

# San Joaquin County Development Title Update

## Summary of Stakeholder Interviews

**Prepared for:**

Community Development Department

**Prepared by:**

**DYETT & BHATIA**  
Urban and Regional Planners

**July 2020**

# Table of Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
	1.1 Project Objectives .....	1
	1.2 Purpose and Format of Stakeholder Interviews .....	1
<b>2</b>	<b>Stakeholder Comments .....</b>	<b>3</b>
	2.1 Key Themes.....	3
	2.2 Stakeholder Comments.....	4
	General Comments.....	4
	The Permitting Process .....	7
	Zoning Districts .....	10
	Land Use .....	11
	Development and Design Standards .....	18
	Subdivisions .....	22
	Sign Controls .....	23
	<b>Next Steps .....</b>	<b>25</b>
	<b>Appendix A: Stakeholder Questions .....</b>	<b>26</b>
	<b>Appendix B: Participants .....</b>	<b>27</b>

**San Joaquin County  
Development Title Update**

*This page intentionally left blank.*

# **I Introduction**

## **I.1 Project Objectives**

---

San Joaquin County has initiated a comprehensive update of the Development Title in the County Code. The purpose of this Update is to implement the vision, goals, policies and actions outlined in San Joaquin County's General Plan 2035, adopted in 2016. With this in mind, this project will revise, as needed, the County's development regulations, including zoning and subdivision controls and other regulations related to infrastructure, services, and fees, to be consistent with the 2035 General Plan. Amendments to the Zoning Map also will be prepared for General Plan consistency, and some General Plan amendments may be proposed along with the updated Development Title, if warranted. Through this process, the objective is to craft new regulations and Zoning Map designations that:

- Reflect the County's vision for future land use and development in the urban and rural sustainable communities, while also protecting agriculture and natural resources and supporting economic development;
- Streamline the permitting process and allow for simple, easy to navigate access online;
- Provide a user-friendly document with more tables and diagrams, which will be particularly helpful to the non-English speaking population; and
- Are easier to understand with clear and modern language.

The Development Title Update will support other planning projects the County is concurrently working on, such as an update to its fees and new technical procedures for environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). In addition, the Update will also incorporate, as appropriate, standards modelled on design guidelines the County has adopted for some individual communities, such as Mountain House and Woodbridge.

## **I.2 Purpose and Format of Stakeholder Interviews**

---

As part of the community outreach effort for the Code Update, the planning team interviewed 37 stakeholders on July 1 and 2, 2020 at San Joaquin County offices in Stockton or by telephone. Two additional interviews were conducted over the telephone on July 6th.

The interviews were conducted in groups of one to four, with one hour allotted for each interview session. Stakeholders included Supervisors' aides, Farm Bureau representatives, County Economic Development staff, farmers, winery and business owners and their representatives, developers,

**San Joaquin County  
Development Title Update**

engineers and land surveyors, and members of the Delta Stewardship Council and Delta Protection Commission.

The purpose of the interviews was to learn about stakeholders' experiences with the Development Title to determine what is working well and what is not working well and how it needs to be changed to implement the General Plan. Specifically, interviewees were asked to identify regulations that hinder implementation of what's described in the General Plan and also describe improvements they would like made in the permitting process. Stakeholders were also asked to share their insight on specific changes to the Title that would result in "better" projects; whether regulations should apply differently to parts of the County; and if there are any concepts, approaches or standards that have been used in other areas that the planning team should consider. In addition to these particular topics, interviewees were also given the opportunity to discuss issues of significance to them.

The full list of the stakeholder interview discussion questions is included in Appendix A. The list of participants is included in Appendix B. The following summary presents the range of responses organized by topic area, without attributing any remarks to specific individuals.

## **2 Stakeholder Comments**

### **2.1 Key Themes**

---

During the stakeholder interviews, several themes were repeatedly identified. Those mentioned by many stakeholders are summarized below for quick reference. The following sections provide the varying individual perspectives on these topics as well as additional issues that were raised.

- Address truck parking; it's a problem in many areas.
- Capitalize on San Joaquin's agricultural resources as a prime asset to the County.
- Communicate the Development Title regulations in clear, straightforward language that includes ample diagrams where appropriate.
- Continue to support the wineries, allowing them, as appropriate, to provide some food service, but standards for "mega-wineries" are needed to avoid adverse impacts and conflicts with efforts to expand agri-tourism.
- Do not be so restrictive on urban services; many sites can provide water, sewer and drainage on their own, without hooking into city systems. Why not allow this?
- Ensure that there is enough parking for new development, without requiring more than what is needed. Consider requiring more parking lot landscaping, including shade trees.
- Expand the list of allowable uses in agricultural zones to facilitate agricultural industry and allow for uses that support agriculture.
- Have rules and development standards that make it easy to work from home and support biking and walking.
- Keep it simple, and don't change rules that are working.
- Make it possible to develop clustered, high-end housing in rural areas; this could help the County attract new businesses development by providing places for executives to live.
- Provide standards and incentives for multifamily and affordable housing, such as accessory dwelling units and farmworkers housing.
- Protect the Delta, but allow for reasonable agricultural and recreation uses that are consistent with the General Plan and the Delta Plan.
- Reconsider development and design standards to allow for increased flexibility and better building design.
- Streamline the development process to the extent possible, and provide clarity about project submittal requirements. Allow for Director approvals of use permits for small, non-controversial projects where there are not significant land use issues, with an appeal to the Planning Commission, if warranted.
- Update the sign regulations, so they are less restrictive and reflect best practices; include appropriate standards on size, design, and construction.

## **2.2 Stakeholder Comments**

---

A comprehensive list of comments made by the stakeholders, organized by topic, follows.

### **GENERAL COMMENTS**

Stakeholders shared a number of general comments regarding the overall approach to the Development Title Update, the clarity of regulations, and obstacles to promoting economic development. In addition, many stakeholders asked the requirements for infrastructure and urban services be made more flexible as this could allow for development that the County needs and is consistent with the General Plan. Some comments related specifically to the Delta, and others to Mountain House. Finally, it was often stated that regulations and development standards should promote agricultural uses and industrial development as envisioned in the General Plan and provide incentives for projects that would increase the County's tax base.

