



ORLAND PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING AGENDA

Thursday, September 24, 2026 at 5:30 PM
Carnegie Center, 912 Third Street and via Zoom

P: (530) 865-1600 | www.cityoforland.com

Commission: Stephen Nordbye | Sharon Lazorko

Vernon Montague | Tyler Rutledge | Daniel Louder

City Clerk: Jennifer Schmitke

City Staff: Jake Morley, City Planner

Virtual Meeting Information:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/82886794302>

Webinar ID: 828 8679 4302 | Zoom Telephone: 1 (669) 900-9128

Public comments are welcomed and encouraged in advance of the meeting by emailing the City Clerk at jtschmitke@cityoforland.com or by phone at (530) 865-1610 by 4:00 p.m. on the day of the meeting

1. CALL TO ORDER - 5:30 PM
2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
3. ROLL CALL
4. ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

Public Comments:

Members of the public wishing to address the Commission on any item(s) not on the agenda may do so at this time when recognized by the Chairperson. However, no formal action or discussion will be taken unless placed on a future agenda. The public is advised to limit discussion to one presentation per individual. While not required, please state your name and place of residence for the record. (Public Comments will be limited to three minutes).

5. CONSENT CALENDAR

[A.](#) Approve Planning Commission Minutes from August 27, 2026

6. PUBLIC HEARING

[A.](#) Lakewest Parkside Project – General Plan Amendment and Rezone of 5.7 acres (APN 041-262-028) of land at the southwest corner of South Street and Pabst Avenue.

7. STAFF REPORTS
8. COMMISSIONER REPORTS
9. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS
10. ADJOURN

CERTIFICATION: Pursuant to Government Code Section 54954.2(a), the agenda for this meeting was properly posted on September 18, 2024.

A complete agenda packet is available for public inspection during normal business hours at City Hall, 815 Fourth Street, in Orland or on the City's website at www.cityoforland.com where meeting minutes and video recordings are also available.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, the City of Orland will make available to members of the public any special assistance necessary to participate in this meeting. The public should contact the City Clerk's Office 530-865-1610 to make such a request. Notification 72 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting.



PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

Thursday, August 27, 2026

CALL TO ORDER – The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Nordbye at 5:30 PM.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL:

Commissioners present:	Commissioners Sharon Lazorko, Tyler Rutledge, Daniel Louder, Vice Chairperson Vern Montague and Chairperson Stephen Nordbye
Commissioner absent:	None
Councilmember(s) present:	Councilmember Enriquez
Staff present:	City Planner Jake Morley, City Attorney Scott Drexel and City Clerk Jennifer Schmitke

ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS: None

CONSENT CALENDAR

A. Approval of Planning Commission Minutes from July 23, 2026

ACTION: Vice Chairperson Montague moved, seconded by Commissioner Lazorko to approve the consent calendar as presented. Motion carried by a voice vote, 5-0.

ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS

Lakewest Parkside Project – General Plan Amendment and Rezone of 5.7 acres (APN 041-262-028) of land at the southwest corner of South Street and Pabst Avenue.

City Planner Jake Morley presented the staff report for the Lakewest Parkside project, a proposed 5.7-acre development located at the southwest corner of South Street and Pabst Avenue (APN 041-262-028), directly south of the Glenn County Fairgrounds. The applicant is requesting a General Plan Amendment to change the property's designation from Low Density Residential, allowing six dwelling units per acre, to High Density Residential, allowing 25 dwelling units per acre, along with a Rezone from R-1 Single-Family Residential to R-3 Multiple-Family Residential.

Mr. Morley reviewed the project's previous continuances and noted the Commission's prior concerns that the rezone request was not accompanied by a site plan or building elevations. He explained that under the current R-3 zoning, residential projects containing more than four dwelling units require a Use Permit. The City's 2021–2029 Housing Element identifies the Use Permit requirement as a potential

constraint to multifamily housing production and directs the City to consider replacing it with Site Plan Review or a similar process. Mr. Morley also reviewed the City's existing multifamily design standards and noted that any future development would be subject to all applicable City and State requirements in effect when a development application is submitted.

Mr. Morley emphasized that the current request is limited to the General Plan Amendment and Rezone and does not approve a specific residential development, site plan, or building design. He stated that staff determined the proposed changes are consistent with the City's 2021–2029 Housing Element, which encourages additional housing production, infill development, and maintaining adequate residential land to accommodate the City's housing needs.

