

Jodeana Patterson

From: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: FW: Alternative/RV Housing Ordinance 2025 - Public Draft and Workshop Notice

From: Michael Taylor <mjt4you@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 6:01 PM
To: Jodeana Patterson <Jodeana.Patterson@nevadacountyca.gov>
Cc: Alt RV Ordinance <AltRVOrdinance@nevadacountyca.gov>; Robb Tucker <Robb.Tucker@nevadacountyca.gov>
Subject: Re: Alternative/RV Housing Ordinance 2025 - Public Draft and Workshop Notice

You don't often get email from mjt4you@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Good Afternoon Jodeana,

I agree with the several people complaining about the quality of the survey! The county's survey's have historically the same bad characteristics as the RV survey!

So, as my first public comment, the survey was technically flawed. Here are my other already submitted suggestions;

1. Clean and Clarify the Permitting Process:

The County should streamline and modernize its existing permit structure to allow 12-month RV occupancy permits, renewable for additional 12-month periods upon successful inspection. A clean, consistent process is essential—not only for participation, but for transparent oversight aligning the 12 months for construction and six months for family and friends permissible uses, in other words— it's the same permitting process for any occupied RV.

2. Tie Occupancy to Safe and Legal Wastewater Management

RV units approved for habitation must have a legally compliant system for managing wastewater, with two permitted options:

- Connection to an existing permitted septic system, supported by a letter from a licensed engineer verifying the system's capacity to handle the additional effluent, or
- Installation of a dedicated 1,500-gallon holding tank, with documentation of an active contract with a licensed pump service to empty the tank at least once per month or more frequently as needed.

This dual-path approach allows flexibility for landowners while ensuring environmental and

public health standards are upheld. It also reduces the risk of illegal or unsanitary dumping.

3. Permit Applications Must Be Landowner-Initiated;

To ensure accountability, only the property owner should be eligible to apply for RV occupancy permits on their land. This avoids third-party misuse or informal, undocumented arrangements.

4. Use Existing Setbacks and Codes as the Standard

RVs should conform to existing zoning and setback requirements—no exceptions. There's no need to create new zoning overlays or carveouts. Instead, align this ordinance with what already exists and ensure County oversight is simple, fair, and consistent.

5. RVs Must Be Safe, Registered, and Occupied Responsibly

Permitted RVs must:

- Be currently registered with DMV,
- Be road-ready and safe, and
- House no more occupants than they were designed for.

These baseline standards promote health and safety without overcomplicating the ordinance.

6. Ensure Safe and Code-Compliant Electrical Connections

All RVs must be connected to power using electrical systems that meet both the manufacturer's specifications for the RV and all applicable building and electrical codes for the RV service. Any RV electrical hookup to a house or service panel must be installed to code, including grounding, overload protection, and appropriate amperage. This protects the safety of both the RV occupant and the property.

7. Modernize the Code—Don't Reinvent It

Rather than create an entirely new class of rules, the County should review, consolidate, and clarify existing building codes and ordinances that already address temporary structures, utilities, setbacks, and sanitation. Cleaning up what's already on the books will do more to support long-term oversight than layering on new complexity.

8. This Ordinance Must Not Be a Loophole

People living in substandard or unpermitted RVs that pose a health or fire risk must not be shielded by this ordinance. County oversight of existing violations should continue in parallel. For responsible landowners, this ordinance should create a legal pathway forward—not an excuse to overlook violations or enable unsafe living conditions.

Respectfully,

Sent from my iPhone

Jodeana Patterson

From: Dannielle Norton <danniellenorton5127@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 5:35 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Stop the homelessness

You don't often get email from danniellenorton5127@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Yes, i think that rvs should be allowed to have people living in them on private property. The town has way too many homeless people. For all this acreage that we have. I know too many homeless people that don't have homes because they're not allowed to live in rvs. Good. Please help us stop the homelessness.

Jodeana Patterson

From: Jenelyse Woolery <indigigoldenherbalacademy@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 7:29 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Alternative Housing in Nevada County Comment

You don't often get email from indigigoldenherbalacademy@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Hi there county officials,

I'm not usually a political person, though if I were I'd push for equity as an essential living standard on a global scale. This first starts within our own communities. Not everyone was given the same opportunities in life, some come from more privileged backgrounds, others have always lived paycheck to paycheck, some of us got lucky by marrying into wealth, and others are simply trying to make ends meet. I fit into the later three categories. We live in this county, my partner had an inheritance to purchase land, we are living paycheck to paycheck, and we are barely getting our needs met but we are sustenance farmers in an agricultural zone so we survive. We keep to ourselves! We've been regenerating the land and cleaning up all of the microplastic. We don't do drugs, we do enjoy our own cannabis from time to time, we grow tomatoes, cucumbers, squash, and culinary herbs. We are choosing to live an alternative lifestyle from the beginning, we don't live in a big city on purpose and the fertile soil here makes it easy to survive. He comes from a lineage of homesteaders, back when there was no housing policy. I'm a descendant of enslaved peoples, my ancestors and those from my motherland enjoy an array of beautifully built earthen homes. They live longer and healthier lives.

We just want to live simply! We don't want to amass or hoard anything as the bible says, "no rich man will enter the kingdom of heaven". We came here to live simply, study yoga, grow our own food, and eventually grow our family.

Judging everyone against the same caliber is unjust! Not everyone wants a big house, some of us find refuge and sanctity beneath the trees and so we wish to live very modestly. I can imagine that anyone who lives in an alternative way, in alternative housing, is similar. These people want to grow their own food, study nature, preserve the land, clean it up, use natural materials, save money, and live with little stress.

I've personally read books on how the original inhabitants of these lands lived, the Nisenan tribal peoples. Though simple, their homes were beautiful and sustainable.

Extracting everything now to build will leave little resources for generations who will need them in another 50-100 years.

Who am I to say all of this? Well for one I have a bachelors of science degree from Everglades University, a prestigious school, in *alternative medicine*.

Sustainability was one of the main courses that I enjoyed! I also received a permaculture certification in landscape design with an emphasis on natural building from [Quail Springs](#). Upon moving to the county I completed a natural building course with Sasha Rabin one of the main activists and organizers pushing California to normalize natural and alternative building methods.

Why else would younger couples move to this county? What else will the local young people have to look forward to when living in a rural area. This is not the suburbs, building takes time! Not all of us are military, ex veterans, in the cannabis industry, logging industry, etc.

Some of us truly came here because the land is sacred, the waters flow beautifully, our gardens thrive, it's peaceful, and the nature preserves are sanctuaries.

Would the county come down on us for living in this natural and alternative way when it's all that we can afford?

When things are kept tidy and the people and children are happy it doesn't matter if you're in a mansion or a hut! Life is as beautiful as you make it.

None of us would live here if we weren't mindful of the potential risks of fire. In fact, my husband and I are only here because we lost our tiny home on wheels on a 5 acre parcel we rented in Ojai California in 2017 because an Edison power company transformer blew up!

No one person started that fire, the power company paid us 80k in retribution and you likely can't imagine how much was paid out to property owners and homeowners.

1. Moral of the story, equity over equality because we aren't all given the same opportunities and quite frankly not all of us want to follow the same path as those who have more capital anyways. Most of the time the gaining of those capital resources came at the cost of another person. <https://unitedwaynca.org/blog/equity-vs-equality/>

2. So many other states allow alternative housing with no repercussions. What does the county have to lose when a small percentage of its citizens rely on alternative housing? Not much at all!

3. The cost of living is only going up and when bills are hard to pay and rent is impossible but you can afford a tiny home on a 5 acre parcel, a converted garden shed, or a RV then why should any government or persons have reservations against a person's only means of living a humbly abundant, honest, and enriching life close to Mother nature?

Thank you!!!

With deep care for all people who deserve to live within their means.

--

Certified Herbalist Jennifer Elyse Woolery

Herbal Teacher

Doula

Landscape Designer & Steward

www.indigigoldenherbals.org

Jwoolery10@gmail.com

Instagram @indigigoldenherbalacademy

"Blessings and abundance to the humble and the meek, for they shall inherit the earth"

Email and social media is always the best way to get in contact

Jodeana Patterson

From: marian weast <mvweast@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 7:40 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: RVs

You don't often get email from mvweast@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

I would like to suggest that RVs being allowed as residences on private land could help solve our housing shortage crisis.

We have land space but, no RV.

If someone with an RV wished to live on our back 1/2 acre lot, we would be interested in making it possible.

We understand road access, power, water and septic hook-ups would be required.

There are hundreds, if not thousands of good quality RVs sitting unused in CA.

We appreciate our county investigating this option for housing those in need.

This could be a Win/ Win opportunity for RV owners, property owners with usable space and for those needing safe, affordable homes.

Respectfully~

Marian Weast
Nevada City, CA
#619-889-2328

Jodeana Patterson

From: ken bigham <krbigham@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2025 7:59 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Alternative Housing Draft Ordinance

You don't often get email from krbigham@yahoo.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

To receive comments, you need to provide an anonymous on-line survey.

Jodeana Patterson

From: Starshine Ranch <Linda@StarshineRanch.org>
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2025 9:51 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Alternative RV Housing

You don't often get email from linda@starshineranch.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Hi... I would like to express my view on this ridiculous proposal.

PLEASE say **NO** to alternative housing as in RV's, etc.

We are already facing a dilemma with far too many people, along with their associated vehicles, crowding our roads, hospitals, doctors, banks, pharmacies and grocery stores.

And there is a concern as to the availability of enough water!

Also, while some will make sure there is proper disposal of human waste, many will not.

PLEASE..... don't allow what will become a real mess that could be just as bad as the homeless situation.

Linda Lanzoni

14149 Christopher Robin Way

32 year Grass Valley resident who bought an existing house.

--

DON'T LET THE WORLD CHANGE YOUR HAPPINESS... LET YOUR HAPPINESS CHANGE THE WORLD.

Jodeana Patterson

From: Peter Brewer <peter@brewerfirm.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2025 10:36 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: alternative housing, such as RVs, on private property

You don't often get email from peter@brewerfirm.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Re: the consideration of the use of alternative housing, such as RVs, on private property, I have no objection per se, but would suggest that any such housing be rendered immobile by such as removing the wheels so that in the event of an evacuation the evacuation routes are not impeded or congested by such vehicles.

Peter N. Brewer, Esq.
11401 Winter Moon Way
Nevada City, CA 95959-9694
(650) 327-2900 **ext'n 11**
www.BrewerFirm.com
BayAreaRealEstateLawyers.com
Real Estate Law – From the Ground Up®



Jodeana Patterson

From: Robert Norman <bnorman@ix.netcom.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2025 11:54 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: I'll all for

[You don't often get email from bnorman@ix.netcom.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Homing the homeless
Sent from my iPhone

Jodeana Patterson

From: Barbara Simmons <simmons@redshift.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2025 1:19 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: RV ordinance

[You don't often get email from simmons@redshift.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

I would encourage a NO on this proposal.

Barbara Simmons
16471 Wolf Meadows Dr
Grass Valley

Jodeana Patterson

From: John Kitts <john422@mindspring.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2025 2:05 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Rv's

[You don't often get email from john422@mindspring.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

I have a big concern with water usage. I'm on a well and if there is a 20% increase in water usage from the well system it will affect the quality , amount , and possibility of permanent damage to the water systems. Please rethink where these will be allowed to be . If on NID water there issues otherwise NO.

Sincerely John Kitts
12780 Spring Rd.
Nevada City
Sent from my iPhone

Jodeana Patterson

From: RM Fraley <rmf525@att.net>
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2025 4:25 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Have Your Say: Comment on Nevada County's Draft RV Housing Ordinance

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

You don't often get email from rmf525@att.net. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Nevada County Board of Supervisors,

Common sense? My opinion is if you start allowing people to live in RVs on private land, you will create an 'out of control' problem that will directly lead to increased drug trafficking and use. You will not be able to monitor this in the Grass Valley and Nevada City foothills. This in turn will directly lead to FIRE, from accidents caused by stoned out and intoxicated people at these sites. An example is the person that caused the fire that destroyed the business Sierra Motor Sports in town. If we could not prevent that in town, how will you control what happens in the foothills. You can't. So my question to you, where is your common sense?

Respectfully,
Michael Fraley – homeowner and retiree here since 1990.

Jodeana Patterson

From: David Schott <schott.davidm@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2025 5:40 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Public Comment on Alternative/RV Housing draft ordinance Section 12.03.151
Recreational Vehicle Dwelling

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Hello,

I oppose this ordinance in its entirety. I do not wish for RVs to be allowed as alternative housing. The county government should focus housing effort on existing allowable land uses and means of encouraging additional housing without adding RVs. Previous to moving to Nevada County, my neighbor and surrounding area in San Francisco County were subject to long and difficult issues with allowing RV living. Even locally here in Nevada County, the owned RVs are often unsightly, broken down, and unsafe to be around. One can find new articles going back to the 1940s about house shortages. It is not a new thing that needs us to throw all things to the wind. Yes, we need to continue to work on supplying more housing, especially subsidized housing. We can do this without the extreme of RVs. It feels like a vocal few local housing advocates have pushed Nevada County Board of Supervisors down this path. They are able to spend time at board meetings, talk to the press, etc. Yet, I doubt that they represent the majority. Please don't go down this extreme path just to appease these vocal few.

Cheers,
David Schott
12042 Logans Run Ct.
Grass Valley, CA 95945

Jodeana Patterson

From: Equal Rights for Youth <equalrightsfor youth@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2025 6:03 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Two comments

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

AltRVOrdinance@nevadacountyca.gov

Include a setback of X Feet?

Include a requirement to build a solid-material fence in line-of-sight from the nearest road from which the RV will be visible?

Google "Randy Om" comedian and smile.

Jodeana Patterson

From: ken bigham <krbigam@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2025 7:42 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Alternative Housing Draft Ordinance

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Here are my thoughts:

Yes, alternative housing is needed for a small portion of Nevada County residents; however, these types of housing communities should be confined to specific areas, like trailer parks, so they can be closely monitored by County entities, such as Planning, Mental & Public Health, Building, Fire, Law Enforcement etc. Having worked many years with this low-income population, I have found it unstable at best. If this idea of confinement is not possible or suitable, I would abandon this Alternative Housing Ordinance as it stands and create another one that keeps Class K Housing out of established neighborhoods and into designated areas where it can be monitored and controlled. Placing RVs, campers etc. into existing neighborhoods is a very bad idea for many reasons, such as:

The danger and encroaching issues neighborhoods would face regarding fire, mental health problems, violence, sanitation, road access and maintenance, noise, property devaluation, crowding etc.

The cannabis ordinance is an example of a poorly designed ordinance that allows neighbors to grow and smoke pot with no regard or prohibition to the smell invading others' property. The Nevada County Cannabis Alliance has done nothing to stop this after my many calls and e-mails. I used to be able to walk outside and smell the country air I worked so hard to move to and establish a home and family.

After reading the Alternative Housing Draft Ordinance, I am convinced there is no way the County can enforce and monitor what this Class K Housing group will actually adhere to and do. These are generally alternative people who have already proven to be breaking the law by living in alternative housing.

In conclusion, my thoughts are "Yes" alternative housing in alternative sites like a trailer park but "No" in neighborhoods. Hopefully the BOS will reconsider the ordinance you are assigned to draft.

Thank you.

Jodeana Patterson

From: Rebecca Blanton <rebeccaablanton@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2025 9:41 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Comments on Draft Alt RV Ordinance

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

To the Board of Supervisors:

I am writing in support of the Draft of **Section 12.03.151 Recreational Vehicle Dwelling**. The lack of affordable housing in California and the presence of a large number of properties with 3+ acres occupied by a single family dwelling makes this a sensible addition to the housing ordinances. The current fire and health and safety provisions ordinances are sensible and reasonable.

I would encourage you to consider a few additions to the ordinance.

1. This ordinance provides for up to 24 months of occupation of a recreational vehicle as a residence. This creates a potential for churning- someone who is facing housing instability who is able to avail themselves of this ordinance on someone else's property for two years. Those two years pass and the person is not in any better financial shape to find permanent affordable housing. They are either evicted or remain on the property illegally beyond the two year limit.

I suggest adding a requirement for the renewal at one year to include the person living in the recreational vehicle to meet with social service officers to create a plan to identify affordable more-permanent housing in the remaining 12 months as part of the renewal process. Having a requirement to meet with someone who can help navigate the complicated housing program options in NC would improve the chance of moving temporarily housed people into more permanent dwellings.

2. People who have properties upgraded to allow for RV dwelling are limited to a two-year permit. This will reduce the number of people willing to put in the work and cost of upgrading properties to meet the licensing standards for RV ADUs. I would suggest that there be a provision to allow property owners to renew their permits after a year of no RV ADU on the property. The potential for revolving 2 year on-1 year off income from renting the spot and providing water/electricity would be more enticing to many property owners.

3. If the property is accommodating a RV ADU as part of a long-term project of building a more-permanent ADU structure, build in a waiver option if construction takes more than two years. With the current federal attacks on immigrants, trade tariffs, and cutting staff in various permitting offices, it is projected that construction projects will take significantly longer and cost more in the near future. There needs to be a way for a property owner to show that a more-permanent structure for an ADU under construction is in-process and has an active contractor working on the project. A temporary extension beyond 24 months could be granted until the completion of a permanent dwelling.

4. When setting the permitting fees, there needs to be a waiver for low-income individuals. For people making upwards of 300% of the current poverty level, paying for an RV and potential rent on a property to park the RV, paying permitting and inspection fees could be a barrier to establishing housing in an RV ADU. Creating a fee structure based on income and expenses which makes allowances for people living near the poverty level will help create a more accessible way to becoming housed.

Thank you for the time and consideration on this ordinance. I ask that you vote to pass it either with or without my suggested amendments.

Sincerely,

Rebecca E. Blanton, Ph.D.
11200 Hackett Court
Grass Valley, CA 95949
(443) 388-2044

Rebecca E. Blanton

aka Auntie Vice

LoveLettersToAUicorn.com

@AuntieVice ([Twitter](#), [IG](#), [Facebook](#), [Reddit](#), [TikTok](#)), Buesky, Petlife)

NOTICE: I live with a dynamic disability. While most of the time I respond quickly to emails, some may be delayed due to health issues. If I am slow, please send me a note and remind me to get back to you!

Jodeana Patterson

From: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: FW: Housing

From: Daniel J Desmond <djdesmond@ucdavis.edu>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2025 6:52 AM
To: Heidi Hall <Heidi.Hall@nevadacountyca.gov>
Subject: Housing

You don't often get email from djdesmond@ucdavis.edu. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Supervisor Hall,

I want to voice my opposition to the proposal to allow RV's and trailers to be residences on private property. I don't think it will significantly impact the homeless problem but will significantly impact the character of the neighborhood and community in a negative way. We have had personal experience with an RV moved into a home at Hawke Lane. It housed a variety of people for a while and gradually turned into a collection of trash. Code Compliance finally had them remove the RV. Please oppose this plan.

Thanks for your leadership and service.

Dan
Daniel Desmond
10500 Hawke Lane
Nevada City CA 95959
707-696-8626

Jodeana Patterson

From: Bennett <bennett1280@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2025 7:34 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: RE: RV Ordinance

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

I think this is a great idea. I would like to see it for 2.5 acres vs 3. I have been thinking about this as a solution as most of my acres are unused.

We are located at 13376 Noel Lane, Grass Valley.

Thank you

Mary Bennett

T: 530-583-9363
E-mail: bennett1280@gmail.com

Jodeana Patterson

From: Brook Binley <babinley@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2025 8:03 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Opposed to RVs as Permitted Dwelling

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

To whom it may Concern,

I am opposed to permitting RVs as permanent dwellings due to the fact that they are often powered by generators or their electricity comes from extended electrical wires, and cords. As such, this ordinance would allow for more fire danger in the area, especially on rural properties.

Additionally, this ordinance is requested to allow for pot growers to have a permanent structure on their property in order to make larger grows under current county pot ordinances. Currently, the county is doing an abysmally poor job of monitoring both unpermitted and permitted grows, and rural land owners near grow plantations have suffered due to increase fire danger, increase pollution, stench, watershed pollution increased activity on adjacent lands, and increase traffic to properties that are growing marijuana. This all results in a reduction in the value of neighboring homes and property.

Please do not allow this ordinance to go through.

Sincerely

Brook Binley

Jodeana Patterson

From: Julia Carroll-Shea <jcarroll43@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2025 8:24 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Draft RV Housing Ordinance

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

About the draft ordinance, I think it would benefit only a handful of folks for whom it would be a relatively inexpensive way to put a rental unit on their property. The restrictions and processes are too onerous to add much relief to the lack of affordable housing in Nevada County.

I don't know what the answer is to the housing situation, but I don't believe that people living in a few scattered RVs is it. Why not develop a place similar to the Grass Valley RV Resort instead? That would have more impact.

Julia Carroll, Nevada County resident

Jodeana Patterson

From: Rebecca Rickey <becca4255@icloud.com>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2025 10:03 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: The proposed ordinance does not solve the lack of affordable housing

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

1. An RV should be viewed-no differently than a “tiny home” on wheels. **I did not appreciate the picture of the really old ugly RV that you use on your campaign** to consider whether or not RV’s can be considered permanent housing. You chose an RV that basically looks like a blight to the neighborhood.
2. Barrier to Entry
The county’s requirement of an existing single-family home plus 3 acres makes this a privilege, not a solution. **It shuts out the very people it’s supposedly designed to help. it also forces our viewers to be renting from someone instead of owning their own property. People who can afford a single-family home don’t need to live in an RV so that means if an RV is on a property of 3 acres or more it’s basically to benefit the more**

privileged who can own a single-family home and then rent space to someone in an RV. The rich get richer and the poor get poorer.

3. **Practical Proposal**

RVs should be allowed as primary residences on any legally owned parcel, provided minimum health and safety standards are met (sanitation, waste disposal, utility compliance).

4. **Equity & Autonomy**

People who buy land should have the right to live on it in a safe, sustainable, self-contained dwelling — whether it's a stick-built house, a manufactured home, or an RV.

Rebecca Rickey

Wishing You The Best in Life

Jodeana Patterson

From: Paul Elias <ppcpaule2000@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2025 10:05 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance; Lisa Swarthout; Sue Hoek; Heidi Hall; Hardy Bullock; Robb Tucker
Cc: Tim Kiser; Alison Lehman; Trisha Tillotson
Subject: Recommendation by GV City Mgr. - "Security" deposit for Removal of RV and "Restoration" of RV site

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Hello Supervisors and RV Comments -

I recommend strengthening Section C.1 of the draft ordinance with a clear enforcement mechanism so RVs cannot be left abandoned after permit expiration. As written, the section requires the RV to be unoccupied within ten (10) days of permit expiration, but it does not provide a remedy if the owner fails to comply. To address this gap, I propose requiring a refundable \$5,000 security bond at the time a permit is issued. This bond would act like a security deposit — if the property owner removes the RV on their own, the bond is fully refunded, but if the RV is abandoned or in violation, the County can use the funds to remove and properly dispose of it. This approach protects neighborhoods from blight, fire hazards, and unlawful continued occupancy, and unlawful disposal while ensuring fairness to responsible property owners.

Proposed Addition to Section C.1 (Permitting):

To ensure compliance and prevent abandoned RVs and their adjacent debris from creating blight, fire hazards, or unlawful disposal and continued occupancy, each RV Dwelling Administrative Development Permit shall require the property owner to post a refundable \$5,000 security bond with the County. This bond shall be held as assurance that, if the permit is not renewed within ten (10) days of expiration or the RV is otherwise found in violation of permit conditions, funds will be available for the County to remove and properly dispose of the RV. If the property owner removes the RV and debris in compliance with this section, the bond shall be fully refunded.

Best regards,

Paul Elias

District 3

Ps. yes, while “assigned” the same homeless camp cleanup crew, my faint picture is on the Union’s 7/17 front page, Tim made the \$5k recommendation Believe he said something to the effect, RVs are expensive to tow and get rid of Most salvage yds won’t take ‘em No value. . .

Jodeana Patterson

From: tobinriverotter@aol.com
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2025 11:53 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Permanent RV's

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Good day,

I am apposed to Recreational Vehicles being allowed as permanent housing in Nevada county.

Cheers, Jeffery

Jodeana Patterson

From: Steve and Carolyn Battaini <crosjb@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2025 1:32 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Cc: Steve Carolyn Battaini
Subject: RVs as permanent housing causes a wave of unintended consequences you will regret

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

I would like to go on record as **opposed** to the proposal to have RVs as alternative housing. It is a bad idea for the following reasons:

- 1. Fire safety** in areas that are **already out of compliance with State's regulations for evacuation** roads for areas in the county, specifically Greenhorn Road which is my home. It is already a potentially dangerous situation and this will increase the potential for a horrific fire. Many areas have NO or minimal at best, official evacuation roads. For example, Greenhorn Rd has 5.5 MILES of road with no County approved evacuation routes. Can you imagine 900 homes with one or more cars trying to evacuate on one road? A recipe for disaster, similar to the Paradise fire. **Lives are at risk!!**
- 2. Environmental safety.** where will the waste water of the RVs go? If you think they will hook up to septic, think again. That will rarely happen. They don't have the funds and who will police this life safety issue. This situation will pollute our waters, rivers, lakes and anything downstream.
- 3. BIGGGG Problem waiting to happen in near future.** RVs are cheaply made and used RVs fall apart within years. They are unsafe, don't comply with housing rules, filled with flammable materials and can burn up within minutes, before a fire dept can arrive. These fires can spread easily to adjoining properties. What's more.. the laws for removal of people disobeying your laws is on the side of the perpetrators, and just try to get them out..... ain't gonna happen. Then what does the County do.....

This is a short term fix causing multiple long term problems for the residents of this beautiful community, and problems for the policing of the safety of all of it's residents.

This is happening every day in the once beautiful Chico.

Take a look as the decades long problems in CHICO and you'll see what this would happen here.

I ask you to consider instead... a county property or sanctioned private property that is improved with slips, electric, and septic (that get pumped regularly) to house those that need it. It is for the safety of themselves, the community, and the environment.

Lastly, property values will decrease over time and you will not have enough funds to finance your county commitments.....

THINK ABOUT ALL THAT.....

With great concern,

Steve Battaini

Jodeana Patterson

From: PERRY BLAKE <pblake9630@aol.com>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2025 3:43 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Draft Ordinance

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

I do not support the Draft Ordinance that would include RVs as permanent residence on private property.

I understand the intent is good but it is my experience that county code enforcement does not have the resources to enforce existing codes that are in place to keep our county safe.

Most important is the county's ability to inspect every unit for fire safety. These RV's use portable generators with extension cords and propane. Will the areas around the RV's be cleared of fire fuels? Will there be an inspection requirement and permit process as stated in existing county code?

Will the inspection include a requirement for potable water and proper waste disposal?

If the Draft Ordinance includes these requirements, will the County Code Enforcement Officers be able to enforce them?

We absolutely do not need more people clogging our rural roads during an evacuation.

We live in a nice neighborhood and we have all made improvements to our properties to make them more fire safe. We all pay high premiums for fire insurance.

We have a neighbor who has not developed his property and lives there in a travel trailer surrounded with junk. He has never had an inspection, Fire Department or otherwise, or permit to live there. He has no proper means of waste disposal. When he is contacted by Code Enforcement he says he doesn't live there.

Now he has a friend who sleeps in his van on the property just off the road, across the street from our house. The Sheriff couldn't do anything because this person has permission from the property owner to sleep there.

Ours is just one example.

You can write a perfect ordinance but if it can't be enforced the result could be catastrophic.

Perry Blake
11799 Trish Court
Nevada City

Sent from my iPad

Jodeana Patterson

From: Barbara DesChamps <chateau@achateau.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 21, 2025 3:47 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: RV Housing Issue

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

I sent this to Tyler last month and am now told I should send it here instead. Your online survey is asking the wrong questions. Parcel size is not the important factor! Please read the message below and acknowledge receipt by email. Thank you!

----- Original Message -----

From: Barbara DesChamps <chateau@achateau.com>
To: "tyler.barrington@nevadacountyca.gov" <tyler.barrington@nevadacountyca.gov>
Date: 07/17/2025 1:58 PM PDT
Subject: RV Housing Issue

Good Afternoon, Tyler!

People on NextDoor have encouraged me to send the following post to you. Please acknowledge receipt by email. Thank you.

Before I make my points here, allow me to justify my opinions with my background. In the 1970s, I was chair of a septic and solid waste committee for a general plan for part of San Mateo County. I studied septic systems with the then two of the top three experts in the country. In the 1990s, I was vice chair of the Land Use committee for the Nevada County General Plan. Our recommendations were very clear. Additional housing potential should be placed in areas that are close to existing infrastructure and services. To do otherwise would cause serious problems. Many of the rural roads cannot easily handle the extra trips of more population density beyond the current zoning. We worry about the roads not handling the current population in an evacuation. Imagine the situation with an increase. Proper septic systems not only require space but money. It does not make economic sense to direct low-income housing to areas which require such systems and relying on low-income residents to pay for regular pumping does not make sense either. If you think that RVs are one solution to the housing problem, then the logical thing is to create RV parks in areas near existing infrastructure. You are asking for huge problems by scattering them throughout the county. Once you allow them, you will not be able to remove them to correct the problems they cause. The same goes for other forms of low-income housing. We should be providing more help for people but in the areas with services. Before I make my points here, allow me to justify my opinions with my background. In the 1970s, I was

chair of a septic and solid waste committee for a general plan for part of San Mateo County. I studied septic systems with the then two of the top three experts in the country. In the 1990s, I was vice chair of the Land Use committee for the Nevada County General Plan. Our recommendations were very clear. Additional housing potential should be placed in areas that are close to existing infrastructure and services. To do otherwise would cause serious problems. Many of the rural roads cannot easily handle the extra trips of more population density beyond the current zoning. We worry about the roads not handling the current population in an evacuation. Imagine the situation with an increase. Proper septic systems not only require space but money. It does not make economic sense to direct low-income housing to areas which require such systems and relying on low-income residents to pay for regular pumping does not make sense either. If you think that RVs are one solution to the housing problem, then the logical thing is to create RV parks in areas near existing infrastructure. You are asking for huge problems by scattering them throughout the county. Once you allow them, you will not be able to remove them to correct the problems they cause. The same goes for other forms of low-income housing. We should be providing more help for people but in the areas with services.

Barbara

Barbara

Jodeana Patterson

From: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: FW: Have Your Say: Comment on Nevada County's Draft RV Housing Ordinance

From: Rebecca Rickey <becca4255@icloud.com>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2025 10:54 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance <AltRVOrdinance@nevadacountyca.gov>
Subject: Re: Have Your Say: Comment on Nevada County's Draft RV Housing Ordinance

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

You sure picked a really horrible crappy RV to display. Is that to deter people wanting RV housing in their neighborhood!!

Also, your suggestion that RVs can only be placed on 3 acres or more with a single-family house means that this is basically to help existing homeowners make more money.

It does not solve the affordable housing crisis. It does not allow for an individual to buy property and live on it in a nice clean RV that meets all the health and safety standards, especially if all the utilities are on the property.

Your solution helps the rich get richer and the poor get poorer.

It is not a viable solution to create progressive ideas for affordable housing.

Rebecca Rickey

Wishing You The Best in Life

Jodeana Patterson

From: Be a Winna <lovimgcare@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2025 4:46 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Allowing RV's for housing on single family home parcels.

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

I am in favor of this ordinance. Many low income residents of Nevada County face homelessness and housing insecurity. There truly aren't housing options due to lack of affordable housing. Allowing legal RV dwelling could provide a safe and affordable alternative. Many elderly homeowners could benefit by having tenants to assist them monetarily and with personal assistance. Properties not occupied year round could have caretakers to insure protection against fires and trespassers. I applaud the planning commission and BOS for their diligence in addressing this issue as one of many housing solutions for our citizens.

Jodeana Patterson

From: Susan Street <susan@goldenoaksassociation.com>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2025 4:56 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: RV housing

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

I would like to respond to your RV housing on 3 acres or more. I am vice president of Golden Oaks Association so I am speaking for the association of Golden Oaks development. We have CC&Rs that would prohibit some of these ordinances that you are trying to implement. I would like it to be considered that in neighborhoods with CC&Rs That you consider on an application that those regulations are acknowledged and adhered to.

Jodeana Patterson

From: Susan Street <susan@goldenoaksassociation.com>
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2025 4:59 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: RV ordinance

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

I am sorry I just emailed you from the Golden Oaks Association and forgot to sign my name. I am Susan Street -
Vice president of Golden Oaks Association
I had put in there that I feel that the ordinance should consider CC&Rs For associations of this kind would be a consideration on an application. That the CC & Rs would be adhere to and acknowledged on an application.

Jodeana Patterson

From: john@smartcampaignsca.com
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2025 5:10 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Comments

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

As a rural property owner I am extremely concerned about the impact of loosening regulations on housing in rural areas.

While I support the use of ADUs, second units and similar housing, this proposal risks turning vast portions of our county into a permanent, under-regulated campground, adding enormously to the risk of wildfire and complicating evacuations during emergencies, impacting public health and safety, undermining property values and burdening county staff.

Before approving these changes the Board must ensure that there will be adequate funding and staff to process permits, conduct inspections of participating parcels (as well as regular, follow-up inspections to ensure compliance), ensure compliance with road and fire safety regulations, confirm that property owners are not renting space to multiple RVs, "tiny homes" or similar units, and provide an expedited complaint and inspection process.

Rural property owners throughout the county live in constant fear of wildfires, with narrow roads and evacuation routes that are overgrown, narrow, and overburdened with existing residents. Adding thousands of RVs to these areas is a recipe for disaster.

Regards,

John Regan
14068 Mystic Mine Road
Nevada City, California 95959

Jodeana Patterson

From: Lynn Archer <molly1414@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, August 23, 2025 11:05 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: RV ordinance

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

As a homeowner in Nevada County i am not in favor of allowing people to live in RV on property. I moved from Boulder Creek where my neighbor was living in his RV. The smell, the trash, the generator noise, the hose for waste out the back was all to much. The County refused to do anything and just allowed him to put waste water into the creek.

I did not move here to live in an RV park. There are RV parks for a reason. The trash and sewage that will be put into the creeks and ground will not be acceptable. You will not convince me that the County will stay on top of it.

Then there is the fire risk from extension cords and the noise from generators running all the time.
Lynn

[Yahoo Mail: Search, Organize, Conquer](#)

Jodeana Patterson

From: Leah Freeland <leahfreeland@officecareers.org>
Sent: Saturday, August 23, 2025 11:28 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Alternative housing
Attachments: To Planning dept RV proposal.docx

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Thank you for Reading my letter against this proposal to allow RVs to set up house on private land

Leah Freeland

8/23/2025

To Planning dept. Nevada County

RE: Alternative Housing ordinance:

I am writing to give my opinion on the Alternative Housing Ordinance being discussed.

I am a home owner in Grass Valley, I live on a very long dirt road with most all of the parcels being five acres or more. I believe this proposal will have a huge impact on our home and Road.

1. The proposed plan could possibly turn our very narrow one lane road into an even more busy road. Each additional vehicle is noticed. We have to pull over to let cars by.
2. I also do not understand what you all propose for the sewage/waste issue as I do not see these "Rvs" being taken out to empty on a regular schedule or hiring a company to come and empty.
3. Also I think that this a huge Fire Safety issue, as the RVs that are currently being used here on this road alone are parked very near vegetation.
4. We pay taxes and want our home to retain its value and not have our neighborhood looking like a trailer park.

I sincerely appreciate you considering the opinions of myself, a homeowner here in Nevada County.

Leah Freeland
13973 Hidden Valley Rd
Grass Valley, Ca. 95949

Jodeana Patterson

From: thomas tereskiewicz <tomt4@hotmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, August 23, 2025 12:47 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: renting out trailers on unincorporated land in Nevada County

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Firm yes on that, makes excellent and safe housing for folks who cannot afford a one bedroom apartment but be careful who you rent it to, there are some quirky ones out there for sure!

Thomas Tereskiewicz

Jodeana Patterson

From: Nathan W. <wolfson.nathan@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, August 23, 2025 3:55 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Please make housing easier for everyone

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

As a resident of Nevada County I think it's great that we are finally looking at ways to allow people to responsibly use RVs for year round living. I wanted to voice my support for moving forward with this proposal as long as appropriate sewage accommodation is required and enforced.

Thank you

Nathan Wolfson
Nevada City

Jodeana Patterson

From: Paul Elias <ppcpaule2000@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, August 24, 2025 6:41 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Additional Ordinance Recommendation/Comment: Reporting & Transparency

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Additional Recommendation: Reporting & Transparency

To support enforcement, the County should create an **anonymous reporting system** for ordinance violations, as well as a **direct contact person or office** for residents to check on permit status. Many neighbors may be reluctant to raise concerns publicly, but anonymous reporting ensures issues are identified without fear of retaliation. In addition, a simple public database or lookup tool — similar to what already exists for building permits — would allow residents to confirm whether a property has obtained or applied for an RV permit. Together, these steps will build transparency, encourage compliance, and strengthen community trust in the ordinance.

Best regards,

Paul Elias
Dist 3

Sent from my iPhone

Jodeana Patterson

From: Rebecca Franks <rebecca@rebeccafranks.com>
Sent: Sunday, August 24, 2025 11:53 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Cc: Sue Hoek; BOS Public Comment
Subject: Public Comment on Proposed Alternative-RV Housing Ordinance (PLN25-0084, ORD25-1)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Nevada County Planning Department

Re: Public Comment on Proposed Alternative-RV Housing Ordinance (PLN25-0084, ORD25-1)

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed ordinance allowing recreational vehicles (RVs) as permanent dwellings in Nevada County. While I recognize the urgent need for creative housing solutions, this proposal presents more risks than benefits and does not provide a safe or sustainable answer to our community's housing challenges.

Key Concerns

- **Density in inappropriate areas:** The ordinance allows increased density in rural and high-fire zones that are not designed to handle it. Roads, emergency access routes, and basic infrastructure cannot safely support additional residential use in these areas.
- **Sewage and septic limitations:** Most existing septic systems are not designed for the demands of additional permanent dwellings. RVs were not built for full-time sewage loads, and increased greywater and wastewater pose real risks to our creeks, wells, and groundwater.
- **Lack of enforcement capacity:** Current codes are already under-enforced. Illegal grows, unpermitted grading, and unsafe dwellings continue without resolution. Adding a new category of housing without first addressing enforcement capacity will only multiply these issues. The ordinance does not address whether additional Code Compliance officers or funding will be allocated.
- **Fire and insurance concerns:** Nevada County is already one of the most challenging insurance markets in California due to wildfire risk. Adding more trailers, vehicles, and residents increases ignition sources and creates further hazards in evacuation scenarios. Even with requirements for fire protection plans, real-world compliance and maintenance are unlikely to match the written standards.
- **RVs are not built for permanent housing:** By design, RVs are for short-term travel and recreation. They lack long-term durability, insulation, fire safety, and construction standards for permanent

residential use. Other regions that experimented with allowing RVs as dwellings, such as rural Oregon and parts of Colorado, experienced negative outcomes including failed septic systems, blight, neighborhood opposition, and eventual policy reversals.

- **Impact on community safety and quality of life:** Concentrations of RV dwellings can change neighborhood character, reduce property values, and strain community resources. Although the ordinance intends to limit occupancy to one RV per parcel, history shows that enforcement of such rules is inconsistent.

Conclusion

This ordinance would normalize unsafe, unsustainable living conditions and place additional burdens on infrastructure, fire safety, and community well-being. Nevada County should prioritize durable, code-compliant housing solutions such as incentivizing accessory dwelling units, modular housing, and workforce housing programs. These approaches provide safe, long-term housing without undermining zoning standards or creating new hazards.

Thank you for considering these comments. I urge you to reject this ordinance in its current form and redirect efforts toward housing solutions that support both community safety and long-term sustainability.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Franks



Rebecca Franks, Lic#01186299

REALTOR®, RE/MAX Gold

RE/MAX HALL OF FAME * MASTERS CLUB

Navigating Northern California Real Estate with Expertise!

530-913-5323 | www.RebeccaFranks.com

rebecca@rebeccafranks.com

[776-B Freeman Lane, Grass Valley, CA95949](#)



Jodeana Patterson

From: Ron <ronwerner@comcast.net>
Sent: Sunday, August 24, 2025 12:22 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: No to RV's as ADU's

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

I am against the proposal to allow RV's as dwelling units on private property.
I believe they are unsightly, and a fire hazard.

Thank you.

Ron Werner
13984 Dalmatian Drive
Grass Valley, CA 95945

Jodeana Patterson

From: Jeanne Franklin <jeanneaf@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, August 24, 2025 3:41 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Cc: Jodeana Patterson; Tyler Barrington
Subject: Alternative/RV Housing Ordinance 2025 - Public Draft and Workshop Notice
Attachments: 07.23.2025 RV email to Tyler BarringtonDoc.docx

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Please confirm that my previous comments and concerns provided to Tyler are included in the public draft and workshop. See attached.

Thank-you,

Jeanne Franklin
22605 Swenson Ravine
Grass Valley CA 95949

RE: Should RV's be Homes, the answer is NO 



Tyler Barrington

To: me, Cc: jennyrice@wizwire.com, and 27 others Wed, Jul 23 at 5:37 PM

Hi Jeanne,

Thank you for providing your comments. I will be sure they are included as a part of the public record for consideration of the County decision makers.



Tyler Barrington
Principal Planner- Planning Department
Interim Director- Housing & Community Services

Office: 530.470.2723 Housing Cell: 530.913.3306
www.NevadaCountyCA.gov

*I am out of the office every other Friday as follows: 7/25, 8/8, 8/22 and 9/5

This message is for the designated recipient only and MAY CONTAIN PRIVILEGED OR CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION. If you have received it in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete the original. Any other use of this E-mail is prohibited.

From: Jeanne Franklin <jeanneal@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 23, 2025 4:39 PM
To: Tyler Barrington <Tyler.Barrington@nevadacountyca.gov>
Cc: jennyrice@wizwire.com; Marianne Boll-See <mboll-see@theunion.com>; Scott Thomsen <scott@leftcoastarch.com>; ajyoder12@yahoo.com; cworden33@gmail.com; djweger333@gmail.com; dmzacamy@gmail.com; encoregsd@yahoo.com; fenfrond@yahoo.com; jderobaris@aol.net; lbarhydl@yahoo.com; lori.anne.long@gmail.com; miprechler@gmail.com; osburg530@gmail.com; pepper911.sp@gmail.com; mrcmanaman50@gmail.com; rockinr4364@sbcglobal.net; rfray@hotmail.com; nvf1954@yahoo.com; sage@silcom.com; scheevelr@yahoo.com; segremarcia@gmail.com; tabuela48@gmail.com; ted_holden@hotmail.com; thekmao530@gmail.com; bmccutcheon@prsd.us; wildisdeh@aol.com; zipthegold@aol.com
Subject: Should RV's be Homes, the answer is NO

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Hello Tyler,

"Should RV's be Homes", let's think about the ramifications

1. Will Nevada County create a committee to do random/unannounced checks to ensure that RV's are tapped into a septic systems AND not pulling too much water from local wells?
2. How can the county identify and ensure that "RV's as homes" doesn't constitute as a local marijuana grow bypassing the county rules?
3. Will "RV's be Homes be scrutinized to ensure that "riff raff" including citizens on probation, etc. not be approved?
4. What is the proposal for the number of RV's to property size? The last thing our county needs is to degrade our demographic.

Jodeana Patterson

From: Elaine Ashton <econjoura@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, August 24, 2025 4:32 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: re: RV Housing Draft Ordinance

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

This "idea" to help people who need housing is not helping the homeless people nor is it helping the neighboring people living in stick homes.

Who or what is providing the water, sewage and electricity to these RVs? These people will be no better off than if they were living in the street.

Whoever thought of this idea needs to check if they have a brain because **OBVIOUSLY LOGIC HASN'T PLAYED A PART IN THIS RIDICULOUS PLAN.**

Exactly who is benefitting from this?

Jodeana Patterson

From: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: FW: Opposition letter to RV ordinance proposal

From: Kristen Adams, Realtor <kristenadamsrealtor@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 25, 2025 12:25 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance <AltRVOrdinance@nevadacountyca.gov>
Cc: BOS Public Comment <BOS.PublicComment@nevadacountyca.gov>; Sue Hoek <Sue.Hoek@nevadacountyca.gov>
Subject: Opposition letter to RV ordinance proposal

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

August 25, 2025

Nevada County Planning Department

Re: Public Comment on Proposed Alternative-RV Housing Ordinance (PLN25-0084, ORD25-1)

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed ordinance that would allow recreational vehicles (RVs) to be used as permanent dwellings in Nevada County. I understand and share the concern over housing shortages, but this approach creates more problems than it solves and ultimately puts our community at risk.

Main Concerns

- **Increased density in unsafe areas:**

Many of the parcels where RVs would be placed are in high fire zones with narrow roads, limited water access, and fragile infrastructure. These areas are already difficult to maintain and evacuate safely. Adding more permanent dwellings only makes matters worse.

- **Sewage and septic issues:**

RVs and existing septic systems are not designed for full-time use. Overloading these systems risks contaminating our creeks, groundwater, and wells. Once those resources are damaged, the cost and impact are far greater than any short-term housing gain.

- **Lack of enforcement:**

We already struggle with enforcement of existing codes. Unpermitted structures, grading, and cannabis grows remain unresolved for years. Introducing RV housing without the staff or funding to oversee it guarantees even more violations and neighborhood conflicts.

- **Fire danger and insurance impacts:**

Our county already faces some of the highest wildfire risk and most difficult insurance conditions in California. More vehicles and dwellings increase ignition risks and complicate evacuations. Even with fire plans written into the ordinance, enforcement and upkeep in reality rarely meet what is written on paper.

- **RVs are not permanent housing:**

RVs were built for vacations, not year-round living. They do not meet the durability, insulation, or fire safety standards of real housing. Other counties that tried similar policies have seen septic failures, blight, declining property values, and eventually had to reverse course.

- **Impact on neighborhoods and quality of life:**

Allowing permanent RVs undermines the stability and safety of our communities. Even if the ordinance says "one RV per parcel," history shows enforcement will be inconsistent, and neighbors will bear the consequences.

In conclusion, this ordinance normalizes unsafe and unsustainable living conditions, while increasing risks to health, safety, property values, and our fire-prone environment. Nevada County should be investing in real, code-compliant housing solutions such as accessory dwelling units, modular homes, and workforce housing programs. These approaches provide safe, durable places for people to live without compromising the safety of our community.

For these reasons, I urge you to reject this ordinance in its current form and instead focus on housing strategies that truly strengthen Nevada County's future.

Sincerely,

Kristen Adams

Jodeana Patterson

From: Judi Wade <bjwade@outlook.com>
Sent: Monday, August 25, 2025 4:00 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Alternative RV Ordinance

Importance: High

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

To Whom It May Concern:

I am totally AGAINST permitting or allowing RV's as housing on private properties. I do support "Tiny Houses" as additional housing, however, if they are properly permitted.

I am a homeowner, and also own a towable travel trailer. I realize the daily maintenance required to live in a trailer. They should not be considered for housing, not even temporarily.

Sincerely,

Judi Walcom-Wade
13192 Colfax Highway
Grass Valley, CA 95945
530-272-2445

Jodeana Patterson

From: Joyce Hoffman <joyceasmymself@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 26, 2025 10:30 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: RV housing

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

I can't think of any such housing that hasn't become a trashy site. I've seen it in the Bay Area and I don't want to see it here.

Jodeana Patterson

From: Greg <gregbriggs14@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 26, 2025 4:55 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: RV ordinance comments

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

- 1) how in the world can you tell someone who owns property how to live if they aren't negatively impacting anybody else? If they want to live in a car, an RV or a tent who cares it's their property and they pay the county every year in property taxes to do what they want. It's seems like the County acts like the sheriff of Nottingham sometimes.
- 2) the requirements for a permitted house should be waived.
- 3) there should be no registration or insurance requirements since it's not on the public road.

Jodeana Patterson

From: SharonClaire.com <horsedesigns@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 12:02 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: RV Ordinance YES please read

You don't often get email from horsedesigns@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Hi,

I'm reading extremes online by community members about the very good and the very bad of this ordinance. I'd like to state that I'm very much in favor of this ordinance with some regulation. Those opposing are imagining homeless like camps popping up and devaluing their neighboring properties so some minimal AND ENFORCED regulations for appearance could go a long way as well as requirements for having an operational septic tank or approved composting toilet system. This will help and still go a very long ways toward making housing affordable.

