



Mariposa County

Mariposa County MINUTES of the Planning Commission

<http://www.mariposacounty.org/>



ART BAGGETT, CHAIR
WARREN GRAY
MICK HERMAN
DENI SMITH, VICE CHAIR
JOHN MCCAMMAN

DISTRICT I
DISTRICT II
DISTRICT III
DISTRICT IV
DISTRICT V

PLANNING COMMISSION FINAL ACTION SUMMARY MINUTES

AUGUST 22, 2025 (Approve 10/10/25)

A. Call to Order and Roll Call

Chair Baggett called the meeting to order at 9:03 A.M.

Attendee Name	Title	Status	Arrived
Art Baggett	District I	Present	9:00 AM
Warren Gray	District II	Present	9:00 AM
Mick Herman	District III	Present	9:00 AM
Deni Smith	District IV	Present	9:00 AM
John McCamman	District V	Present	9:00 AM

B. Pledge of Allegiance

Commissioner Baggett led the pledge.

C. Public Comment on Non-Agenda Items

Persons wishing to speak on any item of interest within the subject matter or jurisdiction of the Commission that is not on the agenda.

There was no public comment received.

D. Approval of Minutes

1. Planning Commission - Regular Meeting - August 8, 2025

By motion of Commissioner McCamman, seconded by Commissioner Herman, the Planning Commission approved the minutes of August 8, 2025, as presented. Motion passed.

RESULTS: APPROVED

AYES: Commissioner Baggett, Commissioner Gray, Commissioner Herman, Commissioner Smith, Commissioner McCamman

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

EXCUSED: None

E. Public Hearing

- 1. PUBLIC HEARING: A Resolution Recommending that the Board of Supervisors Adopt a resolution approving General Plan/Zoning Amendment Application No. Plan-DIS-2025-00023 with findings, including a finding that the project is exempt from environmental review, with the land use change to be effective on the effective date of the zone change; and Adopt an ordinance amending the Mariposa County Zoning Map to change the zoning on APN 004-010-012 from the General Forest and Mountain Home zones to the Resort Commercial pursuant to General Plan/Zoning Amendment Application No. Plan-DIS-2025-00023. APN 004-010-012, 7567 Hamilton Station Loop, Groveland Ca. 95321. Tim Miller Applicant, Steve McCorkle and Alexandra North, Owners.**

Engfer introduced the property owner, Steve McCorkle (present at the meeting) and presented the project with a PowerPoint Presentation. Engfer noted that the applicant proposed the reclassification of the 35.93-acre parcel from the Mountain Home and General Forest to the Resort Commercial zone and that the proposal does not include any proposed new resort commercial development as a part of the request, nor would new development be allowed as a part of this request. Engfer then recommended that the Commission adopt a resolution recommending that the Board of Supervisors adopt a resolution approving the General Plan/Zoning Amendment and adopt an ordinance amending the Mariposa County Zoning Map to change the zoning.

Public comment was received from Tim Miller (applicant/consultant, participating by phone), who expressed support for the project. He spoke about the project's development process, stated his agreement with the CEQA findings, and emphasized that the project would contribute to job growth in the area and enhance the experience for visitors.

By motion of Commissioner Gray, seconded by Commissioner Herman, the commission adopted a resolution approving General Plan/Zoning Amendment Application No. Plan-DIS-2025-00023 with findings, including a finding that the project is exempt from environmental review, with the land use change to be effective on the effective date of the zone change; and adopt an ordinance amending the Mariposa County Zoning Map to change the zoning on APN 004-010-012 from the General Forest and Mountain Home zones to the Resort Commercial pursuant to General Plan/Zoning Amendment Application No. Plan-DIS-2025-00023, APN 004-010-012, Property Address: 7567 Hamilton Station Loop, Groveland, CA 95321, Applicant - Tim Miller; Owners - Steve McCorkle and Alexandra North. PC Reso No. 2025-009

RESULTS: ADOPTED

AYES: Commissioner Baggett, Commissioner Gray, Commissioner Herman, Commissioner Smith, Commissioner McCamman

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

EXCUSED: None

F. Information Items

1. Receive Informational Presentation - Yurts

Engfer provided a brief recap regarding public comments that were received at the Planning Commission August 8, 2025 meeting regarding Yurts being utilized as Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) from the Living Intent Yurts Company. Engfer then introduced Sara Dasilva (representative of Living Intent Yurt Company who joined the meeting by phone), gave a presentation on the permit ready Yurts and highlighted that the yurts are designed to comply with building codes, including Title 24 and Title 25.