The public hearing was opened at 5:34 p.m.

Joe Ripple, Director of Real Estate Operations for Schellinger Brothers, addressed the Commission on behalf of the applicant and provided a brief history of the proposed project. He explained that the property was purchased in the early 2000s for residential development and that the project had been redesigned twice in response to market conditions. He stated that the applicant pursued the proposed rezone after previous City planning staff identified the property as underutilized and indicated support for increased residential density.

Steve Butler of Precision Surveying, representing the applicant, spoke regarding the requested General Plan Amendment and Rezone to R-3. Mr. Butler stated that the infrastructure in the area was already in place and that the applicant was seeking the principally permitted uses associated with the R-3 zoning designation. He also discussed other areas within the City that are currently zoned R-3.

Written comments from Orland residents Robert Turner, Teresa Ribolin, and Rebecca Malin were submitted to the City Clerk, distributed to the Commissioners, and made available at the meeting. The comments expressed concerns regarding and opposition to the proposed zoning change.

Orland resident Tina Noraas expressed concerns regarding increased traffic associated with potential development.

Orland resident Betty Skala spoke regarding the need for improvements to the area's sewer system before additional development occurs.

Orland resident Ron Lane stated that he would like to see sidewalks and increased traffic enforcement in the vicinity of the fairgrounds before additional development occurs.

Orland resident Christine Stifter questioned whether the development could result in subsidized housing and stated that the City needs housing that is affordable to middle-income residents.

Vice Mayor Alex Enriquez spoke in support of additional housing and discussed the disparity between local incomes and local home prices.

Mr. Butler responded that development generates funding for infrastructure improvements. He stated that traffic concerns, sidewalks, paving improvements, sewer repairs, and intersection improvements would be addressed through conditions of approval.

The public hearing was closed at 6:00 p.m.

Vice Chairperson Montague asked about development impact fees and stated that if the City does not allow development, the City does not receive the associated development-related revenues and impact fees.

Commissioner Lazorko asked about other areas of R-3 zoning, and Mr. Morley provided information regarding those areas.

City Attorney Scott Drexel advised the Commission that he did not believe the cited CEQA exemption applied to the proposed rezone. He explained that a rezone constitutes a project under CEQA and that the exemption relied upon by previous planning staff applies when there is no possibility of a significant environmental effect. Mr. Drexel further stated that a rezone, by definition, constitutes a project under CEQA.

Mr. Drexel advised that approving the rezone without completion of an initial study could result in the matter returning to the Planning Commission after consideration by the City Council. He recommended continuing the item to allow the CEQA issue to be addressed and stated that a continuance would likely be the most efficient course of action.

Mr. Butler disagreed with the City Attorney's interpretation and stated that he believed the rezone was exempt because there was no specific development project currently before the Commission. He noted that CEQA review would be required when a specific development project was submitted.

Mr. Morley stated that he had raised his CEQA concerns with the applicant prior to the meeting but did not want to change course midway through an application that he had inherited from previous planning staff.

Mr. Butler asked about the criteria for determining when a CEQA review would be required. He discussed a potential future project consisting of duplexes or triplexes and stated that such development could significantly change traffic in the area. Mr. Drexel explained the legal test for the "common sense" CEQA exemption and stated that the exemption would apply only if it could be determined with certainty that there was no possibility of a significant environmental effect.

Mr. Butler advised the Commission that a draft initial study had previously been prepared by a former City planner and paid for by the applicant. Mr. Morley stated that he had not reviewed the document and was unaware that it existed.

The Commissioners discussed the next steps with Mr. Morley and Mr. Drexel.

Mr. Butler expressed frustration regarding the Commission's decision to continue the matter rather than move forward with the request.

Commissioner Lazorko expressed concerns regarding the proposed R-3 zoning and stated that there were unknown factors that needed to be addressed.

Vice Chairperson Montague stated that the City needs additional housing and that infrastructure improvements in areas of the City are often made through development. He stated that he would like to see a compromise between the developer and the City but agreed that the CEQA issue needed to be addressed first.

Commissioner Tyler Rutledge stated that he did not see a benefit to rezoning the area to R-3 and expressed concerns regarding traffic in the vicinity of the school and the uncertainty surrounding the potential development.

Commissioner Louder stated that, optimistically, the proposed project could assist the City in meeting its Housing Element requirements. Commissioner Louder also expressed concerns regarding traffic in the area.

