



PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF APRIL 16, 2026

The San Joaquin County Planning Commission met in regular session on April 16, 2026 at 6 p.m., in the San Joaquin County Administration Building, 44 N. San Joaquin St., #640 (Board of Supervisors Chambers), Stockton, California.

The meeting was called to order by Donald Ruhstaller, Chair.

The Pledge of Allegiance to the flag was given.

Roll Call:

(present)

Commissioners

Donald Ruhstaller, Chair
Chris Meehleis, Vice-Chair
Gloryanna Rhodes
Jass Sangha

County Staff

Kirin Virk, County Counsel

Steven Shih, Environmental Health Department
Scott Sangalang, Environmental Health Department

Community Development Department Staff

Jennifer Jolley, Director
Corinne King, Deputy Director of Planning
Megan Aguirre, Principal Planner
Stephanie Stowers, Principal Planner
Jessica Leal, Associate Planner
Gerardo Altamirano, Office Assistant Specialist
Sean Cardenas, Office Assistant Specialist

(absent)

APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MEETING MINUTES:

1. Minutes from 08/15/2024.

MOTION:

It was moved, seconded (Sangha / Meehleis), and passed by a vote (3-0) to:

1. Approve and accept the minutes.

VOTE:

AYES: Donald Ruhstaller, Chris Meehleis, Jass Sangha

ABSTAIN: Gloryanna Rhodes

2. Minutes from 02/05/2026.

MOTION:

It was moved, seconded (Meehleis / Sangha), and passed by a vote (4-0) to:

1. Approve and accept the minutes.

VOTE:

AYES: Gloryanna Rhodes, Donald Ruhstaller, Chris Meehleis, Jass Sangha

ACTION ON REQUESTS FOR CONTINUANCES OR WITHDRAWALS:

Community Development Department staff requested continuance of Item #3 and Item #4 to an undetermined Planning Commission hearing.

MOTION:

It was moved, seconded (Rhodes / Meehleis), and passed by a vote (4-0) to:

1. Continue Item # 3 and Item #4 to an undetermined Planning Commission hearing.

VOTE:

AYES: Gloryanna Rhodes, Chris Meehleis, Donald Ruhstaller, Jass Sangha

ACTION ITEMS:

1. **GENERAL PLAN AND HOUSING ELEMENT ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORTS FOR 2025.** This is a review of the San Joaquin County General Plan and Housing Element Annual Progress Reports (APRs) for calendar year 2025. The purpose of the General Plan APR is to report on the status of each specific implementation program contained in the General Plan. The purpose of the Housing Element APR is to provide a status of the progress made towards implementing the Housing Element's programs for meeting the County's share of the Regional Housing Needs Allocation, as required by the California Department of Housing and Community Development.

NON-CONTESTED

MOTION:

It was moved, seconded (Sangha / Rhodes), and passed by a vote (4-0) to:

1. Approve action Item #1 and Item #2 on non-contested agenda.

VOTE:

AYES: Gloryanna Rhodes, Donald Ruhstaller, Chris Meehleis, Jass Sangha

2. GENERAL PLAN MAP AMENDMENT, ZONE RECLASSIFICATION AND ADMINISTRATIVE USE PERMIT NO. PA-2400361 AND PA-2400417 OF PERRY L HERRGESELL TR (C/O DILLON & MURPHY C/O JOE MURPHY) This project is comprised of two applications:

* General Plan Map Amendment and Zone Reclassification No. PA-2400417 to change the General Plan designation from A/G (General Agriculture) to AI (Agriculture Industrial) and the zoning designation from AG-40 (General Agriculture, 40-acre minimum) to AI (Agricultural Industry) for a 13.93-acre parcel. The 0.63-acre portion on the southern property line of the parcel currently designated in the General Plan as OS/RC (Open Space Resource Conservation) will retain this designation.

* Administrative Use Permit No. PA-2400361 to establish truck parking for 25 trucks with attached single trailers. The project also includes the construction of a 400-square foot office.