Baggett called for recess at 10: 00 A.M. and reconvened at 10:08 A.M.

G. Discussion and Action

1. Discussion and Action on the Draft Development Code Update, Articles 4 and 8 Zoning Ordinance. And Article 5 Subdivision Ordinance Draft Progress Update.

Baggett requested clarification on the staff memorandum references related to implementation, goals, and policy on page 97, and the public comment on page 99 from Environmental Health Manager Carolyn Coder, which included a recommendation for Article 4, 4-Environmental Health Unit Compliance, specifically regarding sewage disposal and water supply requirements.

Goger clarified that the implementation, goals, and policy page has been included in every staff report outlining the various actions of the General Plan. He then explained that the public comment submitted by Coder was in response to the Commission's direction regarding the stricken text on page 99. Coder requested that the Commission restore a reduced version of the text that had been removed from the code.

After the discussion, the Commission did not support the request to restore the language. Engfer stated that staff will invite representatives from Environmental Health to the next Planning Commission meeting to clarify the purpose of the code requirements and explain why they are necessary, particularly considering the Commission's concerns regarding their applicability to vacation rentals.

Goger shared that he drafted the Workforce Housing policy based on the recommendations from the Yosemite Conservancy letter submitted on January 6, 2025, in accordance with the Commission's direction. He also included road width requirements in alignment with Government Code 4290, as well as provisions for proof of water supply as noted on page 139. Goger also explained that Workforce Housing and its typology are permitted under the Planned or Cluster Residential Development and Preservation of Open Space provisions (page 126).

McCamman expressed concerns about the second and fourth paragraphs on page 95 under Article 4: Detailed Information. He pointed out the use of the term "requirement" following the mention of the California Board of Forestry in the second paragraph, and requested clarification which states that "staff finds the addition of Section 17.52.230 (Remote Workforce Housing) to be redundant" in the fourth paragraph.

Goger clarified that until our local jurisdiction adopts these as code, they are not considered local requirements, and therefore, the second paragraph in the staff report that states "Staff aligned the proposed text with California Board of Forestry requirements and added a standard requiring proof of sufficient water supply as a condition of project approval" is incorrect as the BOF 4290 is not a requirement but a standard at this time.

Williams brought attention to page 127, Item H – General Standards, #6 Density and noted that the language should more clearly define the number of primary and secondary residences permitted by zoning. Goger responded by clarifying that density is calculated based on the existing zoning provisions for that zone type or using the Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADUs) standards. Then Goger suggested using the current zoning standards unless the units proposed on the property were the State’s obligatory ADUs provision that would need to be approved by the County and be incorporated into Planned or Cluster Residential Development and Preservation of Open Space provisions with specific typologies for those ADUs and follow the statutory requirements of ADUs. Baggett agreed with Goger and proposed the State’s obligatory ADUs provision within the Density section.

Baggett requested clarification on page 148, Section 17.56 - Density Bonuses, 17.56.020 - Requirements, asking whether State law requires documentation verifying the five percent threshold to qualify for low income housing under the density bonus provisions and noted that this did not make sense to him. Goger recommended increasing the density bonus to 10%. After discussion, the Commission concurred with Goger’s recommendation to increase the density percentage on the State density bonus tables from 5% to 10%.

During discussion Engfer directed the commission to page 153 to review Item B – Greater or Lesser Bonuses. Then McCamman directed to add #8 – Workforce Housing – No affordable units are required to qualify for this bonus to page 153, 17.56.030 – Density Bonus Amount. Staff acknowledge and will review for consideration as this may not align with State law.

