

ALIGNING POLICY AND ZONING WITH DOWNTOWN VISION

ALIGNING POLICY AND ZONING WITH DOWNTOWN VISION

Zoning is a community's rulebook for land use and development. It determines what types of activities and buildings are allowed in different areas and establishes standards for how properties are developed. When aligned with community goals, zoning can support economic development, downtown revitalization, and long-term community character.

Many downtowns allow uses that are technically legal but undermine economic or social vitality, such as ground floor spaces that are closed to the public, government or legal offices, low traffic uses, social services concentrated in retail cores without complementary activity, or residential or storage uses on prime storefront blocks.

At the same time, few communities require or strongly encourage active ground floor uses, regular operating hours, or mixed-use activation. As a result, downtowns "look like downtowns," but do not *function* like them day to day.

Small communities in northern California are experiencing challenges related to the current use of existing buildings and facilities that undermine the long-term vitality of downtowns, including using storefront facilities for unproductive/unpermitted purposes including storage, living quarters, and office spaces.

Enacted zoning language generally is not the issue. New and emerging projects that push the limits of existing regulations, or properties/projects that change use after permitting or construction can create issues. Administrative and political will is required to identify and properly address these situations.



Why it Matters

Small communities often have a limited number of buildings suitable for commercial use in critical downtown or main street areas. When these facilities are utilized in a manner that defies local policies, the overall business and economic environment suffer. These conditions can cause cascading impacts including chronic vacancy, vandalism, disrepair, and blight. Damage caused to the economic outlook of a community because of these conditions can be challenging to reverse, with the difficulty increasing the longer these conditions are allowed to persist.

Step by Step Actions

The concept of zoning as a public policy creates a framework where a vision for a community's form and function in its built form can be realized. While this may sound simple, the establishment, maintenance, execution, and enforcement of zoning policies is a challenge for communities of all sizes, most significantly small communities. The challenges are not only based on resource considerations (lack of funding, lack of staffing) but also the toll this can take on morale and public sentiment. Despite these challenges, a community that has zoning policies established can use them to nurture a healthy economic environment. It is important to examine the observed and experienced challenges with existing policies first to establish a strategy of 'right sizing' zoning and enforcement programming to meet community goals.

1

Assess the challenges identified by property owners, developers, municipal staff, and other downtown stakeholders. Those parties currently doing or attempting to do business in your downtown area are a valuable source of information. They can speak to their experience of rules and regulations pertaining to all facets of operating their business in their chosen location. This could include crucial information about processes including permitting, fees, review times, submission requirements, as well as more detailed property specific information relating to building codes and physical requirements.

A review of enforcement practices should be included in this early phase as well. If current or past enforcement efforts have been insufficient or ineffective, greater examination should be conducted. Consider the enforcement actions that have been utilized to address non-conforming or illegal uses and assess their effectiveness. Enforcement actions to learn more about include the following:

- a. Notices of violation sent to property owners/operators
- b. Notices of violation posted at offending locations
- c. Active permits suspended, revoked, or cancelled
- d. New permits prohibited
- e. Fines levied
- f. Liens placed

As you review the actions taken, it is also crucial to create and maintain documentation including responses received to notifications, remedial actions taken or observed, payments remitted and any other supporting information to construct a record of the efforts taken to resolve the issue.

2

Examine requests for variances, special use permits, and other variations from standard zoning or permitting policy and procedures. When property owners have challenges meeting existing zoning requirements, they can often seek variances or other forms of temporary or special approval to alleviate these hardships. If requesting parties are regularly seeking variances for similar items (i.e., setbacks, side/rear yard clearances, signage considerations, special uses, etc.), consider seeking revisions through your local legislative body to better reflect the current needs of stakeholders.

3

Examine the status of connections between local planning efforts and zoning policies. Communities engage in comprehensive planning efforts to identify the conditions they would like to see changed in their area and strategize to realize those changes. Often these goals include topics related to improving the local economy through increased employment, the attraction and development of new businesses, and creating an environment where residents can improve their overall quality of life. A zoning policy is one tool a community can deploy in pursuit of those goals and should reflect the desires of the community as shown in community planning. If the community wishes to limit major industrial development, focus development in main street areas, accentuate specific industries or business clusters, all of these can be reflected in appropriately developed zoning policy language.