Chairperson Stephen Nordbye expressed concerns regarding the application and recommended that the Commission not take action based on an incomplete record.

ACTION: Commissioner Lazorko moved, seconded by Vice Chairperson Montague to continue the discussion to the September 24th Planning Commission meeting allowing the city to gather documents to complete the record. Motion carried by a voice vote, 5-0.

A. 1008 6th Street – Use Permit (UP 2026-01) and Site Plan Review (SPR 2025-05)

City Planner Jake Morley presented the staff report for the proposed tire sales and service facility at 1008 Sixth Street. The applicant is requesting a Use Permit and Site Plan Review to construct a new 1,200-square-foot pre-engineered metal building on the approximately 0.14-acre commercially zoned property. The facility would include two vehicle service bays, a customer waiting area, office space, ADA-accessible restroom, employee storage, parking, landscaping, drainage improvements, and utility connections.

Mr. Morley explained that the property is designated Commercial in the General Plan and zoned C-2 Community Commercial, where a tire sales and service business is an allowable use subject to Use Permit approval. The project is considered infill development within an established commercial area and would utilize existing streets and municipal infrastructure.

Mr. Morley reviewed the proposed 18-foot-tall building, six parking spaces, site access, landscaping, lighting, and outdoor storage areas, noting that the project exceeds the City's minimum requirement of four parking spaces. Staff recommended conditions addressing an awning over the front entrance, legal cross-access agreements, landscaping and screening, trellis finishes, lighting, noise control, and durable enclosures for trash, recycling, and used-tire storage. The applicant indicated that used tires and other materials would be removed from the site approximately once a week.

Mr. Morley stated that the project qualifies for a categorical exemption under Section 15332 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines for Infill Development Projects because the site is less than five acres, surrounded by urban uses, can be served by existing utilities and public services, and is consistent with the General Plan and C-2 zoning regulations.

Mr. Morley also confirmed that required public hearing notices had been provided, including mailed notices to properties within 300 feet of the project site, and that no written comments had been received by staff at the time the staff report was prepared.

The public hearing was opened at 6:40 p.m.

Mr. Lane asked about the location of the proposed project.

County resident Marilyn Ponci expressed concerns regarding traffic on Sixth Street and asked whether the project would have an access point onto the street. Mr. Morley explained that the alleyway has access to Sixth Street, but the project parcel itself would not have direct access to Sixth Street.

The public hearing was closed at 6:43 p.m.

Mr. Lane asked about the location of the project.

County resident Marilyn Ponci shared concern about traffic on 6th street asking if there will be egress coming off 6th street. The alley way has access on 6th street, but the parcel itself will not have access.

Public Hearing closed at 6:43 pm.

ACTION: Vice Chairperson Montague moved, seconded by Commissioner Rutledge to approve Resolution 2026-06 and approve Use Permit (UP 2026-01) and Site Plan Review (SPR 2025-05), subject to the conditions of approval, and find the project exempt from review under the California Environmental Quality Act pursuant to Section 15332 (Infill Development) and fix the APN number. . Motion carried by a voice vote, 5-0.

COMMISSIONERS REPORTS

- Commissioner Lazorko nothing to report.
- Commissioner Louder working with Chairperson Nordbye on the possibility of agendizing data center ban discussion for a future meeting.
- Commissioner Rutledge thanked the community for coming to the meetings and expressing their opinions.
- Vice Chairperson Montague had nothing to report.
- Chairperson Nordbye thanked the community for coming out to the meeting and sharing their voice on future projects. Attended the EDC meeting in August.

ADJOURNMENT – 6:48 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Schmitke, City Clerk

Stephen Nordbye, Vice Chairperson



CITY OF ORLAND STAFF REPORT

MEETING DATE: September 24, 2026

TO: City of Orland Planning Commission

FROM: Jake Morley, City Planner

SUBJECT: **Lakewest Parkside Project – General Plan Amendment and Rezone of 5.7 acres (APN 041-262-028) of land at the southwest corner of South Street and Pabst Avenue.**

BACKGROUND:

On August 27, 2026 the Planning Commission held a public hearing for the Lakewest Parkside project consisting of 5.7 acres located at the southwest corner (APN 041-262-028) of South Street and Pabst Avenue, directly south of the Glenn County Fairgrounds located at 1310 Pabst Avenue, which consists of:

General Plan Amendment (2024-02)

Amend the General Plan designation from Low Density Residential (6 dwelling units per acre) to High Density Residential (25 dwelling units per acre).