The project site is on the east side of North Cherokee Lane, 1,185 feet south of Calimyrna Road, adjacent to Collierville. (Supervisory District: 4)

Environmental Determination: A Mitigated Negative Declaration for this project has been prepared and is proposed for adoption.

NON-CONTESTED

MOTION:

It was moved, seconded (Sangha / Rhodes), and passed by a vote (4-0) to:

2. Approve action Item #1 and Item #2 on non-contested agenda.

VOTE:

AYES: Gloryanna Rhodes, Donald Ruhstaller, Chris Meehleis, Jass Sangha

3. **GENERAL PLAN AND DEVELOPMENT TITLE TEXT AMENDMENT NO. PA-2600004 OF SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY (C/O SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT)** to allow parcels smaller than 2 acres in size to be redesignated to the Warehouse Industrial General Plan land use designation and zoning in specific cases. The proposed amendments also include language to ensure coordination with cities during the review process for Warehouse Industrial projects, where applicable. This application is being reviewed concurrently with a General Plan Map Amendment/Zone Reclassification No. PA-2500411 and Administrative Use Permit No. PA-2500412. The project is Countywide. (Supervisory District: Countywide)

Environmental Determination: This project is exempt from CEQA pursuant to Section 15061 (b)(3). A Notice of Exemption will be filed if the project is approved.

THIS ITEM IS CONTINUED TO AN UNDETERMINED PLANNING COMMISSION HEARING

4. GENERAL PLAN MAP AMENDMENT, ZONE RECLASSIFICATION, AND ADMINISTRATIVE USE PERMIT NO. PA-2500411 AND PA-2500412 OF ROBERT D. BEADLES FAMILY TRUST (C/O POWER SAFETY SERVICE LLC) This project is comprised of 2 applications:

- General Plan Map Amendment/Zone Reclassification No. PA-2500411 to change the General Plan map designation and zoning of a 1.01-acre parcel from General Agriculture (A/G | AG-40) to Warehouse Industrial (I/W | I-W).
- Administrative Use Permit No. PA-2500412 to establish a traffic control business on the 1.01-acre parcel. The project includes converting an existing 5,498-square-foot farm services building to an office for administrative functions and construction of a 4,000-square-foot building for equipment storage and minor repairs. Equipment stored on-site will include light towers, arrow boards, cones, barricades, signage, and related equipment. The project will be served by an onsite private well, onsite septic system for wastewater treatment and onsite stormwater drainage. The project will utilize the existing driveway on the south side of E. Harney Lane for access. The property is not under Williamson Act Contract.

This application is being reviewed concurrently with a County-initiated General Plan & Development Title Text Amendment (PA-2600004).

The project site is on the south side of E. Harney Lane, 0.6 miles east of State Route 99, Lodi. (Supervisory District: 4)

Environmental Determination: This project is exempt from CEQA pursuant to Section 15061 (b)(3). A Notice of Exemption will be filed if the project is approved.

THIS ITEM IS CONTINUED TO AN UNDETERMINED PLANNING COMMISSION HEARING

OTHER BUSINESS:

After the vote to continue Items #3 and #4, Mr. Robert Beadles, applicant for Item #4, wished to speak against the continuance. Mr. Beadles, owner of a 1.1-acre parcel at 5440 East Harney Lane, urged the Commission to reconsider postponing Item #3 because his related project under Item #4 cannot proceed without it. He emphasized that the City of Lodi, whose sphere of influence includes the property, submitted a letter stating it does not oppose the project and already designates the site as a business park suitable for the proposed use.

Mr. Beadles proposed a compromise amendment requiring city consent for smaller parcels within a city's sphere of influence, arguing this would address concerns from surrounding cities while preserving the County's flexibility. He warned that delaying the matter based on last-minute objections would set a poor policy precedent and discourage applicants despite staff support and no direct project-related concerns. He stressed that the Board of Supervisors holds final authority, meaning further city input would still occur later.

Regarding his project, he described plans to convert an existing building into administrative offices, add a storage structure, install landscaping and screening, and operate a low-impact business providing traffic control and road safety services. He noted the project has minimal traffic, existing utilities, environmental approvals, and support from all reviewing agencies.