Specific comments from stakeholders on these general topics are listed below:

- BATs (Bay Area Transplants) are increasing in the County and this has changed the dynamics—recognize this in your work!
- Be clear on the standards, application requirements, and timelines—be business-friendly.
- Continuous development increases problems—think ahead to address these problems.
- County has a good planning department—one of the few with good personnel in the Valley that are easy to work with. Questions are answered quickly when asked.
- County staff has been very cooperative and helpful; they are easy to work with, much more so than our experience with State and federal agencies.
- County has a Right to Farm Ordinance, but this is more of a notice to property owners than a regulation. County seems to be allowing development that shouldn't be allowed.
- County needs incentives, such as a transient occupancy tax (TOT), to allow for tax-sharing with businesses. Look at the Gray Wolf TOT—half of it goes back to the developer, allowing for an investment in a hotel facility and a water park serving 60-70,000 people a year.
- County needs to get a handle on cleaning things up. Make sure owners maintain property. One city is using drones for inspection. Does the County have enough inspectors?
- Do not have prior restraints—have a standards-based Code with enforcement.
- Flexibility should be built into the code.
- For the agricultural community, the biggest problem is fitting different uses into zones.
- I get enough flexibility under this Code, but it's because of good working relationships I have with County staff.
- In the County, there are sites near cities which need a college or university. Why not allow for such development in unincorporated areas within SOIs if it would be consistent with a city's General Plan? Example: a site near 8 Mile Road.
- Infill: it's a pocket-specific question and countywide regulations can't really address this.

- Keep in mind that the County had some bad experience with unregulated subdivisions in agricultural areas, so in 1992, they adopted a General Plan with a policy that urban development belongs in cities. Shortly thereafter, 56 new towns were proposed, but in the end, only four went to Board as development proposal. Three of them were approved, two were not built, and only Mountain House went forward. Probably none will be built again. For Mountain House, it took 19 years to get through the permitting process and receive a permit for the first house.
- Keep it simple.
- Many problems are really caused by how the Development Code is applied and not by the Development Code itself.
- Make it easier to do agricultural tourism; this will also serve San Joaquin residents.
- Many project decisions don't get made because standards can't be met and projects are abandoned. Sometimes, applicants do get to go to the Planning Commission, but they should not have to appeal to be heard.
- Our biggest challenge in the agricultural zones is vertical integration: marketing, packing, or turning one product into another product. This will help them survive—have the Development Code support this. The General Plan did not recognize the trend of vertical integration in agriculture. For example, a grower of olives may have no provision for on-site olive oil tasting because the Code does not allow this; breweries face similar constraints as do creameries who wants to manufacture a dairy product.
- Skipped-over small lots next to cities: allow them to develop by rezoning from AU-20 to zoning that is consistent with the General Plan!
- Technology is moving faster than government, with new businesses, types of business, methodologies, and equipment. The Code can be a hindrance for some of these who want to come to the County.
- Tesla looked at sites in the cities' Spheres of Influence (SOIs) but ultimately chose Nevada; I wish we could have got them in the County. More permissive zoning and a streamlined approval process might have made a difference.
- Tourism is going to be a big thing in the County—do what you have to do in the Code that will enable people to enjoy land, have bike and equestrian trails.
- Unincorporated areas are surrounded by dilapidated existing buildings and Code enforcement is not happening.
- Why have approvals for marketing events that are separate from approvals for agricultural production? The former requires a use permit, while the latter is over the counter!
- Yes, the Code provides enough flexibility, particularly in the RR and Agricultural Zones. We also appreciate the flexibility on lot line adjustments.

### **Infrastructure and Urban Service Requirements**

- Allow for temporary, interim sewer services because it may be more logical to allow an interim solution when a project can't often afford to pay for sewer treatment plant upgrades. Some facilities are at capacity. What is the answer?



**San Joaquin County  
Development Title Update**

- County's biggest challenge is infrastructure. An adequate public facilities ordinance might be an obstacle without a funding mechanism. Provide for more flexibility in providing services.
- Don't require CSAs as the only alternative to tying into a city's services. These are very expensive. Maybe the County should be more lenient about on-site systems if standards are met.
- Fix the urban service requirements—they are too onerous. In Stanislaus County, you can do commercial and industrial in the County with septic systems; why not here? This is a disadvantage for San Joaquin in terms of business development.
- For urban service requirements, allow for alternatives to city hook-ups. There should be no obligation to connect to city systems.
- How to provide for infrastructure is the County's biggest problem. Land prices in the County are competitive with those in Tracy (\$250,000/acre for industrial land without infrastructure).
- I would like to see incentives in the Code to provide infrastructure by fronting funds and getting paid back following construction. I don't know whether the County has the fiscal capacity to do this but maybe it could provide bonding to pay for infrastructure. Mountain House has done this with Community Facilities District bonds.
- In a rezoning from IL to IG, no urban service requirement should be triggered. If a prospective user wants to be in an IG zone because more uses are allowed and the standards are not as prescriptive, but the current zoning is IL, he has to have the rezoning approved and a public agency must agree to provide the public services. Sometimes, an applicant can get "will serve" letters, but these often would require annexation. In some cases, services can be provided on-site or through another arrangement. Also, the rezoning may be inconsistent with the General Plan. By way of an example, in the Fairchild Industrial Park, which is not near a city, the land was zoned IL and changing to IG would require urban services. However, the park has had wells and septic systems and some users have package sewer treatment capacity on-site. It's a 40-50-year-old development. Why not allow a project to proceed with a rezoning and deal with the service issues with conditions of approval?
- Look at urban service requirement for industrial uses—separate this determination from a rezoning action.
- Recognize service issues with lot line adjustments but use common sense. In an RR zone with septic system, EHD is requiring a 2-acre minimum lot size. There may be two existing homes with one 1,200 square feet or less—why not grandfather the existing homes and let the lot line adjustment proceed?

**The Delta**

- Get rid of the Delta Stewardship Council . . . Don't change the Development Code, because from a practical perspective, there's nothing to be gained.
- I am not in favor of a pipeline going through the Delta. It makes more sense to cap the Delta Mendota canal—save water with less evaporation.

- In the Delta, the biggest impediment is that it's all below the flood line—used to have packing sheds but can't do this anymore. Flood protection requirements knock uses out.
- Preserve the Delta.
- Recreational and agricultural uses are fine in the Delta but please protect it more.

### **Mountain House**

- At Mountain House, biggest hurdle has been to get office, retail and commercial uses. The owners had hoped for a more balanced community in terms of land use, but housing is the only sector that has been successful—has a problem with little retail and office.
- Leave the Mountain House regulations in place as there were so many hard-fought battles to get them approved.
- Mountain House was a success; don't change the regulations. We know them and they are working.

### **THE PERMITTING PROCESS**

While most stakeholders were complimentary about staff and current permitting procedures, a number of specific suggestions were made that would streamline the process. These included having more administrative approval, including use permits, and eliminating unnecessary permit requirements, such as special purpose plans. Several stakeholders expressed frustration over inconsistent project submittal requirements and wanted to see a checklist of what is required and what the timeframes are. Others spoke of the importance of public notice and input and wanting to ensure that property owners are aware of any proposed rezoning.

Overall, most agreed that the Development Title does provide flexibility, but maybe more could be done for specific circumstances in the agricultural zones.