When a community is applying zoning policies that are not well articulated or that cause impacts that appear uncoordinated with public intention, this can cause issues. Where possible, use existing planning efforts/ documents as the basis for what zoning policy and practice brings the community closer to the desired state. California cities and counties [must adopt General Plans under California State Law that outline the conditions for development of the built environment](#). Communities should use this as an opportunity to make greater connections

between desired community outcomes and goals related to those developments. A small downtown revitalization committee or working group could serve as an advisory body to the local legislative body to increase the value of these more goal-oriented efforts relating to the maximization of land use.

The enforcement of zoning policy creates real life consequences (legal and financial) for individuals based on their actions or inactions against adopted rules

and policies. Administrative staff should be able to articulate the connection between the goals related to the downtown's economic well-being and enforcement actions against property owners/operators. For example, in the Live Oak 2030 General Plan, goal ED-5 states 'Foster growth and expansion among existing businesses in the community as a primary strategy for improving the economic health of the City.' If practical enforcement efforts are not utilized to make sure available and exiting buildings are safe and sufficient for business to locate, it will be impossible to achieve the goal of growing and expanding businesses that could benefit the economic health of the community.

When punitive actions are taken, a reaction is generated, and the basis for the punitive action should be well illustrated and communicated to all parties (participating or not). The goal is not to penalize, but to promote the health, safety, well-being, and success of residents and the community as a whole.



4

Perform a periodic zoning code audit for timely updates that might reflect changes in the local environment. Many communities across the US first adopted zoning policies during the 1960s and 1970s. Often the language of these policies after enactment goes largely unchanged, locking a community into a pattern of growth and development that may not be compatible with current economic conditions and local intentions. For example, zone definitions may include minimum parking requirements for commercial establishments based on square footage and the type of business or may restrict certain types of business signage placements. These zoning codes were often established to guide new construction or new development in a community. Without sufficient revisions to provide considerations more appropriate for rehabilitation or redevelopment, revitalizing existing structures can be made unnecessarily more challenging by placing upon them requirements intended for new construction.

A general review of zoning policies for each participating community found that all had been revised or modified within the past fifteen years, with five communities passing amending ordinances within the past five years. This pace of periodic review is encouraged, with more urgent changes being offered for consideration when raised by partners or stakeholders in the community.

Maximize the use of enacted enforcement policies and available enforcement actions. Enforcement actions against unlawful and unproductive property uses in downtown areas should be applied in an escalating manner as allowed by both municipal regulation and state law. Typically, there are administrative actions that can be undertaken by the municipality as outlined in their zoning ordinance language or other related ordinances. These actions can include revocation of existing permits, denial of future permits, fines, and placement of liens. The menu of available options will vary by community. The authorization for municipalities to levy administrative or financial penalties is based on the language found in [*State of California Government Code 53069.4*](#).

When moving through this process, it is critical to follow the outlined process unique to each community that involves the general sequence of notice of violation, opportunity for response/remediation, review of information, opportunity for hearing, and adjudication. Not following the generally adopted and accepted procedures of due process places the local government at risk of litigation. If these efforts are completed and do not reach the intended outcome, civil litigation is an additional option available for consideration.



External Resources

Zoning and land use development topics are some of the most well-documented areas related to downtown revitalization efforts, as communities have been actively working in this space through a multitude of approaches. Each community will need to determine what level of effort is required to reach their intended goals. The resulting efforts can range from brief strategic updates of policy language or enforcement activity to a complete overhaul of zoning and enforcement ordinances. Some tools include:

- Congress for the New Urbanism released a report in 2018 entitled '[Enabling Better Places - Users' Guide to Zoning Reform](#)' focused on supporting communities in Michigan with zoning code reform efforts. This document guides users through a process of exploring zoning code revision options and provides guidance for distinct areas of interest including main streets, downtowns, and adjacent neighborhoods. For each destination type there are five conceptual groupings of recommendations; streetscape, form, use, frontage, and parking - divided by short-, medium- and long-term strategies.
- In May 2025, the Center for Community Progress released the '[Cleveland Code Enforcement Training Guide - A Strategic Curriculum for Local Practitioners](#).' This

document creates a foundation for effective code enforcement programming. Among the areas covered are topics for initial and ongoing training, field examples, and extensive links to external resources from across the country including webinar recordings, job postings, and other resources that can be utilized as inspiration for local implementation.