Context: My husband and I built our permitted home in Penn Valley in 2005. We love it here and wanted to be here forever. We have extended family, friends and are very connected to the community. We are now retired on only \$2,000 per month combined social security. I work to fill in the gaps but in our 70's and with him unable to work, it's difficult as the property tax and insurance climbs out of reach for our budget. One solution is for us to sell our home, pay off the mortgage and we'd have enough left over to buy a nice piece of acreage where I can still have my horse. I have done the calculations and we'd easily be able to afford a rural piece of property with septic, well and power but there'd not be enough left over to build a home. So the idea building a carport, a couple of nice storage sheds and hooking up an RV would be a dream come true for us. We are fine with minimal regulations that disallow it becoming a shanty town type appearance. We just want to live out our years here happy and close to those we love and grew up around.

Thank you for your consideration.

Tommy and Sharon O'Brien-Lykins
10887 Horton Street
Penn Valley CA
530-575-0322

Jodeana Patterson

From: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: FW: RVs/Campers as Permanent Housing

From: Ursula Donofrio <ursdonofrio@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 2:14 PM
To: Heidi Hall <Heidi.Hall@nevadacountyca.gov>
Cc: Robb Tucker <Robb.Tucker@nevadacountyca.gov>; Lisa Swarthout <Lisa.Swarthout@nevadacountyca.gov>; Sue Hoek <Sue.Hoek@nevadacountyca.gov>; Hardy Bullock <Hardy.Bullock@nevadacountyca.gov>; Tyler Barrington <Tyler.Barrington@nevadacountyca.gov>
Subject: RVs/Campers as Permanent Housing

Some people who received this message don't often get email from ursdonofrio@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

I am a Nevada Co resident living on four acres off Cement Hill Rd in Nevada City. I have serious concerns regarding the above ordinance. Would anyone be willing to meet with me sometime before the Sept 9 workshop? My chief concern is the increased wildfire threat posed by people living permanently in RVs/truck campers/pop-out campers/travel trailers/etc in the woods. Driving on dry grass to access their camper, cooking outdoors under trees, using gas generators as a "backup" power source (which in reality would be often because there are no real restrictions), etc would greatly increase our wildfire risk.

During an active wildfire, evacuations from the many long, winding, narrow private drives feeding onto Cement Hill Rd would be treacherous....even without the added congestion of additional residents evacuating in RVs and campers. Attached is a photo of my .25 mile driveway only wide enough for one vehicle at most points, with a steep drop-off to Cement Hill Rd. Perhaps my current zoning of "one primary dwelling" per three acres and an ADU meeting strict structural and environmental guidelines was put in place for a reason. The leading advocate for the RV ordinance highlights it would be illegal to evacuate in a camper, yet he openly admits to living permanently and illegally in a trailer at an "undisclosed" location. Rules are just lip service if there is no meaningful enforcement. And some of these RVs are the sole vehicle of the occupants. Also critical, what will all these fire safety and zoning "work-arounds" do to our already skyrocketing Fair Plan rates? The passage of this ordinance would increase "housing" density in an extreme wildfire risk area so of course rates would increase.

I'm also concerned about the threat to our environment, especially our streams, rivers, lakes, and groundwater. Improper sewage disposal is a threat to the environment and our water sources, including the wells providing water to many properties on acreage. My well, currently our only source of water, sits on a neighbor's property--the result of a lot split by a previous owner. We have the sole rights to that (shallow) well, yet the quality of our only water source would be susceptible to yet-to-be-defined "alternative or temporary" sewage disposal workarounds. Proponents claim a signed contract with a pumping company would accompany a portable sewage tank "workaround", but such contracts aren't

binding and can be cancelled weeks later. If one is choosing between food or pumping a full portable sewage tank, my well water quality could be compromised. Many homes on acreage are not connected to public water and rely on wells. Do we have any advocates?

Every meaningful attempt to make the "alternative housing" comply with bare minimum building and environmental safety codes for permanent housing (RV connected to existing permitted water supply and onsite sewage disposal facilities that serve the single-family dwelling; installation of dedicated electrical equipment) allows undefined exceptions/"workarounds", rendering the minimum safety codes meaningless. One such workaround: *all occupants must have 24-hour on-site access to hot and cold potable water, a kitchen, toilet, bathing facilities, and a lavatory sink*. So homeowners would provide their house key to their pop-out tent camper tenants and allow them virtually full reign of their home at all hours and even when they are out of town? Sorry, this is not remotely realistic unless your tenant is an immediate family member.

I know this proposed ordinance is well intentioned on the part of homeless advocates, and may enable Nevada County to increase its "affordable housing" numbers by redefining a pop-out camper or truck trailer as permanent housing. Some federal funds may even accompany this creative re-definition of permanent housing, but the risks to our county's fire safety and environmental integrity are too great. Please do the work to offer viable affordable housing. In the meantime, please consider "no-frills" inexpensive Trailer/RV parks with proper electrical/sewer connections, water service, and garbage service. These should be located in proximity to major evacuation routes. This would be much cheaper in the long run.

Please do not normalize living in a camper as permanent housing, and please consider our environment and the well-being of the community as a whole. Your constituents who do not want to live in a giant campground are late to the party, but our concerns are real and growing as the word finally gets out. No concerted effort was made to alert residents and homeowners before the county survey deadline of Aug. 10. The leading proponent surely got the word out to his pro-permanent camping folks, and now the survey results are touted as proof the county wants this. Nevada County does not have the resources to adequately deal with the onslaught of campers and portable sewage tanks/outhouses, outdoor kitchens, and roaring generators that would follow passage of this ordinance. The beauty and environmental integrity of Nevada County would be diminished irreparably. Please pivot to focusing on making the Tiny Homes on Wheels permit process less expensive. Perhaps retired building inspectors could do a few inspections a month at a discounted contract rate? Folks who are passionate about housing should rent out a spare bedroom in their home. Perhaps the police/sheriff's departments can conduct free basic background checks of prospective tenants? Get creative with viable housing solutions, but please do not capitulate to the permanent camping movement and forever change Nevada County for the worse.

Ursula Donofrio (ursdonofrio@gmail.com)

Jodeana Patterson

From: Hal Redlus <hal_redlus@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 5:09 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Cc: Hal-yahoo
Subject: Opposition to ordinance

You don't often get email from hal_redlus@yahoo.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

My thoughts.

- Folks, the county does not have the resources to enforce codes we have in place now. There is no way they will increase the code enforcement staff and absorb all those costs associated with doing so. You can go to the county web site and see current staff members for Code Enforcement; there are only 7 listed. Even the Nevada City Police department only has one person assigned to code enforcement. Who are you kidding, this will be a total S**t show.
- The county already had a vote and approved THOW. Now the people of “No Place to Go project” are trying to manipulate the board into expanding the ordinance to include RVs which could be a Pickup truck with a camper shell. Seriously, where is the concern for preserving the beauty of our region and making this a desirable place for all, not just the homeless.
- Most of the homeless choose that status so they can do drugs and abuse alcohol. There are plenty of rooms out there for rent and plenty of jobs, but you can't blame employers or landlords for not wanting to employ or rent space to those folks choosing drugs or alcohol.
- The county is desperate for funds. They think that by expanding this ordinance they can claim to meet low-income housing standards and gain access to Federal Funds. Just know, once they see what is happening here, those funds will be pulled.
- Members of the “No Place to Go” project admittedly are already living illegally throughout our county. They are currently writing their own amendments to the draft ordinance. So, do we really want to take direction and ideas from these people who already have disregard for the law? They only want to push the extension of the THOW ordinance to legitimize their lifestyle choice.
- And how about environmental concerns. Besides the increase in fire risk, how about the impact of waste and other garbage / litter? Has there been an environmental study to explore the impact this ordinance will have? There better be or again, the county will be faced with high-cost litigating lawsuits based on environmental violations.

- Police and Firefighters – they do not want, nor do they have the resources to manage this. No debate on that matter. We've all seen this in other parts of the state (and other states), as soon as you change the permission structure around the homeless, they quickly became overwhelmed by more homeless.
- We all want to live in a nice, safe place. We want to look out our windows and see the beauty of Nevada County's trees, hills, creeks etc., not campers and RVs. Where is our pride?
- California has 14% of the country's population but 28% of its homeless population and 51% of the nation's unsheltered homeless.

Jodeana Patterson

From: Michael Testerman <mike.testerman@icloud.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 8:33 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Comments and questions

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

You don't often get email from mike.testerman@icloud.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

The ordinance seems well written, understandable and provides reasonable assurances the RV ADU will be maintained and managed properly.

Question#1. Will older RVs that have been extensively remodeled to comply with more current standards be allowed?

Question#2. How are complaints regarding this ordinance going to be addressed?

Thank you,

Mike Testerman
15810 Brewer Rd.
Grass Valley, CA. 95949

Jodeana Patterson

From: Susan Gill <sulac9@icloud.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 28, 2025 10:40 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Re: RV's

[You don't often get email from sulac9@icloud.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

There should be NO restrictions! We are tax payers Susan Gill Sent from my iPhone

Jodeana Patterson

From: Mary Barrett <mtbarrk9@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 28, 2025 6:23 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Nevada County proposed alternative housing.

[You don't often get email from mtbarrk9@gmail.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

I am not in favor of this proposed housing plan. It has too many wholes in the plan. I do not think it has been vested enough to go to a vote.

Mary Barrett.

Sent from my iPhone

Jodeana Patterson

From: Robert Norman <bnorman@ix.netcom.com>
Sent: Friday, August 29, 2025 8:24 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: I proudly support the unhoused

[You don't often get email from bnorman@ix.netcom.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Just want to be heard that I support No Place To go for the advocates of homeless Sincerely Bob Norman

Sent from my iPhone

Jodeana Patterson

From: Edward Cepeda <cepedaelec@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, August 29, 2025 2:35 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: RV housing ordinance

[You don't often get email from cepedaelec@gmail.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

To whom it may concern,

I have been reading the articles in the Union Newspaper and on the Nevada County CA website regarding RV being used as alternative housing on peoples property.

I do have concerns on this.

I read that you have to at least have 3 acres or more, however what is to stop people from have more than one on their property? Will there be proper monitoring from the county? I also have huge concerns about the septic/waste not being addressed appropriately.

There is a person living on a parcel of land at the beginning of Greenhorn Rd that I seriously doubt has had proper sewage removal since it was moved onto the property over a year ago.

I hate being the person saying "not in my backyard" but I believe this county needs to seriously consider this before acting on this issue.

Sincerely,
Lynette Cepeda

Sent from my iPad

Jodeana Patterson

From: Swenja Ziegler <zieswenja1@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, August 30, 2025 10:05 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Comment on the Alternative/RV Housing Ordinance

You don't often get email from zieswenja1@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Dear Nevada County Board of Supervisors and Community Development Agency staff,

First, thank you for the time, energy, and creativity you have dedicated to addressing housing insecurity in our county. Your commitment to finding solutions to our housing crisis is deeply appreciated.

The draft ordinance appears reasonable overall, but I would like to raise one concern: the restriction that habitable RVs be allowed only on parcels of three acres or more. This requirement unintentionally excludes most properties in higher-density areas. Residents who rely on RVs for housing are often low- or very-low-income, and they would benefit most from living closer to jobs, essential services, and existing infrastructure -- typically found in towns and incorporated communities.

I respectfully suggest broadening the ordinance to allow RVs as permanent housing on any parcel that meets the other requirements, regardless of size. This change would better align the policy with the needs of our most vulnerable neighbors while still ensuring safety and livability standards are met.

With gratitude,

Swenja Ziegler, Truckee

Jodeana Patterson

From: Sharon Loucks <irishfilly17@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, August 30, 2025 11:46 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: RV Housing Comments

You don't often get email from irishfilly17@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Greetings

The proposed regulations are a great improvement on the current. It seems like a lot to manage with the number of units we have in the county. My only concern is adding a consideration for the increased traffic, especially in the case of an emergency evacuation.

I would like to see planning for improving existing trailer parks. The living conditions in many of the units are deplorable. Leaks in the roofs, causing mold and health conditions, are a big concern. I am aware of the grant program to fix trailers. The issue here is that most folks who live in trailer parks do not have shovel-ready bids ready to submit, and most are not capable at completing the online forms etc. So a collaboration with FREED would be better to address the problem.

Better regulations would also help vulnerable people from the abuse of the managers and owners. Regular inspections would check parks that do not maintain water and sewer systems. Yes, Planning Department, there is a lot to be done. T

Thank you for the opportunity to weigh in and for all of your hard work.

Sharon Loucks

Jodeana Patterson

From: Doug Farrell <dougf55@msn.com>
Sent: Monday, September 1, 2025 9:28 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Camping Vehicles as ADUs Ordinance Comments
Attachments: AltRVOrdinance Comments.pdf

You don't often get email from dougf55@msn.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Please accept my attached comments on the subject draft ordinance.

Thanks
Doug Farrell

Nevada County Planning Dept
950 Maidu Ave
Nevada City, CA 95959
Attn : Jodeana Patterson

September 2, 2025

Subject: Nevada County Draft RV Housing Ordinance Comments

Dear Board of Supervisors,

Over the past couple of years Nevada County has made a good effort to increase the housing stock and lower costs. Pre-approved ADU designs and tiny homes on wheels were both approved and made available as lower cost dwellings.

ADUs bring impacts to our neighborhoods, some significant, such as increased neighborhood density and increased traffic on our rural roadways. The impacts effect the things many of us value most about living in Nevada County. But these impacts are probably an unavoidable compromise if we want to deal with our housing shortage. I think that , so far, Nevada County's moves concerning ADUs have been reasonable.

However, I think that the term, "reasonable", does not apply to the newest ADU proposal of allowing camping trailers as ADUs. Permanent dwellings.

I have always been a believer in the value of the building codes and design standards that we use in our country to build our infrastructure, buildings and homes. They represent our ongoing commitment to make our communities safer, more resilient and to maintain our quality of life.

Camping trailers are meant for short term recreation uses and in no way meet the standards of our time tested building codes. Trailers are considered as vehicles and are registered and insured as such. Allowing camping trailers as permanent residences will degrade our long held commitments to building sturdy and safe homes. Although I commend the County's attempt to help the homeless find homes, I think that any possible solution that degrades our housing standards in order to benefit one small group, is not necessarily a solution that is justifiable or beneficial to the community as a whole.

It concerns me that this ordinance could lead to camping trailers becoming the "go-to" ADU in Nevada County. They're much cheaper and easier to install and according to the draft ordinance, any old trailer will do. Is this really what we envisioned when we started down the path of allowing ADUs to share our neighborhoods?

I also must ask if Nevada County seriously intends to enforce this ordinance. We currently aren't enforcing people living in unpermitted dwellings unless a complaint is received. If this ordinance is approved will we begin evicting people from their unpermitted dwellings regardless of complaints? If we don't enforce illegal dwellings why would anyone pay the money required to be in compliance with this ordinance? No enforcement renders this ordinance pointless.

I hope the County abandons this approach and keeps looking for other solutions.

Sincerely,

Doug Farrell, Nevada County Resident, District 1

Jodeana Patterson

From: Adams, Claudia <C5A1@pge.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 2, 2025 10:09 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Comment for Alternative/RV Housing Ordinance Document

You don't often get email from c5a1@pge.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Classification: Public

Good morning,

I will not be able to attend the meeting on the 9th and have comments re: enforcement.

I love this idea and want the implementation to be successful if approved.

We tend to fall short when planning *enforcing* laws and rules once approved and communicated.

Please focus on enforcing the human sanitary and other waste disposal issues as this impacts human health and safety.

Should this ordinance also include WHO will be doing the enforcement as they will likely have to enter private properties to do so?

I hope they are extensions of the Sherriff's department and are armed, trained and skilled at diplomacy, negotiations and are allowed to use whatever tools deemed necessary to evict those not complying with the ordinance in short order including jailing them and removing of and destroying the structures if required.

In my opinion we are not doing a great job of enforcing the marijuana grows in the county due to the lack of authority and staff to enforce the law and don't want to see the same "oversight" made with this new ordinance.

Respectfully,

Claudia Adams
Claudhopper1@yahoo.com
925-200-9732

You can read about PG&E's data privacy practices at [PGE.com/privacy](https://www.pge.com/privacy).

Jodeana Patterson

From: Cultural Preservation Department Inbox <cpd@wiltonrancheria-nsn.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, September 2, 2025 3:02 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Alternative/RV Housing Ordinance 2025

You don't often get email from cpd@wiltonrancheria-nsn.gov. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Good afternoon,

Thank you for your letter dated August 20, 2025, regarding the proposed project. Wilton Rancheria ("Tribe") is a federally recognized Tribe as listed in the Federal Register, Vol. 74, No. 132, p. 33468-33469, as "Wilton Rancheria of Wilton, California". The Tribe's Service Delivery Area ("SDA") as listed in the Federal Register, Vol. 78, No. 176, p. 55731, is Sacramento County. The Tribe's Trust Lands are in Sacramento County however, the Tribe's ancestral territory spans from Sacramento County to portions of the surrounding Counties.

Although your project is within the ancestral territory of the Wilton Rancheria, we do not have any comments and do not wish to open consultation at this time. We appreciate your continued outreach and/ or consultation for future projects and respectfully request that you contact us if there are any project updates or changes.

Thank you,



Wilton Rancheria
*Department of Cultural
Preservation*
Front Desk: 916-313-4493
cpd@wiltonrancheria-nsn.gov

Jodeana Patterson

From: Mark Triolo <marktriolo@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 2, 2025 7:11 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Feedback on Alternative Housing Ordinance

You don't often get email from marktriolo@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Greetings,

I wanted to provide my opinion on the Mobile Home ordinance being considered. I have already taken the survey but felt it was also important to send you this message.

Allowing mobile homes to be used as residences will populate our area with many, many unsightly properties. While we are all sympathetic to finding a solution for the homeless, I think we must consider the rights of residents that already live here. We all live here because of the beautiful environment. To diminish that, reduces the standard of living and property values for all of us. It seems to me that this decision is being made without enough consideration for the rights of existing home owners. We have a right to enjoy our town and the properties we have spent significant money to purchase and all of the work it takes to maintain them.

Please consider our rights when making this decision. We need to give all residents equal treatment.

Please say no to this ordinance.

Mark Triolo
15472 Shannon Way
Nevada City Ca, 95959



8/29/25

Planning Development
950 Maidu Ave. suite 170
Nevada City CA 95959

Re: ALTRVO ordinance

We are strongly against the proposed ordinance that would allow RVs or ADUs on property over three acres. The increasing density of housing on these parcels will greatly increase the risk of fire and demand for other community services. It will also change the character of our community for the worse. The end result will be a rich cultural and environmental community turned into one with county and city services stressed and the quality of the community marginalized.

We have had an experience in our neighborhood of an RV moved on to a neighbor's lot. Initially a few people lived in the unit. Then the rear window was broken out and people began dumping trash in and around the unit. Code Compliance eventually had the unit removed. Unfortunately, it was simply towed to a different location and continues to collect trash.

Thanks for considering our experience and comments as you consider this draft RV housing ordinance.

Take care,

Dan & Dee Desmond

10500 Hawke Lane
Nevada City, California 95959

Artwork by YubaCat Designs

Attachment 3

Jodeana Patterson

From: Rebecca Franks <rebecca@rebeccafranks.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 4, 2025 2:52 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance; bdofsupervisors
Cc: Sue Hoek
Subject: Proposed Alt/RV Housing

You don't often get email from rebecca@rebeccafranks.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

To whom it may concern:

Please submit the following to those considering this proposed ordinance. I am reviewing this with lenders and insurance agents to get their input after they have reviewed the proposed Alt/RV Housing Ordinance.

RE: [EXTERNAL] Question About Proposed RV Housing Ordinance and Insurance Impact

External > @rebeccafranks.com

Summarize this email



Burch Boehner

to me, Jessica

2:42 PM (7 minutes ago) ☆ ↶ ⋮

Hi,

Some important considerations regarding the proposed RV dwelling ordinance. State Farm does not provide insurance coverage for an RV when it is used as a primary residence. Additionally, RV insurance policies typically exclude coverage for "business" uses, such as renting the RV to others. This creates a significant gap in liability coverage for renters and owners alike.

I encourage the County to carefully evaluate the potential implications and challenges associated with allowing RVs as permanent dwellings as it relates to insurance. Let me know your thoughts.

Burch Boehner
CA LIC #0E02761

State Farm Agent

If this communication is securities related, see the [additional disclosures](#).



[Q: 408-287-8190](tel:408-287-8190) (Call, Text, Send Photos) | [Request an Appointment](#)
[F: 408-287-8190](tel:408-287-8190) | [321 S. Monroa Street, San Jose, CA 95128](#) | [Agency Page](#)
[Send Documents, Requests & Photos to: docs@burchboehner.com](mailto:docs@burchboehner.com) | [Quote](#)

Burch Boehner Agency
www.BurchBoehner.com



The Best Compliment is your Referral!

Stay Connected: [f](#) [x](#) [v](#) [in](#) [@](#)

Thank you and please confirm receipt of this email.

Rebecca



Rebecca Franks, Lic#01186299

REALTOR®, RE/MAX Gold

RE/MAX HALL OF FAME * MASTERS CLUB

Navigating Northern California Real Estate with Expertise!

530-913-5323 | www.RebeccaFranks.com

rebecca@rebeccafranks.com

776-B Freeman Lane, Grass Valley, CA95949



Jodeana Patterson

From: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: FW: Proposed Alt/RV Housing

From: Rebecca Franks <rebecca@rebeccafranks.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 4, 2025 3:05:07 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance <AltRVOrdinance@nevadacountyca.gov>; bdofsupervisors <bdofsupervisors@nevadacountyca.gov>
Cc: Sue Hoek <Sue.Hoek@nevadacountyca.gov>
Subject: Re: Proposed Alt/RV Housing

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

It should also be noted and considered that after speaking to a local insurance Broker after review of the Proposed Alt/RV Housing Ordinance, that we have "nothing that would accommodate that usage". In his words, "RV's aren't meant for Full-time living and thus policies aren't available to cover them in that manner". The RV policies available are for Personal and Private use.

As soon as you start renting them, you negate the liability policy as it becomes a "business" and you need coverage for a rental that would include things such as wrongful eviction, etc. Again, this presents a very clear and large gap in coverage and CA Fair Plan won't cover them at all - so NO FIRE COVERAGE.

Please add this to the many reasons why this would be a very short sighted move by the County.

Please confirm receipt of this email.

Rebecca



Rebecca Franks, Lic#01186299
REALTOR®, RE/MAX Gold
RE/MAX HALL OF FAME * MASTERS CLUB
Navigating Northern California Real Estate with Expertise!

530-913-5323 | www.RebeccaFranks.com

rebecca@rebeccafranks.com

776-B Freeman Lane, Grass Valley, CA95949



On Thu, Sep 4, 2025 at 2:51 PM Rebecca Franks <rebecca@rebeccafranks.com> wrote:

To whom it may concern:

Please submit the following to those considering this proposed ordinance. I am reviewing this with lenders and insurance agents to get their input after they have reviewed the proposed Alt/RV Housing Ordinance.

RE: [EXTERNAL] Question About Proposed RV Housing Ordinance and Insurance Impact

External 

 Summarize this email



Burch Boehner
to me, Jessica

2:42PM (7 minutes ago) ☆ ↶ ⋮

Hi,

Some important considerations regarding the proposed RV dwelling ordinance. State Farm does not provide insurance coverage for an RV when it is used as a primary residence. Additionally, RV insurance policies typically exclude coverage for "business" uses, such as renting the RV to others. This creates a significant gap in liability coverage for renters and owners alike.

I encourage the County to carefully evaluate the potential implications and challenges associated with allowing RVs as permanent dwellings as it relates to insurance. Let me know your thoughts.

Burch Boehner
CA LIC #0E02751

State Farm Agent

If this communication is securities related, see the [additional disclosures](#).



Burch Boehner Agency
www.BurchBoehner.com

State Farm

The Best Compliment is your Referral! Stay Connected:     

Thank you and please confirm receipt of this email.

Rebecca



Rebecca Franks, Lic#01186299

REALTOR®, RE/MAX Gold

RE/MAX HALL OF FAME * MASTERS CLUB

Navigating Northern California Real Estate with Expertise!

[530-913-5323](tel:530-913-5323) | www.RebeccaFranks.com

rebecca@rebeccafranks.com

[776-B Freeman Lane, Grass Valley, CA95949](https://www.google.com/maps/place/776-B+Freeman+Lane,+Grass+Valley,+CA+95949)



Jodeana Patterson

From: Chris Lotz <chlutz78@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 4, 2025 4:03 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: RV Lot ADU Use

You don't often get email from chlutz78@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Please your plan to allow on 2 acre parcels or greater.

Thanks

Chris Lotz
Nevada City property owner

Jodeana Patterson

From: Tom Durkin <tdurkin@vfr.net>
Sent: Monday, September 8, 2025 3:37 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: amendments 2 ordinance
Attachments: Alternative housing ordinance amendments.docx

You don't often get email from tdurkin@vfr.net. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Hello,

Please include these recommendations to amend the Alternative RV Housing Ordinance.

Best regards,

Tom

Tom Durkin, Director

No Place To Go Project

530-559-3199

tom@noplacetogoproject.com

www.noplacetogoproject.com

Alternative Housing Ordinance Amendments

The No Place To Go Project ("Project") supports the proposed alternative housing ordinance ("Ordinance"). We have some suggestions to improve it, but we see no dealbreakers. We urge passage of the Ordinance.

It's been our concern all along that the regulations would be so restrictive and expensive that it's just housing on paper, not on the ground. The two-year requirement people will either discourage people from taking advantage of the Ordinance, or they will resort to the unregulated housing black market.

Consequently, the major effect of the Ordinance may be to give Code Compliance the guidelines to require the landlord and/or tenant to bring existing and occupied alternative dwelling unit into compliance instead of forcing the relocation of the tenant.

Code Compliance must remain complaint-driven. Code Compliance must be directed to prioritize bringing violators into compliance. Forced relocation must only be used as a last resort. Meritless and malicious complaints must be dismissed.

AMENDMENT #1 – REMOVE TWO-YEAR PERMIT RENEWAL/INSPECTION

Probably the biggest disincentive to requesting a permit for a legal RV placement is the requirement in Section C.1. of the Ordinance. That section requires a fee and inspection every two years to renew the permit. Very few people are going to want to agree to that. An initial inspection and permit should be sufficient.

AMENDMENT #2 – REDUCE PERMISSIBLE ACREAGE

The purpose of the Ordinance is to provide more housing. Restricting RV tenancy to three acres (Section C.6.) or more limits the availability of housing. We recommend one acre with proper screening and setbacks.

AMENDMENT #3 – INCREASE RENTAL TERM

The purpose of the Ordinance also is to provide housing for low-income locals, not tourists. We recommend changing Section C.5.a. from 30 days to 90 days to discourage short-term rentals.

AMENDMENT #4 – PERMIT REMOVAL OF THE WHEELS

Section C.10. prohibits removing the wheels from an RV. Because we are targeting low-income people who may need rental assistance, we recommend eliminating this provision. By converting an RV to an ADU (accessory dwelling unit), tenants could then qualify for federal rental assistance under the rules of the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), which issues Housing Choice vouchers (aka Section 8).

AMENDMENT #5 – PROHIBIT MOVEMENT DURING EVACUATIONS

Wildfire is a risk to all of us. In the event of a wildfire, we want to prohibit the movement of tiny homes on wheels and residential RVs during an evacuation because of the potential to slow down or jam up traffic. In exchange for the privilege of an alternative dwelling permit, tenants must sign an agreement not to jeopardize everyone's safety by attempting to move their homes during a wildfire warning or evacuation. Penalties could be imposed for violation.

AMENDMENT #6 – LANDLORD-LIAISON PROGRAM

To protect property owners who are concerned about renting to an unhoused person seeking to transition out of homelessness, Nevada County offers a [landlord-liaison service](#) that guarantees rent, offers financial incentives to landlords, and covers repair/replacement costs. Landlords may take advantage of this service by calling 530-878-5088 or writing HCT@amihousing.org.

TIMELY PASSAGE

We don't want any amendments to stop the process if they're going to require significantly more time to modify the regulations. For example, it might require additional staff time to stipulate what kind of support (e.g., blocks, foundation) will be required for Amendment #4.

Passage of the Ordinance should not be delayed because of an approved amendment. The Ordinance should be passed with language stating regulations for the amendment will be generated and implemented within six months after passage of the Ordinance.

Jodeana Patterson

From: Jenna Blore <jennablore@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 8, 2025 1:41 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Cc: munchkintravelsrv@gmail.com
Subject: Comment RE: Draft RV Housing

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

You don't often get email from jennablore@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Hello,

I'd like to add my concerns regarding a couple of things...

As we plan to build in AG zoned area and will need to generate income from many sources. We hoped to have our single dwelling + ADU (in-laws) + Trailer-RV (working farm-guests) + MotorCoach-RV (short term rental).

1. We have a problem with only being allowed to have (1) RV on a property (of 5 acres) AND 'STR' being prohibited.

Side note: What happens when we have family/friends visiting in their RV's for a few weeks, are we fined?

2. New 'Tiny Homes' are usually built with the option to have a small efficient wood stove. Why would this be prohibited? It's so much warmer and cost effective than propane heat.

Honestly, depending on how this goes with all of the restrictions. We may just opt to sell and take our plans to another state or county. We worked so hard to be able to finally buy acreage to build a regenerative farm life, semi-retire my 66 yr old husband, and move back to CA to be with our family. It's looking bleak and feeling like just one big HOA/CCR list of rules. 😞

Maybe we should have focused on a property where we could build a wellness 'retreat' or campground or tiny home village (instead of a farm); would Nevada County allow such a place?

Sincerely saddened,
-Jenna

Jodeana Patterson

From: Sharon Currie <currie.sharon@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 8, 2025 3:22 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: A voice against the Nevada County RV Housing ordinance

You don't often get email from currie.sharon@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Making your problem become our problem via the chaos of allowing every parcel in the county to become a campground, is while incredibly brilliant on your part, equally as disastrous for actual residents who you are supposed to be working for. While some property owners and renters will jump on this money making free for all by attracting a lot of homeless people willing to pay them \$500 a month, the rest of us will be stuck with no recourse on looking out of our windows and seeing the sea of campers next door. Make no mistake. These people are campers. They are camping. When we go to a vacation camp site with our RV or trailer, we aren't living there. We are camping. So let's be clear about the word "housing". RV's and campers are not houses. People who only have them to live in are homeless. They aren't residents. They aren't on vacation. They don't pay taxes. They don't contribute to the economic base of our county and they are already causing trouble every day. Look at the police blotter. Look at the unlawful detainer calendar at our local courthouse with property owners trying to get rid of deadbeat trailer occupants. Ask the many attorneys who get paid to boot these "renters" out, after much pain, suffering and financial devastation by the unsuspecting homeowner. Most property owners are not qualified to judge who is financially stable and who isn't or consider their insurance will be canceled when a field rep drone picks up an aerial shot of their makeshift campground. The fall out is the camper pays his rent for a few months and then stops and refuses to leave. Multiply this by 1000 and you'll get an idea of what the unlawful detainer calendar will look like later should you agree to this myopic view of RV housing being the needed solution. It may be the solution you need, getting all the homeless people in campers off the streets but it merely shifts the problem to us. Can you imagine what will happen when news gets out that Nevada County has decided to make homeless camping on private property legal? There will be a flotilla of derelict RV's and campers on the I5 heading to Nevada County, drawn by the abundance of places to "live". If you think we have a lot of homeless campers now, wait until that happens. This "solution" is not in keeping with your own mission statement "To work with the community to develop sound and innovative public policy, provide strong leadership and deliver excellent services in a fiscally responsible manner". There is nothing sound, strong, innovative or fiscally responsible about this plan.

From a practical standpoint, you might try to make some rules about fire safety, sanitation, water, power and so on. They will all be quickly forgotten amongst a lot of extension cords, PVC pipes into the creek, outhouses (if we're lucky), open fire cooking, and accumulated trash. Not to mention left behind "housing" that these folks just walk away from like we are already seeing here. Permits? Ha. A few property owners might obtain them but why should they? The county already has a known policy of

nonenforcement of illegal camping on private property. You'll either have to continue ignoring the complaints or staff up to service them. Seems to me like the best and easiest path forward is to just say no, get caught up on the complaint stack you already have, and represent the tax paying economic contributor residents of this county, not the homeless population that may be here today and gone tomorrow ... or who will be arriving on the flotilla on the I5.

There is however a problem to be solved. Homeless people are here but there is a solution that doesn't shift the burden to us and provides the safety and organization they need. Like other places have done, take some of your own county owned real estate and establish a fenced off area, not next to residential areas, where RV and trailer camping for homeless individuals is allowed. These types of programs are, I believe, called a "sanctioned camping program". And let that be the only place it is allowed. If you really believe in your mission to be innovative, be like San Rafael California who already did something like this. There are many other places too that have. Google it. Is there any money left in the California Encampment Resolution Funding grant program? Other grants? If you want to be innovative, be forward thinking and take care of these people on land you own, not land we own.

Sharon Currie

currie.sharon@gmail.com

530.559.4439 call or text

Jodeana Patterson

From: Paul Elias <ppcpaule2000@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 9, 2025 7:24 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Cc: Lisa Swarhout
Subject: Comments on Ordinance- Please Add Definitions for 'Temporary' and 'Primary'.

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Hello -

My comment on the draft ordinance is that it lacks definitions in section "B" for:

C. 12.Hability, g.1.

". . . unless an alternative or **temporary** septic disposal methods. . ."

Please define 'temporary' in definitions? Is that 30 days, 90 days, 12 mos, 36 mos??

C.12.Hability, g.2.

" Use of a generator as the **primary** power source for an RV is strictly prohibited."

Please define 'primary'. Is it ok to run off a generator 45% of the time? Or 49.9%, or how does the county determine what primary is. "I only run the generator occasionally to power my lights at night, or to power my AC, or heater. That's not primary. . . Running a generator, especially in summer, and where flammable fuel must be added is extremely hazardous with high fire danger from June until Oct.

Thank you for considering my comments and hopefully defining 'temporary' and 'primary' in Definitions.

Paul Elias
District 3, Unincorporated

Jodeana Patterson

From: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: FW: Alt/RV Draft Housing Ordinance

From: Paul Schwartz <psschwartz21@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 8, 2025 11:12 AM
To: Tyler Barrington <Tyler.Barrington@nevadacountyca.gov>; Lisa Swarthout <Lisa.Swarthout@nevadacountyca.gov>
Cc: psschwartz21@gmail.com
Subject: Alt/RV Draft Housing Ordinance

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Tyler:

I support the proposed Alternative/RV Housing Draft Ordinance. I will not be able to attend the public hearing because I am one of the NU Girls Tennis Team coaches and we have an away match tomorrow. I do have a couple of comments.

1. At a dinner event, a local real-estate agent was drumming up opposition to the proposed ordinance saying it would allow many RVs on a 3-acre parcel.
2. I would reduce the 3 acre minimum to 1 acre.
3. Implementing the ordinance would benefit from some language that speaks to the process to bring existing RV units into compliance. Typically, the RV resident is going to be low income and will need both time and guidance to comply with the requirements.
4. I wonder whether the skirting requirement is needed. We want the RVs to stay mobile in case of emergencies, if I interpret the requirement to leave inflated tires on. I have put skirting on many portable buildings. Taking skirting down is a time-consuming process. The other thing is, on most RVs there is functional infrastructure under the RV. Something to consider.

Thanks for the opportunity to weigh in.
Paul Schwartz

Dear Nevada County Planning Department,

I am writing to you regarding the proposed Alternative RV Ordinance. To begin, Eric Zibbel, housing project manager for Housing and Community Services states that “Manufactured and mobile homes are an important source of affordable housing, but they often have deferred maintenance or aging infrastructure to address.” I agree that those categories of homes are important sources of affordable housing. Eric’s quote also highlights the problems with a particular class of affordable housing, RV’s and trailers. Older RV’s and trailers present a host of problems that are quite serious. They are usually in disrepair, they are poorly insulated, climate control is an issue, and they are prone to mold and pest infestation.

When driving in Nevada County one can observe trash accumulation near encampments which attract pest infestation, which in turn, harm neighborhoods, waterways and pose fire hazards. RV’s and trailers contain flammable materials, and they use multiple fuel sources-propane, electricity, and gasoline, another fire hazard. Occupants are at risk of carbon monoxide poisoning due to the small, enclosed spaces, especially with poorly maintained equipment. RV’s require lots of maintenance and repairs, are people who want to live in an RV ready to take this on?

In the event of a wildfire, if an RV becomes a person’s only means of escape, do you think they are going to comply with regulations that say they cannot drive their RV? No, they will say “to heck with the regulations.” Many roads in this county are single lanes and if RV’s are being driven, especially those in disrepair, then we are all sitting ducks!

Code Compliance freely admits that the majority of current RV dwellers (98%) do not comply with current regulations. If RV’s are allowed, you are opening the door to an influx of non-tax paying people to Nevada County. We will see home and property values decline, there will be destruction of neighborhoods, and relationships with neighbors will weaken and pit neighbor against neighbor due to nuisances, noise, and unsightly living environments.

Look around the county today, the RV's currently being lived in are dilapidated and dangerous.

The County is unable to enforce the regulations already on the books. You will need to hire more employees to inspect and enforce the laws. State law does not generally permit RV's as primary residences. Tiny homes on wheels may be used because they are designed to meet specific standards for permanent living whereas RV's are not!

Solutions to the unhoused should not detract from our community. Leland French who wrote to Other Voices in the Union Newspaper suggested "Safe Sites, Tiny Home Villages" that could provide shelter and needed services. Good idea! Perhaps expanding current mobile home parks with some incentives for the park owners could happen. Perhaps the County could identify plots of land that are available and create an appropriate RV park where everyone is safe-RV dwellers and private property owners alike.

The questionnaire that the County used was not unbiased. Some questions were leading and left no room for disagreement. The number of respondents when compared to the population was very low and not representative of a majority vote. In fact, the entire issue regarding RV's as permanent housing should be put before the voters. A vocal minority is leading the charge and the face of this community will be forever changed if this ordinance is passed.

If you're compelled to have this ordinance pass, then please consider raising property taxes on those properties that allow a RV. They should also be REQUIRED to have additional insurance on their property, and the owner of the RV must have liability insurance! The suggested 3-acre minimum should be increased to a 5-acre minimum and in certain micro-climates you should realize that 2,800 foot elevation gets just as much snow load as 3,200 foot elevation.

Sincerely,

Mary Lee, 13389 Little Meadow Ct., Grass Valley, CA 95945

Jodeana Patterson

From: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: FW: Comment RE: Draft RV Housing

From: Jenna Blore <jennablore@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 8, 2025 1:41 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance <AltRVOrdinance@nevadacountyca.gov>
Cc: munchkintravelsrv@gmail.com
Subject: Comment RE: Draft RV Housing

You don't often get email from jennablore@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Hello,

I'd like to add my concerns regarding a couple of things...

As we plan to build in AG zoned area and will need to generate income from many sources. We hoped to have our single dwelling + ADU (in-laws) + Trailer-RV (working farm-guests) + MotorCoach-RV (short term rental).

1. We have a problem with only being allowed to have (1) RV on a property (of 5 acres) AND 'STR' being prohibited.

Side note: What happens when we have family/friends visiting in their RV's for a few weeks, are we fined?

2. New 'Tiny Homes' are usually built with the option to have a small efficient wood stove. Why would this be prohibited? It's so much warmer and cost effective than propane heat.

Honestly, depending on how this goes with all of the restrictions. We may just opt to sell and take our plans to another state or county. We worked so hard to be able to finally buy acreage to build a regenerative farm life, semi-retire my 66 yr old husband, and move back to CA to be with our family. It's looking bleak and feeling like just one big HOA/CCR list of rules. 😞

Maybe we should have focused on a property where we could build a wellness 'retreat' or campground or tiny home village (instead of a farm); would Nevada County allow such a place?

Sincerely saddened,
-Jenna

Jodeana Patterson

From: Bill Zoller <zollerbill@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 9, 2025 3:34 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: No on this ordinance. It is impractical, dangerous and serves no good purpose!

You don't often get email from zollerbill@yahoo.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Bill and Karen Zoller
116 Starling Circle, Grass Valley CA

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone](#)

Jodeana Patterson

From: Sam Carter <ethylcooter@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 10, 2025 12:01 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: RV'S as permanent housing

You don't often get email from ethylcooter@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Just a quick word from a local to the area,
My vote sits with a strong YES in this matter. The housing crisis that plagues near & far is critical and obviously rapidly becoming more critical as time passes. Small gestures of years past is definitely not enough to solve the crisis. Simply approving RV's for permanent housing on private property, will also not solve the problem, however it may help to reduce it and certainly won't act against it. The obvious answer is Yes my friends & neighbors. Thank you.

Samantha Carter

Jodeana Patterson

From: Nicole Johnson <nic_johnsc@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 10, 2025 2:03 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Cc: scoutburton1@yahoo.com
Subject: RV ordinance Question and Comment about fire insurance rates

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

You don't often get email from nic_johnsc@yahoo.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Hello,

Is there any information about how the proposed ordinance might impact fire insurance rates for home owners? As you may know, rates have gone up significantly. We are assuming that the RV owner/occupant will not be putting money into that pool. If an increase in RVs as permitted living quarters results in hire insurance rates for existing homeowners in these rural communities, we are not in favor of the ordinance.

Thank you,
Todd and Nicole Burton Dog Bar Rd.

Jodeana Patterson

From: Minkel, Peter G.@Waterboards <Peter.Minkel2@waterboards.ca.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, September 9, 2025 11:04 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Cc: Yang, Houa@Waterboards; WB-RB5S-chron
Subject: COMMENTS TO REQUEST FOR REVIEW FOR THE NOTICE OF PUBLIC WORKSHOP FOR PROPOSED DRAFT ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT, ALTERNATIVE HOUSING SUCH AS RECREATIONAL VEHICLES AS PERMANENT HOUSING (PLN25-0084; ORD25-1; EIS25-0005) PROJECT, NEVADA COUNTY
Attachments: PLN25-0084; ORD25-1; EIS25-0005_HY.pdf

You don't often get email from peter.minkel2@waterboards.ca.gov. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Jodeana,

Enclosed are our comments for your Project. We want the permits required for driveways or decks on the record for planning purposes. Please email if you have any questions.

Pete



Peter G. Minkel
Engineering Geologist

R5 CENTRAL VALLEY - SACRAMENTO
401 Certification Unit

Email: Peter.Minkel2@waterboards.ca.gov
Phone: +1 (916) 464-4684

Regional Water Quality Control Boards
11020 Sun Center Drive, Suite 200, Rancho Cordova CA 95670
Website: www.waterboards.ca.gov

Follow: [X](#) | [YouTube](#) | [Facebook](#) | [LinkedIn](#)



Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board

9 September 2025

Jodeana Patterson
Nevada County Planning Department
950 Maidu Avenue, Suite 170
Nevada City, CA 95959
altrvordinance@nevadacountyca.gov

COMMENTS TO REQUEST FOR REVIEW FOR THE NOTICE OF PUBLIC WORKSHOP FOR PROPOSED DRAFT ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT, ALTERNATIVE HOUSING SUCH AS RECREATIONAL VEHICLES AS PERMANENT HOUSING (PLN25-0084; ORD25-1; EIS25-0005) PROJECT, NEVADA COUNTY

Pursuant to the Nevada County Planning Department's 20 August 2025 request, the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (Central Valley Water Board) has reviewed the *Request for Review for the Notice of Public Workshop for Proposed Draft Zoning Ordinance Amendment* for the Alternative Housing such as Recreational Vehicles as Permanent Housing (PLN25-0084; ORD25-1; EIS25-0005) Project, located in Nevada County.

Our agency is delegated with the responsibility of protecting the quality of surface and groundwaters of the state; therefore our comments will address concerns surrounding those issues.

I. Regulatory Setting

Basin Plan

The Central Valley Water Board is required to formulate and adopt Basin Plans for all areas within the Central Valley region under Section 13240 of the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act. Each Basin Plan must contain water quality objectives to ensure the reasonable protection of beneficial uses, as well as a program of implementation for achieving water quality objectives with the Basin Plans. Federal regulations require each state to adopt water quality standards to protect the public health or welfare, enhance the quality of water and serve the purposes of the Clean Water Act. In California, the beneficial uses, water quality objectives, and the Antidegradation Policy are the State's water quality standards. Water quality standards are also contained in the National Toxics Rule, 40 CFR Section 131.36, and the California Toxics Rule, 40 CFR Section 131.38.

The Basin Plan is subject to modification as necessary, considering applicable laws, policies, technologies, water quality conditions and priorities. The original Basin

NICHOLAS AVDIS, CHAIR | PATRICK PULUPA, EXECUTIVE OFFICER

11020 Sun Center Drive, #200, Rancho Cordova, 95670-6114 | www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley

Attachment 3

Plans were adopted in 1975, and have been updated and revised periodically as required, using Basin Plan amendments. Once the Central Valley Water Board has adopted a Basin Plan amendment in noticed public hearings, it must be approved by the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board), Office of Administrative Law (OAL) and in some cases, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). Basin Plan amendments only become effective after they have been approved by the OAL and in some cases, the USEPA. Every three (3) years, a review of the Basin Plan is completed that assesses the appropriateness of existing standards and evaluates and prioritizes Basin Planning issues. For more information on the *Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins*, please visit our website:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/basin_plans/

Antidegradation Considerations

All wastewater discharges must comply with the Antidegradation Policy (State Water Board Resolution 68-16) and the Antidegradation Implementation Policy contained in the Basin Plan. The Antidegradation Implementation Policy is available on page 74 at:

https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/basin_plans/sacsjr_2018_05.pdf

In part it states:

Any discharge of waste to high quality waters must apply best practicable treatment or control not only to prevent a condition of pollution or nuisance from occurring, but also to maintain the highest water quality possible consistent with the maximum benefit to the people of the State.

This information must be presented as an analysis of the impacts and potential impacts of the discharge on water quality, as measured by background concentrations and applicable water quality objectives.

The antidegradation analysis is a mandatory element in the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System and land discharge Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) permitting processes. The environmental review document should evaluate potential impacts to both surface and groundwater quality.

II. Permitting Requirements

Clean Water Act Section 404 Permit

If the project will involve the discharge of dredged or fill material in navigable waters or wetlands, a permit pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act may be needed from the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). If a Section 404 permit is required by the USACE, the Central Valley Water Board will review the permit application to ensure that discharge will not violate water quality standards. If the project requires surface water drainage realignment, the applicant is advised to contact the Department of Fish and Game for information on Streambed Alteration Permit requirements. If you have any questions regarding the Clean Water Act

Section 404 permits, please contact the Regulatory Division of the Sacramento District of USACE at (916) 557-5250.

Clean Water Act Section 401 Permit – Water Quality Certification

If an USACE permit (e.g., Non-Reporting Nationwide Permit, Nationwide Permit, Letter of Permission, Individual Permit, Regional General Permit, Programmatic General Permit), or any other federal permit (e.g., Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act or Section 9 from the United States Coast Guard), is required for this project due to the disturbance of waters of the United States (such as streams and wetlands), then a Water Quality Certification must be obtained from the Central Valley Water Board prior to initiation of project activities. There are no waivers for 401 Water Quality Certifications. For more information on the Water Quality Certification, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:

https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/water_quality_certification/

Waste Discharge Requirements – Discharges to Waters of the State

If USACE determines that only non-jurisdictional waters of the State (i.e., “non-federal” waters of the State) are present in the proposed project area, the proposed project may require a Waste Discharge Requirement (WDR) permit to be issued by Central Valley Water Board. Under the California Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, discharges to all waters of the State, including all wetlands and other waters of the State including, but not limited to, isolated wetlands, are subject to State regulation. For more information on the Waste Discharges to Surface Water NPDES Program and WDR processes, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at: https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/waste_to_surface_water/

Projects involving excavation or fill activities impacting less than 0.2 acre or 400 linear feet of non-jurisdictional waters of the state and projects involving dredging activities impacting less than 50 cubic yards of non-jurisdictional waters of the state may be eligible for coverage under the State Water Resources Control Board Water Quality Order No. 2004-0004-DWQ (General Order 2004-0004). For more information on the General Order 2004-0004, visit the State Water Resources Control Board website at:

https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/board_decisions/adopted_orders/water_quality/2004/wqo/wqo2004-0004.pdf

Dewatering Permit

If the proposed project includes construction or groundwater dewatering to be discharged to land, the proponent may apply for coverage under State Water Board General Water Quality Order (Low Threat General Order) 2003-0003 or the Central Valley Water Board’s Waiver of Report of Waste Discharge and Waste Discharge Requirements (Low Threat Waiver) R5-2018-0085. Small temporary construction dewatering projects are projects that discharge groundwater to land from excavation activities or dewatering of underground utility vaults. Dischargers seeking coverage

Alternative Housing such as Recreational - 4 -
Vehicles as Permanent Housing (PLN25
-0084; ORD25-1; EIS25-0005) Project
Nevada County

9 September 2025

under the General Order or Waiver must file a Notice of Intent with the Central Valley Water Board prior to beginning discharge.