On page 133, Chapter 17.52.180 – Special Event Facility, item #11 – Lighting, Baggett provided an editorial comment pertaining to lighting that was not updated by staff.

McCamman drew attention to the second paragraph on page 136, Section 17.52.220 - Temporary Occupancy of Recreational Vehicles, which states, “Recreational Vehicles (RVs) and Park Trailers must meet California Building Code requirements including code compliant plumbing and electrical service connections.” He noted his understanding that there is no building code requirement for RVs and Park Trailers. Williams recommended revising the sentence by removing “including code compliant” and replacing it with “for” so it would read: “Recreational Vehicles (RVs) and Park Trailers must meet California Building Code requirements for plumbing and electrical service connections.” The Commission concurred with Williams’s recommendation.

Public comment was received from resident Ken Melton, who recommended removing the reference to the “California Building Code” in Item A – Purpose on page 136, Section 17.52.220 – Temporary Occupancy of Recreational Vehicles and Park Trailers, and replacing it with “as defined by the California Department of Housing and Community Development,” noting that the Department has its own set of building codes specific to RVs and Park Trailers. He also suggested removing the phrase “California Building Code requirements” from the second paragraph previously discussed by the Commission and Williams.

A discussion took place regarding the requirement for one staff parking space for Emergency Shelters, as listed on page 121, Section E - Development Standards, Item #2. Following the discussion, Williams recommended adding the phrase “per shift” to clarify the requirement.

The Commission took up discussion on the Remote Workforce Housing text. Goger explained that the recommendation is from a public comment letter and was developed using RV standards. The language was (copied directly) and noted that the term “Recreational Vehicle Site” had been replaced with the more

general term “Accommodation Site.” He acknowledged that while “Accommodation Site” is a vague term, the letter notes that it was intentionally chosen to allow greater flexibility in accommodating various housing typologies within this new section of code. Goger further clarified that the Planned or Cluster Residential development and preservation of open space provisions in the revised code was designed to expand permissible and flexible housing options and decreased discretionary approval while aligning with General Plan values. He then questioned the Commission’s intent regarding the extent of flexibility for remote workforce housing, cautioning that such flexibility could lead to the creation of trailer park like developments in planning areas without adopted area plans. This, he noted, could result in new impacts to existing neighborhoods and the residents residing in workforce housing.

McCamman noted that the Planned or Cluster Residential Development and Preservation of Open Space provisions and the Single Room Occupancy Unit does not reference Workforce Housing and recommended that both sections needed to be clearer. He also noted that workforce housing should be at a basic standard quality, whereas cluster development and preservation of open space has language noting enhanced public services. But what the Commission is talking about with workforce housing is not enhanced anything and cited an example of cabins from a TV series called “Landman”.

After discussion, Engfer noted that staff will review and make edits to accommodate workforce housing and the purpose to the Remote Workforce Housing draft to bring back to the Commission.

Baggett asked for clarification regarding the phrase in the Remote Workforce housing section “approximate to a consistent housing need.” Goger clarified that housing should be situated within a reasonable distance from the work site or near community services and the intent of this language is to benefit the employees being housed at the location as they would not have extra travel to either to workplace or to community services. The commission directed that this language is removed. Baggett also recommended to remove #3 “the density cannot exceed the base parcel zoning” on page 139.

Baggett asked for clarification regarding Item E4 regarding the definition for “sufficient water supply” and recommended that the definition should be included.

Williams suggested the following:

- Item D – Compliance: Remote location workforce housing accommodations shall comply with all applicable State Uniform Building Code, Fire Code, Mariposa Environmental Health, Public Works and SRA Fire Safe Regulations. Staff will amend the language to reference HCD.
- Item E – Operational and Development Standards, #5 - Screening and Design Standards. Must meet all applicable design standards for area plan. Williams recommended that this item be stricken.
- Item E1 and E3 are not consistent with each other, and if the intent is allowed remote workforce housing based on RV standards, then Item E3 should be eliminated.
- Item E5 – Screening and Design Standards – suggested this item be stricken as the code is for areas that have not adopted an area plan. McCamman recommended revising the text. Williams suggested “that screening from adjacent land uses shall be provided along property lines except front property line.” Staff will amend.