- The United States Environmental Protection Agency '[Smart Growth](#)' program offers resources for communities seeking assistance with development and conservation activities that build economic capacity and resilience. Two products focused on zoning were released in 2009 and 2012 respectively entitled '[Essential Smart Growth Fixes for Urban and Suburban Zoning Codes](#)' and '[Essential Smart Growth Fixes for Rural Planning, Zoning, and Development Codes](#).'
- National Zoning Atlas: <https://www.zoningatlas.org/>. California is one of the states with full coverage in the data. There's a tool where you can also search for where you can build certain types of housing. NARC and NADO hosted a webinar with Sara Bronin, the founder, last year: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HaR4BpU3NK8>

In the search for best practices, the research team surveyed the NADO membership—over 300 regional development organizations representing over 2,000 counties and 19,000 municipalities. Several members responded with feedback on efforts that had been useful in their communities. Among these responses were several relevant to zoning challenges. A summary of those responses is offered below.

- Members from Minnesota offer a **community charette opportunity** to brainstorm local ideas and generate local buy in. Invite local officials engaged in planning/zoning efforts including city council representatives and planning commission members to build perspective on variances and other issues that commonly arise during development/redevelopment efforts. During these activities, discussions around potential uses and their compatibility with local planning efforts often become evident, providing an opportunity to problem solve before a real issue arises.
- Members from South Carolina outlined the **value of utilizing overlay districts** to permit special uses in specific high value commercial locations. Revisions were made in communities that prohibited first floor residential uses and language limiting storage uses in commercial locations. Discuss whether the use of overlay districts will help solve zoning issues.
- Members from Texas reiterated the **importance of zoning code management as 'routine maintenance' done regularly**, offering five years as a maximum window between review efforts. Implementing this rhythm of review can be challenging to initiate but has paid off for their communities. Information was also shared on the



connected nature of uses in non-downtown areas having impacts community wide and on downtown locations. For example, the extreme growth of smoke shops in the city of Denison led to a city-wide ordinance regulating new vape and smoke shops to limit youth access and control business locations. While the downtown areas were not the cause of this new policy, it did create impacts in the downtown area. Consider the use and practice of code enforcement in your place.

Who to Involve

Zoning policy and enforcement reform is conducted through a legally defined process that varies slightly from community to community. The key parties involved will be the same in each scenario:

- City administration leadership and staff
- City council representatives
- Planning commission members
- Property owners
- Business owners/operators
- Developers

Potential Timeline

Phase 1 - Assess challenges, shortcomings, and pain points. This phase involves assessing the zoning or enforcement challenges that are readily identifiable. A small advisory group of downtown stakeholders could be assembled to gain perspective from parties trying to navigate the existing regulatory environment. Areas to consider could include identified use violations, enforcement actions taken in response, status of ongoing

enforcement cases, document review including variance applications, decision records, and any information that can provide context for the current situation.

Phase 2 - Implement incremental changes and improvements identified during initial assessment. Changes to policies are typically best received when deployed over a period with clear reasoning and guidance from municipal leadership and staff. Improvements to policy language or processes identified in Phase 1 can be incrementally implemented where necessary, working to make tangible progress toward the issues and pain points identified to date.

Phase 3 - Substantial policy review, revision, and adoption (*If necessary*). Following the fact-finding effort and incremental implementation of policy and procedure changes identified, more significant efforts can be considered. This phase could include identifying a third-party consulting partner to assist with developing substantial zoning policy revisions and enforcement procedure recommendations. Along with pure zoning language, this in-depth review could cover additional topics like submission materials, timelines, fees, review periods, and other associated aspects of compliance.