For more information regarding the Low Threat General Order and the application process, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/board_decisions/adopted_orders/water_quality/2003/wqo/wqo2003-0003.pdf

For more information regarding the Low Threat Waiver and the application process, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:

https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/board_decisions/adopted_orders/waivers/r5-2018-0085.pdf

Limited Threat General NPDES Permit

If the proposed project includes construction dewatering and it is necessary to discharge the groundwater to waters of the United States, the proposed project will require coverage under a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. Dewatering discharges are typically considered a low or limited threat to water quality and may be covered under the General Order for *Limited Threat Discharges to Surface Water* (Limited Threat General Order). A complete Notice of Intent must be submitted to the Central Valley Water Board to obtain coverage under the Limited Threat General Order. For more information regarding the Limited Threat General Order and the application process, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:

https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/board_decisions/adopted_orders/general_orders/r5-2016-0076-01.pdf

NPDES Permit

If the proposed project discharges waste that could affect the quality of surface waters of the State, other than into a community sewer system, the proposed project will require coverage under a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. A complete Report of Waste Discharge must be submitted with the Central Valley Water Board to obtain a NPDES Permit. For more information regarding the NPDES Permit and the application process, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at: <https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/help/permit/>

If you have questions regarding these comments, please contact me at (916) 464-4684 or Peter.Minkel2@waterboards.ca.gov.



Peter G. Minkel
Engineering Geologist

Jodeana Patterson

From: Jennai Patterson <tours@nevadacountyvirtualtours.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 9, 2025 2:49 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Please allow RVs as ADUs

You don't often get email from tours@nevadacountyvirtualtours.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Housing is in crisis in Nevada County. It's difficult to fill jobs, businesses are closing, and we are losing our community. RVs as ADUs would go far in helping with this issue. Otherwise, the County needs to not charge for permits. It's out of control.

PS: DOWNLOAD OUR APP! Book shoots, view media, etc.! All from your phone!

GOOGLE PLAY

STORE: https://play.google.com/store/apps/details?id=com.nevcotours&pcampaignid=web_share

APPLE STORE: <https://apps.apple.com/us/app/nevada-county-virtual-tours/id6463821672>

We Love Reviews!

Sincerely,

Jennai Patterson

Nevada County Virtual Tours | Emerald Forest Design

"A great photo is worth 1,000 escrows!"

Cell: 530-277-8575

<http://www.NevadaCountyVirtualTours.com>
tours@nevadacountyvirtualtours.com

11303 Butler Road
Grass Valley, CA 9594

Confidentiality Notice: This message contains information that may be confidential and/or privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, you should not use, copy, disclose, distribute or take any action based on this message. Please advise the sender if you received this message in error. Email messages from us are to be considered privileged information and are not to be forwarded or shared without prior consent. Thank you.

If you no longer wish to receive email communications from Emerald Forest Web Design / Nevada County Virtual Tours, please reply to this message and place the word "Unsubscribe" in the subject field. You can also call me directly at (530) 477-8334. Please allow 48 hours for your email address to be removed from my list. Thank you.



Virus-free. www.avq.com

Jodeana Patterson

From: hal redlus <hal_redlus@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 10, 2025 5:25 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Meeting 9/9/2025

You don't often get email from hal_redlus@yahoo.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Spent time at your event on 9/9 in Grass Valley

Was interesting to hear the many perspectives on this view, and appreciate the time spent putting this together.

Seems the problem here, like every town in CA, is the high cost of housing for people living in the \$0-\$40k /year (possibly up to \$60k/year) income range.

California is expensive.

I've commented on a Nextdoor page and been called 'entitled', 'inhuman', or 'lacking compassion' when i point out one truth that we can not escape. California has a favorable climate, good working opportunity, and is a beautiful place to live, and because of this it is expensive. None of us were guaranteed a home here. No where is it said that any of us have a right to live here even if we can not afford it. Living in California is a privilege that has a price. It's the most expensive state in the country to live.

By allowing a person to live in an RV on a 3 acre parcel next to a home is only perpetuating the problem. It does not solve anything long term. If you put a 1 year, or 2 year, or 5 year review on each permit, all you are doing is putting off for that period of time the person living in that RV's dealing with reality, which is that they can not afford to live where they want to live. In the process you devalue that home and the homes around it, you stress the environment, stress the power grid, and increase hazards in the community. You also invite an element to that community with potential for drug use, crime, violence, and as one person pointed out given you have no limit to the number of people that can occupy that RV, human trafficking. Very real issues. In addition there are the 'feeling' and 'emotion' arguments, or the physical 'eyesore' arguments, but logic should win out.

The community has to put together a central location where people can safely place RV's, where there are hookups, septic or sewage disposal, and easy access to public transportation near work, medical, and shopping centers. In addition the community has to put money into more high density housing options, more apartments.

And, the other reality is, people that can not afford to live in a community sometimes have to move.

Just like i may want to live in Beverly Hills and drive a Bentley, my reality has me in an old house, driving a 25 year old car, eating at home, and living within my means. And, if there comes a time where i can no longer afford to live here i will move somewhere that i can afford to live. That's the logical thing to do. I'm not a terrifically intelligent person, but this simple logic makes sense to me. Why does it not make sense to everyone else?

Jodeana Patterson

From: A Perreault <perreau@msn.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 11, 2025 10:19 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Cc: Heidi Hall
Subject: Comments

You don't often get email from perreau@msn.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

NC - MAC -

The proposed ordinance to define/re-define Alternative/RV housing in Nevada County must be reviewed carefully before any implementation. As with many good intentions, the actual implementation may trigger unwanted results - in this case possible increase in homeless population seeking housing; increase in wildfire activity; increase in garbage and "trash" filled properties.

Although the obvious purpose is to provide housing options for unhoused or low-income residents, it is incumbent upon the County Supervisors and MAC to make sure they understand the ramifications of initiating any ADU housing on existing acreage that is not fully prepared for full time housing - i.e. - water, sewer, defensible space, personal accountability.

Also, would such an ordinance supersede neighborhood CC&Rs that state only single-family homes?

I support the efforts to look for affordable housing options in our county, but do not think this is a good proposal.

Implementing a trailer park or "tiny home" park specifically for unhoused or low-income residents is a much better idea. Encouraging a sense of community and personal responsibility over one's "home" could be part of a planned community with support services and access to other amenities.

Thank you.

Adrienne Perreault

Jodeana Patterson

From: Eleanor Anderson <andersons1991@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Thursday, September 11, 2025 11:37 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: RV Ordinance

[You don't often get email from andersons1991@sbcglobal.net. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

I fully support the proposed RV Ordinance for homeless people. Too often homeless people are forced to hide away and camp out in the woods. This increases the risk of fires. As someone living in the Banner Mountain area it is frightening to think of the consequences. Please pass this ordinance to help with the homeless problem.
Eleanor Anderson 13072 Morro Dr. Nevada City Sent from my iPad

Jodeana Patterson

From: Deborah Gibbs <debgibbs2020@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 11, 2025 12:50 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Comments on RV as Dwelling ordinance

You don't often get email from debgibbs2020@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

First of all, I really appreciate the county's pro-active exploration for answers to our difficult housing issues, and for seeking public input at town halls. Involving the public is not done often enough and it builds good will. In my case, hearing the comments of others at the recent Vets Hall session helped me develop my comments that follow.

I support the ordinance but would like to see some changes.

It does strike me that the ordinance should clarify or separate the 2 big issues. Shelter for homeless, or borderline homeless. And affordable housing for our middle-class residents. The ADU approach does offer home owners a way to obtain income, but the onerous permit requirements and oversight is a disincentive. I believe that ADU's are a smart way to partly resolve our housing issue via existing land and homes. It appears that attracting large development capital does not result in affordable homes (e.g. Loma Rica—where are the townhomes, or even duplexes?).

The RV dwelling should not be tied to an existing dwelling as an "ADU" and a landowner should be able to use their land if suitable for an RV dwelling. In this economy, it is hard to afford any dwelling, and frankly, some existing stick-built houses are vastly inferior to RV's and create danger and blight. Let's keep the playing field level.

I do think the County MUST resolve code barriers and find solutions for alternative sewage and electrical. Safe and creative uses for gray water is needed, as our community can't afford to waste water. Off grid electrical is crucial so we are not captive to the danger and expense of investor-owned utility companies and their long-distance power lines. In my opinion, our proactive county should use its resources to guide and help residents employ safe utility alternatives. For example—electric toilets, waterless toilets, disposal options for black waste, etc. Septic installation costs are beyond the reach of many. And traditional plumbing wastes a lot of water.

The permitting requirement for RV dwellings should not exceed what is expected for other housing types.—no double standards please. The fire danger is a problem no matter what kind of structure exists—the problem is too many people. I could argue that allowing residents to do open burn piles is a health and wildfire risk. There is little punishment if a burn pile fire escapes while it endangers us all and

the fire personnel expense is one more drain on the tax tab. Wildfire is simply a problem all its own and should not factor into this particular dwelling structure issue.

I disagree with the call for increased code enforcement which is expensive, and probably ineffective-- there are far better approaches than "Big Brother" tactics. While there are exceptions, I believe in our small community, landowners seeking bundles of revenue from illegal housing is minor compared to those trying to provide housing for someone in need. More often, the landowner often can't afford building to codes that are designed for those with ample incomes. Instead of conducting code enforcement visits, use county staff to develop guidance and information to assist residents in designing, building and maintaining cost effective, environmental, safe and healthy residences (think about what firewise communities are achieving). For those landowners that are non-compliant, how about using some kind of community arbitration-- preferably with neighbors and landowner, tenants, maybe with a county arbitrator. Peer intervention may reveal alternatives and succeed where county threats, intrusion and fines will not.

The concern that RV dwellers pay fewer taxes may be true. But I would counter that there are many vacant homes and second homes that are taxed at the same rate as owner-occupied residences, which is grossly inequitable. In other States (e.g. Vermont), a non-owner occupied residence is taxed at a much higher rate. While this might raise rental rates, it might also increase available housing. And hopefully it would reduce the number of vacant homes and properties that are a risk to neighborhoods.

To summarize, for affordable housing, the Tiny Homes on Wheels ordinance is terrific example of good housing alternatives. The county should provide incentives to promote expanded developments such as SOL Village that Travis Duckworth is trying to create. The time for co-housing has come, and helping our own local developers who hire local folks is smart investing. County support via zoning, subsidies, marketing, etc. are just some of the activities that the county might employ.

For the unhoused, the county MUST step forward and create a place in a central location with the needed electric and sewage facilities and on-site security. Perhaps a float a bond or do a voter initiative, to finance costs, I think voters would approve. Those who own property (business and residential) should be willing to contribute more via taxes. And residents in these complexes should contribute to the community in some way. The Habitant for Humanity model as a starting point may be a good approach with some adaptations.

Finally, the housing problem may be an opportunity in disguise. The County can proceed with innovation, and clearly many in the public are interested and motivated to find a solution. Make it a partnership, and an example of what leadership and cooperation can accomplish to build for the 21st century, not the 20th, here in Nevada County.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Debbie Gibbs

Nevada City

530-277-4891 mobile

Earth provides enough to satisfy every man's needs, but not every man's greed. Mahatma Gandhi

Jodeana Patterson

From: Nikos Hunner <nikos360@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 11, 2025 1:22 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Comment Alternative-RV Housing Ordinance

You don't often get email from nikos360@yahoo.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

I oppose the Alternative-RV Housing Ordinance because there is no explanation of how this ordinance will be enforced and penalties for not following the ordinance. In the past several years, the planning department has expressed it is unwilling to enforce code compliance issues with RVs. My neighbors bought a 2.5 acre RA zoned parcel and on vacant land they now have 3 RVs and no house. The code compliance department gave me several separate answers on whether or not this was allowed and I was told repeatedly that their department couldn't do anything about this 'because it is difficult to prove that people are living in an RV'.

This Ordinance will impact us because we did not move to a forested setting so that we could have a view of RVs. Our property value has decreased and we would not recover the same equity that we paid for our house.

Thank you for considering my comment

Jodeana Patterson

From: Jo Ann Rebane <jarebane@msn.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 11, 2025 2:14 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Cc: Jo Ann Rebane
Subject: Comments on RV as Dwellings
Attachments: Public comment on RV for ADU 2025.pdf

You don't often get email from jarebane@msn.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Comments – Public Review Draft – RV Dwelling

Comments:

1. How will having an RV as an ADU affect property owner's property tax assessment? How has the Assessor been involved with drafting the ordinance?
2. What enforcement is contemplated? Which agency will respond to what kind of complaints?
3. Who will pay for enforcement activities – property owner, county agency, taxpayers?
4. This RV dwelling review draft is a good try at reasonableness but falls far short. The cost of compliance will not incentivize anyone to undertake all required steps to comply with these rules. Many requirements will be expensive to implement. If the measure is passed as is, without penalties and enforcement provisions spelled out, it will encourage and continue scoff law RVs and continuation of the known health and safety/fire safety issues and dangers well known to all who live and work in Nevada County.
5. Living in an RV for months with fully permitted and operational utilities is not easy. I know this from personal experience, having lived in a 5th-wheel trailer with my family on the site of the construction of our home in the Santa Monica Mountains. The utility connections, especially the “dumping” of sewage is tricky and requires smart use of grey water, additives, and timing. Rain and wind (in SoCal) presented enormous problems with the propane pilot system for heat and water heating. Wind and rain drove us off the mountain more than once to seek safe conditions in town. Heavy rain, snow, and cold here in Nevada County will cause unsafe and difficult times for people living in an RV full-time.
6. I oppose passing this RV dwelling regulation. I have commented in RED on each provision which will be expensive for the property owner to implement and/or where the language of the numbered section is unclear or needs to be expanded.
7. Jo Ann Rebane – Cement Hill Rd., Nevada City, 95959 – 530-470-8444

Section 12.03.151 Recreational Vehicle Dwelling

- A. Purpose - Reasonable regulations – use of RV to provide needed housing for county residents
- B. Definitions – OK
- C. Standards: permits, site inspections, 2 yr -
 - 1. Administrative Development Permit - Permit valid 2 yrs, fee, site inspection, unoccupied w/in 10 days of permit expiration AND should be removed w/in 10 days. Fees should cover cost of removal if property owner fails to remove or tax lien placed on property if county removes.
 - 2. Inspection – OK - \$
 - 3. Certifications – OK - \$
 - 4. Current DMV registration – OK - \$
 - 5. Deed Restriction – recorded – OK - \$
 - 6. Zoning – RV can be an ADU in RA and R1 zones & all Rural zones on minimum 3 acres (allowing on any R1 acreage is inconsistent with preserving the rural character of county)
 - 7. Location – no comment
 - 8. Site Development Standards – no comment
 - 9. Accessory Structures – detached & permitted thru final - \$
 - 10. Foundation: keep wheels on and inflated – OK
 - a) Paved / gravel surface – strict thickness / compactness / slope - \$\$
 - b) Use chocks & jacks, no leveling blocks – preventing the use of leveling blocks assumes that the paved/gravel surface is absolutely level like one would find in a top-notch RV park.
 - 11. Screening – cover undercarriage, wheels, solid & fixed – OK - \$
 - 12. Habitability –
 - a) Live & sleep w heat & light – OK
 - b) Require 24 hour on-site access to ... unclear – is the RV required to be equipped with and provide or does the property owner's residence provide good water, kitchen, toilet, bath and lavatory sink?

- c) Street address – does the RV have a separate street address from the primary residence?
- d) Detectors – OK
- e) Fire extinguisher – OK
- f) Solid Waste – OK \$
- g) Utility Connections & Mechanical Equipment
 - 1. Existing permitted water supply & sewage disposal meeting all regulations including alternative/temporary septic & water – approved, permitted, inspected. \$\$\$ - what consequences if connections are not approved, permitted, inspected?
 - a. Well production – OK
 - b. Keep systems in good working order – OK
 - 2. Electric utility connections (equipment, panels, meters) require building permit. No extension cords or generators. - OK \$\$\$ - what consequences if connections not approved, permitted, inspected?
 - 3. Building permit required for ground mounted propane tank. OK - \$
 - 4. All utility connections (water, sewage drain, fuel supply) must meet regulations and be inspected prior to permitting. – OK - \$ - what consequences if connections not approved, permitted, inspected?
 - 5. No wood burning heat sources – OK
- h) Modification of RV must be to ANSI standards, inspected & approved. – OK - \$ - what consequences if changes not approved, permitted, inspected? How would anyone know about modifications to the RV? Self reporting?
- i) Wind and Snow loads –
 - 1. Above 3,200 ft. an approved, engineered ramada or snow shelter required (or proof that RV meets load standards) – OK - \$\$ - what consequences if snow shelter not approved, permitted, inspected?

2. Above 3,200 ft. snow removal maintenance agreement required – OK - \$ - building department must keep a file? Will it check for compliance and issue fines?
13. Driveways must provide minimum fire safety access – OK - \$ - Which agency checks compliance? Any consequences for non-compliance?
14. Fire Protection Plan – RV must comply
 - a) Applicant for Administrative Development Permit must submit a Fire Protection Plan, approved by County Fire Marshal prior to approval of Administrative Development Permit. Planning Dept keeps original & fire district gets copy. Fire Protection Plan must be site specific & address issues: – OK - \$ - Who qualified to write protection plan? How are representations verified? Any bond required? How is compliance monitored after permit issued and by which agency? Any consequences for non-compliance?
 - b) Issues:
 1. Distance to fire dept & possible response time – OK
 2. Description of access road conditions – OK
 3. Identify RV's emergency water supply – OK
 4. Location of required fire extinguisher – OK, but will the tenant keep it there?
 5. Identify evacuation routes – OK
 6. Describe Fuels Management Plan requiring:
 - a. Defensible space design – who prepares this – property owner, master gardener, forester...?
 - b. Identify high fuel load areas – what proximity? 20 Ft or 100 yds? High fuel loads exist in the entire county – this requirement needs to be much more specific.
 - c. How defensible space will be ensured -
 - d. Mechanism for maintenance of defensible space – OK - \$\$ - Does property owner certify/promise to annually hire weed whackers and foresters to

comply? Must owner provide signed contracts
with weed whackers and tree service companies?

Can he promise to do the work himself? Which
agency checks compliance?

e. Evacuation plan/safe routes – OK

Jo Ann Rebane – Cement Hill Rd., Nevada City, 95959 – 530-470-8444

Jodeana Patterson

From: Rick Hill <rick95648@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 11, 2025 4:53 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: No RV / Tiny homes

You don't often get email from rick95648@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

It's a bad idea to have for RV residents living on a three acre unincorporated lot without fire insurance. Or any other type of safety regulations such as building permits taxes for property and further ordinances of size and space for people.

Please do NOT pass this bill. This is probably when the worst options for individuals to live in especially creating fear and dangerous fire hazards for true homeowners.

Stop stop trying to create workarounds for the permits that are required for owning a home.

Jodeana Patterson

From: chris owen <chris.owen@att.net>
Sent: Thursday, September 11, 2025 6:23 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: RV ordinance

[You don't often get email from chris.owen@att.net. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

My name is Chris Owen. I have lived in Nevada County for over 50 years. I taught at Nevada Union High School for 26 years and nights for Sierra College many of those years. It is past time to deregulate and make living easier in Nevada County for many of our young people, older people, Veterans and those working in service jobs with incomes that often do not support the high cost of renting or owning a home. Let's help be part of the solution in solving the housing challenges that so many find themselves in. Please consider the RV/trailer ordinance as an opportunity to help so many on the edge of homelessness.

Sincerely, Chris Owen
Sent from my iPhone

Jodeana Patterson

From: R-Way Forward-AKA <johngaertner.gaer@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, September 12, 2025 1:14 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Home.

You don't often get email from johngaertner.gaer@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

My wife and I (might) live in a 2024 Mallard RV on private property in Nevada Co with sewer and electric maintained within building codes.

Our home is in better condition than many older occupied stick, mortar, or brick built homes. There is literally no difference between this and a "tiny home", which (as I'm sure you're aware) have already been approved to live in, in Nevada County. "Mobile" Homes have been legal to "live in" for decades, as a friendly reminder.

Keeping this out of ordinance on RVs within code, in good shape, will only blow up an already blown up homeless problems for many... Middle class homelessness... Probably not something to get reelected over.

In our case, the only hope we have is for this to get approved as leaving the State is our only other alternative. What a shame. Tax payers you need. Rebellion and/or tax payer abandonment, probably not.

Signed;
A tax paying resident of Nevada County, California, USA.

Jodeana Patterson

From: ljghiron@umich.edu
Sent: Friday, September 12, 2025 1:14 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Ordinance acreage requirement out of step with survey

[You don't often get email from ljghiron@umich.edu. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

To Nevada County decision-makers,

The proposed RV ordinance's minimum acreage requirement is out of step with the community survey question and results, which, as pasted below, asked respondents to choose among <1 — 1.1 - 4.9 — 5 - 9.9, and 10+ acres. Of the estimated less than half (~835 total question respondents or 44% of ~1,900+) who felt that a minimum acreage should be associated with the ordinance, much more than half of those felt that 1.1 - 4.9 would be an appropriate size. Note that this also means that ~56% felt there should be no acreage requirement or otherwise declined to answer.

And yet, we now have a draft ordinance that mandates lots should be >3 acres, which was not an amount you requested input on. This is distressing to me personally since my lot is < 3 acres - at 2.25 - which seems ample given my land siting and is also well within what community input encouraged. I urge you to reconsider adjusting the minimum acreage downward (for example to 1.5 or 2.0 acres would seem appropriate) to be more in keeping with what you sought input on or otherwise provide us with the rationale you used for selecting the limit be 3 acres, as well as the process by which the minimum of 3 was arrived to, since it is not an amount that you asked about.

Also for the survey, did you somehow only accept responses from IP addresses within the county? I have land in the county and have been following these proceedings carefully; but my IP would have come from outside of it since my current home residence is in a nearby county until when I can make my move full time to my land.

Thank you in advance for considering to revise the minimum parcel size as well as for being transparent about these decisions,

Midge

Jodeana Patterson

From: Stephen Greenberg <sgberg@pacbell.net>
Sent: Friday, September 12, 2025 1:25 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: in support of RVs as ADUs

[You don't often get email from sgberg@pacbell.net. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

County Supervisors -

As a longtime county resident, I write in strong support of this proposal. Although I'm fortunate enough to be a homeowner — to even have a true home, for that matter — I sadly acknowledge how difficult/insurmountable a process that's become for far too many people. Unless and until we create an economy and society that recognizes and enforces legal rights to housing, healthcare, and work, we'll have to rely on reasonable fixes like this one.

- Stephen Greenberg
Nevada City, CA

Jodeana Patterson

From: Stuart Smith <tikalstu@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 13, 2025 9:33 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: RV's can help provide homes to the homeless

You don't often get email from tikalstu@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Many studies have shown that one of the best ways to help homeless people regain a productive life is to provide them with housing.

A place to get off the street in bad weather or overnight is helpful but rarely leads to a permanent solution.

Housing at an affordable cost often does bring about a life-saving change.

I support the Alt RV Ordinance.

I am a citizen of Nevada County living just outside the city limits of Grass Valley.

Stuart Smith

Jodeana Patterson

From: Rona Seabrook <nonarona@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 13, 2025 7:55 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Re: The Nevada County, CA proposed Alternative Housing Ordinance

[You don't often get email from nonarona@gmail.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

> On Sep 8, 2025, at 8:12 PM, Rona Seabrook <nonarona@gmail.com> wrote:

>

> Good evening,

>

> My name is Rona Seabrook.

> I moved to Nevada County in 1977, 48 years ago.

>

> I have owned homes in Nevada City, Grass Valley, and rurally. To see if I wanted to live in LWW, I leased a home for 3 years.

> Over the years, I have hiked and X-county skied much of the county. I must have come across just about every Yuba River swimming hole!

> I was a Realtor with Grass Roots/ Coldwell Banker real estate. I traveled smooth roads and bumpy roads throughout Nevada County.

> I know Nevada County! I know property and homes.

>

>

> Prior to airBnB and VRBO, affordable housing was easier to find.

> Prior to more monied folks moving here, affordable housing was easier to find.

> Prior to Nevada County receiving national and international recognition as a tourist destination, affordable housing was easier to find.

> There are many reasons.

>

> For many folks ; our fellow county parents, workers, retired, there is no available affordable housing. None.

> Families living in illegal homes fear that they will be reported and become homeless.

> Homeless folks work in our county and homeless children attend our schools. With affordable alternative housing, they would have a home, stability.

> People who are at risk of losing their rental will have an option.

>

> Alternative homes of many types have always been here. This is nothing new. I have seen hundreds throughout the county.

>

> I believe approval of the Alternative Housing Ordinance is the right thing to do.. I would make a few changes.

> It is the morally right action and for the good of our county.

- > There are many ways it would benefit our county.
- >
- > I think Nevada County has the intelligence, concern and expertise to do this.
- > As with all change or complexity, situations will arise.
- > The County designs, solves and implements very complex plans.
- > This is doable.
- >
- > As Mr Tom Durkin, and many others ,have so logically and rationally put forth,There is no place to go.
- > I urge the Board of Supervisors to adjust and approve the Alternative Housing Ordinance.
- > Support a place to go.
- > Support a place to call home.
- >
- > Thank you.

Dear Planning Director Foss,

The above is what I said publicly at the The Alternative Housing Workshop.

This is what I added as I spoke at the Vets Hall on 9/9/25.....

Thank you for all the work you have been doing. I've been following the County involvement.

Yes, as prior speakers have said, there are people living in dusty RVs and cars. As I see it, this ordinance will probably not reach many of them. It is aimed at the group already living in alternative homes and those who, with a little support ,could be .

I have seen hateful statements on line. Please stop.

It is important to keep out of unfounded fear and worry. They never solve anything.

My observations of the meeting are.....

Good points were made.

I was disheartened that some speakers hadn't read the proposed ordinance, didn't understand it or were so caught up in their worst scenario fears that exaggeration or falsity was all they could see and say.

I left shortly after the evening was opened to a questions period. I left when someone said alternative RV homes would cause human trafficking. I could sense tension, anger in the crowd from those opposing the Ordinance...possibly bullying.

The last thing I would like to contribute is that I think passing the Alternative Housing Ordinance will help our County in many ways. It is the solution to problems. I could name them but I think I have written enough. If you would like my input regarding County benefits, please email.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Rona Seabrook

- >
- >

Jodeana Patterson

From: on-the-spot <on-the-spot@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Sunday, September 14, 2025 9:16 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Alt RV Ordinance

You don't often get email from on-the-spot@sbcglobal.net. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

To Whom It May Concern,

I would like to say a few words about the proposed ordinance, and even more so for the need to support RV living as an option for citizens who live in RV's either by choice or because they have been priced out of housing, consider the fact that for those who have been priced out of housing, the only other option is living on the street.

The problem of homelessness, instead of getting better despite the community efforts, is not decreasing, but increasing, and will continue to do so because of the fact that wages have not kept up with housing cost increases. Tents on the street will only increase unless and until the public and public officials come to understand that the time for bickering must come to an end and that without viable alternative this problem of homelessness will only continue to grow. It is time to face this issue head on by removing obstacles to alternative living arrangements that will allow people to keep a roof over their heads, even if that roof is supported by wheels.

The chickens have already come home to roost, which can be seen by how large this problem has become in every municipality, due to homeless sweeps and inaction towards viable solutions mainly because some people don't want to see or be inconvenienced by the "problem" of homelessness. The truth is that if things continue in the direction they have been going in, what is to some an eye sore and inconvenience will only be compounded.

Please consider the the fact that whether or not one pays property taxes is not what determines whether one is a human being with innate rights for a place to rest and be safe, and that even those who are property owners to day are just one catastrophic event, or one job loss away from finding them in the same boat. Please act compassionately!

Sincerely,

Heather Ireland



Virus-free www.avg.com

Jodeana Patterson

From: Micah Panzich <mpdesignlb@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 15, 2025 11:28 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Comment from a member of the public

You don't often get email from mpdesignlb@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Hello, I am a resident of Nevada County. I appreciate that the county is trying to do something about low income housing. I hope a solution that makes sense is found. That being said, I oppose this RV housing draft, and I think this idea is bad for the county and its residences.

This RV plan does nothing significant to help with low income housing. Instead, it opens up options that are dangerous, and will put a strain on county resources to enforce the standards that the county is asking for. This puts the environment at risk, and encourages more transient living conditions. This does nothing to improve the livelihood of our neighborhoods, and does not provide a long term solution to this issue.

RV's are not affordable housing. RV's depreciate at a very high rate. We are not doing anyone a favor by encouraging them to make bad investment decisions (as opposed to a tiny house that could possibly appreciate). RVs are not cheap. The RV's that are cheap - are junk, and an eyesore. Do we need a number of RVs in this questionable shape - on our roads during a fire evacuation? Do we need more tarp covered RVs and nuisance properties dotting the county?

Please do not make a decision that will lower the quality of life in Nevada County.

--

Thank You,
Micah Panzich

Jodeana Patterson

From: CARL MCCOSKER <cjmac2@icloud.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 16, 2025 8:19 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Housing

[You don't often get email from cjmac2@icloud.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

I think this is an idea that's time has come. With the extraordinary housing prices in California, lack of affordable housing, and fire threats, having a mobile alternative for low income folks is necessary. If we have a fire, the trailer can be relocated, unlike a house. I believe enforcement of non-licensed trailers would be important too.

Carl McCosker

Jodeana Patterson

From: ken bigham <krbigham@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 17, 2025 7:50 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Proposed Alternative Housing Ordinance

You don't often get email from krbigham@yahoo.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

As is becoming evident from the vocal majority now speaking up, this ordinance, for numerous valid reasons, should not pass as it's written. In fact, I think the Planning Department should focus on removing those in the vocal minority who are currently living illegally in alternative housing-- better known as Class K Housing. They are breaking the law set forth in Nevada County, and it is, therefore, the duty of the Planning Department to identify and remove them.

A more realistic and agreeable ordinance would be to focus on creating low-income RV parks where the Planning Department and other relevant county departments could monitor and regulate those in need of alternative, affordable housing.

Let's not turn the numerous private properties in Nevada County into homeless camps; let's go a different direction in providing the un-housed and low-income population a secluded compound where they can receive services and support that are focused on their special needs, such as job-training, mental health, financial assistance etc.

Thank you for asking for the public's input.

Jodeana Patterson

From: Deborah Van Stone-Stapleton <dvdeborahvs@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 17, 2025 11:31 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Rv trailer parking

You don't often get email from dvdeborahvs@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Hello

This is a great partial solution for the thousands of people in our community that can't afford the high rental prices and/or the lack of availability..as know having a permanent address will also assist the folks still looking for employment on their applications.

Please keep us updated on this project and thank you for supporting this.

Sincerely

Deborah Van Stone-Stapleton

Jodeana Patterson

From: Mark Henry <mark@montoliva.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 17, 2025 12:23 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Proposed ordinance

You don't often get email from mark@montoliva.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Good Day,

I am adamantly opposed to the proposed ordinance that would allow RVs to qualify as ADUs. I live in the agricultural community of Chicago Park. Lots of parcels around here that would qualify for using RVs as ADUs. And too many neighbors who already think they live on the ridge, and don't understand why they should have to pay to remove their garbage when they have acres of land to dump their old appliances and non-operational cars. I can only imagine how much worse these properties are going to look if the residents are allowed to live out of broken down old RVs.

I understand that there is a housing shortage in California. All this proposed ordinance does is push the problem out into what is left of Nevada County's farming communities.

Oh yeah, and I can't believe that Amy over at Environmental Health is ok with this idea. I recall back when some vineyard/winery operations in Nevada County considered allowing the Harvest Host program to operate on their land. Amy made it clear that she would take a dim view of this activity, so none of us participate.

Best Regards,

Mark L Henry
Montoliva Vineyard & Winery
Chicago Park, CA
SBA Certified Service-Connected Disabled Veteran Owned Business

these wines are like tuning forks struck

in an acoustically perfect concert hall

Dave McIntyre, writer for the Washington Post

Mark Henry has his own opera resounding through

the small but historic Nevada County enclave of Chicago Park.

Mike Dunne, Signature Wines of Superior California

Jodeana Patterson

From: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: FW: Have Your Say: Comment on Nevada County's Draft RV Housing Ordinance

From: Steve and Carolyn Battaini <crosjb@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Wednesday, September 17, 2025 5:39 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance <AltRVOrdinance@nevadacountyca.gov>
Cc: Steve Carolyn Battaini <crosjb@icloud.com>
Subject: Fw: Have Your Say: Comment on Nevada County's Draft RV Housing Ordinance

You don't often get email from crosjb@sbcglobal.net. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Please don't fall victim to a bad decision now and in the future. There are so many issues that this will create for Nevada County. You will have created a series of new issues/problems/concerns that will be harder if not impossible to unwind, and is worse than you can realistically imagine. Don't kick the can down the road. **So JUST SAY NO.**

We have several valid concerns about the proposed RV Housing Ordinance, which are listed below in bold print. As a property owner, resident, and community participant we feel that instead of allowing RV as homes (which were never built to house a permanent population), the Co. Planning commission and B.O.S. should focus on creating more RV parks with **proper infrastructure** to support the RV-dependent population. That would mitigate most of the issues below and still achieve your state mandates.

It is all summed up by:

Lack of Infrastructure and Support: in the rural areas. There isn't enough county support for the current residents, and adding more residents is not a good idea. Water, sewer, electricity, fire protection. Need I say more?

Lack of Infrastructure for existing homes and now RVs:

How will the residents disposal of black water and other waste from RVs, particularly in areas with inadequate infrastructure. This is an environmental nightmare in the making. So many will not heed the rules, because of finances and how will you monitor this?
This will lead to the inevitable violation state and local laws, which protect our health and safety, and the environment.

• **Increased Fire & Public Safety issues:**

there is a significant potential for residents living in RVs to impede evacuation routes during emergencies, such as wildfires, due to their placement on private roads, many not are paved and are single-lane roads. The evacuation routes are virtually non-existent and this will only compound the neighborhood trying to flee a significant danger. I know this very well in the Greenhorn area, with NO

formal evacuation routes. It's a disaster waiting to happen and you'll make it worse by adding more residents in rural areas (most of Nevada County).

• **Financial and Legal Issues for homeowners and the County:**

Have you thoroughly thought about the financial implications, including the potential difficulty in refinancing homes with RVs on the property and the added burden of potential insurance and liability issues. This will ultimately lower your property tax base and hamper your financials from the County level.

Monitoring compliance, virtually impossible to handle: you can't properly offload compliance and inspections to a third party. You won't be able to view the RVs from the street in so many cases, and you won't know what you don't know.

All the above bullet points create a bigger problem than the issue you are trying to fix.

In summary if you are going to legalize permanent RV living, there is a better alternative....**the county should focus on creating more RV parks with proper infrastructure to support the RV-dependent population.**

Please respond with any questions or comments, you have about this email.
Thank you,

Carolyn & Steve Battaini
14027 Liquidambar Ln
Grass Valley, CA. 95945
(c) 650-996-1939

Happy Trails, Carolyn

Jodeana Patterson

From: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: FW: Have Your Say: Comment on Nevada County's Draft RV Housing Ordinance

From: Starshine Ranch <Linda@StarshineRanch.org>
Sent: Thursday, September 18, 2025 10:54 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance <AltRVOrdinance@nevadacountyca.gov>
Subject: Have Your Say: Comment on Nevada County's Draft RV Housing Ordinance

You don't often get email from linda@starshineranch.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Below is what my neighbor just sent to you and I heartily agree. **JUST SAY NO!**

Linda Lanzoni

14149 Christopher Robin Way

GV

Please don't fall victim to a bad decision now and in the future. There are so many issues that this will create for Nevada County. You will have created a series of new issues/problems/concerns that will be harder if not impossible to unwind, and is worse than you can realistically imagine. Don't kick the can down the road. **So JUST SAY NO.**

We have several valid concerns about the proposed RV Housing Ordinance, which are listed below in bold print. As a property owner, resident, and community participant we feel that instead of allowing RV as homes (which were never built to house a permanent population).

The Co. Planning commission and B.O.S. should focus on creating more RV parks with **proper infrastructure** to support the RV-dependent population. That would mitigate most of the issues below and still achieve your state mandates.

It is all summed up by:

Lack of Infrastructure and Support: in the rural areas. There isn't enough county support for the current residents, and adding more residents is not a good idea. Water, sewer, electricity, fire protection. Need I say more?

Lack of Infrastructure for existing homes and now RVs:

How will the residents disposal of black water and other waste from RVs, particularly in areas with inadequate infrastructure. This is an environmental nightmare in the making. So many will not heed the rules, because of finances and how will you monitor this?

This will lead to the inevitable violation state and local laws, which protect our health and safety, and the environment.

Increased Fire & Public Safety issues:

there is a significant potential for residents living in RVs to impede evacuation routes during emergencies, such as wildfires, due to their placement on private roads, many not are paved and are single-lane roads. The evacuation routes are virtually non-existent and this will only compound the neighborhood trying to flee a significant danger. I know this very well in the Greenhorn area, with NO formal evacuation routes. It's a disaster waiting to happen and you'll make it worse by adding more residents in rural areas (most of Nevada County).

Financial and Legal Issues for homeowners and the County:

Have you thoroughly thought about the financial implications, including the potential difficulty in refinancing homes with RVs on the property and the added burden of potential insurance and liability issues. This will ultimately lower your property tax base and hamper your financials from the County level.

Monitoring compliance, virtually impossible to handle: you can't properly offload compliance and inspections to a third party. You won't be able to view the RVs from the street in so many cases, and you won't know what you don't know.

All the above bullet points create a bigger problem than the issue you are trying to fix.

In summary if you are going to legalize permanent RV living, there is a better alternative....**the county should focus on creating more RV parks with proper infrastructure to support the RV-dependent population.**

Please respond with any questions or comments, you have about this email.

Thank you,

Carolyn & Steve Battaini
14027 Liquidambar Ln
Grass Valley, CA. 95945
(c) 650-996-1939

Happy Trails, Carolyn

Jodeana Patterson

From: mfurney@aol.com
Sent: Thursday, September 18, 2025 3:09 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: RV Ordinance

You don't often get email from mfurney@aol.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Hello,

I am in favor of allowing all RVs to be considered as affordable residences with following much of the current draft ordinance requirements but with my preferred changes below:

- *A one time fee and inspection instead of the two year renewable Admin. Devel. permit.
- *Allow residential RVs on ONE or more acres.
- *Minimum rental term no less than 90 days to ensure no "tourists."
- *Permit removal of wheels to qualify for section 8 vouchers likely benefitting renters as well as landlords.
- *Allow some kind of amnesty program to prove existing residential RVs can be brought into compliance.

I also feel that the wildfire evacuation negative comments regarding such residential RVs is almost silly. Human beings are already living unhoused throughout the county and somehow those folks must be allowed to evacuate along with housed people. I sure haven't seen/heard Nevada County housed people raise the issue with all the current subdivision, hotel and apartment construction occurring or slated to be built to the extent they have of potentially allowing residential RVs. The frightening reality is that any emergency wildfire evacuation anywhere in this area is likely going to be a cluster no matter what, simply due to the county's geography, topography, fuels and the existing road infrastructure pretty much regardless of who lives where and in what or in nothing at all.

A little info about myself: I have lived in the area off and on for almost 35 years and have owned homes as well as lived in rentals in Grass Valley. I am retired from the United States Forest Service and have worked on many wildland fire incidents in a variety of capacities.

Thank you for your consideration of approving the proposed draft RV ordinance along with my recommendations.

Please let me know this email message was received.

~Mary F. Furney
360 Bennett St. Apt 15
Grass Valley, CA 95945

mfurney@aol.com

Jodeana Patterson

From: Annie Mikal-Heine <Annie@freed.org>
Sent: Thursday, September 18, 2025 3:24 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Support for the Alternative RV Housing Ordinance
Attachments: THOW Ordinance Public Comment - ADRC 5.23.25.docx

You don't often get email from annie@freed.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Dear Planning Commission

I would like to submit the attached Public Comment on behalf of the Nevada County Aging and Disability Resource Connection in support of the Alternative RV Housing Ordinance. This Public Comment was approved by the ADRC Advisory in May, and it reflects our support for the inclusion of Travel Trailers in the Tiny Homes on Wheels ordinance.

Best Regards,

Annie Mikal- Heine

Deputy Director

FREED

Aging and Disability Resource Connection

530.477.3333 x216 phone

annie@FREED.org



This email may contain confidential and privileged material for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any review, use, distribution or disclosure by others is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient (or authorized to receive for the recipient), please contact the sender by reply email and delete all copies of this message. Please consider environment before printing this email.

Public Comment to the Nevada County Planning Department on the Proposed Tiny Homes on Wheels (THOW) Zoning Ordinance Amendments

Dear Nevada County Planning Department,

On behalf of the Nevada County Aging and Disability Resource Connection, which represents a network of local organizations serving older adults and people with disabilities, we want to express our collective appreciation for your ongoing efforts to expand housing options in our community. We commend the Board of Supervisors for adopting the Master Plan for Aging and Disability and for committing to the strategies identified in **Goal 2: Housing for All Ages and Stages**. The Board's directive to allow for alternative building types and your approval of the Tiny Homes on Wheels (THOW) ordinance is a positive step toward fulfilling this commitment and demonstrates your leadership in addressing the diverse housing needs within Nevada County.

As you review this ordinance, we respectfully urge the Planning Department to include options that serve the unique needs of residents over 60 and people with disabilities of all ages, many of whom are on fixed incomes or earn low wages. We believe that broadening the scope to incorporate alternative housing options such as RVs, travel trailers, and mobile homes will provide more comprehensive support. These forms of housing, when upgraded to meet code-equivalent standards, can offer safe and flexible options that are much more affordable and within financial reach for many of our aging and disabled community members.

We advocate for maintaining minimal health standards across all housing types, ensuring they are sustainable and functional. This could involve allowing portable waste removal systems, alternative sewage disposal methods such as composting toilets, and mobile onsite pumping services, which promote health and safety without imposing excessive costs. Additionally, enabling the use of alternative sources for potable water, such as mobile delivery and storage, along with solar panels for sustainable energy, will create a more robust housing policy that supports both affordability and environmental sustainability. Applying these basic standards, along with requirements such as skirting and proper site

placement to increase the residential appearance of travel trailers, will address the urgent need for diverse affordable housing options.

In conclusion, we encourage the Planning Department to embrace a more comprehensive approach that also allows for RVs, travel trailers, and mobile homes, when updated to code-equivalent standards. This inclusive strategy will help ensure a safe, affordable, and dignified living environment for all Nevada County residents, aligning with the Board of Supervisors already established commitment to **Housing for All Ages and Stages**.

Thank you for your continued dedication to addressing the housing needs of our community. We look forward to collaborating with you to develop solutions that benefit everyone.

Sincerely,

Nevada County Aging and Disability Resource Connection
Master Plan for Aging and Disability- Housing Workgroup

Jodeana Patterson

From: DoNotReply@auburnrancheria.com
Sent: Friday, September 19, 2025 9:27 AM
To: Brian Foss
Subject: PLN25-0084; ORD25-1 (Alt-RV Ordinance) Notification Confirmation
Attachments: Thank you for consulting with the UAIC.pdf

You don't often get email from donotreply@auburnrancheria.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.



Thank you for submitting your project notification to the UAIC. Our Preservation Department conducts a thorough review of all submissions through our Tribal Historic Resource Information System (THRIS). We will reach out if there is a potential to impact Tribal Cultural Resources or Historical Properties.

Due to the high volume of projects we process, a lack of response from our department indicates that no consultation is necessary and no concerns have been identified. Please keep this email for your administrative record.

You will find a copy of your consultation submission attached for your records.

**This is an automated email. Replies to this address will not be received.

Nothing in this e-mail is intended to constitute an electronic signature for purposes of the Electronic Signatures in Global and National Commerce Act (E-Sign Act), 15, U.S.C. §§ 7001 to 7006 or the Uniform Electronic Transactions Act of any state or the federal government unless a specific statement to the contrary is included in this e-mail.

Jodeana Patterson

From: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: FW: Notice of Public Hearing (for PC 10/9/25 meeting): Alternative/RV Dwelling Ordinance (PLN25-0084; ORD25-1)

From: Rona <nonarona@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, September 19, 2025 9:32 AM
To: Jodeana Patterson <Jodeana.Patterson@nevadacountyca.gov>
Subject: Re: Notice of Public Hearing (for PC 10/9/25 meeting): Alternative/RV Dwelling Ordinance (PLN25-0084; ORD25-1)

You don't often get email from nonarona@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Hi Jodeana,
Thank you for the notification.
I am very comfy in my home, one of many I have owned, and I fully support this ordinance. It is a missing piece.
Rona Seabrook
Sent from my iPhone

Jodeana Patterson

From: john murray <eldorado37@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, September 19, 2025 10:15 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Cc: john murray
Subject: RV's for the Homeless

You don't often get email from eldorado37@hotmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

To Whom It May Concern

Just a short note regarding you all on making a decision on the recommendation I see is coming up.

I understand where and why this is in the works

If you want to approve this I have no problems in trying to help the homeless, but if you are thinking about out in the county area which is not within the city limits, then I will vote a "NO" as the rural county areas are not to be used, we have enough fire problems in rural Nevada County keeping the fires down as it is and you know and I know and so do all the citizens of Nevada County with all the problems you all ready have in Grass Valley/Nevada City, etc. trying to keep the county safe as it is right now, then I would definitely put down a NO VOTE for this ordinance if it's for Rural Nevada County, The cities can't handle the problem now, so how do you expect rural Nevada County citizen's to do better than the cities can't.

John R Murray

Alta Sierra Resident

Jodeana Patterson

From: Bridget Storie <bridgetstorie@icloud.com>
Sent: Friday, September 19, 2025 10:32 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Alta Sierra RV

[You don't often get email from bridgetstorie@icloud.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Absolutely NOT!!!! we already have small congested roads, and a case of a fire. We don't need to worry about a bunch of RVs blocking the streets do not flood Alta Sierra with a bunch of RVs!!!!

Bridget Magnusen

Jodeana Patterson

From: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: FW: Notice of Public Hearing (for PC 10/9/25 meeting): Alternative/RV Dwelling Ordinance (PLN25-0084; ORD25-1)

From: Rick Hill <rick95648@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, September 19, 2025 10:36 AM
To: Jodeana Patterson <Jodeana.Patterson@nevadacountyca.gov>
Cc: Brian Foss <Brian.Foss@nevadacountyca.gov>
Subject: Re: Notice of Public Hearing (for PC 10/9/25 meeting): Alternative/RV Dwelling Ordinance (PLN25-0084; ORD25-1)

You don't often get email from rick95648@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

I vote no.

Jodeana Patterson

From: Gregory Barker <barkercpa@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, September 19, 2025 11:16 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Ordinance

You don't often get email from barkercpa@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Hello,

I would like to comment on the RV draft ordinance. I am definitely in favor of allowing RV's to be considered legal dwelling units.

I am hoping the board will make RV's legal without requiring a single family residence on the property. There are many people in the county who have land and because of COVID cannot afford to build a home on their property. An RV offers an affordable alternative to building a conventional house.

Many opposed to the ordinance seem to think this an ordinance that is only for homeless. I see it as an affordable option (RV without SFR on land) for working class folks in this county to buy land and live in an RV. They will add to the property tax base which will help out the county financially as well. I think it is important in our county that working people can afford a home.

The other critique I see is that the roads will be clogged with RV's in the event of a disaster. Assuming the population in the county does not increase, there should not be an increase in vehicles in the event of a disaster. And I doubt all RV owners will be fleeing in their vs their car.

Thanks for the opportunity to speak and I applaud what the county is doing by moving in this direction!

--

Gregory Barker, CPA
PO Box 640
Chicago Park, CA 95712
(530) 273-8531

Jodeana Patterson

From: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: FW: Alternative Housing Draft Ordinance

From: Bridget Storie <bridgetstorie@icloud.com>
Sent: Friday, September 19, 2025 11:31 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance <AltRVOrdinance@nevadacountyca.gov>
Subject: Re: Alternative Housing Draft Ordinance

You don't often get email from bridgetstorie@icloud.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Thank you for taking the time to read that and reach back out. I truly believe that will cost too many issues in the community and we already have enough as it is. And especially if we have to evacuate I feel that that puts us all in danger also. There are enough spaces and places to not add that to our area. Please and thank you

Bridget Magnusen

Jodeana Patterson

From: Rebecca Rickey <becca4255@icloud.com>
Sent: Friday, September 19, 2025 11:45 AM
To: Brian Foss
Subject: RV Public Hearing

[You don't often get email from becca4255@icloud.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

This is my public input. I don't think the current ordinance solves any problems related to housing at all. Only a limited number of people would be able to rent an Rv Space and even at that, the spaces would be limited given the parameters 3 acres with a single-family home one RV per property.