Mr. Beadles requested the Commission either approve the project, approve it conditionally pending Item #3, or at minimum continue it without forcing him to restart the application process.

In response to Mr. Beadles, Tom Terpstra Jr., City Attorney for the City of Ripon, spoke about the continuance. Mr. Terpstra stated that the City of Ripon and other cities do not oppose the applicant's project but have concerns regarding the process used to introduce the proposed text amendment. He explained that while the project does not affect the city's jurisdiction, the amendment has countywide implications that extend into each city's sphere of influence.

Mr. Terpstra noted that cities have different planning needs and that the applicant's suggested revision, while well-intentioned, does not address all potential impacts. He cited the City of Tracy as an example of unique circumstances requiring further discussion. On behalf of Ripon, he requested that the Commission maintain the continuance to allow the cities additional time for review and coordination. Mr. Terpstra emphasized that the request is not related to the merits of the applicant's project and offered to answer any questions.

Mr. Beadles questioned why the City of Ripon, or other cities, would oppose the amendment moving forward if they ultimately must provide written consent before any project could proceed.

County Counsel Kirin Virk interrupted to note an objection and clarified that the Commission was only addressing whether to reconsider the continuance, not the merits of the proposed text amendment.

Commissioner Ruhstaller reiterated that comments should be limited to the continuance and that further discussion on the applicant's suggested revisions would occur later through staff and city coordination.

Mr. Beadles apologized and restated his question, emphasizing he was seeking clarification.

Commissioner Ruhstaller acknowledged the question but reaffirmed that the current agenda item pertained solely to the continuance. The discussion then returned to the Commission, where he requested staff to clarify the usual process in regard to Item #3.

Community Development Director Jennifer Jolley apologized to the applicant for the delay, explaining that an oversight in the County's notification process resulted in the cities receiving late notice. She clarified that

staff cannot recommend approval of the land use permit unless the related text amendment is also approved, because required findings regarding consistency with the general plan and zoning cannot otherwise be met.

Director Jolley stated that staff have already contacted multiple city planning directors and would meet with them next week to address their concerns, intending to bring both items back together as quickly as possible. She emphasized that the delay is procedural, not related to the merits of the project, and confirmed that no additional fees will be charged to the applicant. When asked about timing, Director Jolley estimated returning on May 21st and noted that the items could potentially be scheduled for a Board of Supervisors meeting in June.

Commissioner Sangha asked a question regarding late city comments.

Director Jolley responded by explaining that the issue resulted from the County's notification error, not the cities; only Lodi received proper notice. She added that although the County prefers early referrals, submissions are allowed up to the hearing date. Director Jolley reiterated that staff have apologized to the cities and were working to resolve the matter promptly.

Director Jolley reported on the Variance application regarding a fence built within the Alpine Road right-of-way, noting that the Board of Supervisors heard the item two days earlier and voted 3 to 1 to approve the variance, allowing the fence to remain.

Commissioner Ruhstaller asked whether approving the Variance sets a precedent that would allow others to build on County property.

Director Jolley responded that each Variance is unique and must meet specific findings; the Board determined the findings could be made in this case.

Deputy Director of Planning, Corinne King, also noted that additional conditions were added by the Board, including an insurance rider and a deed restriction requiring fence removal upon property sale.

Commissioner Ruhstaller asked whether neighbors involved in litigation could also sue the County.

Director Jolley stated the existing case is a civil matter, and Deputy County Counsel, Kirin Virk, added that while anyone may file a lawsuit, the issue of merit is separate.

Commissioner Sangha raised concerns about potential liability and whether the Board's approval opens the door for similar future requests. She also asked whether Board decisions can be appealed further.

Deputy County Counsel Virk explained that any appeal would occur through the courts and reiterated that the Board has final authority on appeals of Commission decisions.

Commissioner Meehleis requested clarification on the Board's vote count.

Director Jolley confirmed the vote was 3 to 1, with one Board member abstaining.

The meeting adjourned at 6:26 P.M.

Donald Ruhstaller, Chair

Jennifer Jolley, Secretary