Specific comments from stakeholders on the permitting process are listed below:

- All in all, the County process is pretty good. “We have had very positive experiences with County staff.”
- All works well for us because we know the process and we just do it.
- Allow more decisions at the Staff level.
- Allow more over-the-counter approvals.
- Apply the Permit Streamlining Act timelines.
- Community Development Director should have more authority to approve permits, as is done in Tracy.
- Counter staff understand the permitting process or someone else in the vicinity of our projects does. For a newcomer, however, it probably is difficult to understand the Code because so much of it comes from 1982.

**San Joaquin County  
Development Title Update**

- County planning staff are some of the most fair and best people I've worked with. They are well-respected by the industry.
- County planning staff is helpful with developers although we have had some concerns about uses not matching with those in the Code.
- Designate one point-of-contact to follow a project for the duration of the permitting process.
- Director should hold staff accountable on timeframes.
- Don't change a lot as we know how to go through the process today. Don't make this like Costco where things are always being moved to different shelves.
- For use permits, have an earlier notice. Encourage people to respond in a timely manner so their comments can be addressed by applicants. We would like fewer surprises at hearings.
- Hats off to Planning as they are very receptive and willing to help me get my permits.
- Have a clear path and timeline for permitting for all projects and checklists for Mountain House and elsewhere so we know what is required.
- Have a provision for Administrative Use Permits which the Director could approve.
- Have concurrent processing for applications; this will streamline the process.
- Have more administrative approvals with a 10-day appeal period.
- Have more Program EIRs; this will streamline the process.
- Have more staff-level decision-making if General Plan consistency requirements are met. Make the Code business-friendly!
- Have staff list all corrections to applications at one time. There is no clear list of submittal requirements and processing takes too long.
- I am pleased with the County's process compared with other jurisdictions.
- I haven't applied for a Variance because there's no defect in the property. It's just a problem in the Code. The County does have a process for deviation, allowing percentage exception to be approved, but this only allows minor adjustments.
- Improve the noticing provisions, particularly with rezoning.
- It takes more time and there are more obstacles these days to get an entitlement; the process has been broken for a while.
- Liberalize the County's application procedures for those who may not have urban services available but want to have their proposals heard. This can not happen now.
- Look at the role of the Planning Commission; allow them to be the appeal body for discretionary staff decisions.
- Make getting a Variance easier; sometimes, a zone change should not be needed.
- Make it easier for lot line and Williamson Act changes.

- Many permitted uses require too many permits
- More applications should be able to be approved administratively by the Director. Many straightforward projects do not need to go to the Planning Commission if there are no controversies.
- On applications, are you going to allow digital submissions? Will “hardcopy” still be required? Give us flexibility in sheet sizes—a 24”x36” sheet is not always needed for a simple detail.
- On time extensions, clarify whether the Planning Commission can give an extension even when the Board of Supervisors has acted on an appeal but was not the decision-maker for the original application. County staff has not seen it that way.
- Open up the process; give people the right to present an application even if there are urban service issues; let them be heard. We hear that maybe half of the Planning Commission meetings have been postponed or cancelled so why not accept more filings from applicants? The Commission does not have a full agenda.
- Provide flexibility to deal with specific situations.
- Provide more flexibility on uses.
- Recognize that you will be seeing more and different types of projects which may have special needs and requirements and do not always fall within the County’s rules and regulations.
- Refine the concepts of Site Approval and Use Permit. Site Approval really is an Administrative Use Permit process and the Planning Commission can act on Conditional Use Permits for larger projects and projects with the potential for impacts on neighbors.
- Special Purpose Plans: I have never understood why they are needed. They do not seem to have influenced the outcome of an approval process (making it better) or affected how a project looked.
- Special Purpose Plans: these are unnecessary and should not be needed just to get a standard sign changed.
- The Agricultural Commissioner’s office has a regulatory role but doesn’t establish regulations. The office also has not been involved in environmental review. In contrast, Stanislaus County has a good environmental review committee including County Counsel. When I worked in Stanislaus, in some cases, I even met with the applicant. At least 12 different agencies are involved in permit review in that County—this helps to avoid problems.
- The permitting process could be faster.
- The permitting process is our biggest challenge. Things can be convoluted. Sometimes, it is difficult to know what’s necessary to get through the process. There is no streamlining. You have to go from one department to another. Sometimes, Staff is forced by the Code to stay within a box.
- The process is frustrating; there are too many corrections being requested!
- The process works well.

**San Joaquin County  
Development Title Update**

- Use more common sense and respect time frames—deadlines often are missed.
- We generally are okay with the current permitting procedures.
- We have no real problems with the Code; we work within its confines. No big changes should be made.
- Yes, the current procedures work and are meeting our needs. County staff has been very customer oriented; they are one of the best to work with in the Central Valley. County staff has a good approach and attitude.
- You need to enforce more accountability to have deadlines met: a lot line adjustment should not take nine months; this is not complicated.

**ZONING DISTRICTS**

A number of stakeholders brought up specific concerns with some of the individual zones, including the CX Crossroads Zone, the AL zones, and the IL and IG zones. The suggestions made focused on how to make these more responsive to current needs by being less restrictive. This could help the agricultural economy and support the County’s business development efforts.

Specific comments from stakeholders on zoning districts are listed below:

- AL-5 and AL-10 zones have been established but the AL-10s are next to useless. The lots are too large. You need an AL 2.5, or, add a RE Residential Estate zone which might meet a need for executive housing. We need this kind of housing to attract tech firms.
- Allow the CX zone to apply to more than one quadrant at an intersection!
- Create an IX Industrial Mixed Zone that would be a new district, allowing a broader range of uses than in the IL, but have all activities within enclosed buildings. It could be consistent with both the IL and IG General Plan land use designations.
- Crossroads zone in Agricultural areas was intended to provide limited commercial for services and products to nearby residents but the regulations for this zone don’t work. Special use regulations limit the CX zone to only one corner. Is this appropriate or adequate? It may be time to review the purposes of this and whether to allow any commercial vs. how much. Also look at whether to allow a CX zone on more than one corner.
- Crossroads zoning is a major issue that comes to mind. It needs to be refined and the use list expanded to meet the needs of those living nearby.
- Do all the rezoning for General Plan conformance now, at one time?
- In the AG-40, allow for rural clusters of executive housing on large sites (over 200-300 acres, for example) if the overall density (1 home per 40 acres) is maintained. Look at projects like this and the standards used in other counties.
- In the airport environs, recognize this is not an office market and should be for light industrial uses.
- In the CX Zone, expand the list of uses to include services that nearby residents need—gas and general store, maybe a hardware store, up to 5,000 square feet, as in Victor.

- Look at potential for rural subdivisions within Agricultural zones.
- Look at the OSRC overlay. One Farm Bureau constituent was told he couldn't build a house on his property in that zone. However, he thought this was approved during the General Plan, despite the Farm Bureau's concerns. This was supposed to be a non-issue. The effect is that the site can't be used in any way.
- Maybe have an IL zone that is conditionally consistent with the General Plan, pending resolution of the public facility and service issues.
- Okay with AU-20 up-zoning idea to achieve General Plan consistency.
- When converting IL zoning to IG zoning, don't require that water, wastewater, and drainage be supplied by an adjacent city; allow for alternative arrangements.