Additionally, allowing an RV to stay on a property as long as there's an active building permit for three months is not reasonable either;who can build a home in three months?

People are living in RVs anyway, if RVs are fully self-contained, and there are facilities to dump the , they meet basic health and safety regulations. If they didn't, RV manufacturers would be out of business.

I had hopes and dreams of buying some land, developing it with utilities and then when I could afford it, putting a manufactured home on it or a prefab, but that would take a lot of time and money, but that would be the only way I could have a proper home someday. Your proposed regulations are killing a dream.

I'm sure there are many more people in the same predicament.

I currently have an active building permit in another county. I live in an RV on the property with Septic electric and water. My property is fully fenced. You wouldn't even notice that I'm there. I'm not creating any health and safety issues yet, my permit will be expiring and I will have to move. I won't be able to live on my own property. It's like this all around the country. It's ridiculous.

What you're proposing as a solution is not sustainable, and it helps a limited few.

I also noticed a short of a long-term RV parks in the area.

So when people in RVs, don't meet the criteria to live on land and there are not enough RV parks for them to stay, they will have to leave and go somewhere. Where?

And you call this a solution to the housing crisis?

Rebecca Rickey
928-274-0044
Wishing You The Best in Life

Jodeana Patterson

From: Susan Hufford <susan_hufford@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, September 19, 2025 1:08 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: RV ordinance

You don't often get email from susan_hufford@yahoo.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

To whom it may concern,

I am a resident of Alta Sierra. I would like to inform you of my support for the ordinance to ALLOW RV's on property over 3 acres.

As a property owner, It should be my legal right to do what I want with my property! Do not take our rights away!

I hope you can support what Community members actually want!!

Thank you,
Susan Hufford

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone](#)

Jodeana Patterson

From: Robin Nichols <robin4realty@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, September 19, 2025 3:31 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: RV Ordinance Draft
Attachments: RV Ordinance Comments Submitted by Robin Nichols.pdf

You don't often get email from robin4realty@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Hello,

I attended the meeting at the GV Vets Hall and would like to formally submit my comments for review. Please see attached.

Thank you,

Robin Nichols

Robin Nichols, Owner/Broker

South Fork Realty

"Experience, Integrity and Over-the-Top Service!"

Nevada County Association of Realtors Masters Club 2015 - 2024

(530) 277-2589

CA BRE license # 01932643

September 19, 2025

To Whom It May Concern:

I am a 50+ year resident of Nevada County and a local Realtor®. I attended the meeting regarding the RV Ordinance at the Grass Valley Vets Hall and appreciated learning more about the ordinance and hearing the comments and suggestions of others who attended. I wanted to formally submit my comments for consideration.

- **This ordinance is for the benefit of rule-followers, not rule-breakers.** We all know that there are property owners who have multiple trailers and make-shift dwellings on their properties already. This ordinance will neither alleviate nor aggravate that issue. Those who currently disregard the zoning laws will likely continue to do so, but people wanting to legally house family members, friends, or create passive income, will be able to do so relatively inexpensively, compared to a stick-built or manufactured home.
- **Allow RVs (and Tiny Homes on Wheels) to be primary residences, not only ADUs.** Mobile homes are already allowed as primary residences in mobile home parks, but these parks do not offer housing security, as the space rents rise yearly. RV parks are even more expensive (the new local park across from the fairgrounds is over \$100/night!). If they're good enough to house people in RV and mobile home parks, they're good enough to house people on their own property! Many people can afford to purchase and improve a plot of land with the required services, grading, etc., but can't also afford to build. Many choose to live in RV's because they're affordable. Some would like to park an RV on a family member's or friend's property, while others would like to live in an RV full-time on their own property. As long as all the required infrastructure is in place to support a residence, whether it be stick-built, manufactured or mobile, if RVs are considered adequate dwellings, they should be allowed as primary residences.
- **Extend the occupancy permit to 5 years rather than 2 years.** The initial investment required of property owners is substantial (grading, electrical, water, septic, pad, possibly a ramada) for only a 2-year guaranteed use. The inspections are expensive, take county resources to complete, and five-year periods should be sufficient.
- **Allow the wheels to be removed** so renters can qualify for housing vouchers.
- **RVs should be allowed as residences in town, connecting to city services, with the same setbacks and parking requirements as those required for primary residences and ADUs.** Until RV's are banned from being parked in town, they should be allowed as residences. An RV is an eyesore to many people, regardless of whether or not it's housing someone full-time. Pushing RV occupants solely to rural areas makes those who require assistance even more reliant upon others for transportation to and from their medical care, groceries, etc.
- **RVs should be allowed on lots smaller than 3 acres, as long as all setback requirements can be met, including well and septic.**
- I know some people are concerned that RVs used as residences will degrade the neighborhoods, yet I see RVs parked in plain sight in front of million-dollar homes.

- **Property owners should pay county and city taxes on residential RV's and tiny homes to support county services/roads/schools/fire mitigation/etc..** These services benefit the property owners and their tenants/guests just as much as they benefit residences of stick-built 2nd homes and ADUs.
- **RVs should not be tarped if within the sight of the road or a neighbor** (should be behind a privacy fence or sufficiently distanced from the property line).
- **RE: Concerns about impact on emergency/fire routes:** From my understanding of the ordinance as proposed, RV's will not increase density any more than is already allowed by adding an ADU or expanding a primary residence, as RV dwellings would still require sufficient sewage disposal. With sufficient sewage capacity, a homeowner could expand their primary residence to create a J-ADU, or add an ADU on their property, which would add the same density. Therefore, the argument that RV's will impact fire escape routes because of the added housing density isn't a valid one.
- **The number of residents allowed in the RV should be limited by the septic/sewage capacity servicing it, just as with an ADU/primary residence.** I believe the county environmental health assumes 2 people per bedroom? While RV's may have multiple sleeping areas, the allowed occupancy should be based upon the septic/sewage capacity.
- **Contrary to some comments, there is no evidence that RVs as residences will affect the lendability of a property.** RVs are licensed as personal property, not real property. They neither add to nor detract from the value of real property, and appraisers don't evaluate RV's when inspecting a property for lenders.

More thoughts:

- Curious what the reasoning is behind skirting an RV. Also, why does this ordinance not allow Park Trailers as defined by HSC Section 18009.3? If they're allowed to be permanent/full-time dwellings in mobile home parks, they should be allowed for similar use on private property.
- Most RVs aren't well insulated; nor are they built to withstand extreme weather or to last decades. That said, people are, in fact, enjoying the use of RVs that are decades, perhaps even half-a-century, old. My personal preference would be to see more sustainable, eco-friendly, permanent structures built as affordable housing, but RV's can and do provide affordable housing to many who might otherwise be homeless.

Respectfully submitted,



Robin Nichols
PO Box 2562
Nevada City, CA 95959

Jodeana Patterson

From: Stacy Stanley <2stacystanley@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, September 19, 2025 7:35 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: RV ordinance thoughts

You don't often get email from 2stacystanley@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Why Unrestricted RV Living on Parcels is Problematic

1. Building Code & Safety Concerns

- **Different Standards:** RVs are built under recreational vehicle standards, not HUD housing or local building codes. They are not engineered for long-term residential use, especially in rural climates with extreme heat, cold, or fire risk.
- **Fire Hazards:** Improvised or overloaded electrical connections pose major risks. Unlike permitted wiring, RV hook-ups may not be inspected or designed for continuous residential loads.
- **Structural Safety:** RVs are not built to withstand snow loads, earthquakes, or other local hazards. Allowing them as permanent dwellings circumvents protections already in place for residents.

2. Utility & Environmental Risks

- **Septic Systems:** Safe wastewater disposal requires a permitted septic system. Illegal hookups or makeshift dumping contaminate groundwater, wells, and local streams. Improperly handled sewage creates serious health hazards.
- **Water Supply:** Rural parcels often rely on wells or limited water rights. RV use increases demand without infrastructure planning.

- Electrical Systems: DIY or unsafe connections (extension cords, ungrounded plugs, backfeeds) create both fire danger and power instability for surrounding properties.

Consequences if ignored: ground contamination, public health crises, higher fire insurance rates for entire neighborhoods, and expensive county cleanup interventions.

3. Enforcement Challenges

- Who enforces? Counties would need to assign code enforcement or planning staff to monitor compliance. This stretches already limited resources.
- Compliance issues: If people ignore septic and electrical rules now, what guarantees they would follow new RV ordinances?
- Consequences: Without strong penalties, violations would go unchecked. With penalties, enforcement becomes costly and adversarial. The balance of benefit vs. risk tilts toward risk.

4. Community Impacts

- Property Values: Nearby homeowners may see reduced property values if RVs—with visible tanks, tarps, or makeshift hookups—become common. Appraisers factor neighborhood character and safety into valuations.
- Neighborhood Standards: A proliferation of unpermitted RVs undermines the investment residents have already made in their homes, and creates tension between neighbors.
- Precedent: An ordinance permitting RVs everywhere would make it difficult to restrict unsafe or inappropriate uses later.

A Better Alternative: Purpose-Built Mobile Home Communities

- Localized Development vs. Scattered RVs: Instead of allowing RVs to appear haphazardly on individual parcels (creating enforcement challenges and safety risks), rezoning to allow more mobile home or manufactured housing parks would centralize affordable housing options in properly serviced areas.
- Economies of Scale:

- Mobile home parks can be designed with shared infrastructure (permitted septic, water, and power systems) rather than each RV owner improvising.
- Residents benefit from lower monthly space rents, since costs are distributed across many households.
- County agencies have a single, centralized site to inspect and enforce standards.
- Preservation of Rural Character: Concentrating affordable units in designated parks avoids the “shotgun approach” where RVs appear unpredictably across neighborhoods, protecting the property values and aesthetics of rural areas.
- Flexibility: Modern manufactured home parks can be designed to include tiny homes, park models, or manufactured homes, giving residents a range of safe, code-compliant, and affordable housing types in one place.

Summary Statement:

Allowing unrestricted full-time RV use on parcels not designed for it may seem flexible, but it bypasses safety codes, strains rural infrastructure, creates enforcement problems, and lowers neighborhood property values. Safer, code-compliant alternatives already exist and should be prioritized.

Summary -Alternative Solutions :

Instead of weakening countywide standards by scattering RVs, consider rezoning to allow more mobile home/manufactured housing parks. This strategy balances the need for affordable housing with the community’s interest in safety, aesthetics, and property values, while making oversight and utilities far more manageable.

Thank you,

Stacy Stanley
530-277-9577
HomeSmart iCareRealty

Jodeana Patterson

From: Tracy Huston <tracyehuston@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 20, 2025 7:49 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Cc: Brian Foss; Tyler Barrington; Ryan Gruver; Sue Hoek; Alison Lehman; George Schureck; Trisha Tillotson
Subject: Support for passing the RV Ordinance

You don't often get email from tracyehuston@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Nevada County BOS, CDA Directors and Staff, and Community Stakeholders:

I think it is safe to say that few if anyone would choose to live in an RV unless they had no place else to go. That the cost of housing is beyond reach of so many--including hard working people who have jobs--is a tragedy and an undeniable reality. As the president of a housing nonprofit that builds affordable housing and who appreciates what our county and other housing nonprofits do to address what is a true emergency, I can tell you that despite our collective best efforts, we simply do not have the resources to meet the need. For the few units our community land trust had available this summer, I was inundated with calls from working people desperate for something they could afford, and we now have a growing waiting list that breaks my heart. Cashin's Field reportedly had a waiting list of over 1000 households. When observing a homeless family asking for money at the grocery store parking lot the other day, my granddaughter asked me, "Why can't we just build houses for them?" I told her we are trying, very hard. She was distraught seeing kids her age and younger who had no home to go to, and rightly snapped back, "Well you should try harder". We should and we do, everyone involved in affordable housing, every day. But until we find more solutions than we have now, for those faced with no affordable alternatives, an RV is without doubt the only acceptable choice--far safer than living on the street, in a car, or a shelter, and far better than emergency housing in a hotel room, especially for families.

So, while RV living is not ideal, as a necessary, humane, safe, and immediately feasible solution I wholeheartedly support the RV ordinance. And I have to say with confidence that there is no reason to fear it. Having built several homes in western Nevada County, I have had the pleasure of working with every department at CDA for many years now, Planning and Building, Environmental Health and Public Works, as well as our wonderful fire departments. Without exception, the expertise, diligence, and by-the-book oversight with which county staff support the development of housing of all types is extraordinary. We can trust that the exceptional care with which staff are developing the RV Ordinance will assure that necessary standards for health and safety are met, protecting neighbors and occupants alike.

Also speaking from direct experience, I feel we have no cause to fear those who live in RVs. Those I have known who live in RVs are good, hard-working people who simply have no other place to go. One is a

family in my neighborhood who lost their home in a fire, and while both parents work, cannot afford the high rents around here and so stay in their RV on a kind lady's land with their two delightful children. Another is a single mom of three whose husband left them and who subsequently lost their Lake Wildwood home, ending up in a tiny room at the Booth Center until the mom found work and they were forced to leave, earning too much to stay in the shelter yet not enough to afford high rents, so had no recourse but to go to live in an RV on land they owned as the only affordable solution. Another is a ranch hand who not only cares for the land but has also done wonders for the entire community by brushing to help achieve their fire-wise community status. Sure, there are bad actors; but they live in all kinds of homes--the worst in my neighborhood were drug dealers who lived in the nicest home on the road, thankfully now gone. We cannot judge our neighbors by the type of home they live in. And we cannot turn a blind eye to what is a housing emergency due to the high cost of homes that many hardworking, decent people simply cannot afford.

So, as the county and our local housing nonprofits are striving to build affordable homes to address the crisis, for as long as the need far outpaces our capacity and funding to provide them all, as the fastest and most affordable housing solution by far we need RVs to help assure shelter for everyone, now.

I therefore urge passage of the RV ordinance, and with the suggested modifications from The No Place to Go Project that will assure it actually benefits those in need. As a matter of fairness in terms of land use policy and all other codes, and practicality in enforcing codes, the RV ordinance should be no more restrictive than the Tiny Homes ordinance already passed (which pose the very same health and safety concerns as other types of RVs and yet are far less affordable to low income people), or than the existing RV temporary occupancy ordinance which has worked just fine for years, or with restrictions that exceed what is required for site built and manufactured homes (e.g., once permitted, they do not require subsequent inspections, as proposed in the draft RV ordinance, and may be built on any parcel subject to land use zoning, density, and setbacks). We need legally consistent and objective standards for all occupancy types, including those adopted for the RV ordinance, without prejudice.

Lastly, for those already living in RVs who wish to come into compliance, as cost will surely be a prohibitive factor for many, I suggest the County seek sources of funds for grants to help with the costs. The public funds needed to bring RVs and utilities to code will be far less than what is required for new construction of affordable housing units and other forms of emergency housing assistance, and will benefit far more households in shorter time--while also improving neighborhood health and safety.

I thank all who have contributed to the draft ordinance and the public input process.

Respectfully,

Tracy Huston
President, NevCo West CLT
www.NevCoWestCLT.org
1-310-663-1296 cell

Jodeana Patterson

From: Gerard Gorman <jgor99@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 20, 2025 10:28 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: RV proposal

You don't often get email from jgor99@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Dear Board Members,

My wife and I had looked into buying a "tiny home" a few years back. The price's due to this years rampant inflation has put them out of reach for us so we looked at trailers of at least 25'. This is something we can certainly afford and they have more space and amenities for a lower price. I was a housing provider in Los Angeles for 30 years under rent control and never had a problem renting my units if I kept rents below local market value. We plan to do discounted rent here for a local Working Class person in Nevada County if this proposal goes through. I do hope you all vote for this measure and try to alleviate at least some of our local housing problems. Thank You.
g.r. Gorman

Jodeana Patterson

From: Gregory DeYoung <gregdeyoung@comcast.net>
Sent: Saturday, September 20, 2025 10:48 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Support for Alternative RV Housing Ordinance

[You don't often get email from gregdeyoung@comcast.net. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Dear Nevada County Officials.

I am writing as a Nevada County resident and former environmental planning professional in support of the proposed Alternative RV Housing Ordinance.

County land use regulation is important to protect the quality of the environment and our residents. At the same time, regulation needs to keep up with evolving community needs. It is clear that affordable and flexible housing for our residents is a critical issue today. The younger generations can't afford to stay; many older residents can hardly afford rising costs and do not have many housing options; the under-employed face similar housing scarcity. These people are critical to the well-being of our county.

The Alternative RV Housing Ordinance would these community members with another legal option for living in the county. Yet, the proposed ordinance would have reasonable limits and conditions.

Please approve the Alternative RV Housing Ordinance.

Thank you,
Greg DeYoung

Jodeana Patterson

From: Barbara Gentry <bgentry_51@hotmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 20, 2025 11:28 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: I Support Alternative RV Housing Ordinance

You don't often get email from bgentry_51@hotmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Dear Nevada County Officials,

I'm a 40 plus year resident of Nevada County and retired educator in favor of the proposed Alternative RV Housing Ordinance.

Affordable housing is at a CRISIS point in Nevada County. The Alternative RV Housing Ordinance would allow LEGAL options for many local citizens to stay in the county.

Please approve this ordinance.

Barbara Gentry
545 Jordan St.
Nevada City, Ca

Get [Outlook for Mac](#)

Jodeana Patterson

From: shawn Vandervort <wapati12004@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 20, 2025 12:19 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Rv Ordinance

[You don't often get email from wapati12004@yahoo.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

NO.
Sent from my iPhone

Jodeana Patterson

From: Lance Goddard <lancegoddard@mac.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 20, 2025 12:32 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: RV Ordinance

[You don't often get email from lancegoddard@mac.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Although I am sympathetic to the ridiculous price of housing, I am strongly against the proposed ordinance. This ordinance will allow for a degradation of our neighborhoods and will also serve as a magnet for the additional inflow of people within the margins. The additional threat of fire will be experienced by all and we cannot afford to ignore the growing threat of the fires set by individuals, nor should we accept the additional threat to escape routes if a fire is nearby.

Lance Goddard

Jodeana Patterson

From: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: FW: Alternative Housing Draft Ordinance

From: ken bigham <krbigham@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 20, 2025 12:33 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance <AltRVOrdinance@nevadacountyca.gov>
Subject: Re: Alternative Housing Draft Ordinance

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Hello Jodeana,

Thank you for responding to let me know my input was received and will be on the public record. As this Alternative RV Housing Ordinance proceeds, I will offer my input as information becomes apparent. One thing I read recently was the following from the Planning Commission:

PROJECT LOCATION: Countywide. **RECOMMENDED ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION:** Recommend the Board of Supervisors find the project categorically exempt pursuant to Section 15305 of the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines.

My research showed this:

Section 15305 of the [California Environmental Quality Act \(CEQA\)](#) Guidelines designates a categorical exemption for Minor Alterations in Land Use Limitations. This exemption applies to activities that involve minor changes to land use rules or limitations, provided they occur in areas with an average slope of less than 20% and do not change the actual land use, density, or result in the creation of new parcels. Examples include minor lot line adjustments, setback variances, and the issuance of minor encroachment permits.

I really don't think that this proposed Alt RV Ordinance is a "minor alteration" since it could likely affect whole neighborhoods and their environmental quality. As a resident of Nevada City for 52 years, I'm appalled and baffled by the direction our county government is going. More than ever, I ask that this ordinance either be drastically changed or dropped.

Thank you.

Jodeana Patterson

From: Joan Goddard <joango@icloud.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 20, 2025 12:36 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: RV ordinance

[You don't often get email from joango@icloud.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

I have a lot of empathy for the people who are unhoused and need an affordable place to live and understand the motivation of those who want to make RVs available for them. However, I am not sure this is a practical or best solution.

Where are these RVs going to be located? On whose land? Will this be close to neighbors? Who will carry the liability for such dwellings? And what about the threat of fire, escape routes for evacuations? etc. I'm sure there are many more questions to ask but these come to mind as I wonder who is going to have the resources to maintain these RVs and will there be regulations for upkeep, repair, appearance, uncluttered surroundings? etc. Will the cities bear the cost of enforcement of such regulations?

I am against this ordinance and also worry that this may bring more problems to this community than we already have. Let's find another solution.

Joan Goddard
Sent from my iPad

Jodeana Patterson

From: Pete Stockdale <petestockdale10@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 20, 2025 1:15 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Current new proposed RV ordinance.

You don't often get email from petestockdale10@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

The current RV laws are inadequate. The current laws allows residents to be removed from their necessary homes. This is a case of government act, not justifiably, against the will of the people. It is, a case where county building inspectors, who ostensibly are to protect public safety, perform no such service. In fact, the fines related function simply as revenue raising. In a sense, it creates welfare to the unneedy that perform limited service. This is a classic case of those who oppose big, unnecessary government fund as reprehensible. It can serve as fuel of an antigovernment movement that can results of more widspread antigovernment movement in Nevada County.

Jodeana Patterson

From: Lora A. Moore <Lora.A.Moore@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 20, 2025 3:12 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Comment for consideration
Attachments: RV Ordinance Ltr 9-18-25.docx

You don't often get email from lora.a.moore@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Please see my attached letter regarding the above.

Thank you for acknowledging receipt of my email.

Lora A. Moore
916-549-4449

Lora A Moore
13075 Woodstock Dr
Nevada City, CA 95959

Nevada County Planning Department
950 Maidu Ave., Suite 170
Nevada City, CA 95959

altrvordinance@nevadacountyca.gov

September 18, 2025

Re: COMMENT REQUESTED FOR PROPOSED DRAFT ZONING ORDINANCE
AMENDMENT TO CONSIDER ALLOWING ALTERNATIVE HOUSING SUCH AS
RECREATIONAL VEHICLES AS PERMANENT HOUSING
(PLN25-0084; ORD25-1; EIS25-0005)

I am still opposed to allowing RV's, campers, vans and tents as Accessory Dwelling Units on private property.

While I appreciate that some guidelines have been placed on the size of property and setbacks, length of time between permits and inspections I do not see anything that addresses the more compelling reasons to NOT ALLOW THIS.

The county already has several "boot-leg" residents living on unincorporated property. Some are being charged rent and may have compliant hooks up for sewage but they are uninspected and unregulated. What will be done about this?

Many of the proposed vehicles are older and may not even be road-worthy. In the event of a fire what is to prevent these vehicles from trying to evacuate and breaking down along the roads that the rest of us are trying to use in our cars or trucks?

Who is going to police the unregulated properties, some of which are populated by "tweakers" who are the ones who may very well be igniting the fires that get out of control?

I see more problems than benefits unless the county will step in and regulate/inspect all properties which is probably unfeasible.

Thank you for considering my input.

Lora A Moore

Jodeana Patterson

From: Kristen Lucas <lucas.kristen@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 20, 2025 3:50 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Rv ordinance

You don't often get email from lucas.kristen@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Dear Members of the Planning Department,

I am writing to express my strong support for the ordinance allowing residents to live in RVs and tiny homes on their own property. I believe this is a vital step toward addressing housing affordability and providing residents with more flexible living options. If residents are not allowed this option it could mean extremely increased rates of homelessness given the current skyrocketing cost of living.

However, I would like to respectfully urge the Board to expand this ordinance even further. In my own experience, despite having a college degree and working multiple jobs, I still found it incredibly difficult to afford traditional housing, especially when I encountered medical issues. Without the option to live in an RV, I genuinely might have ended up without any safe place to stay.

For individuals like myself, and many others dealing with environmental illnesses, chemical sensitivities, or mold toxicity, traditional housing can sometimes pose serious health risks. Being able to choose an RV, a tiny home, or a naturally built dwelling that meets our unique health needs is not just a preference—it's essential.

I believe that on private property, it should be our right to choose the type of dwelling that works for us, whether that's an RV, a tiny home, or a naturally built structure. Expanding this ordinance to include more flexible zoning and permitting would help ensure that many residents can find affordable and healthy places to live. In my opinion, allowing these alternative types of housing is crucial to maintain compassion and freedom in our communities.

Thank you for considering my story and these suggestions.

Sincerely,

Kristen Lucas

Jodeana Patterson

From: cofnevco@gmail.com
Sent: Saturday, September 20, 2025 5:59 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: RV Ordinance Response

You don't often get email from cofnevco@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Charisse Lolli
15729 Little Valley Rd.
Grass Valley, CA 95949
(530) 913-3945

Response to Proposed Recreational Vehicle Dwelling Ordinance

Let me start by saying that overall, the following items are all reasons this proposal should be withdrawn in its entirety, and reconsidered at a later date when answers have been provided.

Although I appreciate how the high rents in California, and specifically Nevada County, make it unaffordable to many who would like to make it their home. Perhaps it has even been their home for many years, but can no longer afford it. It's a sad state of affairs, but our situation is not unique to Nevada County. Economics make it necessary for many to uproot and seek out areas that are affordable, as myself. But I am truly frightened that the County Seat has overstepped its purpose by lowering health and safety standards in trying to control local economics.

This proposal should not even be considered as a solution to the lack of affordable housing in Nevada County. The economics of this plan do not work. Besides creating more fire dangers and costs to each of us who pay for homeowners' insurance, there is no clear explanation of how this ordinance will provide the "needed housing for County residents", which suggests creating "affordable" housing. But according to *No Place to Go*, they are advocating this ordinance to provide rentals of the RV's for about \$500 per month (Not clear is this was per person or per family). These folks need **low**-income housing, and that is only available with assistance programs (Section 8 housing). Has Nevada County provided an outline of average costs to pay for the improvements, permits, licensing, maintenance, insurance, etc. on this proposal? Are those small rents going to satisfy the needs of the investor who has paid to create this rental? Or will the rent be comparable to what is already available for a traditional cabin or room rental? If this is meant to help those in our community who cannot afford the cost of renting in a home, this will not help them. I believe that this proposal should be subject to an Environmental Impact Study and Report to explain financial figures and calculations, and identify how this actually helps those who need it.

In spite of our attempts to avoid what Study Area Assessments state that "**Alta Sierra has the most significant potential for a catastrophic wildfire event**", (along with 4 other areas) as cited by Supervisor Ed Scofield in October 2024, Alta Sierra is **STILL** trying to identify and improve the insufficient evacuation routes for fire events to serve the existing allowable density. There are still sections of our area that have not qualified for Firewise Certification. After 4 years of extreme tree removal by PG&E, we're left at the mercy of Cal Fair Insurance from year to year, **IF** we are even offered

the last option of insuring our homes with Cal Fair Fire Insurance (at the 500% increase to our premiums). It continues to make home ownership unaffordable to all of us, not just renters. As long as those costs continue to escalate, so will the cost of renting! Our fire danger has us listening for notifications from the WatchDuty app and Yubanet on our phones to monitor the daily fires within our communities in case we will have to pack up or evacuate along with only "Go Bags" for immediate evacuation. I have had to load my car more than once, ready to drive away and never see my home again. In this atmosphere, I wonder why Nevada County Planning Department would state that the only way to help the "housing shortage" is to increase our density with recreational vehicles that are not intended for full-time residency... they are not approved for full-time residency by either the manufacturers of the RVs, DMV, or the Insurance industry. Before our County is endangered any further, we would rather that Nevada County enforce what is already the law. You know there are over 1000 illegal RV's now. Correcting these infractions could go a long way in decreasing our fire danger rating, and thus our cost of living in Nevada County. Additionally, You EIR should include a statement from Cal Fair that assures us this ordinance will not deem us any higher of a danger, and that their policy will not affect any other insured against the acts of a neighbor's decision to call an RV a house. I believe this proposal will open the door for denial after denial for any Fire insurance coverage in Nevada County, along with denial of payment for any fires caused on property where an RV is used full time. Insurance agents have expressed fear and uncertainty how Cal Fair will deal with this proposed change.

There is no question of the substandard housing provided in an RV. That is why it is not ever suggested to be used for full-time habitation. Standard RVs are normally built with materials that are easily penetrated by rodents. Beside the health dangers of rodent infestation, the rodents chew on the easily accessible wiring and create dangerous situations for residents and neighbors of electrical shorts and fire danger. RVs are rarely salvageable after serious damages. They have fewer outlets and a smaller load capacity than a home, a common occurrence of loose connections, vibrations causing bad ground connections and propane system leaks, they are hard to keep warm, require continual use of space heaters in a small space, and have warnings against any unattended cooking, and close quarters are all high-risk situations that can cause ultimate fires. RVs are not homes, nor do they improve your property like a home or ADU. They are personal property assets, like cars, that begin to depreciate to zero value as soon as you put them in service.

At the meeting, and by comment, many have suggested that Nevada County do some site preparation on a property that we, the Public, already own. It would be infinitely easier to develop and maintain a parking facility for those who have access to various housing types, but cannot afford park fees. We could create such a facility to charge rent at an AFFORDABLE rate with the proper hookups and/or services that they need... to help them improve their situation and work toward better situations. I would consider my tax dollars to be better spent on that than this proposal!

In your townhall meetings, we also heard from realtors how having a view of an RV from a neighbor's established home instantly reduced the value of that home \$10,000. Your proposal has no size restrictions on any accessory structures to these RVs, like decks, porches, sheds, gazebos, ramadas. All of these things easily double the footprint of the RV. When any RV is in view from a neighbor's home or regular outdoor entertainment area, the property owner should be required to obtain permission from that neighbor to proceed. Any permit granted should have written waivers from property line neighbors, along with agreements as to any additions allowed to expand the RV footprint with anything except a moderate porch not being allowed as an add-on. If your plan is to help us stay housed in Nevada County, you should be doing things that build our value instead of tearing it down. This forces our older population to move from Nevada County because we can no longer afford a home... even after being a resident of 50 years! Help protect our value... don't tear it down.

Since an RV is not an approved Habitable residence, you have not provided any calculation specifics for additional septic needs when an RV is added to an existing system. This could also be addressed in an EIR. Although you state within this proposal that a site will meet the requirement of Local Area Management Plan (LAMP) and Onside Wastewater Treatment System (OWTS), these are State Guidelines based upon houses, which do not approve vehicles used as Habitats. I believe that transparency suggests that you have certainly studied this issue already, and have designed an outline of how you will determine the septic needs of an RV. Readily published documents for California state that a residential septic system size is often based on 150-200 gallons of wastewater per day for a 3-bedroom home. Sewage tanks in RVs can hold from 15 to 40 gallons of concentrated black water (sewage). Septic systems are designed to handle

a continuous flow of wastewater, not the large sudden volumes dumped from RVs. Your proposal only mentions that the RV be hooked up to an existing septic, and nothing more. If there is no upgrade to the septic required, it suggests that everybody's septic system is sufficient for more bedrooms than we have been permitted for. Secondly, you give no information on how you will determine the needs, since having an RV for full-time habitation is never recommended, and thus has no specifications. Clearly, the 1000+ RV's that have already been established illegally within our county, if they are hooked up to a septic at all, are likely hooked up to a dwelling that has already been built with the number of rooms they were allowed with their existing septic system and leach field, and are currently misusing permitted improvements. Although smaller in living space, the size of the RV does not change the water usage or septic needs per individual. If the RV can sleep 6 people (and some sleep 8), then it will produce at least as much wastewater and sewage as a 3-bedroom house or more. Additionally, because the RV has a holding tank, chemicals are used that destroy the beneficial bacteria that a septic system relies on to break down waste. Without the proper bacterial action, the waste in the septic tank will not decompose correctly, and may cause solids to build up faster, leading to a clog in the leach field. Do your calculations coincide with that, or stricter? You have not provided any guidelines.

The most serious fire hazard with the 1000+ known RVs not permitted within our county, is that none of them have a legal, permitted, and inspected power source completed by a licensed Contractor. Nor have they been inspected by County Fire Marshall. This is terrifying, but our county's lack of enforcement is the same as having no laws at all. Your community is depending upon you to maintain our Safety and Health standards. Any discussion of a 'grace period' for compliance should be administered with the same time guidelines as any house with those same compliance issues. Proposals should not be discretionary to any particular group of people. Personally, I found myself having to find a rental for a number of months, and found that MOST of those rentals offered on social media were not legal at all, and had extension cords, along with 2nd structures hooked directly to the Power panel on the main house, really anything with 4 walls and an extension cord was being offered. I would like Nevada County to inspect publicly advertised rentals for compliance. Instead, you are relying on the folks who are desperate to find a place to live to file a complaint, although we are willing to pay more than their worth for these rentals because that is what you allow to exist in our county.

I'm sure it was embarrassing to be faced down by your most vocal offender, claiming to set up over 300 units himself. I don't find it comforting to hear him say how he's doing it with all the things Nevada County would require if you allowed it, when it is obvious he is not. It's lack of County enforcement that gives him freedom to boldly proclaim his lack of adherence. At least it should be easy for you to identify the whereabouts of these units for safety and compliance if you should ever decide to enforce the code.

As a prerequisite to any consideration of acceptance, Code Enforcement must personally search out, and respond to anonymous calls, about RV's currently being used as illegal dwelling units, and then cite and cause the property owners to relocate those RVs to a legal location/condition. I see RV's and trailers that are butted against existing homes in our neighborhoods to presumably create more living space for more inhabitants than the dwelling was built for. Enforcement should have been done prior to the writing of this Draft Ordinance! It's time landlords provide safe rentals for their renters and their neighbors who will suffer from any calamities caused by their presence. Imagine a landowner rents out an RV, with or without any hook-ups (because they are ALL illegal!), and then it burns down the homes, or inhabitants. Nobody's ridiculously expensive insurance will cover any part of that loss since it was used illegally, even if Nevada County calls it a habitable dwelling. (Can Nevada County guarantee that they will?) Unless Code Enforcement will site the discrepancies for correction, you should consider yourself equally responsible for our safety that is being sacrificed.

Permits should last for a period of one year. That is how long a rental lease lasts. That is how long the DMV registration lasts. Additionally, you should be checking for proof of the right kind of insurance. Lack of inspection except for every two years is turning a blind eye, again. If Nevada County Code Compliance is too busy to enforce it, you should not allow it. If you are relying upon our cooperation to report it, then you should make the information available online at "My Neighborhood" updated with both cited and legal RV sites that have been identified, along with the type of RV to make sure that hasn't been changing. That will give your community the tools we need to report any "overstaying" or illegal RVs that we see. Those that have been recognized for 90 day emergency stays, or those that have been cited, could contain the cite date for our review.

There is no reason why a rented RV-type structure should change characteristics to an on-road Recreational Vehicle during its permitted period, although owners should be able to relinquish any permits during the time period, at which time all anchors can be removed and connections unhooked, and coverings of undercarriage can be removed as they are back to being classified as a Recreational Vehicle. Any use after that should require a resubmission. In other words, once you have identified the RV-type structure as a home, you can't unhook it and travel across the country, and then come back and re-connect it to water, sewage, electrical, propane, etc. without going through all the permits, applications, and inspections again.

Your statement about a current DMV Registration only provides proof of ownership, and suitability for road travel, not residency or habitability. But, some of those structures you are mentioning don't even require any recording of ownership, and can be swapped out with others very easily... (truck camper?) Your proposal lacks a statement that any of these RV-type structures even need to be owned by the property owner. The ordinance contains no mention of who owns the RV/motorhome, but it should. If applicable with DMV, the homeowner needs to be the titled owner. In any case, the deed restriction should also state the identification of the RV-type structure that has been permitted. To have a third-party hold title, or units that swap from time to time, will create a chaotic responsibility issue that will make any attempt to enforce unattainable. Additionally, if the landlord is renting out the RV-type structure as a residence, you should be requiring them to carry a Commercial Rental policy in addition to their Homeowners policies to cover damages to neighbors and themselves. Homeowner insurance companies do NOT insure a Recreational Vehicle as a residence.

Although the Ordinance of 2023 allowing ADU's and JADU's specifically excludes RV's because they are not designed for year-round occupancy, you are now trying to cancel that statement. Forgive me for saying so, but this is not very trustworthy behavior. Additionally, in the face of our State agencies deeming RV's as NOT a full-time habitable choice, you are trying to redefine the basic meaning without voters' approval. The implications on the Tax Assessor, Collector, and Code Enforcement are enormous, and your proposal clearly demonstrates that you not ready to accept any responsibility in this matter.

After hearing Tyler Barrington express the future plans, I was left with the impression that you have plans to reconsider the numerous complaints and concerns, but will use the responses and townhall meetings to tweak the ordinance with concerns as you can, rather than eliminate it. I think by doing so, you eliminate the obvious choice of recognizing that the proposal is faulty and needs to respond to the multitude of questions you have not provided answers or solutions to. Sometimes the answer is an easy NO.

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to an issue that affects everyone's ability to live here.

Charisse Lolli

Jodeana Patterson

From: Anthony Barnosky <tonyandliz@me.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 20, 2025 8:24 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Against Alternative RV/Housing ordinance

You don't often get email from tonyandliz@me.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Dear Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to express my concern about the Alternative RV/Housing Draft Ordinance, and am urging you to vote no on the draft as it now stands. While I recognize that the homeless crisis in Nevada County is growing as it is throughout the nation (actually, the world), the ordinance does little to address it in a meaningful way. It basically just allows for pushing people with housing issues up into the woods where there are no services to help them. A much better solution would be to designate a few acres of Nevada County-owned land for housing people transitionally in their RVs, where they would be proximal to county services that could provide both the infrastructure and social services to help the transition to more permanent housing and jobs.

The Alternative RV/Housing Draft Ordinance does take a stab at codifying RV-living on private land, but falls short in the following ways, particularly for the Banner Mountain area where I live.

Enforcement. The county enforcement team already is overstretched, with hundreds of outstanding complaints to investigate. The proposal should not be approved unless there is an adequate increase in the county budget for enforcement to be effective. Ideally enforcement should include monthly inspections by county personnel of all RV sites on private land. Otherwise it is not feasible for neighbors to report code violations without trespassing. The added enforcement expense should not be an added burden on county tax payers. It potentially could be at least partly mitigated if landowners who are allowing RVs to be installed on their land pay a fee commensurate with what the added enforcement costs would be. And if fines were substantial for violations (the landowner, not the tenant, should be responsible for fines—people living at the margin are not going to have the money to pay fines). These costs should be clearly specified up front in the proposal.

Liability. The proposal should clearly specify that the landowner is financially responsible not only for ensuring adequate pad, sewage and electrical hookups, etc., but also for any problems that arise from negligence by a tenant, including but not limited to starting a fire, littering, pollution clean-up, etc. Approximate costs should be specified in the draft proposal. The county needs to assume liability for any problems that arise from lack of code enforcement.

Lack of road infrastructure to allow adequate egress in emergencies. Adding more people into these rural parcels—especially those who are so economically disadvantaged that it is difficult to maintain vehicles in good working order etc.—ensures that during an emergency such as a rapidly spreading fire that necessitates evacuation, roads will be clogged to the extent that lives are lost. Any draft ordinance should include a traffic study of existing roads that identifies the maximum number of vehicles that could safely evacuate in the event of wildfire, and limit additional RV or other housing appropriately.

In closing, I'll note that myself and neighbors already experience significant and repetitive problems with RV-housed residents that nearby land owners currently allow to camp (illegally?) on their land. These include regular gunshots, drug paraphernalia, litter, illegal dumping of sewage, broken-down cars on the road, and at least three run-away fires over the past three months within a mile of our house. Luckily first responders were able to put these fires out before they exceeded an acre or two, but it is only a matter of time before a fire gets out of control if ignition sources are added. Adding more RVs onto the landscape clearly adds more ignition sources, particularly when people living in them are not fully aware of or are not responsibly following fire-safety protocols. That unfortunately applies to many living out of their RVs, who cook outside on campfires on hot days, use generators or other equipment that can start fires in dry conditions, or carelessly throw down a cigarette butt.

I applaud the Planning Commission's attempt to address the housing crisis, but the current proposal does not provide the help that most people living out of their RVs need, and it puts the safety of current property owners and their property values at risk. Rather than solving the homeless crisis in Nevada County, it invites more people living out of their RVs to come to the county, thus making the problem even worse. Again, the solution is concentrating these people-in-need in county-owned land where adequate help and resources are easily available, not just pushing them up into the woods where they are out-of-sight-out-of mind.

Please do not approve this draft proposal as it now stands.

Sincerely,
Anthony D. Barnosky
14990 Red Dog Road
Nevada City, CA 95959

Jodeana Patterson

From: Elizabeth Hadly <lizhadly@me.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 20, 2025 9:02 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Against Alternative RV/Housing Ordinance

You don't often get email from lizhadly@me.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

20 September 2025

Dear Nevada County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors,

We moved to Red Dog Road in January 2025 and are impressed and excited by the history, nature and local stewardship here, which leads to the strong sense of community. We are also aware of challenges that members of our community face—among them, people looking for affordable housing, especially those on the verge of being homeless. While we recognize the homeless crisis is growing nationwide and needs to be addressed, the county's proposed plan to allow Campers, Van Conversions, and Recreational Trailers as primary residences on private, rural parcels does not offer a viable solution. It simply pushes people in need out of sight into the forest, creates opportunities for their exploitation by landowners and does not provide the services they require. Additionally, this ordinance is essentially an unfunded mandate because our county does not have the financial resources or personnel to enforce it. The plan introduces significant risks for existing residents in the outskirts of town, as detailed below, particularly in the forested areas of Banner Mountain.

Therefore, I am writing to express my strong opposition to the county's proposal to permit an increase in temporary dwellings on private lands in forested areas. Instead, I suggest setting aside parcels of county land for RVs where they are in proximity to needed social services, can more easily integrate with and develop community, and where the risks detailed below would be minimized.

The safety implications of this proposal are alarming. Our mountain community is already at extremely high risk of wildfire. It is well known that ignition sources are correlated with humans, especially in the Wildland-Urban Interface. The ignition risk is likely to increase significantly because those living in RVs are much more likely to be cooking or otherwise using campfires (in part because their indoor facilities are so limited) even on days when outdoor burning is prohibited.

The addition of transient or inadequately equipped vehicles on narrow, winding roads such as Red Dog X, Red Dog Road and Buckeye Road could dramatically impact emergency evacuation efforts. It only takes one unmaintained trailer or disabled tow vehicle to block an evacuation route and endanger lives. This is

not hypothetical—we have witnessed this before. One such vehicle was left abandoned on Red Dog X, obstructing the road and requiring highway patrol intervention. In a fire scenario, that could be catastrophic, especially where evacuation routes are limited as they are in the Banner Mountain area. In our area just this summer **four fires** were started in or around encampments or from illegal fireworks. Luckily our incredible Nevada County fire response team was available and acted quickly but this type of danger to our land and our homes is unacceptable. The county's own evacuation study documented that Banner Mountain has insufficient evacuation routes for those of us that live here. Additional residents will only exacerbate this problem.

As a long-time user of public lands for my employment (USNPS and Stanford University) and for personal recreation, I can attest that the most challenging and expensive aspect of management of people in nature is dealing with trash, sewage and damage to natural resources. At least public lands provide access to rangers and law enforcement for monitoring. These priorities are nearly impossible to manage on private lands without permitting and enforcement. Who is liable for the infractions of the RV residents? While the ordinance encompasses language that includes documentation of permitting, it does not include extra funds for enforcement. The only way to determine whether the ordinance is followed is when there is an infraction and a complaint. Without public access for observation and assessment and without funding for continued vigilance and enforcement, these camps will deteriorate and potentially endanger those of us around them. The forest infrastructure is just not designed to support long-term habitation by individuals living in RVs or campers without proper roads, sewage, water, and waste systems. Septic systems are expensive and highly regulated for a reason, and it is unrealistic to assume that someone who cannot afford traditional housing will be able to install or maintain a permitted system. The same is true for trash removal. The result will likely be increased illegal dumping, environmental degradation, potential contamination of neighborhood wells and a burden on neighbors and emergency services. Who will ensure that generators are not running at all hours, that cooking fires are extinguished, that trash is removed, and that human waste is managed? If the county lacks the capacity to enforce these rules now, it certainly won't be able to once many more unregulated dwellings are allowed.

We recently witnessed a camper (with expired license plates) living on private property near us DELIBERATELY dumping his sewage from his trailer as he drove down Red Dog Road. We reported this, but there was no way for the county environmental officers to clean up the sewage since it had dried in the heat before they arrived. This type of behavior (increase in trash, in bodily wastes, in large furniture discards, and in traffic at all hours) has increased even in the time we have lived here and if it continues, will decrease our property values, increase dangers and threaten the nature where we live.

Community matters. People who move into rural trailers out of economic necessity may not have access to the support systems they need. They are isolated from jobs, healthcare, and social services. That isolation also makes integration into the existing community difficult, especially if some of the newcomers are not invested in long-term stewardship of the land or relationships with neighbors. Sadly, our community has seen increases in drug use (and the detritus associated with drugs), aggressive dogs, trespassing and theft, and it is not unreasonable to link some of those challenges to past efforts to allow unregulated housing.

And, if the proposal passes, the county will attract even more people whose primary residence is an RV, exacerbating all the problems we highlight, while at the same time depleting the tax base that provides county services, and for which homeowners presently pay.

From an aesthetic and environmental perspective, we moved to the Banner Mountain area to be part of a quiet, forested community—not a sprawling campground. Allowing long-term RV residency threatens the very character of our neighborhoods. It is a change that would undermine the values of those who have invested in and cared for these lands over many years and is antithetical to the very reason we moved here.

We all care deeply about solving the housing crisis and we want to invest in solutions that work. But the proposed ordinance is not it. The County should focus on real, sustainable housing options that come with local community support services: affordable housing developments, mental health services, job training, easy access to employment and transitional housing with wraparound care. Legalizing trailers in the forest does not solve homelessness—it only hides it, while creating new, serious problems. It widens the footprint of the problem, marginalizes the people needing our community support and means that it becomes more difficult for social services to identify problems and help those in need.

Please do not approve this proposal. Our forests, our safety, and our community depend on responsible planning and this is not it.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth A. Hadly

14990 Red Dog Road

Nevada City, CA 95959

Jodeana Patterson

From: Dee Anne Dinelli <deeannedinelli@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 21, 2025 6:33 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Alternative Housing Ordinance

You don't often get email from deeannedinelli@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

I support the alternative/RV housing ordinance. I stand with **Sierra Roots** in advocating tiny homes, co-housing, RVs, or modular units which can cost much less than traditional houses, making homeownership or stable living possible for more presently unhoused people.

With rising rents and insufficient number of houses in Nevada County, alternatives like accessory dwelling units (ADUs), container homes, and micro-apartments help meet the challenges faced by so many of our county residents.

Sincerely,

Dee Anne Dinelli
13050 Little Deer Creek Lane
Nevada City, CA 95959

Jodeana Patterson

From: Serena Cantway <serena@freed.org>
Sent: Sunday, September 21, 2025 7:52 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Cc: Annie Mikal-Heine
Subject: RV Ordinance Public Comment
Attachments: RV Ordenience Statement letter.pdf

You don't often get email from serena@freed.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Serena Cantway
Housing Program Manager
FREED
435 Sutton Way
Grass Valley, CA 95945
530-477-3333 voice Ext 226
530-477-8194 tty
530-477-8184 fax
www.FREED.org





ABILITY REDEFINED

Subject: Public Comment on Section 12.03.151 – Recreational Vehicle Dwelling

I am writing to provide feedback on the Public Review Draft of Section 12.03.151 – Recreational Vehicle Dwelling. First, I want to thank the County for recognizing the importance of expanding housing options for residents. As many in our community continue to face housing insecurity and financial strain, flexible solutions like allowing the long-term use of RVs on private property are more critical than ever.

RVs as Essential Housing & Income Support

For many residents, allowing someone to live in an RV on their property provides a meaningful source of extra income, income that can make the difference in covering rising utility bills, increasing property taxes, and the skyrocketing cost of fire insurance in California. These financial pressures are especially severe in rural areas and are pushing out long-time Nevada County residents who have called this community home for decades. Homeowners who can no longer afford to stay, they often are faced with limited economic opportunities. With lack of affordable rentals in today’s housing market, many are facing homelessness. I’ve witnessed community members lose their homes after they were red-tagged due to unaffordable repair costs or forced to sell their homes because they could no longer pay for fire insurance. These are not isolated cases; they reflect the growing economic challenges many are facing. Allowing RVs as dwellings can help long-term residents remain in their homes, maintain their properties, and preserve the fabric of our community, all while providing safe and affordable housing for those in need.