Rezone (2024-02)

Rezone the subject property from the R-1 Single-Family zoning district to the R-3 Multiple-Family zoning district to be consistent with the proposed General Plan Amendment.

During the public hearing, the city staff and city attorney noted that the previous determination that the project was exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15061(b)(3), commonly called the common-sense exemption, may not be the most appropriate determination for the project, in that such exemption has a very high standard.

During the public hearing, the applicant noted that previous staff completed an Initial Study on the project and that the document could be used for the project. Staff were unaware that the document existed and told the Commission that it could exist and would need time to locate it and determine its adequacy for the new project. As such, the Commission continued the item to the following Planning Commission hearing and directed staff to work with the applicant to source the initial study document.

Previous Environmental Analysis

In 2008, staff prepared an Initial Study that resulted in a Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND). That document analyzed a 23-lot single-family subdivision known as Penbrook Tentative Subdivision Map (Penbrook). The scope of this analysis was not for a General Plan Amendment or Rezone of the site, as Penbrook project used the existing R1 Single Family zoning. Using the stated densities and gross acreage as a rough comparison, the proposed land-use change could increase the site's theoretical capacity from approximately 34 units to approximately 143 units, compared with the 23 lots studied in 2008. Actual development capacity would be determined through later project review.

The environmental analysis resulted in an IS/MND because the 23-lot subdivision was found to have environmental impacts, and mitigation measures would need to be incorporated to lessen those impacts. Mitigation measures in the IS/MND related to Air Quality, Cultural Resources, Hazardous Materials, Hydrology, and Noise.

After locating the document, staff advised the applicant that the 2008 IS/MND, by itself, did not evaluate the proposed General Plan Amendment and Rezone. Staff asked the applicant whether a later environmental document addressing the current proposal had been prepared.

The applicant then provided staff with a copy of a June 2025 Addendum to the Penbrook IS/MND that was completed by previous staff. The Addendum notes that since the original 2008 approval, the proposed project has been modified multiple times and various addenda have been prepared. This 2025 Addendum then looked at the Penbrook project and analyzed a General Plan Amendment from Low Density Residential to High Density Residential and a zone change from R1 – Residential One Family to R-3 Residential Multiple Family – Professional Zone.

Staff Analysis

CEQA Guidelines section 15164, an Addendum is an environmental document that is used when minor technical changes or additions are needed for the previously approved environmental document (IS/MND). This section of the code is for minor design modifications or changes (i.e., road layout). Creating an Addendum does not involve additional decision-making integration or public review.

Under CEQA Guidelines section 15162, further environmental review is required when substantial changes to the project or its circumstances, or new information of substantial importance, may cause a new significant environmental effect or a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified effect.

A General Plan Amendment and corresponding zoning designation change may result in taller buildings, greater lot coverage, more parking and paved surface areas, and increased activities through increased residences, vehicles, and traffic. The designation change may increase demand on water, sewer, storm drains, fire protection, police services, schools, and parks. The existing record does not adequately show that the reasonably foreseeable effects of development at the proposed R-3 intensity were evaluated against current conditions and CEQA standards. Updated review should address, as applicable, transportation and vehicle miles traveled, air quality and greenhouse gases, noise, utilities and service capacity, drainage, biological and cultural resources, and tribal cultural resources. The City should also document compliance with SB 18 – Tribal Consultation Law, which requires consultation for the General Plan Amendment and, if a new CEQA document is prepared, compliance with AB 52 – Tribal Cultural Resources to the extent applicable.

RECOMMENDATION

Upon further review of the project, applicable CEQA requirements and the reasonably foreseeable development allowed under the proposed General Plan designation of High Density and R-3 Multi-Family zoning designation, staff has determined that the existing record does not support the prior exemption determination.

In particular, the proposed increase in residential density warrants additional evaluation of potential transportation, utility, noise, air-quality and other environmental effects. Staff therefore withdraws from its prior CEQA recommendation and recommends that the project be continued without a date certain, pending preparation of an Initial Study and the appropriate environmental document.

Future public hearings will receive new public notices, including mailed notices in compliance with Orland Municipal Code and publication in the local newspaper. Pursuant to CEQA requirements, future CEQA analysis will also be published on CEQAsubmit as well as sent to regulatory agencies for review and comment.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Staff received a public comment regarding the proposed project (**Attachment A**) that discusses several topics.