A discussion took place regarding Item F - Road Improvements. Goger noted that this item is redundant, as the County already has road provisions for RV standards. Staff can remove it from the Workforce Housing draft and site the RV park standards

The Commission and staff briefly discussed Urban Infill Development and Engfer noted that staff will create other code language as requested by the Commission.

The following public comment was received from resident Ken Melton:

- Noted that there were issues with the Workforce Housing draft with regards to HCD. McCamman asked Melton to provide staff with his written edits.
- Page 140, Item E – Setbacks, Melton noted that at the previous meeting the information provided by County Fire regarding setbacks and clearance Government Code 4291 regulations were incorrect and recommended that #3 should be removed.

Engfer clarified that the 30ft setbacks from the center line requirement pertained only to the Workforce Housing Typology and staff will rephrase this section to bring back to the Commission.

- Page 145, Item C- General Development Standards, 1 Heights, Melton noted that the sentence mentioned 35 feet, but it did not reference what shall not exceed thirty-five feet. Upon review of text the reference was to the height of an attached or converted ADU.
- Page 145, Item C – General Development Standards, #5 Separate Conveyance, Melton was under the impression that this item was removed as it was a duplicate from page 146, Item G – No Separate Conveyance that has the same definition.
- Melton then questioned the process of selling an ADU that's on the same parcel as the main residence and recommended that this be stricken.

After discussion, the consensus from the commission was to remove Item G – No Separate Conveyance on page 146.

- Page 110, 17.52.040 – Agritourism, Item D – Daily Trip and Access Requirements, Melton recommended that this item be removed.

A discussion occurred regarding Item D, Engfer noted that this is existing code and that the Agricultural Advisory Committee (AAC) wanted to leave this code as is as part of the General Plan process. McCamman highlighted that the Commission will not be addressing the Agritourism section as the AAC will be reviewing this section and making their recommendations.

- Page 124, 17.52.110 – Mobile and Manufactured Homes, Melton asked for clarification regarding the Conditional Use Permit for a permitted use in the zone that's in an HCD park. Engfer provided clarification and noted that staff will review language for clarity.
- Page 127, 17.52.150 – Recreational Vehicle Parks, Melton highlighted that this item refers to the uniform building code and that wasn't correct. Staff noted and will revise.
- Page 128, Item B – Operational and Development Standards, #1, Melton asked for clarification regarding whether HCD regulate the number of recreational vehicle sites per acre or if its Mariposa County zoning. Williams explained that the County establishes the allowance of the use and density and HCD establishes the development parameters.
- Page 136, 17.52.200 – Temporary Camping, Item C – Maximum Number of Days, Melton recommended that the last sentence that reference the Building Code should be removed. Staff acknowledge and will remove the last sentence.
- Page 137, Item C – General Provisions, #6, Melton noted that County Fire has no jurisdiction over park trailers and recommended that this item be removed.

Commissioner Smith left the meeting at 11:56 A.M.

Commissioners did not provide any comments for Article 8 and recommended staff to include this article for the next meeting.

H. Commissioner Reports

Baggett noted that he is unable to attend the October 3, 2025, meeting and suggested that staff conduct a poll to identify alternative dates for the October meeting.

Amended Planning Commission Meeting Dates:

September 5, 2025 - cancelled

September 12, 2025 – new meeting date

September 19, 2025 - cancelled

I. Future Agenda Items

- 2025 Building Code Update Draft (October 2025)
- Article 8 – Development Code Administration
- Article 4 - Regulations for Specific Land Uses
- Article 5 - Subdivision

J. Adjournment

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 12:17 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

ART BAGGETT, Chair
Mariposa County Planning Commission

SOPHEA CRAIGHEAD, Secretary
Mariposa County Planning Commission

Note: Full audio recordings of the minutes are available from the Planning Department by request or online: [Agendas & Minutes | Mariposa County, CA - Official Website](#)