On the flip side, RVs also provide a more accessible, lower-cost housing option for people in our community who are struggling to find stable, affordable places to live. When safe and responsibly managed, RV dwellings can serve as critical housing solutions without placing additional burden on local infrastructure.

2. Support for Caregivers and Family-Based Assistance

In addition to providing affordable housing and income support, allowing RVs on private property can be a lifeline for residents who require regular help. Whether it’s a family member caring for an elderly parent, someone living with a disability who relies on daily assistance, or a person recovering from illness, having a caregiver or relative close by can significantly improve quality of life. An RV offers a respectful and independent living space while still enabling this critical support.

Limiting or over-regulating RV use may unintentionally isolate or displace those who rely on informal, family-based caregiving arrangements that are often far more sustainable and cost-effective than institutional alternatives.

Many individuals and families are increasingly relying on shared living arrangements with relatives or community members as a way to stay housed. The rising cost of living including housing prices, rent, utilities, and insurance has pushed homeownership out of reach for many, and even renting has become unaffordable in much of our community. As a result, shared housing and informal living arrangements have become a critical strategy for survival, especially for those on fixed or limited incomes. Supporting flexible housing options, such as RV dwellings or accessory units, can help reflect and legitimize these real, community-based solutions to the housing crisis.

☐ Grass Valley Office
435 Sutton Way
Grass Valley, CA 95945
Tel: (530) 477-3333
Fax: (530) 477-8184
TTY: (530) 477-8194
Toll Free: 800-655-7732

☐ Yuba City Office
1100 Butte House Road
Suite 120
Yuba City CA 95991
Tel: (530) 742-4474
TTY: (530) 742-2379
Fax: (530) 742-4476

www.FREED.org

Board of Directors, 2025
Mark Fenicle, Chair
Kristin Ansell, Vice Chair
Shannon Dooley-Miller, Secretary
Erin Minett, Treasurer
Joanne Bodine





ABILITY REDEFINED

4. Need for Financial Assistance and Support Programs

Many residents interested in complying with these new requirements may not have the resources to do so. The County already has access to various funds that could help property owners bring their RV setups into compliance. These funds could be used to:

- Offset the cost of permits or inspections
- Help build required snow shelters or ramadas
- Assist with site upgrades or septic compliance

Develop a Fire Protection Plan or provide defensible space work Including education and financial assistance as part of this process will help residents transition into compliance without creating further financial hardship.

In Summary:

Allowing RVs as long-term dwellings is a practical, compassionate, and necessary step toward addressing Nevada County’s housing needs. These dwellings not only provide affordable housing and income opportunities but also allow families to care for one another and age in place with dignity. With thoughtful implementation, support, and flexibility, particularly in rural areas, this ordinance can provide a balanced and meaningful impact.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Serena Cantway

Serena Cantway
 Housing Program Manager
 FREED
 435 Sutton Way
 Grass Valley, CA 95945
 530-477-3333 voice Ext 226
 530-477-8194 tty
 530-477-8184 fax
www.FREED.org



ABILITY REDEFINED

☐ Grass Valley Office
 435 Sutton Way
 Grass Valley, CA 95945
 Tel: (530) 477-3333
 Fax: (530) 477-8184
 TTY: (530) 477-8194
 Toll Free: 800-655-7732

☐ Yuba City Office
 1100 Butte House Road
 Suite 120
 Yuba City CA 95991
 Tel: (530) 742-4474
 TTY: (530) 742-2379
 Fax: (530) 742-4476

www.FREED.org

Board of Directors, 2025

Mark Fenicle, Chair
 Kristin Ansell, Vice Chair
 Shannon Dooley-Miller, Secretary
 Erin Minett, Treasurer
 Joanne Bodine



Jodeana Patterson

From: Mike Wasky <mwasky@suddenlink.net>
Sent: Sunday, September 21, 2025 10:02 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: RVs as housing

[You don't often get email from mwasky@suddenlink.net. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Good morning,

I just got back from a long trip across the northwest and heard about this. I'm am really against this ordinance. In my travels I have passed many of rv housing units or setups. They really end up as eyesores to the public as over time they don't hold up. Tarps and any other cheap material are used to hold them up. Yes you have inspections and rules at a cost to us the public.

Bigger than that is the affect on the infrastructure. Housing is planned for when built. Road size, electricity lines, water pipes and septic size is based on the number of home parcels. You are now proposing, by your rules, to open it up to in theory double what it was designed for. Yes not every parcel will have one but you plan for worst case.

I'm out of electricity a lot down in Alta Sierra, the water is bad already which happened 3-4 years back, I have tested all the time looking for a solution. And septic. Designed for the amount of bedrooms in the house, both tank and leach lines. You will be exceeding the design. I just went thru this again with a nieghbor and it's not fun living next to a broken/full septic trust me.

And there is fire. Trying to get out of here when a fire happens is problematic now. Plus having more people will increase the odds of creating a fire. Yes we haven't gotten directly hit yet, but in my 35 years in my house I've loaded up and headed out several times and it's not fun. If this goes thru it will be downright unbearable if not dangerous.

Last I'll mention the drop in my homes value. It's location, location, location out there. I know this well as I have been weighing my options. Some of us are going to end up living next to the unsightly ones. It's going to happen over time. You now live there full time. Ac summers / heating winters. You can't keep all that inside as there's no room. Sheds and other structures are built on the fly. Some slightly some not. Just spent thousands of miles traveling and seeing this over and over.

This will just add to the decline in my homes value. Fire insurance and home loan interest rates have already hit us pretty hard, please don't make this worse. The ones that worked hard to get what they got to have a decent retirement are being eaten alive by rules like this.

There has to be a better way to do this. Maybe a country run RV park where these issues can be addressed without the impact you're proposing. Inspections in one place, infrastructure same, exits planned for.

I am totally against this ordinance. First I've heard of it as well. And I do try to watch the county meetings too. Surprised me.

Do not distribute this letter to any outside entities with my name or address on it. Don't want to be doxed..

Mike Wasky
16616 Annie
Grass valley, Ca. 95949

Jodeana Patterson

From: Richard C. <richardlc@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 21, 2025 1:13 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Comment on RV ordinance

You don't often get email from richardlc@yahoo.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Good afternoon,

I support most of the RV ordinance that Nevada County is currently considering. The one part that I do not agree with is that there must already be a permitted structure on the property in order to put a permitted RV home on the property. Please reconsider this part of the ordinance. If a property owner can meet all other requirements, they should be able to live in an RV on their property. If there is adequate sewage disposal, water and power, having someone living on the land in an RV can have many positive benefits.

The county has acknowledged there is a shortage of homes for our residents. Let's make it so more people can live legally as soon as possible. Land owners can live in their RV's while saving money to eventually build a larger stick frame building and adding to the taxes the county can collect and use.

Thanks for your consideration.

Richard Coddling
2036 Nevada City HWY #536
Grass Valley, CA 95945
302-723-1676

[Yahoo Mail: Search, Organize, Conquer](#)

Jodeana Patterson

From: Pam Amato <pam@pamamato.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 21, 2025 1:48 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: RV ordinance input

You don't often get email from pam@pamamato.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

County planners and staff,

I attended the Grass Valley Veterans Hall meeting and have been following this housing issue.

I have lived in this county since 1976 and been a realtor since 1979.

I am pleased to see the current RV ordinance will be expanded to not just while building a home or 14 day guest stays.

This ordinance will benefit those wanting to follow some rules. We all know that there are property owners who have multiple RV trailers and makeshift dwellings on their properties already. Those who currently disregard the zoning laws may likely continue to do so, but people wanting to legally provide housing for family members, friends, or create passive income, will be able to do so relatively inexpensively, compared to a stick-built or manufactured home.

I believe RV units can be insured

As vehicles without issues with real estate lenders.

- Extend the occupancy permit to 5 years rather than 2 years. The initial investment required of property owners is substantial (grading, electrical, water, septic, pad, possibly a ramada) for only a 2-year guaranteed use.

I do hope you receive enough good input to go forward in implementing this ordinance by years end.

Respectfully

Pamela Amato

PO Box 181

No. San Juan, Ca 95960

Pam Amato, Broker Associate, CRS, SRES

Lic: 00687475 - since 1979

COLDWELL BANKER GRASS ROOTS

Ofc Lic:00873741

Direct/Cell: 530-913-1102

Jodeana Patterson

From: Leslie Blagg <lkbagg@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 21, 2025 2:24 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Comments on public review draft

You don't often get email from lkbagg@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Thank you for developing such a comprehensive policy.

What is plan to get all the Rvs in the county compliant? Hopefully, the existing RVs won't be allowed to be "grandfathered" in.

The administrative development permit is to be renewed every two years. What is the complaint and enforcement process within that two year period?

Are there any fines associated with non-compliance?

Thank you again.

If you have any questions, please contact me at lkbagg@gmail.com or 530.320.5378.

Leslie & Mike Blagg

Jodeana Patterson

From: Janet Banner <janet.banner@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 21, 2025 2:52 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Comment - Alternative/RV Housing Draft Ordinance
Attachments: Comment_Draft RV Ordinance_Janet Banner_09212025.docx

You don't often get email from janet.banner@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Hello,

Please see my attached comment.

Regards,
Janet Banner

Janet Banner
15151 Red Dog Rd.
Nevada City, CA. 95959

RE: Comment on Alternative/RV Housing Draft Ordinance

TO: Nevada County Board of Supervisors and Planning Department:

I understand the dilemma California faces with unhoused and underhoused residents. I appreciate Nevada County's effort to expand affordable housing options, but the current draft ordinance raises significant safety, infrastructure, and community-stewardship concerns. I think instead of this ordinance to legalize distributed RV housing in locations many miles from necessary services, the county should provide centralized RV housing locations within the town limits (Grass Valley, Truckee, etc), allowing residents access to employment, medical and mental health services, food, etc. Centralized RV locations could be built with full hookups - sewer, water, electricity - thereby eliminating many of the hazards of distributed RV housing located in very high-fire risk forested properties.

If the County continues forward with the proposed Alternative/RV Housing Draft Ordinance, please note below where I outline critical issues and propose targeted recommendations to strengthen the ordinance and protect both existing residents and future RV occupants.

Evacuation Route and Road Safety

Nevada County's road network - particularly in Banner Mountain and areas further east of Grass Valley - already struggles with narrow lanes, winding alignments, and limited ingress/egress points. Adding daily RV traffic and potential bottlenecks during emergencies could overwhelm evacuation plans.

- Lack of sufficient evacuation routes for current residents
- Banner Mountain evacuation study highlights constrained traffic capacity
- RVs will slow traffic flow and occupy more roadway during emergencies

Recommendation:

- Don't allow RVs on parcels with roadways already identified as inadequate for emergency evacuations

Wildfire Risk

Nevada County is rated Very High wildfire risk, with 92% of land zoned High or Very High Fire Hazard Severity. RVs—especially older units—lack built-in ember protection and are highly vulnerable to both ignitions and occupant evacuation delay.

- Very High wildfire risk rating nearly precludes homeowner insurance
- Community Wildfire Protection Plan and Local Hazard Mitigation Plan outline extreme local risk
- Flame lengths up to 12 feet in Grass Valley and Tahoe National Forest zones
- High burn probability in fuels-driven wildfire scenarios

Recommendations:

- Prohibit RV habitation in State-mapped Very High hazard zones unless
- Enforce a minimum 100-foot defensible-space clearance around each RV site
- Require all RVs to connect to property-wide water supply or on-site fire suppression (e.g., exterior sprinklers)

Maintenance of Neighborhood Investment Value and Safety

Allowing RVs as permanent dwelling units without additional resources or clear standards risks blight, over-crowding, code violations, and uneven enforcement—undermining long-held investments in existing neighborhoods.

- There is no new funding allocated for Code Enforcement
- Aesthetics of older RVs can depreciate nearby property values
- Traditional building setbacks are insufficient for visible RVs
- Unlimited occupant counts encourage outdoor sleeping and crowding
- Lack of guaranteed septic connection invites illegal dumping and groundwater pollution, which affect all residents
- Primary homes and ADUs must share same permitting, utility connections, defensible space, and tax obligations

Recommendations:

- Establish dedicated budget hire one additional Code Enforcement officer and supporting Sheriff for follow-up
- Increase side and front setbacks by at least 50% compared to houses
- Mandate certified, inspected connections to existing septic systems or on-site wastewater treatment
- Apply identical permitting, utility connection, defensible-space, and property-tax requirements to RV dwellings as to ADUs and primary houses

Renter Safety

RVs were engineered for temporary travel—not year-round habitation. Without safeguards, occupants face health and safety hazards from weather extremes, wildlife intrusion, and isolation from essential services.

- Thin RV walls and seals invite wildlife break-ins (bears, rodents)
- Lack of insulation forces outdoor cooking or unsafe heating methods
- No limits on occupants heightens risk of unsheltered outdoor sleeping
- Full-time occupation strains RV electrical, plumbing, and structural systems
- Proximity to social services is often miles away on narrow rural roads

Recommendations:

- Require proof of proximity (or commitment to shuttle service) to nearest social and health services
- Enforce installation of wildlife-resistant doors, window screens, and reinforced hitches
- Obligate landlords to conduct annual safety inspections of RV HVAC, electrical, and plumbing systems

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Janet Banner

Jodeana Patterson

From: Ursula Donofrio <ursdonofrio@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 21, 2025 4:18 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Please don't do this to Nevada County

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

This ordinance will lead to an influx of additional down-and-out RV residents in Nevada County. There are already hundreds of folks living illegally in RVs--thanks to inaction by County Code Enforcement. Imagine how many will come once word spreads that Nevada County is the first county in California to welcome and legally define as "permanent housing" any RV you can get across the county line! When you legalize something, you get more of it. That is life 101. Of course the vast majority will not bother with the permit process. Why spend the money when it's clear that there is no will to enforce the law in Nevada County when it comes to alternative housing.

I've spoken with dozens of homeowners who have reached out to Code Enforcement regarding folks living in RV's permanently. Property owners know when an RV on a neighboring property is "being stored" and when it is being "living in"....for well beyond the currently permissible three or six months. Yet all received the same response: *Your code compliance case number XXX concerning the property at XXX is unfounded and has been closed.* We would need to quadruple the code enforcement team to deal with the onslaught and mitigate the most egregious abuses.

Please do not normalize travel trailers, truck campers, camping trailers, or any RV as a permanent house. They were built to much lower minimum standards than permanent dwellings. I know people who have been "smoked out" of RVs from forest fire smoke because *standard RV seals are not designed to protect from smoke and will not prevent fine smoke particles from entering the vehicle.* RVs are also fire risks! A small kitchen fire in an RV can engulf the vehicle and lead to 10-ft flames reaching for the tree canopy above in minutes--much quicker than a fire crew can respond. This is not the case in a "real" house because a real dwelling is built to the minimum standards of a permanent home. Please don't email me daily to clear debris and fireproof my property if you allow and encourage these fire hazards to take over our county. If you vote for this ordinance, you are not serious about fire safety in Nevada County.

I pray this ordinance does not pass, but at the minimum, the county should mandate that the RV be added to the homeowners fire insurance policy. This would protect the homeowner because in the event that a fire originates in the RV, if the homeowner failed to alert his/her fire insurance company that they were renting out an RV on their property, this omission would jeopardize their coverage. Equally important, fire insurance coverage of the RV protects nearby property owners.

Declining property values and declining property tax revenue.....while adding residents in greater need of county resources will bankrupt the county. The day an RV, with the car(s) of its unlimited inhabitants

parked beside it, and the portable sewage tank that may or may not be pumped regularly, and the loud gas generator (with no defined use limit) take root on my neighbor's property, my property value declines. We worked full-time our entire lives, looked at properties for years, and researched the zoning and property codes before making the biggest investment of our lives. How can that not matter?

Unlike a property owner who builds a real ADU, the RV landlord doesn't pay a penny more in property taxes, yet they are hosting tenants who will use our roads and public services. The county cannot afford the drain on county employee time to make this alternative housing arrangement even remotely safe and workable, and the county cannot afford the influx of struggling residents--whether financially challenged, and/or facing mental health challenges and/or drug addiction. You passed the Tiny House on Wheels Ordinance just months ago. Try to secure funding assistance to make that work. And require that any structure housing people in Nevada County connect to the water, electrical, and septic/sewer lines of the primary dwelling. There should be no compromise on mandating utility hookups. Don't jeopardize Nevada County's environmental integrity (and my well water) and our quality of life in a feeble attempt to meet minimum affordable house numbers by simply and irrationally redefining what an affordable house is. Don't normalize permanent camping. It will become your final solution-"Mission Accomplished"- "Problem Solved." Without better-paying jobs (if folks are interested?) and without real affordable housing built to the minimum standards of a permanent house, "Camping in an RV" will be the norm, the accepted and approved solution. You can do better, Nevada County.

Homeowner, District 1

Jodeana Patterson

From: Jacqueline Mazon <babytwins1996@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 21, 2025 5:55 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Alternate RV Ordinance

You don't often get email from babytwins1996@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

To Whom it may concern, I am a resident of Banner Mountain off of Red Dog Road, on Lola's Echo Road. I bought my property in 1977, built my home in 1981, raised my family here, and I just retired from nursing 9 months ago. I have been upgrading and maintaining my home all along, especially now that I have time to do so as a retired person. I have concerns regarding housing temporary persons with the new RV ordinance proposed in this county. My concerns include: safety from individuals this ordinance may allow to reside in these woods, individuals who may not have a vested interest in keeping our neighborhoods free of vandals, free from runaway fires, free from potential environmental hazards (for example: septic issues, fires due to trying to cook or keep warm without proper stoves etc.). My neighbors and I all have these concerns, as we have already had a taste of the consequences from non-residential individuals in the past few years, or longer. I feel it is my duty to inform you that this slippery slope that you are about to introduce here requires high regulations, monitored permitting, and strict enforcement of all rules that should be applied here. Please consider the safety and rights of tax-paying families who work hard to be able to live here and expect a safe neighborhood with responsible residents. Please consider these thoughts when you make you decision in this matter.

Respectfully,
Jacqueline Mazon
14832 Lola's Echo Road
Nevada City, CA 95959
(530)263-6198

Jodeana Patterson

From: Donna Zacamy <dmzacamy@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 21, 2025 9:10 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: RV ordinance letter for BOS and Planning Commission

You don't often get email from dmzacamy@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

13980 Countryside Ranch Road
Grass Valley, CA 95949
September 21 , 2025

Nevada County Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission
950 Maidu Avenue
Nevada City, CA 95959

Dear Ms. Hall, Mr. Tucker, Ms. Swarthout, Ms. Hoek, Mr. Bullock, Mr. Milman, Mr. French, Mr. McAteer, Mr. Foley, Ms. Garst .

I am writing regarding the anticipated County Alternative Housing ordinance, which would allow RVs to become permanent housing. The body of this text is similar to one I wrote in June to Tyler Barrington. Since then, I have attended a community meeting in South County, in which the Advisory Committee voted against the proposed RV ordinance.

As a resident of rural South County, I have many concerns, as do my neighbors. Many of us are conflicted between the need for affordable housing versus the degradation of the open space around us. Agricultural zoning promises the preservation of open space for agricultural use. My area's CC&R's prohibit RVs as permanent housing. Additional population density will lead to additional infrastructure load and additional cost to us to maintain our private roads.

Currently, Nevada County approves the use of RVs as housing in limited circumstances. RVs as permanent housing would be a big change. Many will see it as an opportunity for rental/commercial use, and in any case, it will have the effect of increasing density. This brings up many resource, safety, health and nuisance issues:

- **Significant septic issues, leach field and other environmental health concerns**
- **Well depletion or decreased production on surrounding properties**

- **General safety issues like wiring and careful wiring at a well pump**
- Space between structures to prevent fire.
- **Compliance with WUI, maintaining defensible space and minimizing wildland fire hazards**
- Compliance with all permanent housing Building Codes
- Increased population density causing more stress on electric grids
- **The traffic effect on shared private roads requiring more maintenance and placing an unfair monetary burden on existing residents**
- Violation of current CC&R's, such as ours
- Opening the door to commercial use
- Potential unsightliness of trailers, litter, etc.

In June, prior to the writing of the new ordinance, I had asked Mr. Barrington to please address the above concerns and also to consider:

- Requiring RVs to be placed where they are not visible from the streetscape.
- Limiting the number of permanently habitable RVs to one per parcel.
- Allowing permanent RV housing only on land zoned AG40 or above. This would aid in unobtrusive placement and defensible space. Many AG10 (or less) zoning areas are residential, regulated subdivisions, which makes unobtrusive placement more difficult and runs headlong into subdivision violations.
- **Prohibiting permanent RVs on privately maintained roads and regulated subdivisions.**
- While an RV would be considered a permanent residence, there would still be a likelihood that the residents of the RV could be transient, especially if the parcel owner is using the RV as a source of income. Please prohibit commercial use, except for seasonal agricultural use. Other issues that non-owners bring to an area would require some additional measures, such as fines to owners for transgressions on their land.
- **Encouraging ADUs, modular and manufactured non mobile structures (for which you already have requirements) would be a better way to meet housing shortages, and they are likely more appropriate for families. Lowering County permit fees on these living units would be a better alternative than mobile metal trailers dotting the countryside.**
- Our open land is a unique and precious national resource. Those of us who live in and work it respect that. It is also what supports our property values, which contributes to the County's tax base. Driving our beautiful rural streets is still a draw to Nevada County that benefits all residents.

In the community meeting that I attended, many residents spoke to these issues, and the County addressed some of them. The Planner said that all of the safety building codes that apply to stick structures will apply to RVs as permanent residences. However, **increased fire danger is not well addressed**. The WUI codes will not and cannot, be upheld. **These are mandatory wildfire management codes** that require non-combustible materials, fire resistant doors, windows, siding, roofing, and fire-resistant construction techniques. A special certification is required to indicate a unit or material is WUI compliant. Some modular units can meet those

standards but how can a regular RV be compliant with these? Some temporary RV housing and some disaster area sites have been exempted, but not RVs as permanent housing. Insurance companies have been cancelling fire policies or charging exorbitant fees based on the fire risk by area. Wait until they hear about the WUI problems, the wiring issues, the clearance issues, and the many work-arounds that the County Compliance Department allows. The compliance officer doesn't think he'll need any additional help; yet, I and other residents at the meeting can attest to many cases in which Code Compliance is failing to address the compliance issues it already has. Is there a risk/reward in allotting more taxpayer dollars to an overburdened/failing Compliance department. What really is the reward since the cost of bringing the sites and the RVs up to the permitting standards would work against this as a realistic solution to the housing shortage. Counties, like Placer, have found better ways to address that. I think these are the most compelling arguments in opposition to the Ordinance.

Lastly, I'd simply like to say that I am uncomfortable, in general, with rural/AG zoning being used as a means of density building - if that's part of what's happening here. AG zoning should be, as it has been, a means to protect open space and agricultural use; it's not meant to invite cheap rental housing. Notwithstanding the current popularity of "tiny homes on wheels", this RV ordinance could become an invitation to commercial use, noise, nuisance, unsightliness, monetary burdens and **critical safety issues**. That would be an affront to our current and sought after family oriented agricultural community. Please don't let that happen.

With respect,

Donna Zacamy, resident of South County

Jodeana Patterson

From: ken bigham <krbigham@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, September 22, 2025 8:50 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Proposed Nevada County Alternative Housing Ordinance

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Good morning Planning Department & BOS,

Here is more of my input regarding the proposed Alternative RV Ordinance. This is after reading a NBC News article today regarding RV living. Here are two excerpts from this article:

Priced out of traditional housing, more Americans are living in RVs

"RVs are recreational vehicles; they are a vehicle, they are built for temporary recreational use. That is how they are built and intended to be used," said Monika Geraci, a spokesperson for the RV Industry Association.

They also come with different financial challenges: Unlike a traditional home, RVs often depreciate quickly. Loan terms can be spread out over long periods to lower monthly payments, but that can quickly leave borrowers underwater — owing more on their loan than their RV is worth.

Kat Tucker found that out firsthand. As a disabled veteran unable to work full-time, she moved into an RV in 2017 as a way to cut down on her housing costs. But after two years, she'd had to replace six tires, the refrigerator and toilet had broken, and the generator stopped working. Then the engine started acting up, which would have cost up to \$10,000 to fix. Without money for the repair, she had to move out of the RV even as she continued paying the \$500-a-month loan for several more years.

"It can be a great lifestyle, but it can also be yet another trap for poor people who just keep getting poorer," Tucker, 64, said.

My questions to the Planning Department and BOS is "Who will be responsible to fund Alt RV occupants' RVs when they need repair, and what will the Planning Department do when an RV becomes dilapidated and unlivable?"

Thank you for allowing input on this controversial issue.

Jodeana Patterson

From: Scott Knorp <scottknorp@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 22, 2025 9:26 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: RV Ordinance Comments

You don't often get email from scottknorp@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

To the Board of Supervisors -

I understand the intent of the RV ordinance, but I am very concerned about the unintended consequences of the draft ordinance that would allow RVs and campers as full-time residences.

Following are the reasons for my position:

- **Magnet Effect:** We have seen counties across the West that relaxed RV restrictions and saw increases in RV migration from neighboring areas. By changing the permission structure around RV living in the county, this is bound to happen here when word spreads that Nevada County is the only county in the state that allows RVs as permanent residences. This will stretch resources in the county to the breaking point.
- **Fire and Evacuation Concerns:** Adding additional RVs on narrow rural roads will obstruct escape routes during wildfire events. The proponents of this measure suggest that the solution to do this would be to have the RV dweller sign something that promised they wouldn't use their RV to evacuate, which is the most naive sentiment I've heard in my adult life.

Sanitation and Compliance: This seems to be a murky area of the draft ordinance with vague language. Assuming that the Environmental Health agency signs off on other technologies other than septic, how would this be enforced by the county?

- **Weak Enforcement:** The "No Place to Go" activists openly admit that they live in unpermitted RVs and that "thousands" of others in the county do as well. This speaks to the weak enforcement that is already in place in the county. So, when trailers start showing up on properties that aren't 3 acres and aren't hooked up to electrical and septic, will the county be hiring additional inspectors to enforce the ordinance?
- **Property Tax:** Since parking an RV on a property doesn't improve a homeowner's property value, how will the state come up with the additional resources that low-income migrants from across the state will require? Likewise, as property values drop across the county due to the increase in unsightly campers, how will the county address the shortfall in property tax revenue?

- **Community Impacts:** As mentioned above, this will undoubtedly lead to increases in visible illegal encampments, noise, generators, and neighborhood tensions. Since the language around generators seems to have some loopholes, it's likely that the sound of generators will become the norm around the county. The fire danger risk from generators and outdoor cooking (cooking meals in an RV can get claustrophobic) will go up exponentially.

The proponents of this ordinance talk about the emergency that exists in trying to house workers in the county, which is valid but this ordinance is likely to bring others to the county that have no interest in working.

Some salient facts around homelessness:

- - **UCSF Homelessness Study (2022):**
82% of homeless Californians reported mental health challenges.
 - 65% reported regular drug use.
These figures highlight the potential for vulnerable populations to be disproportionately affected by RV residency policies.

HUD PIT Count (2023):

- - California accounts for ~30% of the U.S. homeless population, but ~52% of the unsheltered homeless due to permissive policies around the homeless. Many of these homeless are drug addicts who have no interest in going to a shelter because of their drug policies.

The following are some case studies from counties that opened the Overton Window in regards to living in RVs:

- **Santa Cruz County:** Relaxed RV restrictions led to sanitation complaints and concentrated vehicle encampments.
- **Humboldt County:** Experienced wastewater dumping and environmental damage in rural zones after less restrictive RV policies.
- **Los Angeles County:** Large RV populations parked along city streets have become a long-term challenge, despite ordinances to stop them.

Bottom line: the county has already taken some dramatic steps to reduce homelessness the THO and THOW. Why not take a breath and see how those effect the county and maybe focus on more permanent low-income housing solutions?

Sincerely,

Scott Knorp
Nevada City Homeowner

Jodeana Patterson

From: Brian Melsheimer <brian@snappraisal.com>
Sent: Monday, September 22, 2025 11:58 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Subject: Comment on Draft Alternative / RV Housing Ordinance — Appraisal Concerns

You don't often get email from brian@snappraisal.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Dear Nevada County Planning Department,

Thank you for your ongoing efforts to expand affordable housing opportunities within the County. I appreciate the intent behind the Draft Alternative RV Housing Ordinance. From a professional appraisal perspective, however, I would like to highlight several concerns, along with constructive suggestions for a more sustainable approach.

Key Concerns

1. **Classification of RVs**

RVs are generally considered *personal property*, not real property, and therefore do not typically contribute to the long-term market value of land or improvements in the same way that an accessory dwelling unit (ADU) or manufactured home would.

2. **Durability and Market Impact**

Because of their temporary construction standards, RVs tend to depreciate more quickly and present maintenance challenges. This can negatively affect both neighborhood character and surrounding property values, as market participants place a premium on permanence and quality of construction.

3. **Safety and Risk**

RVs often carry greater fire risk and may not have systems designed for permanent residential use. Without strong oversight, this could create unintended safety and liability issues for both occupants and neighbors.

Suggested Direction

To balance the County's housing goals with market stability and community safety, I encourage prioritizing **permanent housing solutions** such as:

-
- **Stick-built ADUs** constructed to code, which add lasting value to a property and are more readily supported by appraisal and financing practices.

- **Prefabricated or manufactured housing units**, which can be more affordable to produce than site-built dwellings but still meet durability and code standards.
- **Subsidies, grants, and low-interest loans** to help property owners finance the construction of ADUs, ensuring affordability while building long-term housing stock.
- Clear minimum construction and utility standards that ensure safety, longevity, and compatibility with surrounding residential uses.
- Incentives, fee reductions, or expedited permitting for property owners who pursue these more permanent, market-supported housing options.

Closing

While I recognize the immediate appeal of RVs as an affordable short-term solution, I respectfully recommend that the County focus its ordinance framework on encouraging long-lasting ADUs and manufactured housing alternatives. This approach would both expand housing supply and support neighborhood stability, property values, and community safety in the long run.

Thank you for considering these professional observations as you consider the ordinance. I would be glad to provide further insight from an appraisal standpoint if that would be of assistance.

Sincerely,

Brian Melsheimer, SRA

Lic# AR036505

Sierra Nevada Appraisal Group

(530) 632-3428

Pronouns: He/Him/His

www.snappraisal.com

The contents of this email and any attachments are confidential and may be legally privileged. They are intended solely for the use of the recipient(s) named above. If you are not the intended recipient, any review, disclosure, copying, distribution, or use of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify Sierra Nevada Appraisal Group, LLC immediately by reply email and delete this message and its attachments.

Jodeana Patterson

From: Marrion Lomboy <marrionlomboy@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, September 22, 2025 12:14 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Comment regarding proposed ordinance

[You don't often get email from marrionlomboy@yahoo.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Good day,

I'm coming to this issue late in the game, so forgive me if I bring up topics that have already been addressed or covered by the proposed ordinance...

My vote to this ordinance, if asked, would be a strong no. My concern is that, although you say appropriate safety and health measures will be adhered to, they ultimately will not be. Will each of these tiny homes or RVs undergo a county inspection to ensure things are built appropriately and to code? There is room left for corners to be cut in both safety and health that likely won't be able to be monitored or tracked- until something tragic happens. What is the plan for emergency personnel response for when a 911 call comes in from one of these units, because they do not have an address? I realize EMS responds to non-address calls on the roadways all the time, but being a housing unit surrounded by other numbered and tracked housing might delay critical response time, which could ultimately cost a life. Additionally, do you expect people, who likely already have limited resources, to comply with whatever health and safety regulations you might impose? Such as dumping of human waste in pre approved and established areas? These mobile units do not have the appropriate plumbing and storage to be in one place for extended periods of time, which is why most campgrounds have a dumping station nearby, because people camping for a week generally fill their tank up. I think it's very unrealistic to expect a family or person to tow or drive their mobile homes on a weekly basis, or sooner, to a designated area. I foresee this being dumped into our land and waterways. Another point is that these mobile units are essentially kindling in our very flammable location. These temporary units become fully engulfed in flames at a much faster rate than standard construction homes, yet you will be having people cooking in there, using space heaters in the winters (because they also are poor on insulation usually), etc. This is just asking for an unfortunate incident.

And the last of my concerns, but still a concern, is the potential for decrease in property value once this area becomes inundated with excessive mobile housing units. There has to be a better solution.

Respectfully,

Courtney Lomboy

Sent from my iPhone

Jodeana Patterson

From: Jerre Lynn <hellojerre@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 22, 2025 12:22 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: I approve! 🙏👤

You don't often get email from hellojerre@gmail.com. Learn why this is important
<<https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>>

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

To Whom it may concern:

This is a very well thought out proposal that could be the answer to housing many of our homeless population safely and within financial reasonability.

Everyone deserves a safe and functional roof over their head with the peace of mind knowing that their family is warm, secure and grounded!

I believe, these days, that anyone could be one paycheck or one medical bill away from being Homeless themselves. The housing shortage in Nevada County is terribly high in the last three or more years. I know of a wonderful person who searched diligently for over 5 months to find a rental. Finally found one and is paying over \$2,000. A month Prices that thirty years ago would have been a mortgage payment, and now only get you a rental, if you're lucky!

I applaud and greatly appreciate Tom Durkin, Sierra Roots, and others who've researched the necessary questions, concerns and information, while working with local authorities and other nonprofits that help the Homeless to discover the best possible solutions.

I say, let's give it a go. We won't know how effective it can be until we put it into action ~

I'd appreciate the home owners and the tenants giving their sincere feedback every three months or so so that we can hear how effective this is, and/or if alterations may be in order on individual basis.

Thank you 🙏👤

Jerrelynn Fling

❤️ People don't care how much you know, until they know how much you care.

❤️ ❤️ Live simply, love generously, and be kinder than necessary because most everyone you meet is fighting some kind of battle.

Jodeana Patterson

From: Joan Ramsey <joanramsey@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 22, 2025 12:51 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Alternative Housing Ordinance
Attachments: All housing on wheels letter.pdf

You don't often get email from joanramsey@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Please read the attached letter.

Thank you

I am very concerned about the lack of affordable housing that has driven young and low-income working people and disabled people into living illegally in recreational vehicles. They are living under the threat of being discovered and forced out with nowhere else to go. Many of these existing situations include children. As a mental health professional, I am concerned about the mental health consequences of the anxiety created by never knowing if you are about to be forced out of your home, and the huge stress when it finally happens. People can be forced into the woods, which is far more dangerous for both them and the community.

I am in favor of the ordinance to allow recreational vehicles to become legitimate homes. I would prefer that the ordinance allow pre-existing inhabited wheeled homes to be brought into alignment with a health and safety conditions that has flexibility for unique circumstances that might meet all requirements to insure health and safety and neighbor concerns. Some may not exactly meet the letter of the ordinance as written. For example, an already existing situation that is safe and not bothering anyone, but is on a parcel of 2.5 acres instead of 3 acres. I would like for the ordinance to allow for common sense.

I am in support of all the amendments to the projected ordinance suggested by Tom Durkin, including the recommendation that allows the removal of wheels in order to make the home eligible for Section 8 housing assistance.

Thank you.

Joan Ramsey, LCSW
123 Grove St.
Nevada City 95959
530 648-6105

Jodeana Patterson

From: Tom Durkin <tdurkin@vfr.net>
Sent: Monday, September 22, 2025 12:55 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: revised amendments

You don't often get email from tdurkin@vfr.net. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Hello,

Please add this to my previous submission about amendments to the Alternative/RV Housing Ordinance.

We are withdrawing #4 Amendment about removing wheels from Alt/RVs. We were unable to confirm that removing the wheels would make the subsequent ADU eligible for Housing Choice vouchers.

We are adding #7 Amendment about incentives:

What this Alternative/RV Housing Ordinance seriously lacks are incentives. The restrictions, inspections and fees are disincentives to register an alternative dwelling unit. Something(s) must be added to the ordinance to encourage people to register. We suggest adding a one-year amnesty for existing occupancies to come into voluntary compliance and for new residencies to register. Incentives to register might also include a financial incentive or tax break. While an amnesty or other incentive are an increased cost, they are a relatively inexpensive way to create legal housing.

Bests regards,
Tom

Tom Durkin, Director
No Place To Go Project
530-559-3199
tom@noplacetogoproject.com
www.noplacetogoproject.com

Jodeana Patterson

From: Karin Knorp <karinknorp@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 22, 2025 3:07 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: RV Ordinance

You don't often get email from karinknorp@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

To the Board of Supervisors:

Nevada County's draft ordinance to allow RVs and campers as full-time residences is well-intentioned, but it carries serious risks that should give the community pause. Experience from other counties across the West shows that loosening RV restrictions almost always attracts migration from neighboring areas. If Nevada County becomes the only county in California where RVs are recognized as permanent residences, word will spread quickly, and the county could see a sudden influx of new residents that will strain resources already stretched thin.

Fire safety is another pressing concern. More RVs on narrow rural roads will inevitably clog evacuation routes during wildfires. The suggestion that RV dwellers could simply agree not to use their vehicles in an emergency is unrealistic; in a crisis people will use whatever means they have to escape. This could create deadly bottlenecks when seconds matter most.

Sanitation and compliance present additional challenges. Although the draft ordinance references septic and sanitation requirements, the language is vague and enforcement will be difficult. In practice, many RVs are not properly connected, leading to illegal dumping and wastewater problems. Enforcement is already weak—advocates of the ordinance themselves acknowledge that thousands of people in the county are living in unpermitted RVs or structures. If compliance cannot be ensured now, it is unlikely to improve under more permissive rules.

The impact on neighborhoods also deserves serious consideration. RVs do not increase property values, and widespread use could contribute to property value declines, eroding the county's tax base at the same time demand for services increases. Unsightly encampments, noise, and generator use would become more common, with generators posing both fire risks and quality-of-life issues for neighbors. Property values will plummet throughout the county.

Sincerely,

Karin Knorp

Nevada City

Jodeana Patterson

From: Julie Barhydt <julie@juliebarhydt.com>
Sent: Monday, September 22, 2025 3:41 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Nevada County RV Draft Ordinance

You don't often get email from julie@juliebarhydt.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Dear Nevada County,

I am writing to you today to express my extreme concern for our community if this RV Draft passes. I am a current Realtor in the area and am confident in my skills to address value for homes and properties in our area. If this draft passes it will drive our home values down as the addition of RVs, trailers and campers to properties does not add any value, in fact, it decreases value. I do acknowledge and understand the need for more affordable housing, this is NOT the answer.

The other issue is that many people are already illegally living in trailers and RV's in our community, Dumping waste irresponsibly. This will get worse if we allow more people to live like this. I understand that there is supposed to be a septic set up, but if these people cannot afford a home, how can they afford a 30-65k septic??

This is a bad idea, and I do not support the RV Draft.

Kindly,

Julie Barhydt

Realtor

[530-210-6464](tel:530-210-6464)

RE/MAX Gold

BRE#02002296

www.juliebarhydt.com

Your Local Area Specialist
Farm & Ranch Properties

Jodeana Patterson

From: Chris de Nijs
Sent: Monday, September 22, 2025 4:47 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Public Comment- Alternative RV Housing Ordinance
Attachments: RV Ordinance Comment letter.pdf

On behalf of the Nevada County Agricultural Advisory Commission, please find attached their comment letter.

Regards,

Chris de Nijs
Ag Commissioner/Sealer
Nevada County Dept. of Agriculture/ Weights & Measures
950 Maidu Ave, Suite 170
Nevada City, CA 95959
Phone: (530) 470-2690
Fax: (530) 470-2939
E-mail: chris.denijs@nevadacountyca.gov



**NEVADA
COUNTY**
CALIFORNIA

Community Development Agency
**Agricultural Advisory
Commission**

AgDept@nevadacountyca.gov • www.nevadacountyca.gov/ag

950 Maidu Avenue, Suite #170
PO BOX #599002
Nevada City, CA 95959

PH: (530) 470-2690
FAX: (530) 470-2939

Aleta Barrett – Farming Industry
Alyssa Mayo – Equine Industry
Brad Fowler – Other Livestock Industry

Laura Barhydt – Cattle Industry
Debbie Bierwagen – Agricultural Interests
Theo des Tombe -- Forest & Related Industry

Robert Graham – Cattle Industry
Seth Rosmarin -- Agricultural Interests
Alex Szabo – Viticulture Industry

September 22, 2025

Delivered via email to:

AltRVOrdinance@nevadacountyca.gov

RE: Comments on Nevada County's Draft RV Housing Ordinance

To: Nevada County Planning Department

The Nevada County Agricultural Advisory Commission (AAC) commends the County of Nevada for its efforts to address the ongoing housing challenges facing our community. The proposed Alternative RV Dwelling Ordinance represents a step in the right direction, and we appreciate the County's work in moving this initiative forward.

In reviewing the draft ordinance, the AAC offers the following comments:

- **Permit Fees** – While the AAC recognizes the need to recover costs through permitting fees, it is essential that fees remain low enough to encourage compliance. Excessively high fees risk discouraging participation in the permitting process and may inadvertently result in continued noncompliance.
- **Resources for Enforcement** – Enforcement will fall to the County's Code Compliance Department. To ensure the effectiveness of this ordinance, the AAC strongly recommends that adequate staffing and resources be provided so Code Compliance can successfully fulfill these responsibilities.
- **Future Exemptions** – The AAC encourages the County to consider potential exemptions in future revisions of this ordinance. Specifically, the agricultural community would benefit from exemptions that support workforce housing for agricultural employees. Allowing greater flexibility in the number of units permitted per parcel could help alleviate critical labor shortages, while permitting the use of alternative wastewater solutions would conserve valuable farmland by reducing the need to convert acreage into leach fields.

The AAC again applauds the County for taking proactive steps to address housing needs and looks forward to continued dialogue on how this ordinance can best support both the community at large and the agricultural workforce in Nevada County.

Respectfully submitted,

Alyssa Mayo

Chair of the Nevada County Agricultural Advisory Commission

Jodeana Patterson

From: Bill Drake <billdrake2@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 22, 2025 4:51 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Comment on proposed Alternative Housing Ordinance

You don't often get email from billdrake2@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

9/22/23

Dear Nevada County Board of Supervisors,

As we know we have a housing shortage as well as a homeless problem in our county. I appreciate that the county supervisors are trying to address these problems with the proposed Alternative Housing Ordinance.

However, some of the proposed regulations are unreasonable, for example, the 3 acre minimum, which is too restrictive, and a fee and inspection every two years, which can be an unnecessary hardship.

I support the changes Tom Durkin has proposed.

Thank you.

Bill Drake
123 Grove Street
Nevada City, CA 95959
530 263-8315

--

Visit my website www.healracism.com

"Bill Drake offers an important perspective from someone who grew up in a world poisoned by racism but learned to see others in a more tolerant light."

~Benjamin Todd Jealous, former President and CEO of the NAACP

Jodeana Patterson

From: Jeff Milo
Sent: Monday, September 22, 2025 4:59 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Comment - Alternative/RV Housing Draft Ordinance

You don't often get email from milo.jeff@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Good afternoon,
I am responding to your request for comment.

I have lived in unincorporated Nevada City for over 10 years and have seen what trailer living is doing to our rural neighborhood. I am against this ordinance as it creates a multitude of problems and does not really help the majority of the homeless or provide more affordable and responsible housing. I believe Nevada County is headed in the wrong direction by essentially dispersing additional trailers across our forests. There are numerous **large** trailer encampments within a mile or so of my property. A significant number of the campers cook outside of their trailers in the summer during high fire danger. They dump trash on my property and my neighbors. They steal property. They run noisy generators even when PG&E power is available. They dump their gray and black tanks into pits or along roadsides. It is an environmental and enforcement nightmare. This ordinance is not going to solve the homeless problem, it will only make it worse. Currently the codes already in place are obviously not being enforced properly. This ordinance only advertises for even more code violations.
I am seeing this effect on social media.

I have had trailers dropped on my property blocking emergency fire escape routes. Levying a fine on a homeless person moving a trailer is not a solution. If there is a wildfire and we cannot escape because of these trailers being moved we die, so a fine does not help us at all. I have had numerous occasions where they are moving a vehicle and they run out of gas or their battery is dead.

Putting low income or homeless people this far out from town is a big mistake. They need services, food, fuel, etc.. What would make much more sense is if the county wants trailer living then they should develop it as a community where greater infrastructure and services can be leveraged. For example something similar to the RV camping at the County Fair grounds.

Thank you,
Jeff Milo

Jodeana Patterson

From: Cambria Roberts <cmdiehlholcomb@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 22, 2025 5:34 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Opposed

You don't often get email from cmdiehlholcomb@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

I oppose the proposition. We are not a community that should endorse this. We should push for better in our community.

Cambria Roberts

Citizen of Nevada Cohnty

Jodeana Patterson

From: Metzler Noelle <noellemetzler530@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 22, 2025 6:29 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Single Mom in need of zoning

You don't often get email from noellemetzler530@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Hello,

The only way Ill EVER be able to live on my own land is threw the passing of this ordiance. Thanks, Noelle

Jodeana Patterson

From: C. M. Eldon <cmeldon1952@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 22, 2025 9:54 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance; Heidi Hall; Code Compliance
Subject: RV Ordinance

You don't often get email from cmeldon1952@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Hello,

Current illegal RV Camper and vehicle living on private property, which the land owner of multiple large parcels is charging large sums of money with numbers over 60 illegal "homes" in the area of Red Dog Rd and Jones Ridge with multiple code violations, recent fires, illegal fireworks, automatic weapon fire three nights in a row last week, all reported to the NCSO, several drug using felons arrested in the last week, illegal marijuana grows with Campers that have 3 inch PVC Pipe connected to the toilet discharge that runs 20 feet out to a hole in the ground need to be addressed and abated before any new approved RV Ordinances should even be considered.

Our Neighborhood Watch Group is incensed with the illegal activity that has been going on up on Banner Mt.

The current illegal situations can not be adequately policed so please explain how adding more RV Housing to the mix is going to eliminate the current situation.

Fix what's broken then move on to create an ordinance that might protect the surrounding neighborhood from what we are experiencing now.

Christine M Eldon

Homeowner at 14699 Oak Ridge Rd, Nevada City, CA 95959

Jodeana Patterson

From: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: FW: I

From: Teresita Juarez Lyon <teresitashautetamales@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 23, 2025 9:49 AM
To: Tyler Barrington <Tyler.Barrington@nevadacountyca.gov>
Subject: I

You don't often get email from teresitashautetamales@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Good morning,

I regret submitting my public comment to you a day late, but I hope you will extend me the grace and include this letter with all the others.

I am in favor of passing the Alternative Housing Ordinance. This is a sensible and doable (partial) solution to homelessness in our community. Yes there are concerns with safety & health codes and regulations, but these can be addressed by the county. One good suggestion was that the property owner be responsible in this regard; and if the county could also relax some requirements and fees without causing harm, that would also help.

Many expressed fears that our county would become overrun with outsiders. Studies show that among homeless populations, the vast majority stay put, with 75% remaining in their local area. Many fear roads clogging up with RVs & trailers during a fire evacuation; I believe the ordinance requires that wheels be removed.

The fact is that we already have many RVs and trailers 'illegally' parking on property anyway. It's time to take care of the problem, and come up with solutions that work, and that are good for the community and individuals.

The most important thing to me is that we do something, move forward. It's good that we have public meetings, where disagreement is (hopefully) respectfully listened to, alternatives and compromises can be considered. But to do nothing is to actively prolong our problems and make things worse.

Thank you,
Theresa Lyon Clark

Jodeana Patterson

From: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: FW: Proposed Alternative/RV Housing Ordinance

From: ken bigham <krbigam@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 24, 2025 8:28 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance <AltRVOrdinance@nevadacountyca.gov>
Subject: Re: Proposed Alternative/RV Housing Ordinance

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Good morning Jodeana,

Here are my final thoughts I wish to add to the public record regarding the Proposed Alternative/RV Housing Ordinance. I have already sent this to Brian Foss, but I want to be sure it's also on the public record for the upcoming BOS meeting.

Since RVs are not intended for long-term housing, what will happen when they become dilapidated and unlivable? Will the occupant(s) be evicted and legal expenses be incurred by the County therefore subsidized with tax-payer dollars, or allowed to live in a RV that no longer meets the requirements of the Planning Department, or be expected to incur the costs themselves, which, likely, they couldn't afford? Will more Planning Department staff need to be hired to oversee this potentially massive project of regulating alternative housing throughout the county -- again at tax-payers expense? Will there be an environmental impact assessment?