## **LAND USE**

Stakeholders were asked to weigh in on the land use regulations in the Title and how they affect development, and several agreed that a broader range of uses should be allowed in agricultural zones to support existing farming operations by allowing for “vertical integration.” The rationale is that not only would this provide increased revenues, but it would also help the County be competitive with other agricultural areas in the Central Valley. The homesite regulations warrant a tune-up, but most stakeholders did not want to see more incompatible uses, which would create problems in the agricultural zones.

Land use in the Delta also was addressed, and there was general concurrence on the need for continued protection with possibly some flexibility for agricultural and recreational uses. In addition, some stakeholder desired to see increased opportunities for food service at wineries.

Some participants wanted multifamily development to be encouraged with incentives, especially affordable housing, but noted that most of this development is taking place within cities and there is not a lot that the County can do to get multifamily development outside of Mountain House. However, it was also generally agreed that certain “controversial” uses, such cannabis growing and distribution, should be limited to a very few locations, and residents are not all in favor of these uses.

In terms of industrial land uses, most stakeholders were in favor of allowing for more agricultural industry in agricultural areas, with appropriate standards to ensure land use compatibility. And, the need to address truck parking was frequently mentioned. Logistics are an important element, more people are “self-haulers,” farming needs more trucking, and the County has to recognize that.

Specific comments from stakeholders on land use are listed below:

### **Countywide**

- Address odors; complaints are an issue.
- Adopt the rules used for second units (accessory dwelling units or ADUs) in Mountain House countywide—they work well.
- Airbnbs are good for tourism.

**San Joaquin County  
Development Title Update**

- An ADU Design Manual is a good idea—anything to make the process easier.
- Cannabis growing is a problem; I know the Board has addressed this issue but be aware of some of the community concerns.
- Churches in the middle of agricultural areas are an issue. Proximity to other uses is a problem.
- County policy on rural land use may be too restrictive, reflecting an overreaction to stop the 4 x 4 lot splits in the 1970s and 1980s. Currently, the very strict standards for urban services are curtailing development.
- County treats a lot of agricultural buildings as commercial buildings. For example, sheds for storing agricultural equipment. Sounds like Building Department is determining they are commercial use types.
- County's use restrictions in zoning are too limiting. "You need more latitude on land use."
- Farmworkers' housing: adopt standards for them—not that many would be built but they are needed. Make the approval process for farmworkers' housing more streamlined.
- Farmworkers' housing: allow 5 units on any parcel if workers are in agriculture.
- Farmworkers' housing: the question is where to put it. Some have been built for dairy workers near Escalon, about 5 miles north. It's easy to do this now. However, don't let multi-family apartment complexes in agricultural areas. Most wineries use labor contractors, so they have few on-site laborers and don't need farmworkers' housing on-site.
- Home occupations: lots more people will be working from home. There should be no employees, no retail sales, no home repair, and no beauty salons, but otherwise, make it easy to do.
- Home occupations: no permit should be required. One employee may be fine.
- If a development site is within a city's SOI and has an urban land use designation in the City's General Plan, why not allow it to develop? (Maybe there could be a form of "pre-zoning" that would require a commitment to annex or at least have urban development standards apply.
- Liberalize the Development Code to allow urban uses on County land that is within a City's SOI and has a City urban use designation on their General Plan as long as urban development standards are met. This recommendation also would mean separating rezoning from the need to provide public services and infrastructure for development.
- Mega Churches can create problems because they want to add schools and housing complexes. Maybe allow for a rural church, with a 2-acre limit on the site size and possibly a maximum seating capacity of 100 or so people.
- Number of uses that are not matter of right is too big—simplify the Code!
- On medical uses, allow for a facility that combines functions of medical offices and hospitals, such as clinic or other medical services. These fill a need and aren't currently recognized in the County's list of allowable uses.

- One issue, encountered several times, is that there are little parcels just outside city limits, less than 10 acres, yet zoned AG-40 or AU-20. They are not meeting the County’s urban service standards. Often, they have been sold or inherited and now the owner wants to subdivide for a family member. If the lot is out of compliance, meaning it’s a nonconforming lot, then it can’t develop. This is a revenue loss for the County; it depreciates the value of property. Many want to be able to lot splits.
- Provide a land use classification for a private, members-only recreational club; a Resort classification is not right. A private club would be members-only but have occasional events for outside guests, with no more than four a year.
- Provide zoning for community gardens and urban agriculture. This will help reduce the waste flow to the landfills.
- Provisions for second units (ADUs) are okay but don’t create a second parcel.
- Recognize that more people are working from home; think about making it easier for them. Allow some more activities but with a permit at a reasonable cost. A permit has the value of putting information in the hands of the Fire Department and those handling emergency services so they would know what activities are taking place in a home. This would be valuable.
- Recreation and event venues are problems for us.
- Responding to the need for development, what is missing are opportunities to build high end rural housing. The County is not going to attract Amazon or Texas Instruments without nice areas for CEOs to live in. They would like 40-acre sites—the home “pad” may be 2 acres, with the rest in common ownership.
- There is not much need for “flex space” in industrial zones—what is being built is space for warehousing, distribution and manufacturing.
- Too many incompatible uses in agricultural areas, such as churches which expand to 7-days-a-week activity, events venues, and wine-tasting rooms. No environmental analysis has been conducted on how such urban-type activities affect agriculture—have opposed this at the Board of Supervisors but no legal challenges to date.
- Warehouses are being developed, but not as high quality as in cities nearby. “I would like more cohesive development.” Industrial, commercial, and warehousing needs to be upgraded the more like what we see in incorporated areas.
- We need regulation for bee keeping. Sometimes bees are coming in from elsewhere. If a beekeeper doesn’t provide water for the bees brought in for pollination, then bees will look elsewhere.
- When the General Plan was updated, the big issue was what kind of development the County should have. “The conclusion in the General Plan update was that agriculture is king.” All the County has allowed was some commercial development at freeway quadrants, but sewage disposal is problem. County doesn’t want to provide service, so the solution is package treatment.



**San Joaquin County  
Development Title Update**

- When thinking about ADUs, address the use wells and septic tanks. You may need some criteria to be clear on when an upgrade is needed and a homeowner will they have to meet new standards.
- Where there are land use issues with neighbors, talking with them is better. Whether it's lighting or truck traffic, work out the problems!