Costs

Costs for these efforts can be minimal if undertaken by municipal staff and local stakeholders. Engaging with consultants for engagement and revision of policy language will incur higher costs. Engaging with outside legal counsel on these matters or any actions related to civil legal proceedings that may follow an exhaustion of administrative enforcement will also incur costs.

Case Study: Code Enforcement as a Tool for Downtown Revitalization

The Cities of Yreka and Dunsmuir, California

Overview

Many rural communities struggle with vacant buildings, deteriorating properties, and limited resources to address blight. While code enforcement is often viewed as a punitive process, the Cities of Yreka and Dunsmuir have developed a more balanced approach that combines compliance, incentives, partnerships, and strategic enforcement.

Drawing on more than 15 years of experience working in rural communities across the Midwest and California, Assistant City Manager Juliana Lucchesi has helped shape code enforcement programs that prioritize community improvement while maintaining fairness and due process.

The Challenge

For many small cities, code enforcement can be difficult to implement effectively. Several challenges commonly arise:

- Municipal codes may be outdated or lack the authority needed to address current issues.
- Enforcement procedures are time-consuming and legally complex.
- Staff capacity is limited.
- Significant upfront investment is required before results are visible.
- Local governments often face pressure to address nuisance properties while avoiding overly punitive actions that alienate residents.

According to Lucchesi, code enforcement should be viewed as a long-term strategy rather than a quick solution. "It's a marathon, not a sprint." Communities should expect to invest several years in building an effective code enforcement program before it becomes fully operational and cost-effective.

A Compliance-First Philosophy

Yreka's code enforcement program begins with a fundamental assumption: most property owners want to comply. Rather than immediately pursuing penalties, the city prioritizes communication and voluntary compliance.

The city's first step is typically a courtesy notice informing the property owner of the issue and requesting corrective action. According to Lucchesi, this approach resolves approximately 80 percent of cases without additional enforcement.

Framing code enforcement around safety and community well-being rather than punishment also helps build public support.

Building an Effective Enforcement Process

Code enforcement cases often involve multiple steps before corrective action can occur:

1. Receive and document a complaint.
2. Obtain legal access for inspection.
3. Conduct a property inspection.
4. Identify and document violations.
5. Prepare notices and supporting documentation.
6. Complete legal review when required.
7. Follow through with compliance monitoring.

Strong documentation is critical throughout the process. In Yreka, staff are trained to maintain detailed records, photographs, inspection notes, and timelines to support future enforcement actions if needed.

Administrative Citations: A Key Tool

Both Yreka and Dunsmuir have found administrative citations to be one of the most effective enforcement tools available. Administrative citations allow local governments to issue fines directly through a city-managed process rather than pursuing violations through the court system.

Typical penalties may include:

- \$100 for an initial violation.
- Escalating daily fines after a compliance deadline passes.
- Additional penalties for repeat violations.

Unlike citations processed through the criminal court system, administrative fines remain with the city rather than being absorbed by court costs. The approach also allows communities to maintain local control while ensuring due process through documented violations, appeal procedures, and hearing processes. For appeals,

Lucchesi recommends using independent hearing officers whenever possible, particularly in small communities where staff and elected officials may have close relationships with property owners.

Partnering Enforcement with Incentives

A key lesson from both communities is that enforcement alone rarely produces long-term success. Dunsmuir has paired enforcement efforts with incentives that encourage property improvements. One example is a façade improvement grant program that helps reduce building rehabilitation costs for property owners.

The city has also worked to remove barriers that prevent owners from making visible improvements, such as repainting deteriorated structures. By coupling enforcement with assistance, communities can improve compliance rates while maintaining goodwill among residents and business owners.

Supporting Vulnerable Property Owners

Many nuisance properties may be owned by elderly, disabled, or low-income residents who lack the resources to address violations. Rather than immediately pursuing penalties, Yreka frequently connects these residents with community support organizations.