Maybe the best solution would be to let these Class-K dwellings fly under the radar, which has been the case for all the 52 years I've lived here. This way the County would not be responsible to incur costs for eviction litigation, RV repair, subsidized rent etc. I know the Planning Department's unwritten policy towards red-tagging existing Class-K dwellings is a hands-off approach unless a neighbor complains. This would, at least, promote Class-K dwellers to keep up repairs and rent etc. for their housing situation.

Thank you for acknowledging my concerns.

Jodeana Patterson

From: Harriet Totten <totten.cooper@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 24, 2025 9:23 AM
To: Brian Foss
Subject: RVs as alternative housing

[You don't often get email from totten.cooper@gmail.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Hello. I am writing to voice my support of allowing RVs as alternative housing on private property. I believe this is a good and kind way to help those who aren't able to get regular housing. It would be great if this could be a temporary solution but I'm sure there will be cases where that's not so. I'm ok with that.

Our county is in such tremendous need of a workable solution, and I think this is a good start.

Thank you,
Harriet Totten
Nevada City

Jodeana Patterson

From: Claire Chapple
Sent: Wednesday, September 24, 2025 1:15 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Cc: Amy Irani
Subject: Comments for Alternative / RV Housing Draft Ordinance
Attachments: Alternative-RV Housing Ordinance (PLN25-0084, ORD25-1) Public Review Draft (PDF)_202508201820258048 (1) - Claire Chapple Comments 9.22.2025.pdf

Hello,

I meant to send this earlier. I have two minor comments about the draft language attached for your consideration.

Best,



**NEVADA
COUNTY**
CALIFORNIA

Claire Chapple (she/her)

Environmental Health Specialist IV
Department of Environmental Health
Office: (530) 265-1449

[Environmental Health | Nevada County, CA](https://www.nevadacountyca.gov)

[nevadacountyca.gov](https://www.nevadacountyca.gov)

Claire.Chapple@NevadaCountyCA.gov

Public Review Draft

Section 12.03.151 Recreational Vehicle Dwelling

- A. **Purpose.** The purpose and intent of this Section is to provide for and establish reasonable regulations regarding occupation of Recreational Vehicles to provide needed housing for County residents.
- B. **Definitions.** For the purposes of this Section the following definitions shall apply:
1. Recreational Vehicle (RV) – A motor home, travel trailer, truck camper, or camping trailer, with or without motive power, designed for human habitation for recreational, emergency, or other occupancy that is structurally sound, safe to occupy and protect occupants from the elements, which meets all of the following criteria:
 - a. It contains less than 320 square feet of internal living room area, excluding built-in equipment, including, but not limited to, wardrobe, closets, cabinets, kitchen units or fixtures, and bath or toilet rooms.
 - b. It contains 400 square feet or less of gross area measured at maximum horizontal projections.
 - c. It is built on a single chassis.
 - d. It is either self-propelled, truck-mounted, or permanently towable on the highways without a permit.

This definition excludes a “Camping Cabin” as provided for in California Health and Safety Code (HSC) Sections 18862.5 and 18871.11 and Title 25 California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 2327; or a Park Trailer, as defined by HSC Section 18009.3.

- C. **Standards.** For purposes of this section, an RV is allowed as a residential dwelling on private property, subject to the approval of an Administrative Development Permit and site inspection with renewal every two years and shall comply with the following standards:
1. **Permitting.** A RV Dwelling Administrative Development Permit shall be valid for two years and may be renewed, at a fee established by the Board of Supervisors, so long as the RV, upon site inspection meets the standards outlined below. The RV shall be unoccupied within ten (10) days of permit expiration.
 2. **Inspection.** Prior to the initial issuance of a County Certificate of Use and Administrative Development Permit renewal, the County Building Department, Environmental Health, Planning, Fire and Code Compliance shall perform an inspection of the site to ensure compliance with the standards contained herein. An RV shall not be occupied until all relevant permits supporting the RV occupancy have received final from the appropriate agency or department and a County issued Certificate of Use is obtained.
 3. **Certifications.** RVs constructed on or after January 1, 1999, but before July 14, 2005, must comply with the ANSI A119.5 standard. RVs manufactured on or after July 14, 2005, must be constructed in accordance with the NFPA 1192 standard. Compliance with these standards can be determined by an insignia similar to those issued by the Recreational Vehicle Industry Association (RVIA) that

- is permanently affixed to the RV. However, an insignia issued exclusively by RVIA is not required (HSC Section 18027.3, as may be amended).
- a. Any recreational vehicle manufactured on or after January 1, 1999 shall bear a label or an insignia indicating the manufacturer's compliance with the American National Standards Institute or National Fire Protection Association standard as defined above.
 - b. Any recreational vehicle manufactured prior to January 1, 1999, shall bear a label or an insignia of approval indicating the manufacturer's compliance with the American National Standards Institute standard or a department insignia issued prior to January 1, 1999, indicating compliance with the state standard that was in effect pursuant to this chapter on the date of manufacture, including any modifications contained in regulations.
4. Registration. A current DMV registration permit shall be required and maintained on the RV at all times.
 5. Deed Restriction. Prior to the issuance of the Certificate of Use for an RV dwelling, the owner shall record a deed restriction which addresses restrictions on the unit as follows:
 - a. An RV dwelling may be rented for long-term use only (30 consecutive calendar days or more); short-term rentals are prohibited.
 6. Zoning, Density and Property Size. An RV may be allowed as an Accessory Dwelling Unit for density purposes as allowed for in this Code Section, exclusive of County Code Title 12, Chapter 3, Section 12.03.190 et. seq., on property that is three (3) acres or greater with a permitted single-family dwelling in the Residential Agricultural (RA), Single-Family Residential (R1) and all Rural (AG, AE, FR and TPZ) Zoning Districts.
 - a. No more than one RV may be occupied as a housing unit pursuant to this Code Section on any property.
 - b. An RV dwelling may be established provided that no other dwelling unit, other than a primary single-family dwelling, and second dwelling unit consistent with density as allowed for by County Code Title 12, Chapter 3, Section 12.03.192, is established on the parcel.
 7. Location. The RV shall be in conformance with setback requirements identified by the County Site Development Standard for a single-family dwelling as required within the Zoning District where the unit will be located.
 8. Site Development Standards: All site development standards applicable to a single-family dwelling shall apply to placement of the RV to be occupied.
 9. Accessory Structures: Accessory structures such as decks, porches, sheds, gazebos, and ramadas shall be designed to be detached from the RV. All accessory structure(s) shall be permitted, inspected and receive final, if required for said structures.

10. Foundation. The RV shall not have its wheels removed and the wheels shall remain inflated. All wheels and leveling/support jacks shall meet manufacturers specifications and shall sit on a surface sufficient to support its weight.
 - a. Parking areas for the RV shall utilize a paved or gravel surface. For the purpose of this subsection, a paved surface shall be a minimum thickness of two inches of asphalt concrete or four inches of reinforced Portland cement concrete over four inches of Class II aggregate base. A chip seal surface shall be a double seal coat over four inches of Class II aggregate base. A gravel surface shall be four inches of Class II aggregate base. All base material shall have a 95 percent compaction over a subgrade compacted to 90 percent. The finish grade for the RVs parking area shall not exceed two percent slope in any direction.
 - b. The RV shall be tied down with anchors or otherwise stabilized as designed by the manufacturer and shall include using wheel chocks and jacks. Use of leveling blocks beyond those provided as standard equipment are prohibited.
11. Screening. The undercarriage, including wheels and axles shall be concealed from view by screening that is solid and fixed at all times during habitation.
12. Habitability. RV dwellings must comply with basic habitability standards such as those found in HSC Section 17920.3 as may be amended, and include but are not limited to the following:
 - a. The RV dwelling must include provisions for living and sleeping in the unit with adequate heat and lighting.
 - b. All occupants must have 24-hour on-site access to hot and cold potable water, a kitchen, toilet, bathing facilities, and a lavatory sink.
 - c. Street address numbers shall be visible from the street and meet Nevada County Addressing regulations pursuant to the County Code Title 16, Chapter 1.
 - d. Smoke and Carbon Monoxide Detectors: Every sleeping area and the hallway providing access to the sleeping area shall be provided with operable smoke detectors. A carbon monoxide detector shall be required for any unit that contains a carbon-fueled appliance or heating device. Said detectors must be maintained in good working condition at all times.
 - e. A portable fire extinguisher meeting Class 2A10BC requirements must be present and accessible within the RV at all times.
 - f. Solid waste management shall comply with local and state laws including but not limited to County Code Title 15, Chapter 13, Sections 15.13.060 and 15.13.070.
 - g. Utility Connections and Mechanical Equipment.
 1. The RV shall be connected to the existing permitted water supply and onsite sewage disposal facilities that serve the onsite single-family dwelling subject to permitting and inspection by the Environmental Health Department and/or utility provider, if on public water or sewer; or All new water supply and onsite wastewater sewage

disposal infrastructure that serve the RV shall meet the requirements of Local Area Management Plan (LAMP) and Onsite Wastewater Treatment System (OWTS) Policy as administered by the Department of Environmental Health, unless an alternative or temporary septic disposal method or water supply is otherwise approved, permitted and inspected by the Environmental Health Department.

- a) Water supply, if provided by Residential Well, must ensure that the main residence and the RV have a daily gallon per minute (gpm) service of no less than 3gpm per residence. Well should have a 6gpm production otherwise a storage tank may be required to support the main residence and the RV.
 - b) The water supply and sewage disposal must be maintained in good working order and functions as originally designed and approved. All sewage (grey and black water) shall be properly permitted and disposed of as specified above.
2. A building permit shall be obtained from the Building Department for the installation of dedicated electrical equipment, panels, meters, or devices required to power a recreational vehicle. These utility connection features may require protective bollards at the discretion of the Building Official. Properly sized extension cords (typically 30 or 50 amps) may be used to connect the RV to the dedicated electrical equipment. Conversely, the use of extension cords to supply power to an RV from non-dedicated electrical equipment is strictly prohibited. An RV may be connected to a permitted, dedicated off-grid electrical system consistent with the Building Department's off-grid policy. Use of a generator as the primary power source for an RV is strictly prohibited.
 3. All fuel connections such as propane or natural gas shall be sufficient to meet the energy demands of the unit and shall meet the manufacturer's specifications. Ground mounted propane tanks require a building permit.
 4. Any water, sewage drain, electrical, fuel supply or other utility connection and installation shall conform to State and local regulations and require inspection by the Building Department or Environmental Health Department and issuance of a permit.
 5. Wood burning heat sources are prohibited.
- h. Any modifications made to the unit which would typically require a building permit shall be inspected and approved by ANSI trained inspector to verify the work is consistent with ANSI standards.
 - i. Wind and Snow Loads. The RV shall be constructed to meet the snow load requirements of Title 25 of the Code of Regulations, Chapter 3, § 208.305(c)(3)(1) and to have the snow load capacity to resist the roof live load applicable to the site where the unit is placed.

1. If located at or above 3,200 feet in elevation, the RV shall be placed under an approved engineered protecting ramada or snow shelter, unless it can be demonstrated that the RV itself meets the required minimum load standards.
 2. An RV located at or above 3,200 feet in elevation, for purposes of this ordinance, are required to provide a signed maintenance agreement with the Building Department concerning the removal of snow from the top of the RV.
13. Driveways. The onsite driveway access shall meet the minimum fire safe driveway standard pursuant to County Code Title 4. Fire Safety Regulations, Chapter 3. Driveways.
14. Fire Protection Plan. The RV dwelling is subject to the following provision:
- a. As a part of the Administrative Development Permit application, the applicant shall submit a Fire Protection Plan approved by the County Fire Marshal and/or their designee prior to approval of the Administrative Development Permit. The approved original shall be kept on file with the Planning Department and an approved copy shall be provided to and kept on file with the appropriate fire district. The Fire Protection Plan shall be site specific and address the following issues:
 1. The proximity to emergency responders and estimated emergency response times.
 2. Describe the primary (and secondary if applicable) access road conditions.
 3. Identify the project's emergency water supply or emergency water storage facilities consistent with Nevada County Code Title 4. Fire Safe Regulations, Chapter 4. Emergency Water Supply.
 4. Location of the required fire extinguisher.
 5. Identification of a feasible evacuation plan and/or safe evacuation routes for future occupants of the project; and
 6. Provide a Fuels Management Plan that requires:
 - a) Defensible space design consistent with Public Resources Code 4291.
 - b) Identification of high fuel load areas.
 - c) How adequate defensible space will be ensured.
 - d) The mechanism for maintaining defensible space; and
 - e) Identification of a feasible evacuation plan and/or safe evacuation routes for use by future occupants of the project.

Title 12, Chapter 6, Section 12.06.010: Definitions (blue text new language)

Existing.

~~Recreational Vehicle, Qualified means a recreational vehicle that meets all of the following minimum construction standards:~~

~~A. Either:~~

- ~~1. Manufactured after 1974 and before 1999 in compliance with the 1974 ANSI H19.2 standard or better as provided for herein and with requirements of the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) and bearing its certification sticker; or~~
- ~~2. Manufactured after 1998 in compliance with the 1998 Edition of the ANSI standard A119.5 for park trailers, and the 1996 Edition of the ANSI standard A119.2 for all other recreational vehicles or better and bearing a label or insignia indicating the manufacture's compliance to the appropriate ANSI standard.~~

~~B. Certified, to the satisfaction of the Building Department, to meet the snow load requirements of Title 25 of the California Code of Regulations, Chapter 3, 208.305(e)(3)(1) and to have the snow load capacity to resist the roof live load applicable to the site where the unit is placed (or placed under an approved protecting ramada if the recreational vehicle does not itself meet the required minimum load standards);~~

~~C. Contain a minimum of three hundred twenty (320) square feet of internal living area;~~

~~D. Set up in compliance with no less than the manufacturer's minimum specifications or engineer's certification, with provisions for attachment of not less than six (6) ground anchors to the chassis being provided unless other methods are determined necessary for safety by the Building Official (when over the roof ties are provided, strapping shall conform to Federal Specification QQS 781-H); and~~

~~E. Manufactured or modified with HCD or HUD approval to meet the fire safety requirements of ANSI A119.5 Standard for Park Trailers Sections 3-2.3, 3-2.4 and 3-4 (including 3-4.1, 3-4.2, 3-4.3 and 3-4.4).~~

Proposed: (Health and Safety Code Section 18010, as may be amended)

“Recreational vehicle” means the following as defined by HCS Section 18010, as may be amended:

(a) A motor home, travel trailer, truck camper, or camping trailer, with or without motive power, designed for human habitation for recreational, emergency, or other occupancy, that meets all of the following criteria:

- (1) It contains less than 320 square feet of internal living room area, excluding built-in equipment, including, but not limited to, wardrobe, closets, cabinets, kitchen units or fixtures, and bath or toilet rooms.
- (2) It contains 400 square feet or less of gross area measured at maximum horizontal projections.
- (3) It is built on a single chassis.
- (4) It is either self-propelled, truck-mounted, or permanently towable on the highways without a permit.

**Table 12.02.210.B
Single-Family Districts Allowable Uses and Permit Requirements**

Key to Land Use Permit Requirements:

A — Allowed subject to zoning compliance and building permit issuance

DP — Development Permit required per [Section 12.05.050](#)

UP — Use Permit required per [Section 12.05.060](#)

NP — Not Permitted

NA — Not Applicable

Varies — Refer to listed [Title 12](#) Section for allowable uses and permit requirements.

ALLOWABLE LAND USES (See Section 12.01.040 for Similar Uses)	RA	R1	Zoning Sections

Dwelling, Single-Family ⁽²⁾	A	A	
Dwellings, Multiple-Family	UP	UP	12.03.170
Dwelling, Accessory and/or Junior Accessory Unit	A	A	12.03.191
Dwellings, Second Units consistent with allowed density	DP	DP	12.03.192
Dwelling, Recreational Vehicle	DP	DP	12.03.151

**Table 12.02.030
Rural Districts Allowable Uses and Permit Requirements**

Key to Land Use Permit Requirements:

A — Allowed subject to zoning compliance and building permit issuance

DP — Development Permit required per [Section 12.05.050](#)

UP — Use Permit required per [Section 12.05.060](#)

NP — Not Permitted

NA — Not Applicable

Varies — Refer to listed Zoning Section for allowable uses and permit requirements.

ALLOWABLE LAND USES (See Section 12.01.040 for Similar Uses)	AG	AE	FR	TPZ	Zoning Sections

Dwelling, Single-Family (including Transitional and Supportive Housing)	A	A	A	A	
Dwelling, Accessory and/or Junior Accessory Unit	A	A	A	A	12.03.191
Dwellings, Second Units consistent with allowed density	DP	DP	DP	DP	12.03.192
Dwellings, Multiple-Family	UP	UP	UP	UP	12.03.170
Dwelling, Recreational Vehicle	DP	DP	DP	DP	12.03.151

Jodeana Patterson

From: Megan Soto Kane <meg.soto@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 24, 2025 3:31 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Concerned Citizen in opposition to RV as permanent housing ordinance

You don't often get email from meg.soto@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Nevada County Planning Department
950 Maidu Avenue
Nevada City, CA 95959

Dear Planning Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing as a concerned resident and homeowner in Nevada County in response to proposals that would allow recreational vehicles (RVs) to be used as **permanent housing**.

While I understand and deeply empathize with the need to address housing shortages and affordability, I respectfully urge the County to **draw a clear line between innovative housing solutions and policies that could unintentionally invite long-term issues such as unregulated encampments, environmental degradation, and increased crime rates.**

Cities like **Sacramento, CA**, and others across the state have attempted to address homelessness by allowing RVs in urban and suburban areas. However, these well-intentioned policies have often resulted in:

- **Public health concerns**, including unmanaged waste and lack of sanitation.
- **Increased property crime and drug-related activity**, as documented in multiple neighborhood reports.
- **Strained law enforcement and code enforcement resources**, unable to regulate rapidly expanding encampments.

Unlike **Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)** or legally permitted mobile homes, RVs are **not designed or constructed for long-term habitation**. They lack proper insulation, waste systems, and safety standards for full-time occupancy. Designating them as permanent housing would be, in effect, sanctioning a form of **unregulated and unsupervised homelessness**.

I **do support thoughtful flexibility** for families, especially those caring for aging parents or adult children in transition. As such, I would propose a **conditional permitting process** that allows:

- Temporary RV use for **family members**, with clear **duration limits** (e.g., 6–12 months).
- **On-site lease agreements** recorded with the county.
- Minimum property size and **hookup requirements** to ensure health and safety standards are met.
- Mandatory **review and renewal process** to avoid permanent conversion of recreational vehicles into substandard dwellings.

This allows us to extend compassion without compromising the long-term vision of our communities or lowering the standard of what “home” means in Nevada County.

Our forests, waterways, and rural lifestyle are treasures worth protecting. We cannot afford to adopt policies that, however well-meaning, open the door to unintended and irreversible consequences.

Thank you for your service to our county and your thoughtful consideration of this vital matter.

Warmly,

Megan Soto Kane

PO Box 1151

Nevada City, CA 95959

Jodeana Patterson

Subject: FW: Notice of Postponement of Public Hearing (for PC 10/9/25 meeting):
Alternative/RV Dwelling Ordinance (PLN25-0084; ORD25-1)

From: john murray <eldorado37@hotmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, September 25, 2025 7:30 PM

To: Jodeana Patterson <Jodeana.Patterson@nevadacountyca.gov>

Subject: Re: Notice of Postponement of Public Hearing (for PC 10/9/25 meeting): Alternative/RV Dwelling Ordinance (PLN25-0084; ORD25-1)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Thank You Jodeana Patterson for the updated information, I know this is a sticky situation for everyone and I understand what it is meant to accomplish? I only hope that this happens on developed properties so at least there will be some control of the units, being an ex, Rv'r I know how things go out there.

John Murray

RECEIVED

SEP 29 2025

NEVADA COUNTY
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

September 20, 2025

Danny Milman
Nevada County Planning Commission
950 Maidu Avenue, Suite 170
Nevada City, CA 95959

Dear Commissioner Milman:

I am strongly in favor of the proposed alternative housing ordinance. It will help provide needed housing to those who might otherwise be homeless. Also, the more homeless people who can get housing and not be living in the woods, the less chance of an illegal campfire causing a large wildfire. I don't want my home to burn down because a campfire got out of control!

This ordinance is somewhat restrictive; it will not bring hordes of new trailer dwellers to our county. That is a myth that those against this ordinance would like you to believe. But it will allow homeowners with a large enough piece of land and the proper infrastructure to rent a space for a trailer or an RV. This ordinance not only creates needed housing, it legalizes some housing that already exists.

I am a solidly middle-class retired person, but I can barely afford to live here, primarily due to the cost of housing. I urge you to support this ordinance to help provide housing. Not only is it a smart thing to do, *it is the right thing to do.*

Sincerely,



Randall Musgrave
Nevada County

September 20, 2025

Jo Garst
Nevada County Planning Commission
950 Maidu Avenue, Suite 170
Nevada City, CA 95959

RECEIVED
SEP 29 2025
NEVADA COUNTY
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Dear Commissioner Garst:

I am strongly in favor of the proposed alternative housing ordinance. It will help provide needed housing to those who might otherwise be homeless. Also, the more homeless people who can get housing and not be living in the woods, the less chance of an illegal campfire causing a large wildfire. I don't want my home to burn down because a campfire got out of control!

This ordinance is somewhat restrictive; it will not bring hordes of new trailer dwellers to our county. That is a myth that those against this ordinance would like you to believe. But it will allow homeowners with a large enough piece of land and the proper infrastructure to rent a space for a trailer or an RV. This ordinance not only creates needed housing, it legalizes some housing that already exists.

I am a solidly middle-class retired person, but I can barely afford to live here, primarily due to the cost of housing. I urge you to support this ordinance to help provide housing. Not only is it a smart thing to do, *it is the right thing to do.*

Sincerely,



Randall Musgrave
Nevada County

RECEIVED

SEP 29 2025

NEVADA COUNTY
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

September 20, 2025

John Foley
Nevada County Planning Commission
950 Maidu Avenue, Suite 170
Nevada City, CA 95959

Dear Commissioner Foley:

I am strongly in favor of the proposed alternative housing ordinance. It will help provide needed housing to those who might otherwise be homeless. Also, the more homeless people who can get housing and not be living in the woods, the less chance of an illegal campfire causing a large wildfire. I don't want my home to burn down because a campfire got out of control!

This ordinance is somewhat restrictive; it will not bring hordes of new trailer dwellers to our county. That is a myth that those against this ordinance would like you to believe. But it will allow homeowners with a large enough piece of land and the proper infrastructure to rent a space for a trailer or an RV. This ordinance not only creates needed housing, it legalizes some housing that already exists.

I am a solidly middle-class retired person, but I can barely afford to live here, primarily due to the cost of housing. I urge you to support this ordinance to help provide housing. Not only is it a smart thing to do, *it is the right thing to do.*

Sincerely,



Randall Musgrave
Nevada County

RECEIVED

SEP 29 2025

NEVADA COUNTY
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

September 20, 2025

Steve French
Nevada County Planning Commission
950 Maidu Avenue, Suite 170
Nevada City, CA 95959

Dear Commissioner French:

I am strongly in favor of the proposed alternative housing ordinance. It will help provide needed housing to those who might otherwise be homeless. Also, the more homeless people who can get housing and not be living in the woods, the less chance of an illegal campfire causing a large wildfire. I don't want my home to burn down because a campfire got out of control!

This ordinance is somewhat restrictive; it will not bring hordes of new trailer dwellers to our county. That is a myth that those against this ordinance would like you to believe. But it will allow homeowners with a large enough piece of land and the proper infrastructure to rent a space for a trailer or an RV. This ordinance not only creates needed housing, it legalizes some housing that already exists.

I am a solidly middle-class retired person, but I can barely afford to live here, primarily due to the cost of housing. I urge you to support this ordinance to help provide housing. Not only is it a smart thing to do, *it is the right thing to do.*

Sincerely,



Randall Musgrave
Nevada County

RECEIVED

SEP 29 2025

NEVADA COUNTY
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

September 20, 2025

Terence McAteer
Nevada County Planning Commission
950 Maidu Avenue, Suite 170
Nevada City, CA 95959

Dear Commissioner McAteer:

I am strongly in favor of the proposed alternative housing ordinance. It will help provide needed housing to those who might otherwise be homeless. Also, the more homeless people who can get housing and not be living in the woods, the less chance of an illegal campfire causing a large wildfire. I don't want my home to burn down because a campfire got out of control!

This ordinance is somewhat restrictive; it will not bring hordes of new trailer dwellers to our county. That is a myth that those against this ordinance would like you to believe. But it will allow homeowners with a large enough piece of land and the proper infrastructure to rent a space for a trailer or an RV. This ordinance not only creates needed housing, it legalizes some housing that already exists.

I am a solidly middle-class retired person, but I can barely afford to live here, primarily due to the cost of housing. I urge you to support this ordinance to help provide housing. Not only is it a smart thing to do, *it is the right thing to do.*

Sincerely,



Randall Musgrave
Nevada County

Jodeana Patterson

From: Peter Brewer <peter@brewerfirm.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 28, 2025 6:21 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Comment on RVs as ADUs

You don't often get email from peter@brewerfirm.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

I think the draft ordinance has one issue bass-ackwards. If RVs are being used as ADUs they should be immobilized, that is the wheels should be removed. Otherwise in a wildfire evacuation emergency the RV owner will try to evacuate their RV down our narrow mountain roads, creating congestion and threatening the safety of the other residents who are trying to flee.

Peter N. Brewer, Esq.
11401 Winter Moon Way
Nevada City, CA 95959-9694

(650) 327-2900 **ext'n 11**

www.BrewerFirm.com

BayAreaRealEstateLawyers.com

Real Estate Law – From the Ground Up®



Jodeana Patterson

From: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: FW: RV on McCourtney

From: Court Worden <cworden33@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 29, 2025 11:11 AM
To: Sue Hoek <Sue.Hoek@nevadacountyca.gov>; Tyler Barrington <Tyler.Barrington@nevadacountyca.gov>; Robb Tucker <Robb.Tucker@nevadacountyca.gov>; Lisa Swarthout <Lisa.Swarthout@nevadacountyca.gov>; Jeanne Franklin <jeanneaf@yahoo.com>
Cc: bdofsupervisors <bdofsupervisors@nevadacountyca.gov>
Subject: RV on McCourtney

Some people who received this message don't often get email from cworden33@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Good morning, Sue. This RV was parked in front our house on McCourtney Rd on Friday and our guests spending the weekend with us from out of town were astounded to see how people are living in Nevada County.


The CHP weren't concerned about the dilapidated RV on the shoulderless McCourtney Rd nor was the Sheriff. The sheriff passed along code enforcement's telephone number so I could initiate the removal of what we thought was an abandoned RV.

I haven't heard from the enforcement team yet but the RV is still here and the owner has returned to move the RV up the road to a more permanent living location?

Here are a few pics to give you caution before approving a dangerous RV ordinance to our countryside. These living conditions are unsat and strongly resemble the streets of Oakland.

The scene on Saturday morning resembled a horror flick..the doors were left wide open and the ignition has been ripped out and rewired. The interior resembles a scene from Breaking Bad. The tag was last registered in 2017. Let's not allow this to become the norm in Nevada County.

Thanks
Court Worden





Sent from my iPhone

Jodeana Patterson

From: Aaron Siniscalco <tharp374@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 1, 2025 5:46 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Please vote NO on this

You don't often get email from tharp374@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

My wife and I want to express our deep concern that an approval on this will create a serious drop in property values and the peaceful community energy that we love about this county. Please vote no.

Regards,

Tracie Nickle and Aaron Siniscalco

Owners of several properties and rentals in Nevada County

Tracie Nickle phone
530-615-1698

Jodeana Patterson

From: Trevor Nichols <trevornichols007@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 2, 2025 10:41 AM
To: Planning
Subject: RV housing

Some people who received this message don't often get email from trevornichols007@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

For the record, I am opposed to this happening. I already have people living next in illegal structures. They are nice people, but it adds extra congestion, noise and puts me in an awkward situation to deal with it. I think allowing RV's will also have poor regulation and increase traffic and garbage in our neighborhood on roads that we need to maintain without county support.

Trevor Nichols
530 559-0728

Jodeana Patterson

From: Peter Brewer <peter@brewerfirm.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 2, 2025 1:58 PM
To: Planning
Subject: RVs as ADUs

You don't often get email from peter@brewerfirm.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Dear Commissioners, I am concerned that the draft RVs as ADUs ordinance requires the RVs to be mobile. I think the opposite makes better sense. I think the RVs being used as ADUs should be required to have their wheels removed. Otherwise in the event of a wildfire evacuation the owners may attempt to evacuate in their RVs thus clogging the evacuation routes with oversized sluggish and unwieldy vehicles at a critical time.

Peter N. Brewer, Esq.
11401 Winter Moon Way
Nevada City, CA 95959-9694

(650) 327-2900 **ext'n 11**

www.BrewerFirm.com

BayAreaRealEstateLawyers.com

Real Estate Law – From the Ground Up®



Jodeana Patterson

From: Conor Scott <conor68w@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 2, 2025 4:09 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: RV Housing Ordinance

You don't often get email from conor68w@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

I believe the county requiring permits for trailers on private property to be government overreach. I strongly oppose this ordinance due to my respect for people's private property rights. People just want to live. State and Federal government already dictate every aspect of our lives. We dont need the county doing it as well. Respect our freedom.

Very Respectfully,

Conor A. Scott
C: 831-818-9077
conor68w@gmail.com

Jodeana Patterson

From: Trish McCoy <trishkmccoy@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, October 3, 2025 9:52 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Opposition to RVs as Additional Dwelling Units

You don't often get email from trishkmccoy@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Dear Council/Commission/Board Members

I am writing to respectfully express my opposition to the proposal to allow recreational vehicles (RVs) to serve as additional dwelling units (ADUs) within our community. While I recognize the need for creative housing solutions, RVs as permanent residences raise significant concerns that would negatively impact neighborhood quality of life, safety, and long-term planning.

RVs are not designed for permanent habitation, and using them as ADUs raises important issues, including:

- **Safety and Health Standards:** RVs typically do not meet the same building codes and health standards as ADUs constructed under state and local guidelines. This creates risks related to fire safety, sanitation, and structural integrity.
- **Infrastructure Strain:** Increased use of RVs could overburden existing sewer, water, and electrical systems that are not designed to accommodate these types of dwellings.
- **Neighborhood Character:** Allowing RVs as residences could diminish the character and appearance of established neighborhoods, potentially affecting property values and community cohesion.
- **Temporary vs. Permanent Housing:** RVs are inherently temporary in design. Endorsing their use as ADUs undermines efforts to develop safe, durable, and sustainable housing options that meet long-term community needs.

I strongly encourage the City/County to focus on solutions that uphold safety, quality standards, and thoughtful planning. Allowing RVs to function as ADUs sets a precedent that may have unintended consequences for our neighborhoods and residents.

Thank you for your consideration of these concerns. I urge you to reject the proposal to permit RVs as ADUs and instead support housing approaches that balance affordability with safety and community integrity.

Sincerely

Trish McCoy

14434 Wilder Lane, Grass Valley, CA

Jodeana Patterson

From: tina tyler <tlouisetyler@hotmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 5, 2025 6:48 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: ADU RV

You don't often get email from tlouisetyler@hotmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

I think this is a great idea. Rent is so high and home prices keep going up. I hope it passes.
Nevada resident

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

Jodeana Patterson

From: blue.oyster70@tuta.com
Sent: Sunday, October 5, 2025 8:08 AM
To: Brian Foss
Subject: RVs on a Residential Parcel.

You don't often get email from blue.oyster70@tuta.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Hi.

My name is Mike Wicks and my wife and I have lived in Alta Sierra for nine years. We vote **NO** on having RVs on a Residential Parcel.

Regards,

Mike and Laura Wicks

Jodeana Patterson

From: gary@plan-aire.com
Sent: Monday, October 6, 2025 4:33 PM
To: Planning
Subject: Comments on using recreational vehicles as housing;

You don't often get email from gary@plan-aire.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

I sent these comments on September 11th and September 29th, but this email has been stuck in my outbox. I sent the comments to AltRVOrdinance@NevadaCountyCa.gov;

California's Housing Crisis Is Now Being Offloaded Onto Private Landowners

By Gary Baker

September 11, 2025 | Nevada County, CA

As Nevada County considers allowing recreation vehicles (RVs) as permanent housing on rural parcels over 3 acres in size, it's time to ask a fundamental question: **Why are private landowners being forced to shoulder the burden of California's housing crisis?**

The well-intended effort to legalize accessory dwelling units (ADUs), tiny homes, and now RVs on private lots was marketed as a creative response to the state's chronic housing shortage. But in reality, these policies represent a **massive shift of responsibility away from state and local governments—and onto the backs of homeowners.**

When Policy Becomes Privatized Planning

California's housing laws—particularly the ADU legislation passed in recent years—have been framed as progress. And yet, these laws place the burden squarely on private property owners to become de facto developers, landlords, and financiers of additional housing, often in rural or suburban areas **never designed for the added density.**

According to Nevada County's own figures, the **average breakeven time for a homeowner building an ADU is 17 years.** Meanwhile, property owners must navigate permits, pay for infrastructure upgrades, comply with strict code requirements, and assume all financial risk.

These homeowners are doing the work that **professional developers can no longer do**, because California's broken planning system has made large-scale housing development nearly impossible.

Outdated Planning Laws Are the Root Problem

Modern planning in California is still grounded in principles developed in the 1960s and 70s at UC Berkeley—concepts like **urban containment, growth boundaries, and environmental overlays**. While these tools were originally meant to protect open space and reduce sprawl, they have since evolved into **an iron cage of legal and procedural barriers**.

As a result, we've concentrated development in already built-out areas and ignored the abundance of available land elsewhere in the state—**land that could be safely, responsibly developed** if we had the political will and legal pathways to do so.

Instead of reforming these outdated laws, the state has chosen to **push density into places that were never designed for it**—single-family lots, aging septic systems, fire-prone rural zones, and overburdened school and law enforcement districts.

The Triple Obstruction: CEQA, NIMBYs, and Local Politics

Three major obstacles now dominate the landscape of housing development in California:

1. **CEQA Abuse**: Originally passed to protect the environment, the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) is now routinely weaponized by special interests and NIMBY groups to **kill or delay projects for years**, often under the pretext of traffic, noise, or air quality concerns.
2. **NIMBYism**: Local opposition—often from homeowners already secure in their housing—continues to block or downsize projects through lawsuits, appeals, and political pressure. This resistance is rarely about the environment and far more often about **preserving property values and preventing change**.
3. **Planning Paralysis**: Local planning departments are caught between state mandates and local resistance, often stalling or burying projects in endless review cycles. Developers who can't afford to spend millions fighting this bureaucracy simply walk away.

Consequences for Our Communities

This patchwork approach—wherein RVs, ADUs, and tiny homes are jammed onto lots not built for them—leads to **degraded community character, overloaded public services, and increased safety risks**.

- **Traffic congestion** increases on roads never designed for higher density.
- **Schools** struggle to keep up without new facilities or tax revenue.
- **Emergency services**, especially in fire-prone areas, are stretched dangerously thin.
- **Water systems**, often reliant on wells and septic, face contamination and overuse.

And yet, there is no public investment to accompany this forced density—no new parks, no new roads, no upgraded fire stations, no enhanced policing. **It's privatized urbanization—on a rural backbone**.

Where We Go From Here

California's housing crisis will not be solved by pushing homeowners to build RV pads in the woods. The solution lies in **bold, systemic reform**:

- **Modernize planning laws** to reflect 21st-century needs—not 1970s containment theories.
- **Reform CEQA** to stop its abuse while maintaining its core environmental protections.

- **Challenge NIMBYism in the courts**, recognizing that the state has a constitutional interest in ensuring housing access.
- **Invest in infrastructure** to support well-planned new communities in suitable areas—not piecemeal infill that weakens existing neighborhoods.

The people of Nevada County—and all of California—deserve a real plan. Not a patchwork of half-measures that places the burden of housing on private citizens while letting governments off the hook.

Jodeana Patterson

From: Minkel, Peter G.@Waterboards <Peter.Minkel2@waterboards.ca.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, October 7, 2025 11:09 AM
To: Brian Foss
Cc: Yang, Houa@Waterboards; WB-RB5S-chron
Subject: COMMENTS TO REQUEST FOR REVIEW FOR THE PUBLIC HEARING, ALTERNATIVE/RV DWELLING ORDINANCE (PLN25-0084; ORD25-1) PROJECT, NEVADA COUNTY
Attachments: AlternativeRV Dwelling Ordinance (PLN25-0084; ORD25-1)_HY.pdf

You don't often get email from peter.minkel2@waterboards.ca.gov. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Brian,
Enclosed are our comments for your Project. We want the possible permits required in the record for planning purposes. Please email if you have any questions.
Pete



Peter G. Minkel
Engineering Geologist

R5 CENTRAL VALLEY - SACRAMENTO
R5 Point Source Permitting | 401 Certification Unit

Email: Peter.Minkel2@waterboards.ca.gov
Phone: +1 (916) 464-4684

Regional Water Quality Control Boards
11020 Sun Center Drive, Suite 200, Rancho Cordova CA 95670
Website: www.waterboards.ca.gov

Follow: [X](#) | [YouTube](#) | [Facebook](#) | [LinkedIn](#)



Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board

7 October 2025

Brian Foss
Nevada County Community Development Agency
950 Maidu Avenue, Suite 170
Nevada City, CA 95959-7902
Brian.Foss@nevadacountyca.gov

COMMENTS TO REQUEST FOR REVIEW FOR THE PUBLIC HEARING, ALTERNATIVE/RV DWELLING ORDINANCE (PLN25-0084; ORD25-1) PROJECT, NEVADA COUNTY

Pursuant to the Nevada County Community Development Agency's 19 September 2025 request, the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (Central Valley Water Board) has reviewed the *Request for Review for the Public Hearing* for the Alternative/RV Dwelling Ordinance (PLN25-0084; ORD25-1) Project, located in Nevada County.

Our agency is delegated with the responsibility of protecting the quality of surface and groundwaters of the state; therefore our comments will address concerns surrounding those issues.

I. Regulatory Setting

Basin Plan

The Central Valley Water Board is required to formulate and adopt Basin Plans for all areas within the Central Valley region under Section 13240 of the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act. Each Basin Plan must contain water quality objectives to ensure the reasonable protection of beneficial uses, as well as a program of implementation for achieving water quality objectives with the Basin Plans. Federal regulations require each state to adopt water quality standards to protect the public health or welfare, enhance the quality of water and serve the purposes of the Clean Water Act. In California, the beneficial uses, water quality objectives, and the Antidegradation Policy are the State's water quality standards. Water quality standards are also contained in the National Toxics Rule, 40 CFR Section 131.36, and the California Toxics Rule, 40 CFR Section 131.38.

The Basin Plan is subject to modification as necessary, considering applicable laws, policies, technologies, water quality conditions and priorities. The original Basin Plans were adopted in 1975, and have been updated and revised periodically as required, using Basin Plan amendments. Once the Central Valley Water Board has

NICHOLAS AVDIS, CHAIR | PATRICK PULUPA, EXECUTIVE OFFICER

11020 Sun Center Drive, #200, Rancho Cordova, 95670-6114 | www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley

Attachment 3

adopted a Basin Plan amendment in noticed public hearings, it must be approved by the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board), Office of Administrative Law (OAL) and in some cases, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). Basin Plan amendments only become effective after they have been approved by the OAL and in some cases, the USEPA. Every three (3) years, a review of the Basin Plan is completed that assesses the appropriateness of existing standards and evaluates and prioritizes Basin Planning issues. For more information on the *Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins*, please visit our website:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/basin_plans/

Antidegradation Considerations

All wastewater discharges must comply with the Antidegradation Policy (State Water Board Resolution 68-16) and the Antidegradation Implementation Policy contained in the Basin Plan. The Antidegradation Implementation Policy is available on page 74 at:

https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/basin_plans/sacsjr_2018_05.pdf

In part it states:

Any discharge of waste to high quality waters must apply best practicable treatment or control not only to prevent a condition of pollution or nuisance from occurring, but also to maintain the highest water quality possible consistent with the maximum benefit to the people of the State.

This information must be presented as an analysis of the impacts and potential impacts of the discharge on water quality, as measured by background concentrations and applicable water quality objectives.

The antidegradation analysis is a mandatory element in the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System and land discharge Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) permitting processes. The environmental review document should evaluate potential impacts to both surface and groundwater quality.

II. Permitting Requirements

Clean Water Act Section 404 Permit

If the project will involve the discharge of dredged or fill material in navigable waters or wetlands, a permit pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act may be needed from the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). If a Section 404 permit is required by the USACE, the Central Valley Water Board will review the permit application to ensure that discharge will not violate water quality standards. If the project requires surface water drainage realignment, the applicant is advised to contact the Department of Fish and Game for information on Streambed Alteration Permit requirements. If you have any questions regarding the Clean Water Act Section 404 permits, please contact the Regulatory Division of the Sacramento District of USACE at (916) 557-5250.

Clean Water Act Section 401 Permit – Water Quality Certification

If an USACE permit (e.g., Non-Reporting Nationwide Permit, Nationwide Permit, Letter of Permission, Individual Permit, Regional General Permit, Programmatic General Permit), or any other federal permit (e.g., Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act or Section 9 from the United States Coast Guard), is required for this project due to the disturbance of waters of the United States (such as streams and wetlands), then a Water Quality Certification must be obtained from the Central Valley Water Board prior to initiation of project activities. There are no waivers for 401 Water Quality Certifications. For more information on the Water Quality Certification, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:

https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/water_quality_certification/

Waste Discharge Requirements – Discharges to Waters of the State

If USACE determines that only non-jurisdictional waters of the State (i.e., “non-federal” waters of the State) are present in the proposed project area, the proposed project may require a Waste Discharge Requirement (WDR) permit to be issued by Central Valley Water Board. Under the California Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, discharges to all waters of the State, including all wetlands and other waters of the State including, but not limited to, isolated wetlands, are subject to State regulation. For more information on the Waste Discharges to Surface Water NPDES Program and WDR processes, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at: https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/waste_to_surface_water/

Projects involving excavation or fill activities impacting less than 0.2 acre or 400 linear feet of non-jurisdictional waters of the state and projects involving dredging activities impacting less than 50 cubic yards of non-jurisdictional waters of the state may be eligible for coverage under the State Water Resources Control Board Water Quality Order No. 2004-0004-DWQ (General Order 2004-0004). For more information on the General Order 2004-0004, visit the State Water Resources Control Board website at:

https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/board_decisions/adopted_orders/water_quality/2004/wqo/wqo2004-0004.pdf

Dewatering Permit

If the proposed project includes construction or groundwater dewatering to be discharged to land, the proponent may apply for coverage under State Water Board General Water Quality Order (Low Threat General Order) 2003-0003 or the Central Valley Water Board’s Waiver of Report of Waste Discharge and Waste Discharge Requirements (Low Threat Waiver) R5-2018-0085. Small temporary construction dewatering projects are projects that discharge groundwater to land from excavation activities or dewatering of underground utility vaults. Dischargers seeking coverage under the General Order or Waiver must file a Notice of Intent with the Central Valley Water Board prior to beginning discharge.

For more information regarding the Low Threat General Order and the application process, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:
http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/board_decisions/adopted_orders/water_quality/2003/wqo/wqo2003-0003.pdf

For more information regarding the Low Threat Waiver and the application process, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:
https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/board_decisions/adopted_orders/waivers/r5-2018-0085.pdf

Limited Threat General NPDES Permit

If the proposed project includes construction dewatering and it is necessary to discharge the groundwater to waters of the United States, the proposed project will require coverage under a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. Dewatering discharges are typically considered a low or limited threat to water quality and may be covered under the General Order for *Limited Threat Discharges to Surface Water* (Limited Threat General Order). A complete Notice of Intent must be submitted to the Central Valley Water Board to obtain coverage under the Limited Threat General Order. For more information regarding the Limited Threat General Order and the application process, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:

https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/board_decisions/adopted_orders/general_orders/r5-2016-0076-01.pdf

NPDES Permit

If the proposed project discharges waste that could affect the quality of surface waters of the State, other than into a community sewer system, the proposed project will require coverage under a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. A complete Report of Waste Discharge must be submitted with the Central Valley Water Board to obtain a NPDES Permit. For more information regarding the NPDES Permit and the application process, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at: <https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/help/permit/>

If you have questions regarding these comments, please contact me at (916) 464-4684 or Peter.Minkel2@waterboards.ca.gov.



Peter G. Minkel
Engineering Geologist

Jodeana Patterson

From: Scott Knorp <scottknorp@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 16, 2025 3:20 PM
To: Danny Milman; Steve French; Terence McAteer; John Foley; Jo Garst
Cc: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Please vote against the RV ordinance

You don't often get email from scottknorp@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Dear Planning Commissioners -

As a homeowner in Nevada County, I am asking that you vote against the RV ordinance.

My reasons are simple; we have seen in other CA counties how lowering the permission structure and allowing RVs to be full-time residences destroys the social fabric. Once word gets out around CA that Nevada County allows full-time living in campers, those who are currently living in RVs are not going to pay attention to the 3-acre limitations or the hooking up to electrical and septic requirements in the draft ordinance. The county doesn't have the resources to police the hundreds of people who are living illegally in RVs now, so how will that improve when we get more of this flouting of the laws?

Please vote No. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Scott Knorp
916-871-6772

Jodeana Patterson

From: Bonomo, Ryan <BonomoR@arc.losrios.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, October 22, 2025 3:23 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Nevada County RV Ordinance Comment

You don't often get email from bonomor@arc.losrios.edu. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Dear Nevada County Board of Supervisors,

I'm writing to express my gratitude for your thoughtful work on the RV ordinance. This measured approach balances compassion with community needs, and I appreciate the County's commitment to being a force for good in addressing a complex issue.

Thank you for your leadership and for creating policy that serves all residents.

Sincerely,

Ryan Bonomo
Property Owner
19941 Casa Loma Dr, Grass Valley

Jodeana Patterson

From: Rick Hill <rick95648@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, October 24, 2025 10:14 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: RV recreation Vote No

You don't often get email from rick95648@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

I urge you to not allow the use of RV living due to fire hazards and cleanliness. Rules of Housing and land use should be upheld and no person should live in a Recreational Vehicle as their permanent residence.

Jodeana Patterson

From: RM Fraley <rmf525@att.net>
Sent: Friday, October 24, 2025 10:31 AM
To: Brian Foss
Cc: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment: PLN25-0084, ORD25-1 comment

You don't often get email from rmf525@att.net. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Nevada County Officials,

This is another example of the 'lack of common sense' coming from our local governments. You are now going to allow people (homeless types) to live in RVs on private property, providing they adhere to the " Zoning Regulations to establish health and safety standards, permitting and certification requirements, and site development standards allowing for recreational vehicles as an additional residential unit on developed properties subject to the permitting and standards outlined in the draft Ordinance". Now the problem is there is NO way you can realistically enforce this, in my opinion. With marginal law enforcement staffs in both Grass Valley, Nevada City and the country sheriff dept... vs the huge areas in the hills ... it can't be done with current staffing. Not only will the drug problem increase but the Fire hazard is the one I worry about. Can U Imagin one of the partying drug addicts or drunks tripping over the BBQ in one of the remote property sites in the hills.... I may yet get burned out of my home when the big one hits.

Thank you for the failure of foresight of what this ordinance may bring....
Respectfully,

Mike Fraley
11894 Brentwood Ct.
Nevada City, CA 95959

Jodeana Patterson

From: Lora A. Moore <Lora.A.Moore@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, October 24, 2025 10:50 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance; Brian Foss
Subject: Additional RV comment
Attachments: RV Ordinance Ltr 9-18-25.docx

You don't often get email from lora.a.moore@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Hello,

I submitted the attached letter in September and am still strongly opposed to approving RV's, campers, trucks and even tents as supplemental housing for the various reasons covered in my letter.

I want to add one other comment.

I have seen a prominent sign posted a couple of times on the corner of Bennett St & 174 advertising to buy "used RV's" for cash. My fear is that there already is in motion plans to place RV's on properties that may not come close to complying with the proposed ordinance.

Again, effective and enforceable guard rails need to be in place to prevent this legal action from becoming a compliance nightmare. I am already aware of properties that have these shelters that are not in compliance.

Lora A. Moore
916-549-4449

Jodeana Patterson

Subject: FW: Notice of Public Hearing (for PC 11/13/25 meeting): Alternative/RV Dwelling Ordinance (PLN25-0084; ORD25-1)

From: Jeff Singewald <jeff.singewald@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, October 24, 2025 4:57 PM

To: Jodeana Patterson <Jodeana.Patterson@nevadacountyca.gov>

Cc: Brian Foss <Brian.Foss@nevadacountyca.gov>

Subject: Re: Notice of Public Hearing (for PC 11/13/25 meeting): Alternative/RV Dwelling Ordinance (PLN25-0084; ORD25-1)

You don't often get email from jeff.singewald@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

I will be out of town on business. The main questions I would like addressed are the following:

How will compliance issues be handled? Today it seems as though the county ONLY handles code compliance issues on a complaint basis so it is the responsibility of neighbors to complain before illegal units are addressed. The second question is what will be done with the 1000+ units in Nevada county that are already on property that do not meet new criteria.