**In Agricultural Zones**

- Accommodate new technologies being used in agriculture; this will require updating the allowable use types for the zones.
- "Agricultural Industry" should be defined and added to the list of allowable use types.
- "Agricultural Services" and "Agricultural Industry" should not be narrowly defined. Take almond shelling for example: why not define this as an Agricultural Business? Other examples would be farm support services for tractors and farm equipment, "bio-refineries," indoor hydroponic farming, and agricultural waste processing and recycling. Doesn't it make sense to allow these uses in agricultural zones? There would be no retail sales. These are services that farmers need. They also can provide air quality benefits by avoiding open field burning of agricultural waste.
- Agricultural waste can be recycled into fibers and cellulose for the production of paper and packaging; that's a business the County should support!
- Another issue in agricultural zones is schools due to residents' concern about spraying around them. This issue was raised during the General Plan process but rejected by the Board of Supervisors. Maybe it could be addressed in the Development Code?
- Clarify that jobs in agriculture are commercial; there is no outside work. Expanding a farm business should not trigger a use permit because County staff then thinks it has become a commercial operation. Adding a commercial dimension extends the permitting process—it takes too long for approvals to sort this out. Please fix this.
- Cold storage/packing blueberries for a grower on-site vs. packing for others—all of this should be okay. It's cost-prohibitive to not allow for joint use of packing facilities staggered throughout the season. You should not have to go through an entitlement process to add a user.
- Farm supply should be allowed in agricultural zones. You should be able to add landscaping services and sales as a secondary use for a farm supply business this will help make it viable.
- Growing hemp should be allowed in AL zones, including propagation for seeds. This is a growing market and one we think the County should allow us to be in.
- Indoor agriculture should be allowed in agricultural zones as well as in industrial zones. Yields are quite high, and production will help our economy. In San Joaquin, we can provide the perfect temperature, humidity, and lighting to make this successful.
- Issue of private vs. commercial use in agricultural areas needs to be resolved: a slaughterhouse vs. private butcher shop—what is the distinction? Why require a use permit?
- Many vacant remnant parcels are near city limits; some have a County General Plan Agricultural Designation, but others are in the city fringe areas. Zoning should address this

issue, if possible, particularly where the sites have city General Plan designations for urban uses and are within a City's Sphere of Influence (SOI).

- Will the Development Code allow these other agricultural processing uses in the agricultural zones?

### **In the Delta**

- Geographic area of most interest to the Delta Stewardship Council are lands converted from agriculture to development. Additional flood protection measures (e.g. higher level of free-board) have to be installed. Development projects in outlying areas may need to conduct their own studies. Agricultural preservation is important. The Delta Protection Commission also has concerns about other project elements that may have an impact. Removal of gravel and soil generated by truck traffic is rising to a level of surface mining. Reclamation plans are really slim. Elevation changes are of concern, meaning what was going to be brought in to replace gravel.
- Hunting preserves and growing blueberries—all should be allowed.
- Many old projects are out of compliance. For example, a nonconforming project along the San Joaquin River is seeking a change of use to become private water ski club that hosts large events. The current zoning only allows more limited use. Not sure whether this is a new application or Variance from existing use. The Council and the Delta Plan don't provide a lot of clarity.
- Primary agricultural production is not economically viable. The Delta Plan supports related and value-added uses but there is a gray area about what specific uses should be permitted and how much is being developed in high-risk lands. Uses that need resources extended.
- The Delta Stewardship Commission's charge includes cultural and historic resources, the integrity of levees, and natural resource protection and restoration. Policies on scenic highways are in the Delta Plan. The County Code should include some standards. The Mitigation Monitoring and Report Plan is really long, and I am not sure anyone pays attention to measures identified.
- The Delta Stewardship Council has concerns about amendments to Development Code regulations for agricultural land uses, but they haven't been intimately involved. The Commission would like the County to leave land with conservation easements in permanent agricultural use.
- The Delta Stewardship Council is concerned about permit referrals for projects like mining and agriculture-related recreation uses that have potential to affect overall viability of agriculture. A lot of the unincorporated area is in the flood plain. The Council and the Commission have tried to work with the County to protect agricultural land uses in the Delta. The Council is particularly concerned about large scale development, projects that involve impervious surfaces.
- The Delta Stewardship Council would like to see the areas which are being converted from agriculture to development be subject to more stringent management requirements rather than the same measures as applied elsewhere in the County.

## **Homesites**

- There should be the ability to split off a homesite parcel to non-family members. This would be a discretionary process. There are small homes for sale—homesites were allowed if one house was existing before 1967. You may have had 20 acres in orchard with a primary residence and another home owned by parents who have since died. Why not allow the current tenants to purchase it and have ownership of the lot? If the homes were built before '67 you could approve parcel maps for existing homes even if there were no current family relationship. The new owners would have to recognize the Right-to-Farm ordinance and the rules, if correctly drawn, could protect agricultural land. The Planning Commission seems interested in this option in their discussion of the Van Dyke project.
- Consider expanding the regulations for “Homesites” so a farmer could “parcel-off” a home he has rented for years to his farm manager as part of a retirement plan.
- Homesite provisions work; there is no need for EHD involvement.
- I am leery of any change to the Homesite regulations that would add potential for more parcel maps in agricultural zones for small sites.
- Reset the “trigger” clock, when you can do a homesite, or refine the rules so they work for today’s families. The rule of “per original parcel” doesn’t help the next generation. The 1992 amendments tightened up the regulations, but now, why do you have to own land for 10 years? I am okay keeping for 10 years after the homesite is created, but maybe a two-year wait may be reasonable.
- Why require a building permit to be obtained concurrently with the filing for record of the parcel map(s)? There should be no need to pull the permit immediately. Note that under the “Financing” section of the Homesite regulations, no building permit is required.

## **Truck Parking**

- Address illegal truck parking!
- For a truck terminal and dealership proposal in the County, a rezoning for IL was needed because this was judged a commercial use, but the urban services issue made the project infeasible. The applicant could meet all standards but those for a storm drainage connection to a city system. Why can’t the County allow for on-site storm water retention? There should be no need to hook into the City’s system nor to create a CSA.
- It’s impossible to get a truck parking approval. Allow for day-use truck parking.
- One problem with truck parking is the parking on roads and in fields.
- Self-hauling is increasing, and our regulations should recognize this change in the business and allow more truck parking on larger lots in agricultural area with appropriate standards.
- Should truck parking be allowed with a septic system? Doesn’t it make sense to be able to build one without urban services?
- Tell us where truck parking is allowed, in which zones, and whether the spaces all have to be paved and what the turning radii standards and the ingress and egress requirements are. What is the difference between a truck parking facility and a truck terminal?

- There is not enough truck parking; make it easy to develop this use.
- Truck parking is an issue. For example, east of Manteca, there are sites for truck parking in Agricultural areas where this use should be allowed. Yes, there are complaints about truck noise, but the County should allow for owners to park trucks on their land. Today, an owner has to get a permit for truck parking because it's treated as a commercial truck care facility. The problems are not on a small a homesite; here, the lot was almost 10 acres and it was not in a residential subdivision
- Truck parking rules are needed—not just for parking terminals. Truck parking, as an allowable use, could be similar to a park-and-ride use, and could be an allowable use in many zones, subject to landscaping and perimeter buffering, such as a 50-foot long planting strip on the side.