Examples include:

- Adult Protective Services (APS)
- Local church volunteer groups
- Community service organizations
- Team Challenge, a rehabilitation program whose participants assist with community improvement projects

These partnerships allow cities to address blight while helping vulnerable residents remain in compliance.

Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funding may also provide resources for qualifying property owners, though communities should review current program guidelines and funding opportunities before pursuing this approach.

Addressing Chronic Problem Properties

For property owners unwilling to cooperate, cities maintain a range of escalating enforcement options. These may include:

- Administrative citations
- Inspection warrants
- Abatement orders
- Demolition orders
- Property liens
- Notices of pendency

In severe cases involving unsafe or abandoned structures, cities may order demolition and recover associated costs through special assessment liens placed on the property.

Lucchesi described examples where demolition costs, permitting expenses, and administrative costs were fully liened against properties. In some instances, owners forfeited the property to the city rather than paying accumulated obligations. In others, liens remained until the property was sold or transferred through tax-default processes.

A Notice of Pendency can provide another effective tool by notifying prospective buyers that unresolved code enforcement violations exist, incentivizing compliance before a transaction can occur.

Proactive Prevention

Yreka and Dunsmuir have also focused on preventing future code issues through updated land-use regulations. For example, Dunsmuir revised portions of its zoning code to require conditional use permits for certain uses, such as storage and secondhand retail operations. Conditional use permits can address operational concerns before they become code enforcement problems. This proactive strategy shifts attention from reacting to violations toward preventing them.

Central to the proactive prevention effort is the utilization of a vacant property registration process. The City of Dunsmuir in 2020 [adopted a resolution](#) establishing a process for registering vacant properties and establishing registration and renewal fees to support the ongoing administration of this effort. The resolution states that within 60 days of vacancy, or 30 days of acquiring a vacant property, registration of the property must be filed with the city clerk. Registration must be renewed annually

for as long as the property is vacant. Most critically, the registration collects contact information for the responsible party in case of any additional code enforcement communications, concerns regarding site security, as well as information for who has authorization to rent or list the property as real estate. Additionally, the resolution requires the property owner to keep the property in a state of general repair and ensure that yards and ancillary areas are maintained to a 'neighborhood standard.' Of particular note, vacant properties in a commercial district must ensure that all windows are fully covered with 'plain paper or display artwork, merchandise offered for sale by another business within the community, or materials provided by a Dunsmuir community non-profit organization.'

Penalties for non-compliance and other infractions are met with administrative penalties and fines ranging from \$1,000 to \$25,000 as specified in the ordinance language.

Building Long-Term Capacity

Successful code enforcement requires sustained investment in people, procedures, and expertise. Yreka's program includes:

- A full-time code enforcement officer
- Administrative leadership support
- Specialized code enforcement legal counsel
- Independent hearing officers for appeals

The cities also utilize the expertise and training resources available through the California Association of Code Enforcement Officers (CACEO), which provides educational programs covering enforcement topics ranging from courtesy notices to eminent domain proceedings.

Outcomes and Lessons Learned

The experiences of Yreka and Dunsmuir demonstrate that effective code enforcement is not simply about issuing fines. Instead, it is about creating a framework that encourages property improvement, protects public safety, and supports long-term community revitalization. Key lessons include:

- Lead with compliance rather than punishment.
- Update ordinances before attempting aggressive enforcement.
- Use administrative citations to streamline enforcement and retain local control.

- Combine enforcement with incentives whenever possible.
- Leverage community partnerships to help vulnerable property owners.
- Maintain strong documentation and due process.
- View code enforcement as a long-term revitalization strategy.

For communities seeking to improve downtown conditions, Yreka and Dunsmuir provide a practical example of how code enforcement can serve as both an accountability mechanism and a catalyst for community improvement when paired with strategic investments, partnerships, and a commitment to voluntary compliance.

Establishing Code Enforcement

Having staff resources available to administer code enforcement activities is critical to managing public health and safety risks related to the built environment. Effective code enforcement also ensures that development takes place in a form that meets the community's expectations and advances established goals deriving from planning efforts. As described earlier, the work of code enforcement is methodical in nature and can encompass many areas including building, construction, maintenance, zoning, land use, and environmental concerns among others.