Regards,

Jeff Singewald

Jodeana Patterson

From: Daniel J Desmond <djdesmond@ucdavis.edu>
Sent: Saturday, October 25, 2025 7:23 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Cc: Brian Foss; Heidi Hall
Subject: AltRVordinance

Some people who received this message don't often get email from djdesmond@ucdavis.edu. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Thanks for the opportunity to comment. I again would like to state my opposition to this ordinance. Our neighborhood has had real life experience with an RV used for additional housing. It turned into a transient living space accumulating garbage and eventually was vandalized to the point of it being unlivable. Code Compliance had to force the removal. I feel strongly that this ordinance will encourage similar problems.

Thanks,

Dan & Dee

Deanna & Daniel Desmond

10500 Hawke Lane

Nevada City CA 95959

530-647-6016

Jodeana Patterson

From: Morris Hervey <morris.hervey@att.net>
Sent: Sunday, October 26, 2025 10:57 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Cc: Brian Foss
Subject: Proposed Alternate RV Housing Ordinance
Attachments: Alt RV Housing.docx

You don't often get email from morris.hervey@att.net. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

October 26, 2025

To Nevada County Planning Commission

Subject: Alternate RV Housing Ordinance and the Safe Fire Evacuation Route Requirement

As stated in the draft ordinance, the Fire Safety Requirement is **inadequately defined.**

For purposes of safety evaluation, a fire evacuation route depends upon 1) the amount of combustible fuels (brush and trees) along the evacuation route, and 2) the level of fire evacuation traffic congestion to be expected as a result of housing density along the route during an emergency evacuation.

In its 2024 Fire Evacuation Study, the Nevada County Office of Emergency Services (OES) has identified several areas of Nevada County that should be expected to have extremely dangerous fire evacuation conditions due to congested evacuation traffic and excessive combustible fuels along evacuation routes.

The OES study employed a combined team of wildfire experts, traffic engineers and computer simulation specialists – the latter to evaluate evacuation traffic congestion.

The draft ordinance states that the Nevada County Fire Marshal will be responsible for approving Alt RV Housing permits. However, unless the fire marshal has a team of traffic engineers and computer simulation specialist to employ in the approval process – the fire marshal does NOT have adequate staff with proper backgrounds to evaluate a proposed fire evacuation route for safety.

The Alternate RV Housing ordinance should clearly state:

- 1. Who will be responsible for approving an applicant's permit concerning an evacuation route safety.**

2. The specific safety criteria:

- a. The proposed route safety concerning combustible fuels along evacuation routes.**
- b. The level of evacuation traffic congestion to be expected from the applicants location to a place of unencumbered traffic flow, such as Highway 49, for example.**

This draft ordinance, and the process by which it has been created, certainly violate the spirit and intent, if not the letter, of CEQA due to its large scale (county wide and cumulative effects) impact on fire evacuation safety!

Sincerely,

Morris M. Hervey Jr

Nevada City

Jodeana Patterson

From: Deborah Wilder <deborah@wilderlawfirm.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 26, 2025 2:46 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance; Planning
Subject: Opposition to Proposed ordinance for RV Units as ADU's

Some people who received this message don't often get email from deborah@wilderlawfirm.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

I am writing to oppose the proposed ordinance allowing recreational vehicles as ADU units

1. I oppose this proposal based on the fact that RV units have never been designed to be permanent housing. They are by nature recreational. That means they are designed to be used on a part time basis to travel to various sites. While many RVs have fine features, I do not believe that RVs are the equivalent of an ADU which is otherwise a permanent building affixed to the real property.
2. Secondly, I believe that many people will see this ordinance and set up RVs as ADUs on their property WITHOUT complying with all the standards set forth in the ordinance which could easily create both health and safety issues. Who is going to police this and what level of enforcement will be imposed if you find an RV being used as an ADU without full compliance with these rules
3. A few years ago, a neighbor of mine allowed someone to live in an RV on their property, with limited running water and no bathroom facilities. After 3 months, the property was a mess and also stank. Only after I complained to the owner of the property (not the person renting the property, nor the RV guest -they never responded) did this get addressed. So for 90 days we had to live with this situation and the smell . Thank goodness the owner took immediate action. But, what is the county going to do and how quickly will the County respond to complaints. How quickly will they respond if there is no cooperation from the homeowner?
4. Because of the mobility of RVs, I could easily see the county providing notice to a homeowner that they are coming out to inspect and the RV gets moved off the property during that time. Too much room for residents trying to game the system with RVs.
5. Allowing permanent structure ADUs is a positive change, but allowing RVs to occupy this same space is a bad short cut to solving the housing shortage in this community. You want to address the housing crisis, then streamline the permitting process and cut development fees. Allow an expedited process for home building of 1, 2 or 3 bedroom homes to be sold for under \$250,000 -1 bedroom, \$325,000 2 bedroom and \$400,000 for 3 bedroom homes.

Deborah Wilder
13332 Bass Trail
Grass Valley, CA 95945
530-272-3535
Cell 650-208-7852

Jodeana Patterson

From: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: FW: Notice of Public Hearing (for PC 11/13/25 meeting): Alternative/RV Dwelling Ordinance (PLN25-0084; ORD25-1)

From: Jeff Singewald <jeff.singewald@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 1:47 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance <AltRVOrdinance@nevadacountyca.gov>
Cc: Brian Foss <Brian.Foss@nevadacountyca.gov>; Kelsey Hess - CDA <Kelsey.Hess@nevadacountyca.gov>
Subject: Re: Notice of Public Hearing (for PC 11/13/25 meeting): Alternative/RV Dwelling Ordinance (PLN25-0084; ORD25-1)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Thx for sharing this with me. So given that compliance complaints are only handled on a complaint based model only, I see no reason whatsoever for this proposal. First off, given the very strict requirements identified in the proposal why would anyone spend the money to implement said guidelines or even go thru the permit process? Given these folks are likely to have very minimal financial backing why not just take the chance to deploy RV or trailer like they do now and hope no complaints are received.

This whole proposal seems like a joke given that code compliance is only done on a complaint basis. I am all for the proposal if it were designed to enforce the guidelines in proposal but when you only rely on complaints for enforcement I do not see this working well.

Regards,
Jeff Singewald

On Tue, Oct 28, 2025 at 11:09 AM Alt RV Ordinance <AltRVOrdinance@nevadacountyca.gov> wrote:

Hello Jeff,

Thank you for your follow up. Your concerns are valid and have been noted. That is correct; our Code Compliance department operates on a complaint-based system as standard practice. I've attached the Nevada County Code Compliance summary, which provides rationale for this model, which was recommended by a 2001-2002 Grand Jury report and adopted by the Board of Supervisors. *Please note that the fees noted in that summary are most likely outdated.*

Please let me know if I can answer any further questions.

Respectfully,

Jodeana Patterson

Administrative Assistant II

Clerk to the Planning Commission

Clerk to the Zoning Administrator



**NEVADA
COUNTY**
CALIFORNIA

**Community
Development
Agency**

[Planning Department](#)

[950 Maidu Ave. Suite 170](#)

[PO Box 599002, Nevada City, CA 95959-7902](#)

[Main 530.265.1222, Direct 530.470.2526](#)

Jodeana.Patterson@nevadacountyca.gov

Hours 8:30-5:00 Monday – Friday (12:00 – 12:30 lunch)

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to which they are addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message.

From: Jeff Singewald <jeff.singewald@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, October 27, 2025 11:37 AM

To: Alt RV Ordinance <AltRVOrdinance@nevadacountyca.gov>

Cc: Brian Foss <Brian.Foss@nevadacountyca.gov>

Subject: Re: Notice of Public Hearing (for PC 11/13/25 meeting): Alternative/RV Dwelling Ordinance (PLN25-0084; ORD25-1)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

So if I understand your response correctly, code compliance will only be done on a complaint basis regardless of whether this proposal passes, correct?

My concern is that if this is true, this puts code compliance on the backs of neighbors to those who violate current code requirements. And let's face it you and I both know that there are literally hundreds and hundreds of RVs and trailers on property today in Nevada county that do not meet the current compliance rules or the stricter rules and guidelines identified in this proposal. But today the code compliance department does not appear to do anything unless a complaint is filed.

On Mon, Oct 27, 2025 at 10:17 AM Alt RV Ordinance <AltRVOrdinance@nevadacountyca.gov> wrote:

Good morning, Jeff:

Thank you for reaching out to the Planning Department with your questions. The County's Code Compliance team will continue to uphold and enforce all Nevada County codes and ordinances to ensure public safety and neighborhood quality. Regardless of the ultimate decision by the Board of Supervisors on this draft ordinance, the Code Compliance team will continue in their ongoing and regular efforts to investigate complaints, address violations, and ensure compliance with County regulations.

The Planning Department will make certain that your concerns are included as a part of the public record for consideration by the County decision makers.

Respectfully,

Jodeana Patterson

Administrative Assistant II

Clerk to the Planning Commission

Clerk to the Zoning Administrator



**NEVADA
COUNTY**
CALIFORNIA

**Community
Development
Agency**

[Planning Department](#)

[950 Maidu Ave, Suite 170](#)

[PO Box 599002, Nevada City, CA 95959-7902](#)

[Main 530.265.1222, Direct 530.470.2526](#)

Jodeana.Patterson@nevadacountyca.gov

Hours 8:30-5:00 Monday – Friday (12:00 – 12:30 lunch)

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to which they are addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message.

From: Jeff Singewald <jeff.singewald@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, October 24, 2025 4:57 PM

To: Jodeana Patterson <Jodeana.Patterson@nevadacountyca.gov>

Cc: Brian Foss <Brian.Foss@nevadacountyca.gov>

Subject: Re: Notice of Public Hearing (for PC 11/13/25 meeting): Alternative/RV Dwelling Ordinance (PLN25-0084; ORD25-1)

You don't often get email from jeff.singewald@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

I will be out of town on business. The main questions I would like addressed are the following:

How will compliance issues be handled? Today it seems as though the county ONLY handles code compliance issues on a complaint basis so it is the responsibility of neighbors to complain before illegal units are addressed. The second question is what will be done with the 1000+ units in Nevada county that are already on property that do not meet new criteria.

Regards,

Jeff Singewald

On Fri, Oct 24, 2025 at 9:25 AM Jodeana Patterson <Jodeana.Patterson@nevadacountyca.gov> wrote:

Jodeana Patterson

From: cheriecoliver@aol.com
Sent: Tuesday, October 28, 2025 5:54 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: AGAINST the RV Residential Ordinance

You don't often get email from cheriecoliver@aol.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

This ordinance will create terrible public-safety problems, fire-evacuation problems, property-value problems, noise problems, crime problems and nuisance-attracting problems.
Please reject it. Wallace and Cherylene Oliver, Nevada County residents/taxpayers for 14 years



PUBLIC COMMENTS

From: [Justin Dowd](#)
To: [Public Comment](#)
Subject: Cost of Housing
Date: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 7:32:10 AM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

October, 29, 2025

RE: housing cost

To Whom it May Concern:

I am writing as a concerned citizen and property owner in rural Western Nevada County. My concern stems from personal and professional interest; as a stakeholder in my own house and housing in general. I believe that costs of construction, living costs and development costs outpace salary and wages in Nevada County. The County should help reduce these costs specifically in two areas:

1. Cap, reduce or fund property fire insurance.
2. Reduce development fee's, specifically the highschool fee, the fire fee and the road mitigation fee.

Our current house, a somewhat typical California Ranch home from the early 1970's, when we purchased it in 2012 had a property fire insurance policy that cost us \$872 per year. Now we pay over \$6000! This needs to get addressed. This is already significantly affecting the cost of living in this area and the cost of housing in general.

When our house was built around 1972 - the permit fees were \$78. Today, to develop and build the same house would cost over \$20,000 in building fee's! This far outpaces inflation and wage expectation for our area.

Please make real, actual, and viable changes to help the housing industry and the residents be able to prosper here. Nevada County is such a great place to live and raise a family; being able to afford to live here is a viable necessity to living here.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Justin Dowd

please visit our website: www.dowdconstructionanddesign.com

Justin M. Dowd Architect
Dowd Construction and Design
C 40362
CSL No. 1034557
AIA Assoc.
LEED Green Assoc.

Virginia Tech. (M. Arch)
University of Oregon (BS)



Public Comments for Oct 30, 2025 City/County Meeting on Nevada Co Housing

By Ursula Donofrio, Homeowner, Unincorporated Nevada City

THE PROPOSED *RV'S AS PERMANENT HOUSING ORDINANCE* WILL RUIN OUR COUNTY.

In January Nevada Co passed the *Tiny Houses on Wheels as Permanent Housing Ordinance*. The county website clarifies that the ordinance does not permit RVs to be used as permanent housing because ***RVs are not intended to be used for long-term occupancy and are built to different standards. This distinction ensures that housing options meet the safety and durability standards required for permanent living.***

So what changed?

RVs are still notorious for inadequate wiring; an overloaded circuit (or kitchen fire) can engulf an RV in minutes. RVs do not protect occupants from dangerous smoke; they lack the insulation and seals of a permanent dwelling. During an evacuation, what happens when RVs clog our narrow winding roads? No one will be stopped and cited during an active evacuation. If you support this ordinance, you are not serious about fire safety in Nevada County...or public health.

The RV ordinance offers a few “hypothetical” guardrails to protect the environment and our quality of life, but it allows exceptions to almost every guardrail. Hooking up to septic or sewer lines—too burdensome and expensive! Undefined workarounds will be allowed. These will undoubtedly include portable sewage tanks; we’ll have to rely on folks struggling financially to pay to have full sewage tanks pumped rather than desperately draining black water after dark. Such draining, which is very likely, will contribute to contaminated soils and contaminated underlying or adjacent water sources such as wells, creeks, and rivers. What about residents whose only water source is a well? Do we have a right to clean drinking water? If portable sewage tanks are appropriate for a residential community, why not allow them for all homes in the county?

A dedicated electrical box for the RV has also been deemed too burdensome by supporters. Though a gas generator is not supposed to be the primary power source, the ordinance sets no limit to the number of hours RV tenants can run a gas generator. So when their roll-up solar panel runs out of juice, neighbors (and ditch/canal trail hikers) will listen to loud gas generators for hours on end. No mandatory utility hookups seems like permanent camping to me. If you turn the unincorporated county into a glorified campground then I’d like my property taxes to reflect that. Currently they do not.

Many folks already live illegally in RVs, even on smaller parcels, because Code Enforcement is mostly absent—even when neighbors complain. Countless property owners have received the *Complaint “Unfounded”* email, lacking any details of how that determination was made. What kind of “sewage arrangements” do these illegally-occupied RVs have? Outhouses? Chemical toilets? Where is our Environmental Health Department?

Let’s face it—without enforcement, any guardrails are irrelevant. If this ordinance passes, a handful may spend the time and money on permits, but the majority will not. Who will

bother them? No one. This ordinance will be an open invitation for more RV folks to flock here because we're desperate enough to achieve our affordable housing numbers by simply redefining an RV as a Permanent Dwelling. How innovative--normalizing camping as permanent living! Mission accomplished! If we already have hundreds of folks living illegally in RVs, imagine how many we'll have when it's legal.

In reality you'll be creating as many problems as you solve. Can property owners get liability coverage for an RV rental? Not likely. They could lose everything when a tenant trips on an extension cord. Will RV-lords charge tenants fair rents or might some take advantage of folks with marginal credit? Yet they escape the additional property tax assessments that befall those who build ADUs to permanent dwelling standards.

I don't know what it's like to be housing insecure...but I do know what it's like to work full-time for over 30 years. I know what it's like to move for more-affordable housing. I know what it's like to carefully review property codes and zoning before making the biggest investment of my life. When the Board of Supervisors rejected Rise Gold's mining permit, one reason cited was current zoning and regulations. Will you continue to respect regulations and zoning? If rules, environmental integrity, water quality, community aesthetics, and quality of life no longer matter, then revisit the Rise Gold permit request. If we're desperate enough to consider the RV ordinance, we really need those good-paying jobs.....and the tax revenue to provide affordable housing in dwellings built to safety and durability standards required for permanent living.

Jodeana Patterson

From: Tina Patton <rochorse@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2025 11:14 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Public comment

You don't often get email from rochorse@yahoo.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

To Whom it may concern,

The proposed RV ordinance is not a safe solution to the housing crisis. It simply transfers the burden of creating a solution to the rural property owners of Nevada County, whether they want to be a part of it or not. This ordinance will have the result of unintended consequences, which will come in the form of property owners having to constantly police and report non-compliant RV living situations. These situations can be:

- Unpermitted RV housing
- Slum landlord scenarios with multiple issues
- Unsafe conditions with old trailers in disrepair
- Poor occupancy behavior
- Garbage and debris
- Unsafe campfire and fire pit activity
- Poor management of waste water, unintended waste water leaks (flexible connection hose and connectors are not meant to withstand year-round conditions)
- Unsafe housing with potential issues for propane leak, electrical problems, and fire risk (since RVs were never intended for permanent housing)
- Mice and rat infestations causing damage (this even happens to cars that move daily)
- Neighborhood blight and eyesore
- Creating an environment that is no longer truly rural

I understand the thought process is that an ordinance will eliminate these concerns. I beg to differ. The ordinance simply puts a mechanism in for property owners to police and report these less desirable situations, which will be a constant. Neighborhoods will experience conflict and it will cost Nevada County tax payer funds to handle and enforce. Why should property owners be tasked with something such as this?

I firmly believe that if the county is going to look at allowing humans to live in vehicles that are not meant for permanent housing, there should be a central location to efficiently accomplish the task and reduce risk. The idea would be to invest in a property that is close to town AND the amenities that the unhoused would need, such as public transportation, schools, grocery stores, health care, and employment. These are services the unhoused MUST have access to. This property could be

developed to the standard the county is requiring in the ordinance. This centralized location would operate much like an RV campground, with low cost or no cost subsidized rent. A central location would be much more effective for things such as inspections or the handling of violations, and would ensure public safety and the unhoused access to needed services. It would also protect the unhoused from the predatory practices of property owners looking to take advantage of someone in need for a quick buck. It also has the added benefit of protecting rural property owners who have made a lifetime investment in their home from the problems that follow this type of living situation.

I understand that some people will follow the ordinance, but a great many will not. That is already evident in Nevada County with illegal camping and RV/trailer living. I can gladly submit many of these illegal and non-conforming situations if it would be of assistance. Unfortunately, the ordinance will simply pave the way for more of these scenarios to exist, along with threatening the health and welfare of the unhoused. It will also transfer the burden of enforcement onto residents of Nevada County, which most do not want.

Please protect your tax payers, your property owners, your community, and the beauty of Nevada County by coming up with a better plan. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully,

Tina Patton

Jodeana Patterson

From: Bevan Iredell <ibevanbob@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2025 12:58 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance; Iredell Bevan
Subject: Full-time RV, attaching to existing anaerobic septic systems.

You don't often get email from ibevanbob@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Professionals who service anaerobic septic systems consistently report that system performance and longevity are directly affected by what is introduced into them—specifically toilet paper and harsh chemicals such as bleach.

Systems that require little to no maintenance are often discovered during property transactions. In many cases, these systems have functioned effectively for two decades or more, with homeowners noting that they have never introduced toilet paper or harsh cleaning agents into the system.

Under proposed regulations, all full-time Campers and RVs are subject to inspection every two years to ensure compliance with fire defensibility standards. If an RV were permitted to connect to an existing septic system, An additional inspection could be made on the existing septic field, on the condition that the system successfully pass a biennial flow test—property owners could avoid the expense of constructing a dedicated leach field. This adjustment could reduce installation costs by approximately \$15,000 to \$30,000 for the addition of the Camper or RV.

By simply educating the homeowner to not put toilet paper or chemicals in their septic system, making them responsible to maintain their full-time RV permit.

Given this insight, the idea of implementing biennial septic inspections, along with the fire, defensibility inspection, warrants consideration.

Bevan iredell
Signal; iBevan.01
(951) 662-2600

Jodeana Patterson

From: Kathy Spanberger <kspanberger@peermusic.com>
Sent: Saturday, November 1, 2025 10:01 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Cc: Brian McGrath
Subject: RV Housing Ordinance---Comment from a local citizen

You don't often get email from kspanberger@peermusic.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Dear Sir/Madam:

I am writing to lodge my negative opinion of this ordinance. Allowing people to put RV's on their private property and rent them out will forever change the make up of communities and diminish the local property values. RV's belong in designated areas, or when privately owned, should not be rented out to third parties. It's a slippery slope to start changing the make up of communities and changing the reason people bought their homes and properties in the first place. The increase in traffic, parking and other issues should also be a very concerning factor. Can you imagine the beautiful areas in Nevada County now littered with RV's? Crazy!

This ordinance seems to be ill conceived and put together under the guise that it will help with the housing crisis. Perhaps the intentions are good in this regard, but it will help very few people with a band aid approach to an issue that requires a bigger picture view and oversight. Don't ruin our neighborhoods or the investments all private property owners have made to our communities with this inappropriate Ordinance.

Thank you.

*Kathy Spanberger
10982 Royal Crest Drive
Truckee, CA 96161
kspanberger@outlook.com*

Jodeana Patterson

From: Lora A. Moore <Lora.A.Moore@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, November 1, 2025 8:51 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Considerations for the hearing above
Attachments: CA State Law AB 628 requiring all rental units to have a working stove & refrigerator.pdf

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

I have already submitted my responses to the request for public input but this article came across my desk and I feel that it needs to be brought to the attention of the Board of Supervisors and any others considering the implementation of the RV/Camper ordinance.

Please see attached.

Lora A. Moore
916-549-4449

Working stove, refrigerator required in rental units under newly signed law

October 10, 2025



Embert P. Madison, Jr.
State Advocacy and Compliance Counsel

Gov. Gavin Newsom has approved a measure requiring all California rental units to have a working stove and refrigerator.

The law, [AB 628](#) by Assembly member Tina McKinnor, D-Inglewood, was signed Oct. 6, 2025, and will go into effect Jan. 1, 2026, and apply to new or amended leases on and after that date.



Assembly member
Tina McKinnor

The legislation requires rental units to include a stove and refrigerator that are maintained in good working order and are capable of safely generating heat for cooking purposes and safe food storage. The law adds this requirement to the existing list of characteristics required for a dwelling unit to be habitable. Examples of other existing habitability requirements include running water, heat, electricity, and plumbing.

The law also requires a landlord to repair or replace a stove or refrigerator that is subject to a manufacturer recall within 30 days of receiving notice of the recall.

A tenant is free to provide their own refrigerator if the tenant and landlord agree to this alternative when the lease is signed. If agreed to by both parties, the law requires the lease to include specific language that informs the tenant of their responsibility of keeping the refrigerator in working order. Additionally, if the tenant agrees to provide their own refrigerator, the tenant can later inform the landlord that they no longer wish to keep their own refrigerator in the unit thereby triggering a 30-day window for the landlord to provide one to the tenant.

The law does not allow a tenant to provide their own stove.

Upon introduction, AB 628 would have required a landlord to place a stove and refrigerator in every rental unit and replace those appliances every 10 years. That version of the bill made no exception for a stove or refrigerator that was 10 years old but still in working order. The California Apartment Association was able to secure amendments to severely lessen this arbitrary and costly requirement.

To help rental housing providers comply with the new law, CAA will update its rental forms and accompanying instructions with the required language from AB 628. All existing and revised forms are accessible through CAA's [rental forms page](#).

Topics

Legislation

Share



View comments (0)

Leave a comment



Jodeana Patterson

From: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: FW: This is regarding on the RV living

-----Original Message-----

From: james beale <teampeps@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 2, 2025 7:30 AM
To: Tyler Barrington <Tyler.Barrington@nevadacountyca.gov>
Subject: This is regarding on the RV living

[You don't often get email from teampeps@gmail.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Hi, my name is James. I am against RV living because anybody can put a holding tank for water and make a homemade septic tank or just let it out on the ground. I have a neighbor that just bought the property right next to me in 2022. he has two big holding tanks for water a cab over camper to live in and other trailers so how are you going to stop him from living in it without the proper permits? Because you guys cannot enforce it without going on these properties without the owners permission so everything has to be done by hearsay. I almost lost my property insurance because of this person because he has everything right on the property line so I had to go and get pictures to show the insurance company that the stuff was not mine.

Sent from my iPhone

11-2-2025

Nevada County Planning Commission

Nevada County Board of Supervisors

I was a member of the Grass Valley Planning Commission in the 1980-90s. I was a member of the steering committee for the Grass Valley General Plan update at that time. Although our intentions as planners were dedicated, increasing the stock of affordable housing over the last 45 years has been marginal. I include here excerpts from the Nevada County General Plan that speaks to housing.

Nevada County General Plan Housing Element

Section 65302(c) of the California Government Code requires every county and city in the State to include a Housing Element as part of its adopted general plan. In stipulating the content of this element, Article 10.6 of the Government Code indicates that the element shall consist of “identification and analysis of existing and projected housing needs and a statement of goals, policies, quantified objectives, and scheduled programs for the preservation, improvement and development of housing.” **This legislation further states that the element “shall identify adequate sites for housing, including rental housing, factory-built housing, and mobile homes, and shall make adequate provision for the existing and projected needs of all economic segments of the community.”**

GV, NC, and Nevada County have had mixed success attracting projects that address housing needs for “all economic segments of the community.” Single family housing prices are prohibitively high for individuals and families with less than middle incomes. There is rental housing stock available for portions of the working class with medium household incomes. Below this group there is a severe shortage of answers. The cost of transportation, healthcare, and other basic needs compete for a share of the medium income resources. As these costs rise, funds for available housing are insufficient.

“It should be pointed out that State law explicitly indicates that Nevada County is not expected to spend any of its own funds in carrying out the objectives of this element. It is not the County’s responsibility to guarantee or ensure that the housing units that are needed to accommodate anticipated population growth are constructed.”

“Instead, the County’s obligations under State law are to: 1) Provide adequate, appropriately zoned sites to meet the existing and projected housing needs of **all economic segments of the community**; 2) **Eliminate any constraints to the private development of a supply of housing to meet the needs of all economic segments of the community**; and 3) Otherwise facilitate the actions required of the development industry in providing an adequate supply of housing.”

“Approximately 68% of all Extremely Low-Income owner occupied housing units and approximately 32% of Extremely Low Income renter occupied housing units were overpaying for housing on already limited budgets. Due to the magnitude of households overpaying for housing countywide and specifically in the Unincorporated Area, the County shall provide policies and programs that will assist these households where possible.”

“Based on the previous information and as provided in Table 8.17, it can be concluded that new single family housing in Nevada County is catering to the needs of primarily the moderate and more realistically the above moderate-income groups.”

“Housing Development GOAL HD-8.1 To provide for a variety of housing types by tenure and price in **all residential areas for all income segments**, special needs groups, and the County’s workforce for both existing Nevada County residents, as well as potential future residents, commensurate with the Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA) Plan and the County’s quantified objectives.”

“Removing Constraints GOAL RC-8.1 Decrease governmental constraints and streamline the processing of housing development to expedite development of affordable housing and reduce the costs of development without compromising other General Plan objectives.”

“GOAL EJ-8.2 Encourage a range of housing opportunities for all segments and income levels of the Citizens of Nevada County.”

Consider that most of the workers in the service industry, such as restaurants and retail shops do not earn a paycheck that puts them in a Nevada County middle income bracket. Those are the workers who are the backbone and infrastructure of our tourist industry.

Consider that we currently allow guest cottages, agriculture worker housing, RVs and trailers during home construction, and small homes on wheels.

Consider that there are estimates of 1000 individuals and families currently living in RVs, motor homes, and trailers in the County. These housing units are affordable solutions for low-income individuals and families. A used 25-foot trailer in excellent condition can be purchased for \$20-25,000 and financed for as little as \$300 per month. Site preparation to meet County requirements could be reasonably budgeted in the \$10-20,000 range. Compare this to any completed or proposed low-income housing project.

I support the RV ordinance approval. I would be happier if the acreage was one acre instead of three. The ordinance needs to have language added that gives existing housing units time and guidance to meet regulation requirements. The County could adopt designs for small-scale septic systems suitable for RVs. I question the conflicting need for skirting and mobility. I have installed skirting around modular buildings, and it is time consuming. It takes an equal or longer amount of time to remove the skirting. If the intent is for the units to be mobile in an evacuation scenario, skirting becomes an obstacle.

Paul Schwartz

13812 Meadow Drive

Grass Valley, CA 95945

psschwartz21@gmail.com

Tyler Barrington

From: Brian Foss
Sent: Thursday, January 30, 2025 8:21 AM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: FW: Allowing Old RVs and Trailers a Menu for Burning Down The House, aka The County - Not a Laughing Matter!!!

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

FYI - for the record

-----Original Message-----

From: Alison Lehman <Alison.Lehman@nevadacountyca.gov>
Sent: Thursday, January 30, 2025 8:19 AM
To: Trisha Tillotson <Trisha.Tillotson@nevadacountyca.gov>; Brian Foss <Brian.Foss@nevadacountyca.gov>; Taylor Wolfe <Taylor.Wolfe@nevadacountyca.gov>
Subject: FW: Allowing Old RVs and Trailers a Menu for Burning Down The House, aka The County - Not a Laughing Matter!!!

FYI

Alison Lehman
County Executive Officer
Office: 530-265-7040
www.NevadaCountyCA.gov

-----Original Message-----

From: Paul Elias <pccpaule2000@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 30, 2025 5:53 AM
To: Lisa Swarthout <Lisa.Swarthout@nevadacountyca.gov>
Cc: Heidi Hall <Heidi.Hall@nevadacountyca.gov>; Tom Ivy <tivy@cityofgrassvalley.com>; Alison Lehman <Alison.Lehman@nevadacountyca.gov>
Subject: Allowing Old RVs and Trailers a Menu for Burning Down The House, aka The County - Not a Laughing Matter!!!

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Hello Supervisor Swarthout-

I once again must voice my alarm that you are promoting old RVs and Travel Trailers (TT) to be placed on property in unincorporated Nevada County as year-round housing. Why is BOS willing to risk the very good chance of wildfire starting up from an old run down RVs/TT and on a wind swept day in dry Sept spreading who knows how far.

Unlike THOWs, RVs/TT components were not designed for years and years, of year round living in all weather conditions. And as stated at the last hearing on the subject, the "unhoused" can't afford the cost of a THOWs but could afford an old RV around \$10,000, or property owners can purchase to put on their property and charge rent on little investment.

Little investment, using vintage and worn RVs/Trailers, with cheap wiring or running off generators is a formula for a disaster. Ask City and County fire marshals. They're the experts, not "unhoused" advocates.

Maybe if a property owner, or unhoused resident can't even afford a reasonable priced, THOWs that are designed for living year round where people won't be using space heaters for warmth in the winter because of poor insulation and leaky windows throughout, or in the summer using AC that draws a big current and people feeding the AC via a 110 wall socket over taxed wiring and/or extension cords, they shouldn't be allowed by you, at the County to risk the overall safety of life, livelihood and property for the rest of us. Sorry, that life is not fair nor often forgiving, especially if do dumb things like place substandard housing surrounded by tall, dry grass.

What actions BOS takes to allow or disallow these dangerous form of poor housing will have an effect many years past your term in office. Is that the legacy you or other Board members want?

You may laugh now, and not see the connection, but the air collision in DC last night when Congress people pushed to have more flights into Reagan Airport when pilots said no but their experience and knowledge was ignored. Please don't ignore experience and common sense.

BOS needs to limit wildfire possibilities not add expanding possibilities.

Best regards,

Paul Elias

p.s. My older brother nearly lost his life and did lose all his possession as a college student renting a travel traveler in winter months outside Boulder, CO. The space heater he was using heated up the circuitry and the fire took off. If hadn't been for snow on the ground, and had been summertime who knows what else would have been lost. Easy to guess. . .

Sent from my iPhone

Tyler Barrington

From: Lynn Flynn <lynn.flynn@realestatesf.com>
Sent: Friday, April 25, 2025 10:07 AM
To: Planning
Subject: RV's for housing options

Some people who received this message don't often get email from lynn.flynn@realestatesf.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

I don't think that having RV's all over our neighborhoods is a good solution to housing options. We already have the ADU options and the Counties/towns need to come up with plans that don't affect our current home values or enjoyment of our properties.

--



LYNN FLYNN
REALTOR®

415.361.7991
lynn.flynn@realestatesf.com
RealEstateSF.com
Lic #00929829

BARB CO

BARBAGELATA GROUP

I have not verified any of the information contained in these documents that were prepared by other people. You will never receive any instructions or changes to any property provided from instructions from myself or my team. NEVER WIRE FUNDS PRIOR TO CALLING THE ESCROW OFFICER AT THE PHONE NUMBER PREVIOUSLY PROVIDED TO YOU.

Tyler Barrington

From: Nikki Aringer <Naringer@outlook.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 8, 2025 3:54 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Public comment 5/27 BOS meeting

You don't often get email from naringer@outlook.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Hello,

I would like to submit a public comment regarding the alternative housing item for the 5/27/25 BOS meeting.

As someone who is currently looking to relocate into the area, housing options are limited and expensive. Although my aspiration is to eventually purchase a home, I am in full support of allowing all homes on wheels as alternative housing. With this ordinance approved, relocation is quicker, easier, and expenses are more affordable, which would allow me to be part of the community sooner.

Thank you for your consideration and thank you for bringing me home to Nevada County!

Nikki Aringer

Tyler Barrington

From: Chris Lotz <chlutz78@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 8, 2025 6:35 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Housing on Wheels

You don't often get email from chlutz78@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Tyler - my comment on this issue is below

Allow folks to live in structures on wheels, provided, the "black water" is captured in a tank or sent via pipe to their main septic tank. The "gray" water can be deposited on to the property for watering the land. Helps to mitigate fires (moist soil).

Have a great day.

Chris Lotz
13299 Mystic Mine Road
Nevada City, CA 95959

Tyler Barrington

From: Peter Brewer <peter@brewerfirm.com>
Sent: Friday, May 9, 2025 11:01 AM
To: Planning
Subject: Houses on Wheels

[Some people who received this message don't often get email from peter@brewerfirm.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

I have no objection to tiny houses on wheels being allowed on Banner Mountain. However, I think the ordinance should require the wheels to be removed so that these vehicles do not congest the escape routes in the event of an evacuation.
Peter Brewer (Banner Mountain resident)

Tyler Barrington

From: Susan Hennings <susan022549@att.net>
Sent: Friday, May 9, 2025 2:24 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Alternative housing

You don't often get email from susan022549@att.net. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

This is intended for the May 27, 2025 meeting.

I am in favor of more alternative housing on private property. It would be fair to require the RV (or other structure) be tidy and not an eye sore for the neighborhood. Also, I think utilities should be available as well as sewage.

That is to say, one can't just plunk down any old item as a ADU. It needs to be maintained and be safe for whomever is inhabiting the space.

Thank you, Susan Hennings

Tyler Barrington

From: Barbara Henrioulle <soul nourish18@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, May 9, 2025 1:31 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: RV housing

You don't often get email from soul nourish18@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Hello,

I am in favor of allowing RV housing as many folks are already living in these accommodations in our county especially with the high cost and low availability of housing for those on low incomes. Approving Tiny Homes was a good step, but in reality , Tiny Homes are too expensive for many to enjoy and I suspect that these Tiny Homes will end up on AirB&B etc, and not truly benefit those who are in need of housing.

Thank you, Barbara Henrioulle Nevada City

"May the grace of your incarnation flood you every day of the New Year."

Lilavati Devi

Tyler Barrington

From: Russell Wilder <rhwilderucd@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, May 10, 2025 8:13 AM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: RVs as homes

[You don't often get email from rhwilderucd@yahoo.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

We had one parked on what I'm sure one of our neighbors thought was their property, but in actuality, it was a strip of land We have going down to Highway 174 from the NW corner of our 5 acre parcel. A relative his lost his job and so they put an RV or trailer smack dab in the middle of that dirt/rock roadway and a family of 3 were living there for several weeks .

Their electrical power source as far a I could tell was just really long extension cords from the main house on the neighbor's property. I have absolutely no idea what they were doing about septic issues from the bathroom, any garbage disposal,, waste water from the sink, etc.

I am not opposed in principle to having RVs being able to park somewhere permanently but issues about their safety as well as neighbors and public safety and general need to be considered, particularly regarding safety of electrical hook ups and what they are going to do with septic waste, etc. not to mention garbage.

My strong suggestion would be set up some courts, sort of application and inspection system, so that somebody from the county goes out looks to see where these units would be placed in CS to the adequacy and safety of electrical power, Propane, and especially sewage hook ups befo before any hours allowed to be placed on a property

Russell H. Wilder

Tyler Barrington

From: Bob Branstrom <bobbranstrom@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 11, 2025 6:06 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: County hearing public comment

You don't often get email from bobbranstrom@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Tyler Barrington--

I regret I will be out of town and unable to attend the hearing on May 27th regarding RVs as housing.

My comment is simply that the county must move ahead to permit RVs as housing. This is not to allow such housing to begin, but to make such housing that already exists safe.

The county needs to set low-cost and reasonable standards for safe and neighborly use of RVs as housing. The reality is that such housing is needed and the public has led the way by providing it. The county simply needs to ensure that such housing is safe from a sanitation and fire perspective.

Best wishes and thank you for holding this hearing.

Bob Branstrom

Bob Branstrom
800 Freeman Lane #103
Grass Valley CA 95949

510-459-5879

May 2025

Rudeness is the weak man's imitation of strength.
Edmund Burke

Tyler Barrington

From: deborah swan <returntofloatingbones@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 12, 2025 10:04 AM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Housing on wheels ordinance

[You don't often get email from returntofloatingbones@gmail.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

I am a property owner and a senior. I support an ordinance that allows rv's and trailers as housing with appropriate septic solutions either tying in with septic tanks or composting toilet and proper gray water disposal. With the cost of living it provides options for our children going to college here and others in need of safe housing. Im a yes to safe clean housing alternatives.

Deborah swan 13036 gray lane
Sent from my iPhone

Tyler Barrington

From: Paul Elias <ppcpaule2000@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 12, 2025 12:37 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Cc: Lisa Swarthout; Heidi Hall
Subject: Ordinance to Allow RV living on PVT Property-Pls not so fast because. . .

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Only makes sense: Why not first see how the county manages THOW county ordinance before proceeding with an ordinance to legalize RV living on private property??

And please answer these questions by county staff at the 5/27/25 presentations:

- how old of an RV would be allowed in the possible ordinance? Majority of RV parks don't allow RVs over 10 years old. Seems a good benchmark for many good reasons, e.g. wiring, fuel lines, battery cables, sewage holding tanks, etc.
- does the RV have to be operational as a vehicle and also register with the DMV. You let a motorized vehicle set for months and you've got troubles as in fire danger.
- what amount of insurance will be required and will a certification of insurance be submitted yearly? Who will enforce this? What happens when the RV occupant/owner doesn't have insurance or amount required.
- has the county done a survey of insurance carriers that they will insure a permanently parked RVs being lived-in 24/7, year-round on pvt property that has batteries, fuel tank for the vehicle's engine/generator? This is not the case of THOW since they have no fuel tanks, nor a vehicle.
- what do area realtors say about declining property value when a neighbor decides they can rent out space for a monthly charge to an RV owner?
- can a property owner decide to purchase, or use an existing RV and advertise as a cheap rental? Won't cheap RV rentals actually attract more unhoused to Nevada County?
- where will county revenue come from to hire staff to enforce the ordinance constantly? I suspect from fees and what will that amount be to fully adhere to an ordinance?
- what added property tax will be applied to property owners who allow RV living on their property?
- will there be an anonymous 'hotline' for reporting, similar as with cannabis growing, for neighbors who witness non-ordinance compliance?

That's enough for now. Thank you!

Paul Elias

District 3
un-incorporated Nevada County

Sent from my iPhone

Tyler Barrington

From: Cory Emmett <coryemmett@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 13, 2025 11:29 AM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Comment - Policy on "RV and Alternative Housing"

You don't often get email from coryemmett@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Good morning Tyler,

Although I won't be able to attend the meeting on the 27th, I wanted to provide a comment regarding proposed changes to the existing ordinance or addition of a new ordinance regarding use of RVs and other alternative housing in private property.

In the interest of safety and housing, small housing units that are well-built, permitted, and adhere to applicable building codes would benefit from a lower barrier to entry. I have no issue with this.

However, RVs used as permanent living spaces opens, in my opinion, a door to many issues.

In my personal experience, I have one neighbor directly adjacent to my property in Grass Valley that has no less than five RVs parked at her house, and all appear occupied. They all run generators for power, usually 24 hours a day, creating a fire hazard and noise nuisance. RVs degrade very quickly when left exposed to the elements so in addition to being a danger to the community, they are also an eyesore. Compounded by this resident's other issues with noise and loose animals, I really feel sorry for the neighbors that share her property line.

In order to support an ordinance that allows for full-time living in an RV on private property, I would want to see strictly enforced regulations on permanent power, septic, and fresh water, proximity to neighboring properties, ability for the RV or motorhome to be towed or operated at any time, and others.

I lived in a 5th wheel for several years in Paradise, CA following the fire - basic standards like those I mentioned above are essentially the minimum requirement for safe living in an RV.

Thank you,

Cory Emmett

Tyler Barrington

From: Denis Drew <dwdrewd@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 14, 2025 7:56 AM
To: Planning
Cc: [REDACTED]; Lisa Swarthout; Barbara Drew
Subject: RV and Alternative Housing

Some people who received this message don't often get email from dwdrewd@yahoo.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Our main concern is how RVs will be hooked up to utilities, specifically electricity, water and, most importantly, sewage. We are also concerned about trash accumulation around RVs and the number of RVs that can occupy one site. A concern for the county is possible reduction in property tax revenue as a result of neighbors surrounding an RV or group of RVs filing for reassessment of their decreased property value.

Thank you,

Denis Drew, MD

Barbara Drew, RN, PhD

11750 Trish Ct. Nevada City

530-205-9511

denis.drew@yahoo.com

barbara.drew@ucsf.edu

Tyler Barrington

From: Stacey Redman <staceyrdmn@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 14, 2025 10:17 AM
To: Planning
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RV Housing

Some people who received this message don't often get email from staceyrdmn@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Hello,

I want to first say that I think the County should be looking at alternative living situations for people. There is a shortage of affordable housing in Nevada County. However, rules and regulations should be applied and enforced. We have a current situation where an RV has been placed on an empty lot in our neighborhood amongst established homes. We live in a neighborhood that is cared for....having an RV parked on an empty lot (as is the case in our neighborhood now) without any hookups....using his car battery to run power - no sewer services....and lots of trash around it doesn't seem sanitary or viable for the long term.

Neighbors have contacted planning and code enforcement numerous times and we have been told that when someone from code enforcement has gone out the owner is not there....it seems a bit silly that someone cannot come out after regular hours or on a weekend - or leave a notice?

I realize that there is a shortage of living spaces for people in Nevada County and believe options should be considered....but this is not a sanitary situation...some rules should apply and BE ENFORCED. I am concerned that there is not proper staffing or regulations that are enforced in these situations. This type of alternative housing should be available if they follow the rules.

Thank you for your attention and I hope that you can help with this situation.

Stacey Redman
11226 Northview Drive
Nevada City

--

Stacey Redman
650-483-9912

Tyler Barrington

From: Mark Triolo <marktriolo@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 15, 2025 4:06 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Input on Tiny Homes Ordinance

You don't often get email from marktriolo@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Hi Tyler,

I am writing to ask that you not approve the AHOW ordinance that is being proposed. (I know the THOW has already been approved).

I believe there needs to be a balance between the needs of the unhoused and housed citizens. Unhoused individuals need lower cost housing, which you have been working to provide. But no amount of workarounds to our existing policies will satisfy all the needs. I think some folks looking for housing will need to look to other lower cost locations, because housed citizens have rights also. We have worked hard all our lives to afford to move to this beautiful area. It's an infringement on our rights to have our chosen community become populated with RVs and mobile homes on properties.

So please, consider both sides of this as you move forward. It would be a shame to ruin the beautiful surroundings of NC, and it is unfair to housed citizens.

Thanks for your consideration.

Mark Triolo
15472 Shannon Way
Nevada City, Ca 95959

Tyler Barrington

From: gprich@lto.com
Sent: Monday, May 19, 2025 10:06 AM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: RV's as housing comment
Attachments: NC RV Comment.docx

[You don't often get email from gprich@lto.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Tyler Barrington
Nevada County Planning Department
RE: RV as primary housing

I support RV's as housing in Nevada County, but for Eastern Nevada County, it presents different challenges than below 4000" feet.

I currently live in Truckee in a mobile home park in a 40' long Park Model RV- a 1988 Venture. Park model RV's such as mine as the original tiny home on wheels. As a Senior Citizen, I will be forced out someday soon, may end up homeless, most likely caused by constantly increasing rent. I will need a place to move my home, hopefully in or near my home of Truckee since 1977.

Park Models are set up for permanent living.

I have a regular size refrigerator, toilet and stove. The water heater and shower are undersized but adequate.

I do not have sewage storage tanks. Travel-camping trailers have sewage storage tanks, that in cold winter climates of Eastern Nevada County need to be protected from freezing and emptied weekly at a minimum.

Energy efficiency is another concern for RV's in eastern Nevada County, as many are not designed for cold weather, or heavy snow. I have added

R-30 in floors and ceilings and R-3 to walls. I have full insulated skirting, and a snow shed roof with metal roofing. Skirting should be required for stationary trailers in cold climates. I have interior & exterior removable Plexiglas storm windows to provide triple winter window insulation. RV's are known for creating perfect conditions for mold, so venting is important. I currently use about 35 gallons of propane a year for my 400SF home. I have covered and insulated a travel trailer in the past and lived in it, so it can be done.

With a roof and skirting my home looks like a small mobile home. I polish the siding and metal roof yearly as I live under a large pine tree. Maintenance of siding and skirting is important for RV use as a permanent home. Most RVs in Eastern Nevada County are going to need snow shoveling, which frequently causes damage and leaks, so a roof is recommended in snowy locations.

I support using RV's as housing, and Park Models should have their own category, if not covered by the Tiny Home Ordinance.

Thank You

Gordon Richards

11070 Brockway Rd. #60 Truckee, Ca. 96161

Tyler Barrington

From: Hindi Greenberg <hindi.artslover@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 19, 2025 4:17 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: comments on proposed ordinance to allow RV living on private property

You don't often get email from hindi.artslover@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Nevada County housing has become much more expensive since I moved here in 2001, making it impossible for those individuals with lower incomes (which is a large portion of the younger residents of Nevada County as well as those who are disabled and unable to earn their living, relying on limited--and now even more limited--government funds) to afford the rents or purchases of housing.

Therefore, I advocate for allowing alternative housing on private property--such as RVs--so long as there can be a system put in place for disposing of waste (either through a dump station, sewer connection or other healthful and environmentally friendly means). This will also allow those with alternative housing to find willing private property owners to accommodate them without having to pay the high rents for a mobile home park.

As for zoning, so long as the alternative housing is kept in slightly condition, there shouldn't have to be acres of space required.

It is important to give those already living in "illegal" situations on private property an opportunity to confirm their legal status so they don't fear getting evicted from their alternative homes. It will also

help relieve the RV and trailer owners from parking on different streets every few nights.

Please add my comments to the consideration for allowing alternative wheeled housing on private property. Thank you.

Hindi Greenberg
Nevada City, CA
530-274-7343

Tyler Barrington

From: PERRY BLAKE <pblake9630@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 20, 2025 11:53 AM
To: Tyler Barrington
Cc: Reeve Constance; Drew Denis; Drew Barbara; Browning Ed; Cunningham Al; Redman Stacey; Witt Ryan; Hogenson Jamie
Subject: RV and Alternative Housing Policy

[You don't often get email from pblake9630@aol.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

We understand the critical need of providing housing for the homeless. Our concern is that it be done safely, in a way "consistent with community character" and adherent to existing County Code.

We have a property owner in our neighborhood who lived full time in his travel trailer from August last year to January this year with no proper means of waste disposal, no inspection, Fire Department or otherwise, and no permit. When an Investigation Services Request was submitted on August 27th, it was deemed UNFOUNDED.