### **Winery Related**

- Allow more pairing of wine tasting with food. Currently, this is not allowed and there can be no restaurants.
- Allow wine pairing dinners. One winery in Napa, B Cellars, has a permit that allows such wine pairing events. It would be fine to have a use permit for this in San Joaquin.
- As a winery owner, I think that it would be an advantage for us if food could be served—light food would help us in our marketing. People come to the winery for tastings and towards lunch, ask us where they could get something to eat. If we could offer a cheese board, charcuterie, and similar incidental food and snacks, that would be great.
- County's agri-tourist industry was largely created in Lodi. The County benefits from the winery industry and it should be supported.
- Current winery ordinance includes boutiques, medium, and large wineries, but does not address "mega" wineries. Gallo proposed a huge facility near Lodi. In response, a local group drafted proposed standards for mega wineries that should be considered in the Development Code update. Mega wineries need to be by themselves; they may adversely affect the potential for agri-tourism in surrounding areas. The Lodi Woodbridge Wine Grape Commission has six mapped American Viticultural Areas, known as AVAs. The Commission was established 25-35 years ago. Its board is elected by growers and has mandatory dues.
- Current winery ordinance was the product of an extensive process of discussion and debate; keep its provisions. The classifications of and standards for small, medium, and large wineries work—keep them!
- Gallo did listen to the community. This was a beautiful project but maybe not the right location there in Lodi.
- I don't mind the setback and parking requirements in the winery ordinance. I am in favor of all of that and of being a good neighbor. Amplified sound is a concern, and this is addressed in the ordinance.
- I support most wineries, but on-site events centers are an issue. Perhaps a better definition of what constitutes accessory or incidental use is needed.

**San Joaquin County  
Development Title Update**

- One issue that needs to be addressed in the winery ordinance is the addition of a classification for “mega winery.” This need arose from a proposal by Gallo to build a high-volume winery near Lodi, which raised community concerns about potential impacts on local efforts to have more agricultural tourism.
- Recognize that a “mega winery” is not a “factory.” It’s just a very large winery and should be regulated separately. Residents and growers are concerned that if it were in the middle of a wine region, where tourists could come and taste local wines, it would pose a land use conflict and be counter to our efforts to build our wine industry.
- Some of the small wineries are not economically viable in themselves, but they work out as event centers out in the countryside—places to put in weddings and receptions.
- Some winery owners are concerned that the County ordinance may be not restrictive enough—many wineries are actually small venues for events, often for weddings, etc. We hear complaints that weddings are being allowed; these wineries are being operated as event centers although they opened as a winery. Noise from music and traffic cause problems and make these uses incompatible. The winery ordinance should be made more restrictive.
- The Williamson Act prohibits restaurants, but you can have riding stables and equestrian facilities. Maybe add to that list with food service related to wineries being allowed.
- There don’t seem to be a lot of grower-operated incompatible uses but new buildings and parking for winery venues may be established by those leasing properties.
- Wineries need permanent food service. Restaurants should go hand-in-hand with wineries and this option should be available for all sizes of wineries.

**DEVELOPMENT AND DESIGN STANDARDS**

Stakeholders generally wanted to see current development standards remain as they are, although parking warrants a close look, in particular, the truck parking and loading dimensions. The number of spaces required may be excessive in some cases, and no one favored imposing requirements for electric vehicle charging. “Let the market deal with the this!”

Standards for Mountain House are working well and, in some cases, may warrant consideration for application countywide. In the agricultural zones, some adjustments may be needed in the setbacks and buffering required for specific uses. Some urged the County to reconsider well setback standards. Others wanted the Title to make it easy to put in solar arrays. Finally, a couple of stakeholders raised specific questions about development standards that apply to wineries and suggested technical adjustments to them.

Specific comments from stakeholders on development standards are listed below:

**General Comments**

- All the development standards seem reasonable; none have been an issue for us.
- County has set high standards in Mountain House; the end product is better than in Manteca, Tracy, and other jurisdictions.
- Development Code has some good things on aesthetics—it does a pretty good job right now.

- Does Public Works really need to be involved for plan checks for a porch addition? The fees are high as a result, particularly in a floodplain.
- Floodway standards have increased, but there is little leeway given for prior approvals.
- Limits on the size of accessory structures are too restrictive (1,000 square feet per acre).
- Manufactured housing: there are some cost savings, but these are not enough to overcome the perception of lower quality. It's not really worthwhile for local builders skilled in cost-effective "stick-built" construction.
- Mountain House has good standards for landscaping and parking lot shading.
- New development in agricultural zones has only a 10-foot setback requirement. There are no barriers or buffering between development and agricultural areas. Growers are responsible for keeping spray on their properties, but this is still difficult when setback is only 10 feet. It may be difficult to observe drift onto adjacent land. Farmers have to notify neighbors before spraying.
- On traffic study requirements, we all know they take time. Some developers are willing to "front money" and pay for the study while staff works on other aspects of the application; why not allow this?
- Provide for "Tiny Houses" with rules for small lot, fee-ownership subdivisions with no HOAs or common area costs. Standards that allow this would be welcome.
- Setbacks in agricultural zones are to us the most frustrating issue. Not only for houses but also for pools.
- Sometimes the Code says what can be built, but when all of the requirements are taken into account, we are unable to meet them and abandon a project.
- Spending time working up objective design standards for multifamily makes no sense as 90% of the multifamily housing being built in the County today is in cities and the "fast-track" option that objective standards would provide is not a sufficient incentive to develop in the County.
- Standards are not an impediment; we can always work out a modification
- Standards are working well. We have dealt with moving a property line closer to barn or structure; all the standards seem fine and have not held us back.
- The federal definition of waterways of the United State is over-reaching. It results in too much taking of land and property rights by the Federal government!
- The landscaping standards are fine and having a buffer on the side for the first 50 feet would be a reasonable additional requirement.
- There are no wildland fire issues or extreme fire hazards, except in the southwest corner where zoning is AG-40—special standards for this just aren't needed.
- Undergrounding or screening utilities in front setback area makes sense.
- We are protecting the agricultural community by adhering to the regulations in the winery ordinance. This makes sense to us.

**San Joaquin County  
Development Title Update**

- When a well goes out on a residential lot, see if there can be some flexibility so a homeowner does not have to meet all the setback requirements and standards for a new well; these requirements limit their options.
- While it's nice to have landscaping, it's not often maintained as other things may be more important. Landscaping shouldn't require a lot of maintenance.