Communities can take a number of approaches to establishing and incorporating code enforcement into municipal service offerings. For any who may be struggling to identify where to start, research indicates three commonly identified approaches:

1. General fund supported - Code enforcement positions are established as stand-alone administrative positions supported by general fund revenues or included in the job duties of relevant adjacent positions. This is most common in small municipalities where fee and fine revenue can only fractionally offset costs and other funds are required and in scenarios where available personnel are limited.
2. Fees supported - In environments where planning and permit activity generates sufficient revenue, code enforcement can be funded substantially or wholly by these funds. This is most common in medium-to-large municipalities. Communities examined as part of this effort generally offer a schedule of building permit fees that vary based on the service performed and the value of the improvements.
3. External contract or partner support - In environments where limited fee and fine revenue are available, municipalities may be able to contract

with other public entities to provide code enforcement services, including county building departments. This approach relieves the municipality of administrative overhead costs but creates a cash requirement for contracting purposes. This approach also requires close communication and coordination between the municipality and the contracting entity.

External funding opportunities for ongoing municipal staff positions are virtually non-existent through state and federal funding sources, not only in California but across the nation. The NADO research team is noting that code enforcement activities are eligible expenses within Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) programming, as outlined in U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development – Community Planning and Development, notice [CPD-14-016](#). The memo outlines that communities can incur costs for code enforcement as outlined in [24 CFR 570.202\(c\)](#). The code enforcement activities are described below:

‘Costs incurred for inspection for code violations and enforcement of codes (e.g., salaries and related expenses of code enforcement inspectors and legal proceedings but not including the cost of correcting the violations) in deteriorated or deteriorating areas in which such enforcement, together with the public or private improvement or services to be provided, may be expected to arrest the decline of the area.’

None of the communities participating in the playbook project are CDBG entitlement communities, so any code enforcement related funding proposals would be subject to the [California Department of Housing and Community Development](#) annual program solicitation and application process.

In an effort to gauge the environment for raising funds for code enforcement activities from internally controlled sources like permit fees, the NADO research team accessed ten years (2015 – 2025) of privately owned residential permit data from the [U.S. Census Bureau – Building Permit Survey \(BPS\)](#). Data was collected for all California places and filtered for communities participating in the playbook project. The permit data illustrated here reflects new privately-owned residential construction. While private residential development may not be directly relatable to downtown economic activity as is the core purpose of the playbook, these permits are one mechanism for consideration in raising fee revenue that could be utilized to pay for general code enforcement activity. This data can provide one data point to help assess whether fee revenue may be a realistic source of financial support for the administration of code enforcement activities. Table 1 below illustrates which

counties had member jurisdictions that provided residential permit data during the ten-year observation period.

	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
<i>Butte County</i>	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
<i>Humboldt County</i>	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
<i>Modoc County</i>								X	X	X	X
<i>Sutter County</i>								X	X	X	X
<i>Tehama County</i>								X	X	X	X
<i>Trinity County</i>								X	X	X	X
<i>Yuba County*</i>								X	X	X	X

Table 1. Residential Construction Permit Data Availability - Place

* Yuba County is included above as having municipalities reporting data; however, this only included Yuba City, not the City of Wheatland.

During the observation period, only Butte and Humboldt Counties had places (cities/ villages) that provided residential permit data for the entire ten-year period. Table 2 illustrates residential permit data for specific jurisdictions and is provided below.

	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	Totals
<i>Oroville</i>	15	15	3	9	72	64	253	226	114	0	63	834
<i>Eureka</i>	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	65	19	46	132	262
<i>Humboldt Co. Unincorporated Areas*</i>	91	139	126	134	296	141	221	166	106	83	121	1,624
<i>Alturas</i>	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Live Oak</i>	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	66	18	3	3	90
<i>Corning</i>	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	5	16	21	4	46
<i>Trinity Co.**</i>	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	21	22	21	33	97
Annual Totals	106	154	129	143	368	205	474	549	295	174	356	

Table 2. U.S. Census Bureau, Residential Construction Permit Data, Place Detail

* Humboldt County Unincorporated Areas' is included illustrate locations including Garberville, which is a Census Designated Place and not a municipality.

