgov.us>; David Spaur <David.Spaur@edcgov.us>; Bob Williams <Bob.Williams@edcgov.us>; Jeff Hansen <Jeff.Hansen@edcgov.us>; Tim Costello <Tim.Costello@edcgov.us>; Patrick Frega <Patrick.Frega@edcgov.us>

Cc Karen L. Garner <Karen.L.Garner@edcgov.us>; BOS-District I <bosone@edcgov.us>; BOS-District II <bostwo@edcgov.us>

This Message Is From an Untrusted Sender

You have not previously corresponded with this sender.

Report Suspicious

Hello,

I am submitting public comment below for the referenced agenda item in tomorrow's Planning Commission meeting. I appreciate having it added to the agenda item, reviewed and discussed for corrections, where applicable. Thank you.

Planning Commission item 25-1064 June-26-2025

- Attachment C-Title 2 Administrative Personnel
- **2.09.030. Applicability. Item B**
 - The change at the end of this section references the “subject of the appeal shall be denied” if the vote is a tie or a decision cannot be reached at the hearing. However, **2.09.110. Decision. Item A** now has additional text added “or rendered at a subsequent meeting of the Board of Supervisors within 45 days...” These two updates seem to lack clarity and alignment. Should the change in Sec. 2.09.030 be clarified further to accommodate a potential future meeting for final vote before the permit or authorization is denied?
- **2.09.110. Decision. Item A**
 - With the addition of the “within 45 days” addition for a subsequent meeting, should the remaining statement from that item be struck out (in quotes below)? It seems that by adding a specified time frame for the next meeting, that additional text is overridden and more clearly defined. Removing the text would reduce potential conflict in understanding exactly what can/ will be done. Or is the purpose for the below line to stay intended to allow the parties to agree to a time more than the 45 days being introduced?
 - “..unless it is stipulated by the parties that the matter may be submitted for a later decision upon a certain date.”
- **2.09.050. Notice**
 - The PowerPoint says (on slide 5) that the appeal timeline will be extended from 30 to 60 days, however this section still says 30 days. In fact, I do not see anything referencing 60 days in the Title 2 update. The updates to Title 130 do include a change to 60 days, so I think this was missed in Title 2 update.

- Attachment D – Title 130 Zoning Ordinance
- Suggestion for general reference updates:
 - While doing this update, it would be helpful to resolve links that are not valid in the document to ensure they work, or to remove and reference specific meetings/legistar references for people to readily access. I suspect most of these are due to the recent change to the county website, but it would be helpful to ensure some method that the public can still track down the documents referenced.
 - Examples of broken links are on pages 4, 6, and 20
- Suggestion for future update reviews: It would be very helpful to have red text on the underline/strikethrough sections, particularly in large documents (this one is 624 pages) for a visual aid.
- **30.050 Setback Requirements and Exceptions**
 - Item D is struck out. If we are considering fire setbacks based on the MOU, then maybe include reference to that as the source of truth, and it should be determined from the local fire district. Otherwise, it may not be factored into reviews.
 - The items below in this section are not adjusted (if there is now no D, it goes from C to E).
- **40.180 Mixed Use Development**
 - Why is item D-4 being struck out? It seems to me that if the parcel is zoned commercial, then the primary zoning purpose should be the focus. That benefits in a couple ways;
 - First, the county wants to prioritize new job growth and potential commercial tax revenue.
 - Second, having the commercial building first ensures clarity on transportation flow and impacts for any mixed-use / residential development.
 - Third, would this change any evaluation on a project to determine if it is ministerial or by-right? If so, this is not a benefit for public review.
 - **51.050 Public Notice Requirements and Procedures**
 - Item F-1 addition: What is the purpose of excluding County-initiated planning efforts? If for some reason the county is driving a Planned Development, Specific Plan or Zoning change, then it is still critical for the public to have visibility to that. Signage is something important they will see in their local area, whereas mailers they may simply overlook.
 - **54.060 Time Limits, Extensions, Permit Expiration, and Relinquishment**
 - Item D: Just to confirm, this means that if a permit holder relinquishes said permit, they are also relinquishing the fees, so no refunds, correct?

Regards,

Linda K Campbell