**Infrastructure**

- On road widths, allow for some encroachments into the 22 feet required for the full distance of road, such as a large tree that would narrow the road. This would only be for a short section and a fire truck could certainly navigate this. There is a loss of a sense of logic and it seems that no discretion is allowed. Use common sense on the rules. The current 22 feet for full distance of road is intended to allow two fire trucks to pass but you could have turnouts 1,500 feet apart, if needed, and set a minimum 12-foot lane for up to certain distances. Such exceptions would only be for limited segments of a roadway.
- Road alignments and driveway specifications from County Fire and other departments are, for a small developer, often costly and cumbersome. Why do you have to get Fire Department approval for an access road for a home addition?

**Parking**

- Do not require electric vehicle (EV) charging stations in parking facilities; we are just not ready for this requirement. It will add costs and potentially make us less competitive with other regions. Prospective businesses look at the local costs of development and compare those with costs in peer communities. We don't want to be put at a disadvantage.
- Don't add more requirements for bike parking; you will see some pushback. This may make sense in city fringe areas but not in rural areas.
- Don't set requirements for EV charging stations. This is a market situation so let that dictate what developers and users provide.
- I like the idea of more bike parking!
- In some of the more developed communities with long-time residents, we hear from the elderly who have concerns about being unable to park close to their residences.
- No real problems with parking regulations. Often, developers are providing more spaces than required.
- Offer incentive for those putting in EV charging facilities, with some offsetting savings, such as reduced fees.
- On parking, the Code needs to be site specific and use specific. Warehouses for cherries vs. warehouses for Amazon have different parking needs.
- Parking and landscaping standards are fine.
- Parking requirements seem okay. County allows for parking adjustments and modifications for landscaping.
- Provide more flexibility in the parking regulations in light of future transit being built to serve Bay Area employment centers.

- It seems that the need for parking isn't always given adequate consideration.
- Shading components for parking lots are in the Code already but this can be clarified. Keep to the current shading standard—don't expand it.
- We have no complaints about the current parking standards.
- Yes, parking standards are being met; we have no problems.
- You require too many parking spaces!

### **Performance Standards and Solar-Related**

- Make it easy to put solar arrays up for agricultural pumps. We have had to deal with concerns for sensitive habitat areas and address setbacks, but there do not seem to be specific standards or rules written up. There were two projects along the same drainage channel serving a stock pond— one was deemed “sensitive,” while the other was not. Have a defined timeline to avoid uncertainty in entitlements.
- On solar, there is not much interest; while subdividers are wiring for solar and for EV charging, the economics just don't justify the added cost when similar homes sell for \$20,000 less without solar. Many developers are waiting for community solar aggregation systems which would make economic sense.
- Recently, we had a challenging issue with the Planning Department about where the 95 dB noise contour line fell. It was outside our site in a rural area, but we still had to do a noise study. County staff had no common sense.
- Recognize the opportunity for solar panel arrays.
- Why require noise studies in rural areas where compliance would be obvious? Also, why not allow jet skis on a lake when they are okay on the river because it's a navigable waterway?

### **Truck Parking**

- At Tracy Boulevard and Linne Road, a truck stop and office, with up to 25 trucks, would make sense but County staff says that ensuring road access means that trailer length is limited to 50 feet. Why not grandfather a trucking business and recognize the limitations on Linne Road? Respect the grandfathered truck lengths that were allowed (52 feet).
- On design standards for truck parking, do these apply to trailers, or tractor, or both? Are offices needed? Can/must there be space for goods distribution, a shop area, and loading and unloading? Don't have any gray areas.
- Address trailer parking size; the required widths are too large.
- If a truck stop is on an SGA truck route, an applicant has to go through DPW [Department of Public Works] and check on truck length; they may also have to have Caltrans approval.
- The loading space standards for truck parking are excessive—15 feet wide for a truck. Why not have the width reduced to 12 feet which matches current needs?



## **Wineries**

- As we passed a certain size threshold (80 or so employees), our water source was reclassified as a “public well” and now we have to meet the same standards as a water source for a city! This has been an onerous process. Take a look at the County’s standards related to the number of people served by a well. These standards need to be realistic and not impose unnecessary costs on winery owners. Why should we be treated like a municipal water source?
- For a winery production facility, the sprinkler system requirement is excessive and does not recognize that a large well on-site can provide the needed water in an emergency. This was not enough for the Fire Department. The applicant had to do an on-site tank. He wanted the option of a well that was over-built but had to build a 50,000-gallon tank at a significant cost. Why not allow for these alternatives?
- For the setback standards, why not allow for a “neighborhood signoff” if the off-site setback standard for an adjacent residence is not met? This has not been accepted by County staff.
- For wineries, the parking setbacks seems to be 300 feet from a road. Why not grant relief if there is no house on the site? Why require setbacks from a house on an adjacent lot? Why not allow parking within a setback area?
- Look at the parking standards for wineries. Sometimes, there are questions related to event parking spaces. Code should allow for a variety of surfacing materials based on the type of event—whether the parking is for overflow vs. regular daily use. Why not allow for less paving and accept use of permeable surfaces? For example, open pavers with grass and other less costly alternatives.

## **SUBDIVISIONS**

Most stakeholders thought the County’s procedures worked well, but more could be done to streamline the lot line adjustment process. Several noted the County’s practice of bundling applications and taking them to the Board only once a year was an unreasonable delay; why not process these individually and set reasonable timeframes to do this? Others thought the way the County handles nonconforming parcels was good, and they appreciated the flexibility that County staff was able to provide. This should not be changed.

Specific comments from stakeholders on subdivisions are listed below:

- Streamline the process for lot line adjustments. It has taken up to one year; this is way too long!
- Be clear on requirements for soils and geotechnical reports accompanying tentative map applications. Tell us specifically what to address so we can save costs.
- Our biggest problem with the subdivision process is getting the County’s surveyor to check the maps but this is not really something that the Development Code can address.
- There used to be a zone called AG-1 and many “paper” subdivisions were approved with small lots. In the past, County staff forced mergers for some of these, with no notice or public hearings. Now, a Certificate of Compliance can be requested, and any staff-proposed

mergers of nonconforming lots have to be considered in a public review process with notice and hearings. This is a good procedure.

- For lot line adjustments and Williamson Act contract changes, we just follow the protocols and no issues have been encountered.
- If a parcel is bisected by a road or a canal, allow for an automatic parcel split if there is adequate access. This would not apply if a land-locked parcel is created. (Note to reader: the Subdivision Map Act does not require this.)
- On private rights-of-way, be clear on when and why are they needed. Why does the County need so much detail? It is really just an accessway. In some cases, County staff-level questions have led to extensive delays. Please fix this.
- On lot line adjustments and Williamson Act contracts, why hold them up so they can be batch-processed and “bundled” together for the Board? This is a costly delay. Makes more sense to process these individually, with reasonable timeframes, such as 90 days.
- It is rare to see requests for subdivisions in the true agricultural areas. This issue is in city fringe areas.
- What works well in the subdivision regulations includes the grandfathering of parcels. For example, a lot line adjustment for a nonconforming parcel can be approved, and the County allows continuing use (even if the lot is nonconforming because of its size). You can maintain the nonconforming status and make adjustment to lot lines.