**Trinity County is included for the same reason, to capture Weaverville.

The values listed for these locations do not indicate permit activity in the specific areas of Garberville and Weaverville only.

¹ City of Eureka Fee & Service Charges FY 25-26: <https://www.eurekaca.gov/ArchiveCenter/ViewFile/Item/454>.

Using the City of Eureka as an example, the listed permit fee for a residential property construction with an estimated value of \$100,000 was \$1,847¹ in FY 25-26. Over the 4 years of data available, 262 residential permits were issued. If we conservatively assume that all residential construction permits issued during this time were for properties valued at \$100,000 or less, this scenario could have generated over \$483,000 in total permitting fees, or approximately \$121,000 per year. For the purposes of this exercise, this could be considered to be a minimum level of permit activity and revenue generation needed to support code enforcement and other related administrative activities.

Based on the permit information provided in Figure 2, it could then be reasonably assumed that Oroville, Eureka and Humboldt County (to include Garberville) may have enough sustained residential permit activity to generate revenue that could support some level code enforcement activities and staffing in those locations. Alturas, Live Oak, Corning, Weaverville and Wheatland would likely need to augment residential construction permit revenue with other funds to generate resources able to support code enforcement activities or consider contracting with a third party to provide or enhance these services.

counties had member jurisdictions that provided residential permit data during the ten-year observation period.

	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Butte County	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Humboldt County	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Madoc County								X	X	X	X
Sutter County								X	X	X	X
Tehama County								X	X	X	X
Trinity County								X	X	X	X
Yuba County								X	X	X	X

Figure 1: Residential Construction Permit Data Availability – Place

Note for Table 1; Yuba County is included above as having municipalities reporting data – this only included Yuba City, not the City of Wheatland.

During the observation period, only Butte and Humboldt Counties had places (cities/villages) that provided residential permit data for the entire ten-year period. Table 2 illustrates residential permit data for specific jurisdictions and is provided below.

	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	Location Totals
Oroville	15	15	3	9	72	64	253	226	114	0	63	834
Eureka	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	65	23	46	132	262
Humboldt County Unincorporated Area*	91	139	126	134	296	141	221	166	106	83	121	1,634
Aktaras	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	0	0	0	0	0
Live Oak	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	66	18	3	3	90
Corning	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	5	26	21	4	46
Trinity County**	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	21	22	21	33	97
Annual Totals	336	154	129	343	368	205	474	549	295	174	356	

Figure 2: U.S. Census Bureau - Residential Construction Permit Data - Place Detail

‘Humboldt County Unincorporated Areas’ is included to reasonably illustrate locations including Garberville which is a Census Designated Place and not a municipality; Trinity County’ is included for the same reason to capture Weaverville. Readers should not equate the values listed for these locations to mean permit activity in the specific areas of Garberville and Weaverville only.

Using the City of Eureka as an example, the listed permit fee for a residential property construction with an estimated value of \$100,000 was \$1,847¹ in FY 25-26. Over the 4 years of data available, 262 residential permits were issued. If we conservatively assume that all residential construction permits issued during this time were for properties valued at \$100,000 or less, this scenario could have generated over \$483,000 in total permitting fees, or approximately \$121,000 per year. For the purposes of this exercise, this could be considered to be a minimum level of permit activity and revenue generation needed to support code enforcement and other related administrative activities. Based on the permit information provided in Figure

¹ City of Eureka Fee & Service Charges FY 25-26: <https://www.eurekaca.gov/ArchiveCenter/ViewFile/Item/454>.

2, it could then be reasonably assumed that Oroville, Eureka and Humboldt County (to include Garberville) may have enough sustained residential permit activity to generate revenue that could support some level code enforcement activities and staffing in those locations. Alturas, Live Oak, Corning, Weaverville and Wheatland would likely need to augment residential construction permit revenue with other funds to generate resources able to support code enforcement activities or consider contracting with a third party to provide or enhance these services.