ATTACHMENTS

- A. Public Comment received on 9/9/2026

Date: 9/9/20 By: [Signature]

September 7, 2026

To: Jake Morley, city of Orland planner;

Regarding the rezone from r-1 to R-3 papst & south.

These are my concerns along with some feedback as I talk with fellow Orland citizens.

- 1) **Traffic** concerns already pretty heavy on south due to amazons' direct line into town then catch freeway. Lots of complaints on Facebook about how folks get off highway 32 turn left onto papst and speed straight to stop sign or pass through as is a race track. Now add 125 to 250 more vehicles if r-3 vs 36-72 As r-1.
- 2) **The quadrant of east street to papst south to walker already a single dwelling residential area**, therefore r-1 is consistent with city's existing plans. Many neighbors in this quadrant have expressed **no** to an apartment complex as I have been speaking directly to them. Stick to residential r-1 housing to complete this quadrant of city of Orland. Better location for an apartment complex further on papst vacant lot across from roundtable less problems for developers.
- 3) **City growth hasn't kept up with infrastructure capacity such as antiquated sewer & storm drain system** & this location kind of at the end of the line out of town pray no hazardous incidents yet to come. On Facebook folks already complaining about city keeping up with maintenance in anticipation for storms so let's add more to an antiquated system. I was told by public works years ago that the stench on south was due to old system & pipes so drop deodorant bars to reduced doesn't work. Thinking $125 \times 4 = 500$ contributors as R-3 vs $36 \times 4 = 144$ contributors as r-1. Address this before problem gets out of hand. city needs to bring infrastructure up to 21st century & beyond standards
- 4) **Ditches** since border agriculture are an endangerment to all children regardless of zoning, water users won't cover so as we develop residential needs to be factored in, especially this location due to park & school.
- 5) At the meeting developers as I **heard want the change due to numbers not crunching out** as 36 r-1 so want you the city to rezone r-3 to 125. Since when errors by the developer should the city of Orland, the planning commission we residents near it or in the quadrant of east to papst & south to walker to bare their responsibility. **No**, we won't and shouldn't bare it. Secondly after reading the housing element cost of home \$300,000 developers need a \$400,000 since when is the profit & risk to be 25%, sounds like greed to me, **maybe an audit of their number crunching is due**. This is rural not urban get real. Future developers need to not only be good at building but vetted for being socially responsible & fiscally ethical as well as concerned about city &

community issues. Why not leave it vacant bet owners from Santa rosa can get a tax write-off break or deduction taxes by donating to the fairgrounds or city, just a thought, turn back into agriculture. **Leave it r-1 vs r-3 better for all city residents.**

6) Recently my sister ran into someone to whom was trying to repair a wall from some low-income apartment or house here in Orland put up picture and wall cracked open so trying to caulk it & repaint, who & where not the issue my point is are we in **city of Orland accepting or getting low-quality work** putting at risk future property resale and or turning around. I know about shoddy work I bought a chip house and have had to do a lot of extra work much like my neighbors have also done.

7) At the public hearing developer had **no idea of extra needed to make any project work** there, only talked sidewalks sounded like minimal effort& investment, no concern for traffic, city lights, putting ditches underground or any infrastructure (sewer & storm drains) concerns, lacked what our city's needs are comprehensively no CEQA info or link provided.

8) **Apartments concerns**, landlord in this case out of Santa rosa so Absent. Then subcontract to property management probably out of chico so not locally vested, already I hear of complaints about other apt squeezed into residential, noise, trash being tossed into their property, police there a lot, problems. Then who the target population, landlords would love to see section 8 vouchers they get paid and others do the work, a sweet deal at least back a few decades when my staff managed these programs. **While city of Orland becomes chicos ghetto suburb. No thank you. Leave r-1 zone.** We on pine, holly & brookside no want apartment tenants looking down into our front & backyards invading our privacy & security.

9) **By keeping r-1** attract folks to be **vested in our city as homeowners**, working their way up in the workforce & housing, just like who I bought mine from they then purchased a step up to bigger home. By being vested in Orland, they then contribute to its growth, possibly volunteer at various city activities maybe even city commissions. vs temporary housing.

10) **What about ancillary costs to the city** such as increased problems or work load impact on ambulance, fire department, law enforcement, public works (roads sewer storm drains) administrative, and so on. Growth goes up these also must go up to handle. Need to be balanced I would imagine homeowners less of a burden on city & greater asset than apartment tenants

Respectfully submitted a concerned pine street resident.