## **SIGN CONTROLS**

Some stakeholders shared thoughts on the County’s sign regulation and the need to update them because they are very restrictive. Signs are important for business development, and not allowing businesses to advertise with reasonably-sized signs puts them at a disadvantage. A few stakeholders wanted more opportunities for digital signage, especially given the advent of new technologies. No one asked for billboards out in the agricultural zones, but many thought the standards along the freeways could be relaxed and made compatible with standards in cities. Others wanted the Zoning Ordinance Update to address lighting standards in order to reduce light pollution and promote safety.

Specific comments from stakeholders on the County’s sign controls are listed below:

- Allow for electronic signs in agricultural zones that are near I-5 to promote businesses in the county. If the sign location is within an SOI, it makes sense to allow such signage near freeway interchanges. This would be good for business in the county. Signs for wineries are okay so why not do the same for electronic signs?
- County has wide-open sign regulations. Sacramento County has a great code; it’s a little ambiguous, but overall, it’s well-written with some good language. The City of Stockton also has good code, and elsewhere, San Antonio and Orlando have good codes. This allowed them to remove signs from the downtown and old neighborhoods.
- In San Joaquin’s Sign Code, the spacing requirements are very ambiguous. The Code seems to allow 1,000 feet between billboard signs on either side of road, but the absolute minimum

**San Joaquin County  
Development Title Update**

elsewhere is 2,500. I think that 5,000 feet is likely to become industry standard. Most jurisdictions restrict off-site signage in certain zones.

- It's time to update the Sign Code as neighboring jurisdictions such as Manteca and Sacramento County have done. Sacramento County's Sign Code is very fair.
- No notification is required for new signs; it's an "over-the-counter" process. Bigger sign companies like us know what to do, but smaller ones don't.
- Stockton allows a new digital billboard only if you take down nine—largest two players in the county won't fight this. Caltrans requires four billboards to be removed for each new one.
- The Sign Ordinance is unrealistic. You need freeway signage, but the County's standards don't work today. You could have "peer review" for signage that does not meet the standards and then approve it.
- There are several problems with the County's sign regulations. First, is ambiguity. The sign regulations have not been revised in over 35 years! This has led to legal challenges on digital signage and other issues.
- Time and temperature signs were great landmarks, but you can't put them in today the way you used to be able to.

## **Next Steps**

The findings of this report will be shared with County staff and decision-makers and the San Joaquin County community. Along with additional input from County Staff and further research on best practices, the stakeholders' concerns and suggestions will directly inform the preparation of the Development Title update and concurrent work on General Plan amendments that may be warranted. Other forthcoming opportunities for community involvement include a community meeting, which may be in a "Zoom" online public engagement format, Planning Commission study sessions on preliminary drafts, and public hearings.

## **Appendix A: Stakeholder Questions**

The interviewees were provided with a brief introduction of the project and the objective of the interviews. They were then asked the below series of questions, which were tailored from this list based on each participants' background, expertise, and/or interests.

1. What types of development are you involved with, and what are the specific areas of the Development Title with which you are most familiar?
2. Generally speaking, from your own perspective, what do you see as the major problems with the Development Title, such as zoning, subdivisions or signs? Please be as specific as possible:
3. What changes to regulations would you like to see in the Development Title to achieve quality development in the County?
4. How effective are the County's processes that allow flexibility in Code requirements i.e. site approvals, planned development, use permits, deviations, variances, and appeals?
5. How do the parking requirements affect development?
  - Are parking requirements seen as a hindrance to development or expansion of certain uses or in certain locations?
6. How well do the permitting procedures work for development?
  - Are there decisions that require a Commission hearing action that you think should be made at the Staff level?
7. What are the most important changes that you would like to see in the Development Code?
8. TIME PERMITTING: Are you aware of any particular Code issues (e.g. height restrictions, use limitations, development requirements) that affect development in the following areas:
  - Recreational uses in the Delta, subject to standards and conformance with General Plan policies – potential need for a new zoning district for the Delta to replace Agricultural zoning?
  - Problematic uses
  - Second dwelling units (also known as accessory dwelling units)
  - Home occupations
9. Are there other issues we have not covered that are important for us to consider?

## Appendix B: Participants

---

Name	
Avery Livengood	Senior Environmental Planner Delta Stewardship Council
Brad Ecker	Client Services / Network Administrator San Joaquin Partnership
Brett Jolley	McKinley, Conger, Jolley & Galarneau, LLP
Bruce Blodgett	San Joaquin Farm Bureau
Chris Roupett	Chief of Staff San Joaquin County Board of Supervisors
Dan Schack	President / Professional Engineer Schack & Company, Inc.
Dan Van Groningen	Board President Van Groningen and Sons, Inc.
Denise Warmerdam	Chief of Staff San Joaquin County Board of Supervisors
Don Moyer	Moyer Consultants
Doug Banks	P.L.S. MCR Engineering
Greg O'Leary	SIOR Executive Vice President Colliers International
Jesse Fowler	Deputy Agricultural Commissioner San Joaquin County Department of Agriculture
Joe Murphy	Dillon & Murphy Engineering
Joe Petersen	Petersen & Company Agricultural Real Estate
John Beckman	Chief Executive Officer BIA of the Greater Valley
John Glick	Quartaroli & Associates
Josh Elson	P.E., P.L.S. Baumbach & Piazza, Inc.
Kamaljit Bagri	San Joaquin County Department of Agriculture
Karen Eagal	Eagal Lakes Resort
Kevin Basso	Republic Services
Matt Rogers	Rogers Media Company Inc.
Michael Anderson	Chief of Staff San Joaquin County Board of Supervisors

**San Joaquin County  
Development Title Update**

Mike Hakeem	Hakeem, Ellis & Marengo A Professional Law Corporation
Mike Sandhu	Sandhu Bros. Farms
Paul Lynch	
Randall Lange	LangeTwins Family Winery and Vineyards
Renee Puig	Executive Director Builders Exchange of Stockton
Sangeeta Lewis	Lewis Engineering
Scott Schendel	Associate Engineer / Project Manager Schack & Company, Inc.
Scott Tyrrell	Chief of Staff San Joaquin County Board of Supervisors
Siva Saini	Sandhu Bros. Farms
Steve Herum	Herum \ Crabtree \ Suntag
Steve Lantsberger	CED/EDFP/HDFP Economic Development Director Revolving Loan Fund Manager San Joaquin County Employment & Economic Development Department
Tom Hoffman	Heritage Oak Winery
Veronica Vargas	Agora Land Consulting
Virginia Gardiner	Program Manager Delta Protection Commission
Zach Wong	Wong Engineers