The property owner continues to use his travel trailer intermittently and often leaves vehicles parked in the street. There is also junk strewn all around the property. This is a clear violation of County Code, may not be Fire Safe, is in no way consistent with community character and is a huge devaluation of all of our properties.

When you consider allowing tiny homes, RVs and travel trailers for permanent residence, please make sure they are in compliance with permit requirements and inspections.

Thank you for your time and thank you for seeking community comments.

- Perry Blake
11799 Trish Court
Nevada City

Sent from my iPad

Nevada County Planning Dept
950 Maidu Ave
Nevada City, CA 95959
Attn : Tyler Barrington

May 19, 2025

Subject: Public Input on Proposed Ordinance, Camping Trailers as ADU's

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I have serious concerns regarding the proposed ordinance allowing camping trailers to be included as Accessory Dwelling Units in Nevada County. This ordinance is intended to provide affordable housing for the homeless living in our county. I ask that the Board deny this proposal.

Our neighborhood had recent experience with this practice when one of our neighbors fell into financial hard times and began renting out a couple of travel trailers on his property. In short, we ended up with several rangy looking young men moving in, speeding on our one lane neighborhood roads in their beater cars and motorcycles. Neighborhood concern grew. Eventually petty thefts began, leading to a couple of home break-in's. One of which resulted in the homeowner's old dog being kicked to death by the burglars. Even though no arrests were made the source was pretty clear. As Bob Dylan once said "You don't need a weatherman to know which way the wind blows". We were pretty darn sure we knew which way the wind blew and we became seriously on guard. Eventually our neighbor moved away and that was the end of the trailer renters. We've had no problems since.

Now I'm not saying that our neighborhood's experience is going to happen whenever someone rents out a trailer or trailer space. But I also believe that, contrary to what our local homeless advocates imply, not all of the homeless population are regular people going thru a rough patch. Certainly many fall into this group but according to Journal of the American Medical Association, two thirds of the homeless population suffer from some form of mental illness, including drug and alcohol addiction. Nobody really seems to know how many are regular people who just need a leg up and how many are in need of treatment or serious intervention. Addressing this seems fundamental since differing personal conditions will require differing housing requirements. The proposed ordinance is silent on this issue.

Camping trailers have never been meant to be permanent housing and fall well outside long held acceptable residential standards. I am concerned that if we lower the bar on residential standards to the extent proposed, we will create mini trailer camps within our neighborhoods that will exist under much lower standards than required for our homes. Building codes won't apply to the habitation (trailer). Sanitation is under consideration for lesser standards as there is a proposal to allow holding tanks for the trailers in-lieu of legal septic systems. A truly misguided idea to lower costs. Background checks on tenants will be less likely since many tenants in this rental sector will have poor credit, and their inability to pass a credit check will be a foregone conclusion. I'm sure our neighbor skipped the background check. All of this will increase the likelihood of a person in need of treatment or intervention moving in to your neighborhood.

In the meantime, if our County housing experts believe camping trailers are the current best option for alternate homeless housing, then develop/construct a long term supervised trailer camping area at a safe location. Provide proper sanitation, utilities, counseling, law enforcement, etc. Oversight of this facility should be conducted only by officials qualified to work with the issues that many of the homeless will bring to this complex situation. But please don't designate camping trailers as legal ADU's.

Sincerely,

Doug Farrell, Nevada County Resident

Tyler Barrington

From: Aaron Siniscalco <tharp374@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 21, 2025 12:40 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: RV Living

You don't often get email from tharp374@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

I am writing to express my dismay and concern about the proposed changes allowing living in RV campers and trailers in Nevada County. I fear the criminality and environmental degradation will increase over time and the degradation to the connection to community will increase due to the transient, unstable nature of allowing this. In addition, I fear this will ultimately deflate property values. Please record my opinion for the upcoming meeting(s). Thank you,

Aaron Siniscalco
11384 Mirror Lake Ct.
Grass Valley, CA. 95945

Tyler Barrington

From: Tina Patton <rochorse@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 22, 2025 10:49 AM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Comment regarding RVs and trailers as permanent housing

You don't often get email from rochorse@yahoo.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

To Whom it may concern,

I am writing to express concern regarding the alternative housing proposal for RVs and other non-permanent living constructs to be used as permanent or semi-permanent dwellings. I have had negative experiences regarding this type of housing and I will quickly share. Keep in mind, I am but one person, as you read the experiences below.

- My neighbor allowed friends to live in an RV 30 ft from my garden fence line without a septic hook up and allowed the septic to overfill and overflow, creating a summer stench that kept our environment rather unpleasant, as well as creating a clean-up problem near human food sources.
- The same neighbor moved a towable trailer within 10 feet of our property fence line and in direct view to the front of our house and had their adult son and friend live in it for over a year. This trailer was hooked to a non-permitted septic connection and still created a bad smell during the summer.
- Another neighbor currently operates a non-permitted campground, "Sunset Vista Farm", at Perimeter Rd. and Otter Rd. and allows year-round camping along with campfires through the summer and fall months and regularly encourages his "campers" to trespass to get to a local creek. These campers come in tents, RVs and trailers and have no septic connection, but he provides a standing portable toilet and a garden hose. For fire suppression, he has nailed fire extinguishers to the oak trees.
- Another neighbor rented out their small house and used a tent trailer on the property to provide housing for herself. This resulted in a kerosene heater nearly burning the tent trailer up with her in it. This same neighbor allowed two persons to live in a converted and non-permitted trailer near our property line and resulted in the theft of power from one of our outbuildings.

I understand my experiences are unique to me and that providing low-cost housing options poses a much larger problem. However, I still oppose using housing that is meant to be temporary for a permanent living situation. Here is why:

- RVs and towable trailers are not built to a standard that upholds and outlasts a permanent living situation. Additionally they generally only have one point of ingress and egress, which creates a safety hazard. I was a firefighter in my younger days and nearly lost a friend and her two daughters to a trailer fire. The ceiling of the trailer caught fire and started to collapse to the

floor and they had to run across burning material to escape. Two of the three received 3rd degree burns on their legs and feet.

- Allowing RVs for housing on private property paves the way for our most vulnerable to be taken advantage of by property owners looking to make a buck. Why not park a few RVs on your property if it can make you extra money in a poor economy. I think we have all seen the situation of a "slum" landlord and unfortunately, proponents of this type of living are promoting the ability to charge someone to live in an RV on your property as a positive aspect in an attempt to sway public opinion. This will lead to the unhoused being taken advantage of.
- PG&E electrical infrastructure may have difficulty under increased load from plug in things such as RV air units in the summer and heaters, including portable plug-ins, in the winter. I live in a rural area off of Perimeter Rd. and we already experience brown outs and power dips, especially in the summer. How will area power grids hold up to the addition of high use utilities?
- Fire mitigation is a logical concern. Many of our rural roads are narrow and barely accommodate a truck and small horse trailer. Depending on the RV housing density, how will this impact ingress and egress from fire prone areas? Will an RV that has been sitting as housing be able to move from it's location in an emergency? Additionally, most homeowners maintain some semblance of fire safety in their residence using things such as smoke detectors and carbon monoxide detectors. Homeowners are generally responsible and keep these things in operating order due to the investment in their home. Will a property owner/landlord of RVs inspect and repair or replace these things in a parked RV on their property as needed?
- For the protection of both the landlord and tenant, do current landlord and tenant laws apply to non-permanent housing such as an RV? Rental laws exist to protect the vulnerable from the unscrupulous acts of others. How would these laws apply to non-conforming housing?
- If Nevada County allows RVs and trailers to be used as permanent housing on private property, how will this impact the overall insurability of our area especially with increased fire risk from converting an RV or towable trailer to permanent housing? Do recommended fire clearance measures apply to vehicles and trailers? Who will inspect these situations and what would it cost the tax payer to do so?

At this point, I've listed concerns and problems. Now I would like to suggest a solution.

- Using state and federal grant money coupled with some local tax revenue, Nevada County should establish a property within the city limits of Grass Valley or Nevada City as a safe haven for vulnerable unhoused individuals to reside in an RV or towable trailer. This would ensure the availability of close services for the occupants and house them in an area where there are amenities such as schools, grocery store, public transportation, law enforcement, and jobs.
- The property should have safe and permitted power and septic, along with a standing bathroom facility with toilet and shower, and laundry.
- The RVs and trailers, along with the facility, should be inspected on a regular basis as deemed by the county. Fire safety inspections should also be conducted via the local Fire Marshall's office.
- Utility cost should be handled with a combination of grant money coupled with a small fee required of the facility occupants.
- Management of the facility would need to be evaluated by Nevada County. Management could fall to private contract or be assimilated under an existing division such as code compliance.
- Current and existing code and law for an RV park should be applied.

If RVs and towable trailers must be used for permanent housing, it would be prudent to enact a scenario that creates a safe situation for both the occupants needing housing and the community at large. It also makes sense to create an environment where the unhoused have the potential for improving their situation, such as in an area where there are jobs and services.

I am glad to converse about these ideas and would be happy to answer any questions. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Christina Patton
16266 Otter Rd.
Grass Valley, CA 95949
(530) 268-0155

Tyler Barrington

From: Tom Durkin <tdurkin@vfr.net>
Sent: Thursday, May 22, 2025 10:19 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: alternative housing ordinance

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Tyler,

Please include these comments on the proposed alternative housing ordinance:

The only available and affordable housing right here, right now for low-income and housing-ready homeless residents of Nevada County is alternative housing.

The mission of the Sierra Roots/No Place To Go Project is to advocate for a reasonable and compassionate approach to mitigating our rural homeless/housing crisis by legalizing existing, unused housing stock – RVs & trailers, and maybe even yurts and shipping containers that meet minimum health & safety standards

The Sierra Roots/No Place To Go Project hopes to engage opposition leaders in seeking common ground and fair compromise because nobody should be forced to live outside if safe, nontraditional housing is available.

Alternative housing lowers the risk of a homeless campfire burning down the whole community. Getting people out of the woods is in everybody's best interests.

A person's rights end at his property line. No one is forcing him to put an alternative dwelling unit (AltDU) on his property, but he cannot prevent his neighbor from exercising her right to rent one out on her property.

Renting a trailer on your property could be a source of extra income to help defray rising fire insurance rates and other inflation-driven costs.

Trailers and RVs parked as AltDUs on private property must be prohibited from being moved during a wildfire evacuation. AltDU residents would have to leave their homes just like everybody else.

To lower upfront costs, three-year delays should be offered to give residents and landlords time to implement septic systems and wells. Contracts for blackwater pumping and deliveries of potable water would be required in the interim.

The regulations must not be so restrictive and expensive that nobody can comply. Overly stringent regs would become nothing more than housing on paper – a waste of staff time and taxpayer money.

We are not here to fight the opposition. We are here to seek common ground and fair compromise because everybody has a right to a safe home – and nobody has the right to deny anybody else a home.

Tom Durkin



Tom Durkin
Creative Director
530-559-3189
tomdurkin@sierra-roots.org
tdurkin@vfr.net
[facebook.com/SRNPTGP](https://www.facebook.com/SRNPTGP)
www.project.sierra-roots.org

Tyler Barrington

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, May 23, 2025 8:02 AM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Alternative Housing Input

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Tyler Barrington,

My input is simple: Alternative housing would be okay as long as it meets the same requirements as standard homes and doesn't diminish neighboring property values or residents' peace of mind.

[REDACTED]
Nevada City property owner and resident of 51 years

Tyler Barrington

From: Tracy Huston <tracyehuston@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 22, 2025 5:59 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Cc: tom.durkin@sierra-roots.org
Subject: AltDU No Place to Go support

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Hi, Tyler. By way of this email I am writing to express my support for approving AltDUs in Nevada County, and as proposed by Tom Durkin and the No Place to Go team. I write as a landowner who lives near many urgently needed RVs that have long been inhabited by neighbors all along the rural road in my community, and knowing that without those homes, few would have an alternative and would become homeless. Their homes and the people who live in them are as much a part of our close knit neighborhood as those who live in mobile homes, manufactured homes, and stick built. What defines a community-- and our individual and collective quality of life--is the caliber and nature of communal caring of its residents, not the manner of construction of the homes they live in.

As a builder, I appreciate that codified acceptance of AltDUs will also enhance the health and safety of RV residents and their neighbors as long as code standards are applied without prejudice and with reasonable time for folks to comply. I appreciate Mr. Durkin's interim suggestions for water and waste, and have no doubt they will suffice.

Lastly, as the County and Cities have been woefully slow to find and execute solutions to our housing crisis, I feel it is imperative to accept and support what solutions arise from our greater community, such as the AltDU proposal, as there are no other viable alternatives for the extremely low income folks who need RVs for shelter at present.

I urge you to support and adopt this measure.

Sincerely,

Tracy Huston
1-310-663-1296 cell
Rough and Ready, CA

May 21, 2025

RECEIVED

MAY 23 2025

NEVADA COUNTY
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Dear Mr. Barrington,

We understand that you are taking comments as principal planner for the proposed RV ordinance. My wife and I live on Dog Bar Road, which as you know, is zoned rural RA-10. We selected this home specifically because we do NOT want to live in high density housing surroundings. We value the rural aspect of our environment, wildlife, and the separation between homes. We are very opposed to the RV ordinance. We have concerns about the quantity of people that will utilize this living situation in our neighborhood, risk of a trailer park popping up next to our home, risk of fires, and the impact to our ground water well and implications of sewage disposal. Most of our neighbors who raise livestock, feel the same way we do about this issue. We believe that downtown Grass Valley and Nevada City should do more to address the housing shortage. Please log our comments as citizens and voters of Nevada County firmly in the NO category for the RV ordinance. Thank you.

Todd Burton,

Dog Bar Rd.

Concerned Nevada County Constituent

Tyler Barrington

From: Amiee Kushner <ackushner@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, May 23, 2025 3:13 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Alternative Housing

You don't often get email from ackushner@yahoo.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Dear Mr. Barrington,

I am a Nevada County homeowner and live just outside of Nevada City. I am writing in favor of an alternative housing ordinance. Nevada County is desperately in need of housing and especially affordable housing. Many people are already illegally living in RVs, trailers and tiny homes. Creating regulations that allow people to safely live in alternative housing will protect renters rights, landowners property and the well being of all of our neighborhoods.

I would estimate 1/3 of my neighbors already own RVs and camping trailers that are parked on their properties. Some are being lived in and others are simply parked for the owners use, so allowing alternative housing certainly wouldn't change the appearance of our neighborhood. Most of us are underutilizing the available land on our properties as well.

Providing safe, affordable, alternative housing will prevent additional homelessness and allow our lower income neighbors to stay a part of our community.

Thank You,

Amiee Kushner

Tyler Barrington

From: Annie Mikal-Heine <Annie@freed.org>
Sent: Friday, May 23, 2025 3:48 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Public Comment Submission
Attachments: THOW Ordinance Public Comment - ADRC 5.23.25.docx

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Hello Tyler,

I would like to submit the attached Public Comment on behalf of the Nevada County Aging and Disability Resource Connection. We are in support of the inclusion of Travel Trailers in the Tiny Homes on Wheels ordinance.

Best Regards,

Annie Mikal- Heine
Program Manager
FREED
Aging and Disability Resource Connection
530.477.3333 x216 phone
annie@FREED.org



This email may contain confidential and privileged material for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any review, use, distribution or disclosure by others is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient (or authorized to receive for the recipient), please contact the sender by reply email and delete all copies of this message. Please consider environment before printing this email.

Public Comment to the Nevada County Planning Department on the Proposed Tiny Homes on Wheels (THOW) Zoning Ordinance Amendments

Dear Nevada County Planning Department,

On behalf of the Nevada County Aging and Disability Resource Connection, which represents a network of local organizations serving older adults and people with disabilities, we want to express our collective appreciation for your ongoing efforts to expand housing options in our community. We commend the Board of Supervisors for adopting the Master Plan for Aging and Disability and for committing to the strategies identified in **Goal 2: Housing for All Ages and Stages**. The Board's directive to allow for alternative building types and your approval of the Tiny Homes on Wheels (THOW) ordinance is a positive step toward fulfilling this commitment and demonstrates your leadership in addressing the diverse housing needs within Nevada County.

As you review this ordinance, we respectfully urge the Planning Department to include options that serve the unique needs of residents over 60 and people with disabilities of all ages, many of whom are on fixed incomes or earn low wages. We believe that broadening the scope to incorporate alternative housing options such as RVs, travel trailers, and mobile homes will provide more comprehensive support. These forms of housing, when upgraded to meet code-equivalent standards, can offer safe and flexible options that are much more affordable and within financial reach for many of our aging and disabled community members.

We advocate for maintaining minimal health standards across all housing types, ensuring they are sustainable and functional. This could involve allowing portable waste removal systems, alternative sewage disposal methods such as composting toilets, and mobile onsite pumping services, which promote health and safety without imposing excessive costs. Additionally, enabling the use of alternative sources for potable water, such as mobile delivery and storage, along with solar panels for sustainable energy, will create a more robust housing policy that supports both affordability and environmental sustainability. Applying these basic standards, along with requirements such as skirting and proper site

placement to increase the residential appearance of travel trailers, will address the urgent need for diverse affordable housing options.

In conclusion, we encourage the Planning Department to embrace a more comprehensive approach that also allows for RVs, travel trailers, and mobile homes, when updated to code-equivalent standards. This inclusive strategy will help ensure a safe, affordable, and dignified living environment for all Nevada County residents, aligning with the Board of Supervisors already established commitment to **Housing for All Ages and Stages**.

Thank you for your continued dedication to addressing the housing needs of our community. We look forward to collaborating with you to develop solutions that benefit everyone.

Sincerely,

Nevada County Aging and Disability Resource Connection
Master Plan for Aging and Disability- Housing Workgroup

Tyler Barrington

From: rmf525 <rmf525@att.net>
Sent: Friday, May 23, 2025 3:42 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Alternative Housing Community discussion

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

You don't often get email from rmf525@att.net. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Tyler.

I am a Nevada County resident and home owner here for 35 years now. I retired here. My comment on this new consideration of allowing people to live in vehicles and RVs on private property is disbelief that the county/city is even considering it. How ignorant are our current crop of government leaders? If this actually passes, we are going to see an increase in crime, in drug use and a flood of transient non productive individuals. This will also increase the threat of fires in our area. I personally believe we are in trouble now and wonder how fast our quality of living here in the Nevada City area will spiral downward with these current leaders considering this?

Respectfully, Mike Fraley

Sent via the Samsung Galaxy Note10, an AT&T 5G Evolution capable smartphone

Tyler Barrington

From: BG <giller@impulse.net>
Sent: Friday, May 23, 2025 4:22 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: alternative housing

[You don't often get email from giller@impulse.net. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Greetings,

As a property owner in Nevada County i support all forms of housing.

There should be no restrictions on people living as they see fit on their own property.

We need more housing and affordable housing should be prioritized. Tiny homes, RVs, vans, etc.... are all good.

thanks,

Brooks Gill

Banner Mountain area.

Tyler Barrington

From: scoziah <scoziah@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, May 26, 2025 7:35 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Pro trailer living
Attachments: IMG_2571.jpg

You don't often get email from scoziah@yahoo.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Attached photo.

I wish everyone could have a place to be.

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone



Attachment 3



Sierra Roots/No Place to Go Project



Alternative Housing Ordinance Public Comment, 5:30 p.m., May 27 Rood Center, Nevada City

These talking points are suggestions. Pick one or two that resonate the most with you and make them your own. You will have three, maybe two minutes to speak, but a short and persuasive statement is often more effective than a longer speech.

Please remember, we are the good guys. We are polite, persistent and relentlessly reasonable. We don't yell, threaten or insult. We offer solutions, not complaints.

- Nevada County can mitigate the homeless/housing crisis by making RV/trailers safe, available and affordable without having to build anything or spend millions of dollars.
- This is about solving a problem, not "addressing" the problem.
- Alternative housing lowers the risk of a homeless campfire burning down the whole community. Getting people out of the woods is in everybody's best interests.
- Renting an AltDU to responsible people on the same basis as any other rental transaction could provide extra income to pay for fire insurance.
- Because of the potential for dangerous traffic congestion, moving a tiny home on wheels or other alternative dwelling unit (AltDU) on wheels during a wildfire evacuation warning or order should be prohibited.
- We have a homeless/housing emergency. Redefining legal housing to include RV/trailers just makes sense, especially if you care about the welfare of our unhoused citizens.
- Housing is healthcare. People in housing have far fewer medical and mental problems than people living in the wild. This saves taxpayers money.
- Each AltDU must have code or code-equivalent septic and water management.
- A person's property rights end at his property line. No one is forcing him to put an AltDU on his property, but he cannot prevent his neighbor from exercising her right to rent one out on her property.

- The regulations must not be so restrictive and expensive that nobody can comply. Overly stringent regs would become nothing more than housing on paper – a waste of staff time and taxpayer money.
- Most homeless people are not mentally ill or addicts. They just need housing they can afford.
- Excluding RV/trailers is implicit class discrimination. Just because we live in RV/trailers because that's all we could find or afford doesn't automatically make us "trailer trash."
- So many people already live in trailers that code enforcement would have to remain complaint driven – but the complaint must have merit.
- Code Compliance's first priority should be keeping people where they are and assisting them to come into compliance. Forced relocation/evictions should be a last resort.
- Code Compliance must report the demographics of all the individuals who are forced to relocate.
- Working-age adults coming out of homelessness need RV/trailers as first-step, transitional housing on their way to better housing once they get stabilized.
- RV/trailers are a last resort for older and disabled people on fixed incomes who can't find housing.
- Currently, RV/trailers are the only truly affordable housing out there that doesn't require government subsidy (our taxpayer dollars) to be affordable.
- For extra income, property owners in the unincorporated areas of Nevada County who are not using their RV/trailers can choose to rent them out to responsible people on the same basis as any other rental transaction.
- People who have private property and the right hookups can rent space to people who have their own RV/trailers.
- Renting homes on wheels on private property is what *housing for the people by the people* is all about.
- *Having a safe place to live is a human right.* If there is no housing, we must at least establish safe places for people to camp or park with toilet facilities and garbage cans.

It is in the shelter of each other that we live.

Tom Durkin, Creative Director
Sierra Roots/No Place To Go Project

tomdurkin@sierra-roots.org

530-559-3199

Tyler Barrington

From: Jenelyse Woolery <indigigoldenherbalacademy@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 25, 2025 1:38 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Alternative Housing Solution in Nevada County

You don't often get email from indigigoldenherbalacademy@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Blessings on this sacred Sunday that the Lord has made.

So many things to say about the housing crisis in America and California.

For one as a Black Woman whose ancestors were stolen from our ancestral lands to build this country but who then have been racialized and often offered less than the captors I am disheartened by how much this country has *not* grown. I am 32 years of age and thought we had advanced so much more past the civil rights movement, but we have *not*.

I couple my ancestral experience with those who settled in the Americas from Ireland, Scotland (I'm 17% Scottish), and those who migrated here due to instability in their own countries, in part due to Western advancement and neo-colonialism.

Most people in my generation are not making 4-6 figure salary incomes and it leaves us in this never ending loop of debt and cycles of renting. The cost of living continues to rise but our payouts do not!

What people in my generation are leaning towards are alternative housing solutions that are land based. I received my certification as a Permaculture landscape designer in SoCal in 2016 and have a **Bachelors of Science Degree in Alternative Holistic Medicine from Everglades University**. I'm also a certified herbalist and doula! This is the future of this country! We are rekindling our connection to the land, natural medicine, and self sufficiency. I personally never fell ill during COVID and I was able to assist countless people in reclaiming their own wellness while deepening their connection to the land.

I work a part time job though I have applied for jobs within my field for the past few years. I've even worked at a local apothecary, sold produce at our local farmers market, and have taken on many land based gigs, including supporting birthing women with their growing families. I cannot afford to build a home on the 7 acre property we own in Nevada county. Our tiny home has been a dream come true and provides so much relief. Our dream was to build an earthen cob home, working with people like Sons development. This **was** our dream until we learned about how strict the county is. We hoped to build a home for less than 10k because that's what we can afford. I am deeply disheartened that the county is not willing to work with people interested in the tiny home and alternative housing movement. I feel that it will deter people like myself from

moving to this county. Though I have shopped locally as a commitment to buying local only. I shop at peaceful valley, briar patch, natural selections, cal organics, and throughout the county. I have a commitment to shop locally! I would have that the county would have a commitment to support the locals.

I was overjoyed when I heard the county would be approving tiny homes and I'd be even more ecstatic if yurts and converted garden sheds were included in that ruling as serving as a single residence.

We have to recognize that the ways that we go about building is truly not responsible nor is it sustainable. We extract and outsource resources at rates higher than ever and most of these homes sit empty due to developers greed, while families suffer greatly across this country and in this county. How can we expect crime to diminish and how can we expect to live in utopia together if we do not support one another.

This message is by no means a cry out for those who have resources to compromise on their lofty goals or expensive dreams. This cry out is for those who have more to understand that those who have less are striving to do all that they can with what they have.

This is a reminder that the global majority live in small residences and some are makeshift homes. I have personally spent months traveling throughout Africa and have seen it all from elaborate large fancy homes to lean to structures. What they all have in common is that they house the people and the people who live in them are the same whether they are business owners, government officials, professors, or simple herbalists and farmers like my family. At the end of it all we all bleed red yes? I can even see the blue veins in my arm! Meaning we are all family, a human species that should be working to collaborate together like a family would. My needs are no different than the high officials, however my choice is to be modest and humble! I wish so much to live close to the Earth in a simple way because that is where I derive my joy from. Just like some people enjoy watching football games, I enjoy watching my flowers grow. Even when I lived at home (both my parents have college degrees and have high government positions) , I still begged them to recycle and refused to have a television in my room. To this day my home remains an artistic, nature based, and simple space and I desire it to be this way.

We pay taxes in this county! That should be enough!

Not to mention I moved here for spiritual reasons, because the energy of the Indigenous Nisenan tribal peoples was palpable and the yoga fellowships along with the emphasis on local and land felt nourishing on a soul level.

I leave you all with these bible verses:

Genesis 1:29-30

Then God said, "Behold, I have given you every seed-bearing plant on the face of all the earth, and every tree whose fruit contains seed. They will be yours for food. / And to every beast of the earth and every bird of the air and every creature that crawls upon the earth—everything that has the breath of life in it—I have given every green plant for food." And it was so.

Job 38:41

Who provides food for the raven when its young cry out to God as they wander about for lack of food?

1 Kings 17:4-6

And you are to drink from the brook, and I have commanded the ravens to feed you there." / So Elijah did what the LORD had told him, and he went and lived by the Brook of Cherith, east of the Jordan. / The ravens would bring him bread and meat in the morning and evening, and he would drink from the brook.

Matthew 6:26

Look at the birds. They don't plant or harvest or store food in barns, for your heavenly Father feeds them. And aren't you far more valuable to him than they are?

Luke 12:1

In the meantime, a crowd of many thousands had gathered, so that they were trampling one another. Jesus began to speak first to His disciples: "Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy.

1 Peter 5:5-6

Young men, in the same way, submit yourselves to your elders. And all of you, clothe yourselves with humility toward one another, because, "God opposes the proud, but gives grace to the humble." / Humble yourselves, therefore, under God's mighty hand, so that in due time He may exalt you.

P.O. Box 326 Penn Valley CA 95946

--

Certified Herbalist Jennifer Elyse Woolery

Herbal Teacher

Doula

Landscape Designer & Steward

www.indigigoldenherbals.org

Jwoolery10@gmail.com

Instagram @indigigoldenherbalacademy

"Blessings and abundance to the humble and the meek, for they shall inherit the earth"

Email and social media is always the best way to get in contact

Tyler Barrington

From: Lora A. Moore <Lora.A.Moore@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, May 24, 2025 4:58 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Alternative/RV Housing Input for meeting May 27th

You don't often get email from lora.a.moore@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

I am writing to provide my input on the issue of allowing RV's, campers and van conversions to be used as living quarters on private property.

I am strongly opposed to this in Nevada County for the following reasons:

I have serious concerns about sanitation. How will these temporary homes be connected to a septic system? Will there be permits and inspections required? In this rural area we already have people living in temporary housing, possibly even paying rent, and not yet legally allowed. Is this a way to "grandfather" these bootleg housing shelters into compliance?

I am concerned that the rural nature of our community lends itself to many violations of housing and building codes.

Another concern I have is the risk of fires. And with fire risk comes evacuation risks. I recall a few years ago when we were evacuated from Arrowhead Mine Rd. There was a very long line of vehicles including animal trailers, campers, vans and RV's slowly traveling down the evacuation route. I have concerns that more residents means more vehicles evacuating on very small and winding roads. Unless there are measures to increase the capacity of our roads to handle more residents I fear we could have fatalities.

I want to know what measures will be implemented to oversee the increase of legal and illegal residents in the rural areas. How will this be managed? What regulations and permits will be required and who will pay for the extra work placed upon county personnel to oversee this process if approved?

I trust this is just a beginning of dialog and there will be more opportunities for more resident input.

Respectfully submitted,

Lora A. Moore
916-549-4449

Tyler Barrington

From: Brian Flosi <brianflosi@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, May 24, 2025 3:52 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Alternative Housing

You don't often get email from brianflosi@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Dear City supervisors

My name is Brian Flosi, and I am a homeowner in Nevada County. I am writing in support of the proposed Alternative Housing Ordinance.

This ordinance would benefit responsible homeowners like myself, as well as renters in need of affordable housing. In my area, many people already live in unpermitted accessory dwelling units (ADUs) due to the strict and often prohibitive building codes currently in place. By passing this ordinance, the county would give these residents a path to legality and encourage more homeowners to provide alternative, affordable housing options.

In my own case, I am unable to install a traditional septic system due to the cost, the location of drainage, and the size of my lot. These factors make it nearly impossible for me to build a permitted, affordable ADU—even one using composting or incinerator toilets—under current regulations.

The Alternative Housing Ordinance would help bridge this gap and support innovative, sustainable housing solutions that align with the needs of our community.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Brian Flosi

Tyler Barrington

From: Frans Velthuisen <fransv@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Saturday, May 24, 2025 1:31 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Alternative Housing Community Meeting - Comments
Attachments: Alternative Housing Meeting Comments 250527.xlsx

You don't often get email from fransv@sbcglobal.net. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Hello Tyler,

Thank you for administering this program.

Since I probably won't be able to attend the upcoming meeting I would like to take the opportunity to share some of my concerns with you.

In the attached Excel spreadsheet I listed most of the items that I think deserve attention and some that deserve strict regulation. In general I am supportive of affordable housing, but I foresee a lot of problems with this type of housing on wheels if it is not well regulated and enforced.

Without filling in this spreadsheet, you will be able to see what my concerns could possibly be.

- Visible impression of neighborhoods may start to resemble 3rd world shanty towns.
- Environmental impacts due to defensible space clearing, pets scaring wildlife, pollution to groundwater and creeks, etc.
- More people more fire risks.
- Problems in case of emergency evacuation.
- Transient population and tourism issues (short term rental)

I hope that all these issues will be addressed.

I'd appreciate having access to the results of the meeting. Will the minutes or a summary be available online?

Thank you.

Frans Velthuisen
13676 Lava Cap Mine Rd
Nevada City, CA 95959
530-693-0334
fransv@sbcglobal.net

**Alternative Housing
Community Meeting**

Nevada County Housing on
wheels

Tiny homes on wheels
RV's
Campers
Conversion vans
Any of the above with wheels
not functioning or removed
Any of the above with add-on
decks
Any of the above with add-on
awnings or enclosures

	Power Supply				Setbacks - Visibility			Sewer Hook-up			WUI Defensible Space			Environmental Impact			Impact Fees			Property Taxes		Emergency Evacuation		Rent								
	PG&E	Solar	PV storage	Batter y	Fuel Type	Nat. Gas	Propane	Hydro Other	from street	from neigh bpr	Other	City	Septic	Other	5ft	30ft	100ft	water	wild life	veget alion	File	Sewer	School	Other	Tax base	Impro veme nts	Are they allowed to evacuate?	short term	Mid term	Long term	Any rent contro l?	

Tyler Barrington

From: Mo Graber <mograberfbm@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 27, 2025 7:41 AM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Proposed Ordinance - RV as ADUs
Attachments: RV-Ordinance.pdf

You don't often get email from mograberfbm@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Good morning Tyler,

Kindly add the attached to your project file. I'll see you this afternoon.

Thank you,
Mo Graber
916-502-1403

DATE: May 27, 2025

TO: ALL Nevada County Planning Commission Members
ALL Nevada County Board of Supervisors Members

FROM: *Maureen Graber*
Maureen Graber
District 1
Tahoe National Forest Areas Zone

RE: Input on Proposed Ordinance to Allow Recreation Vehicles as Primary Dwellings

The Nevada County Planning Commission and the Nevada County Board of Supervisors are entrusted by its residents to make appropriate decisions based upon available information. Fortunately, there is ample information available related to wildfire risk, risk reduction, evacuation safety, and the current homeowners' insurance crisis.

Over the last few years, Nevada County has had to prioritize wildfire preparedness and risk reduction plans and activities. This was the natural outcome of lessons learned from the 2018 Camp Fire, 2021 Dixie and River Fires, 2023 Maui Fire, and the very recent 2025 Los Angeles County Fires.

Wildfire risk reduction gained traction with residents when homeowners' insurance carriers began to non-renew policies, and the FAIR Plan, "the insurer of last resort", offered minimal coverage at a significantly higher cost. The Board of Supervisors is keenly aware of the need to reduce wildfire risk to contribute to the stabilization of the homeowners' insurance market as one of its own members has successfully led the California State Association of Counties Insurance Working Group.

Summary:

1. Adding motor and recreational vehicles into densely forested high and very high wildfire risk zones, to serve as Accessory Dwelling Units, conflicts with wildfire risk reduction practices.
2. Adding motor and recreational vehicles, to serve as Accessory Dwelling Units, bypasses updated safety standards ensuring that new residential units meet home hardening and defensible space requirements.
3. Adding additional people into densely forested high and very high wildfire risk zones, who conduct cooking (and other basic life activities) outdoors, increases wildfire ignition risks.
4. Adding motor and recreational vehicles as Accessory Dwelling Units to our insufficient evacuation routes, which cannot support currently projected resident evacuation traffic flow, is negligent and poses great harm.
5. Adding motor and recreational vehicles as Accessory Dwelling Units to densely forested high and very high wildfire zones that do not have access to fire hydrants, is negligent and poses great harm.

6. Nevada County boasts the highest number of Firewise Communities in the nation. As volunteers, we work tirelessly to reduce wildfire risk. We look to Nevada County to support us with policies and ordinances that align with common sense wildfire risk reduction practices. To support an ordinance that increases wildfire risk, and its associated harms, undermines the efforts of our Firewise Communities.
7. Motor and recreational vehicle living is best located in low to moderate wildfire hazard zones, with appropriate infrastructure, access to services, and nearby evacuation access to freeways.
8. Proposition 1 funds are available to provide alternative living spaces. A properly constructed recreational vehicle park, with appropriate infrastructure, access to services, and nearby evacuation access to freeways should be explored.

Readily Available Information:

Both the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors have received copies of wildfire strategic planning documents resulting from multiple county commissioned studies. These studies consistently indicate that the Grass Valley Area and the Tahoe National Forest Area zones, in particular, have consistently elevated vulnerability to wildfire risks across all plan documents.

1. **Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP).** The CWPP cost approximately \$406,000 to produce and contains over 1000 pages of detailed wildfire risk related information. The purpose of the CWPP is “to serve as a wildfire resilience planning document that summarizes the County's wildfire environment, wildfire hazard and risk, and action items the community can take to reduce wildfire risk.” It details wildfire risk across four wildfire forecast zones. The plan areas exhibit “a complex wildfire environment that presents a significant risk to public and firefighter safety as well as the built and natural environment.” The risk presented by human activity is significant.
2. **Local Hazard Mitigation Plan.** This plan identifies and seeks to reduce risk associated with natural hazards. Of the twelve (12) identified hazards only two were rated as “High” for Nevada County: Wildfires and Winter Storms. The Hazard Mitigation Plan focuses on actions that can be implemented prior to a disaster to reduce or eliminate damage to property and people.
3. **Wildfire Risk Assessment.** This plan includes both wildfire risk and hazard analyses to determine how to best approach wildfire risk reduction activities. The plan calls out that 92% of Nevada County has been determined to be either a High or Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone by CAL FIRE. The flame length maps are particularly sobering and identify the Grass Valley Area and Tahoe National Forest Area zones as being the most at risk for the longest flame lengths; up to 12 feet high! These areas are also called out as having the most significant burn probability for a fuels driven wildfire.
4. **Evacuation Study.** The Nevada County Evacuation Study cost approximately \$135,422 to produce and contains 276 pages of evacuation route analysis. This study analyzed fire behavior, human behavior, traffic management, and

infrastructure capacity. The study revealed that many Nevada County evacuation routes are long, steep, and narrow with limited capabilities for accommodating numerous vehicles during an evacuation event. Shockingly, the study revealed that under evacuation conditions, primary evacuation routes from the most vulnerable areas exceeded 2 hours and may take up to 4 hours!

Lessons Learned:

1. The higher the population, the higher the wildfire risk. Of those identified wildfire causes, 63% are attributed to human behavior.
2. Counties with high seasonal tourism, particularly during peak wildfire season, have an increased evacuation traffic risk. This becomes critical when tourism is centered around water and camping attractions and tourists' only mode of evacuation is a recreational vehicle.
3. Previous California wildfires (e.g., Paradise in 2018) showed how quickly entire communities can be consumed, with tragic outcomes especially for people in mobile housing. Trailers are highly vulnerable in fast-moving wildfires.
4. The December 2024 US Senate Budget Committee's Report on Climate Change revealed that Nevada County suffered the highest homeowners' insurance non-renewal rate in the nation.
5. Evacuation routes became gridlocked, and vehicles were abandoned, at both the Maui and Los Angeles County wildfire disaster areas.
6. The Maui wildfire underscored the urgency of building climate-resilient and community-driven risk reduction systems. It's a stark reminder that preparedness is not just about responding to disasters but ensuring appropriate preventative measures are practiced.
7. The Los Angeles County wildfires demonstrated that wildfire has the potential to devastate a community's infrastructure and economy. Rebuilding takes years, not months, with residents making the difficult decision to leave the community due to the length of time and cost to rebuild.
8. Cities and counties are vulnerable to lawsuits for policies that result in injury or death; particularly when the outcome could have reasonably been foreseen.
9. Most high and very high wildfire risk areas maintain ordinances that ensure strident protections from wildfire start risks.

I appreciate the opportunity to voice my concerns about this proposed ordinance. Although my past Tiny Homes on Wheels ordinance experience has led me to believe that my input will be discounted, I will continue to present my viewpoint and readily available support information.

If for no other reason than to hold Nevada County accountable when disaster strikes because of this ill-advised proposed ordinance.

Thank you.

Tyler Barrington

To: Jodeana Patterson
Subject: RE: Alternative Housing Ordinance Invitation for Comment - May 2025 (PLN25-0084; ORD25-1; EIS25-0005)

From: Nathan W. <wolfson.nathan@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 27, 2025 10:57 AM
To: Jodeana Patterson <Jodeana.Patterson@nevadacountyca.gov>
Subject: Re: Alternative Housing Ordinance Invitation for Comment - May 2025 (PLN25-0084; ORD25-1; EIS25-0005)

You don't often get email from wolfson.nathan@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

I think this is a great idea. I would like to see the time limits for people staying / living in an rv or tiny home lifted.

I may be missing it but I followed all the links in the document and could not see the actual wording of the proposed code changes. I was curious to see the details regarding proposed occupancy limits, setbacks, and rules regarding sanitation/sewage, etc.

Tyler Barrington

Subject: RE: Alternative Housing Ordinance Invitation for Comment - May 2025 (PLN25-0084; ORD25-1; EIS25-0005)

From: Nathan W. <wolfson.nathan@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, May 27, 2025 3:49 PM

To: Jodeana Patterson <Jodeana.Patterson@nevadacountyca.gov>

Cc: Tyler Barrington <Tyler.Barrington@nevadacountyca.gov>

Subject: Re: Alternative Housing Ordinance Invitation for Comment - May 2025 (PLN25-0084; ORD25-1; EIS25-0005)

You don't often get email from wolfson.nathan@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Thanks!

Tyler: I see that the documents contains the current rules (90 day limits, no rent can be charged, etc) so my input, were I able to attend the meeting for public comment, is that I would at a minimum like to see the 90 day limit abolished -- essentially allowing a tiny home or rv to be a year round "permanent" home option.

I still think it should be subject to the basic requirements of habitability and compatibility with living in a community: things like fire safety, protection from the elements, and a responsible manner to deal with sewage waste, probably all the normal code requirements for a residence except those designed to preclude a tiny home or RV from qualifying -- but I am not familiar enough with those issues to offer specific suggestions.

Thanks.

Nathan Wolfson

200 Coyote St #1219

Nevada City

Permissible RVs

5/27/2025

Dear Tyler Barrington,

My name is Cedar Amodeo, resident of District 1, and I'm here to advocate for the inclusion of RVs and trailers as allowable year-round dwellings.

We are in a housing crisis, indicated by the high cost of available rentals and lack of dedicated affordable housing developments. Allowing RVs to become permitted is an immediate solution for individuals struggling to find stable housing.

I want to emphasize how unmotivated people are to uplift themselves from poverty because of the middle-zone of making too much money for government assistance programs yet not enough money to pay for a market-rate rental, health insurance, etc. People need a variety of housing price-points so they can get off government or family/charity assistance and empower themselves with an affordable RV rental.

For me, this issue is personal. My elderly father's future health, financial situation, and housing needs are uncertain, so affordable housing options like RVs or trailers could make it possible for me and other family members to support him without facing unnecessary hardship. These vehicles are a lifeline for families like mine and others in our community.

Opponent arguments have merit, but they do not justify terminating the proposal. For example, it is true that regulations and guidelines need to be established to prevent people from trying to tow away their RVs during a wildfire.

I appreciate the county's leadership in creating pathways for permitted tiny houses and believe including RVs is the logical next step. By allowing RVs and trailers to function as tiny homes on wheels, we can:

1. Provide flexible, affordable housing options immediately.
2. Offer relief to low-wage workers, elderly residents, and individuals with disabilities.
3. Make residential addresses more accessible for job seekers and DMV applicants where a PO Box will not suffice
4. Address housing insecurity without the delays and costs of new construction.

Thank you for your time, dedication, and leadership in this opportunity.

Sincerely,
Cedar Amodeo
District 1

Tyler Barrington

From: Paul Schwartz <psschwartz21@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 27, 2025 4:48 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Cc: Lisa Swarthout; psschwartz21@gmail.com
Subject: RV Discussion May 27, 2025 BOS

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Tyler:

Please circulate my comments to the BOS.

Since I moved to Nevada County in 1971, I have called a number of different circumstances home. My first rental I shared the lower half of a one-bedroom older home with three others near SPD market. Our rent was \$75 per month. Following that I rented a mining claim located off North Bloomfield Road for \$20 per month. I bought a wreck of 16-foot trailer and located it there. The trailer cost me \$50. It had a good kitchen and not much else. At any one time I shared the mining claim with 3-5 others. We had tents and hauled our water in. I lived there for about 18 months. From there I moved to a basement room in an old house on Pine Street. After that I rented an old barn down in the canyon below Ridge Road. I recovered the trailer from the mining claim and moved the kitchen into the barn. I took the trailer to the dump. During my time in the barn I worked in Nevada City waiting tables, bartending, and as an on-call fire fighter for Tahoe National Forest. The National Hotel offered use of showers for \$1 and that was a blessing for me. I was enrolled in Sierra College during the day. There was a free bus that picked up students in front of the National Hotel every morning at 8:00 AM and returned them in the afternoon. This was a great convenience. When I completed my AA degree at Sierra College I transferred to the UC system where I completed a business degree and an MBA. Returning to Nevada County I found a rent to own option in Grass Valley and lived there with my wife and two children for the next 25 years.

Housing has gotten a lot more complicated and costly. For many the idea of an RV on someone's land for a marginal rent is a dream come true. For some one looking to buy a home, allowing them to place one or two RVs on the property could be the difference that makes it affordable for them. From a planning perspective, I can easily imagine a central primary home and pads for 4 or 5 RVs served off a common septic system, common domestic water supply, and electric service. With County technical support and thoughtful building codes this concept could offer an affordable housing supply that doesn't exist today and a new business model for home buyers. Please consider the possibilities.

Paul Schwartz
13812 Meadow Drive
Grass Valley, CA 95945
530-272-2535

Board of Supervisors

I want to thank you for this opportunity to speak with you about a subject that has been at the forefront of my community-based work for the last 20 years.

I have been responsible for placing, as of this past weekend, 297 families into a safe secure warm living space withing our community. This work is done for free for these families, which included placing their name on the title of this gift, and many times creating the facilities necessary to protect the site, community and environment.

Up until 2 years ago this was all done on my dime, as I received no funding, and I am not still a 501C3 organization, but in the past 2 years I have been able to annually secure \$10,000 a year through the usage of GoFundMe, and generous residents of our community.

Now you might question are you placing these with no care for neighbors, or surround properties, and what do you require to place a trailer (or home as I call them).

1. The Site **MUST** have a working septic system, and said trailer must be connected to it. Grey water systems are **NEVER** allowed, and all effluent must go to the septic system to be treated. If the trailer is downhill of the tank, then a drop tank with a pump will be required.
2. The site must have a 220V / 30-amp power source, and this source **MUST** have a newer power supply, with an appropriate fusing system.
3. This site must have adequate water, a well or municipal water system connected to it, and this site must.

I will speak with the neighbors before placing any trailer and give these people my phone number so that if issues do arise with this placement, I can address these quickly making sure that all parties are comfortable and heard.

At times I have been asked to address things like dogs barking on a nearby property that were not connected to the site in question, but being a resource to help people not be

homeless is a valued service to our community, and I want to thank you for the accommodation that I was awarded by the Board of Supervisors last year for these efforts.

I do understand that this is not an easy subject, but if any of you have questions or would like to talk please feel free to call me, as my contact information is on the bottom of this handout.

Brad Peceimer

Brad.Peceimer@gmail.com

530-913-6426

Tyler Barrington

From: Elizabeth Hadly <tonyandliz@me.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 27, 2025 9:02 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Proposal to allow campers as primary residences on rural parcels

[You don't often get email from tonyandliz@me.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Dear Nevada County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors,

We moved to Red Dog Road recently and are impressed by the sense of community in the region. We are also aware of challenges the community faces—among them, people looking for affordable housing, especially those on the verge of being homeless. While we recognize the homeless crisis is growing nationwide and needs to be addressed, the County's proposed plan to allow Campers, Van Conversions, and Recreational Trailers as primary residences on rural parcels does not offer a viable solution. It simply pushes people in need out of sight into the forest, rather than providing the services they need. Moreover, the plan introduces significant risks for existing residents in the outskirts of town, as detailed below, particularly in the forested areas of Banner Mountain.

Therefore we are writing to express our strong opposition to the County's proposal to increase the number of essentially temporary dwellings in forested areas. Instead, we suggest setting aside parcels of County land for people residing in Campers, Van Conversions, and Recreational Trailers, where they are in proximity to needed social services, can more easily integrate with and develop community, and where the risks detailed below would be minimized.

The safety implications of this proposal are alarming. Our mountain community is already at extremely high risk of wildfire. It is well known that ignition sources are correlated with humans, especially in the Wildland-Urban Interface. The ignition risk is likely to increase significantly because those living in RVs are much more likely to be cooking or otherwise using campfires (in part because their indoor facilities are so limited) even on days when outdoor burning is prohibited.

The addition of transient or inadequately equipped vehicles on narrow, winding roads such as Red Dog X and Buckeye Road could dramatically impact emergency evacuation efforts. It only takes one unmaintained trailer or disabled tow vehicle to block an evacuation route and endanger lives. This is not hypothetical—we have witnessed this before. One such vehicle was left abandoned on Red Dog X, obstructing the road and requiring highway patrol intervention. In a fire scenario, that could be catastrophic, especially where evacuation routes are limited as they are in the Banner Mountain area.

Furthermore, the forest infrastructure is not designed to support long-term habitation by individuals living in RVs or campers without proper sewage, water, and waste systems. Septic systems are expensive and highly regulated for a reason, and it is unrealistic to assume that someone who cannot afford traditional housing will be able to install or maintain a permitted system. The result will likely be increased illegal dumping, environmental degradation, potential contamination of neighborhood wells and a burden on neighbors and emergency services.

There is also the issue of enforcement. How will zoning and code compliance be monitored? Who will ensure that generators are not running at all hours, that trash is removed, and that human waste is managed? If the County lacks the capacity to enforce these rules now, it certainly won't be able to once many more unregulated dwellings are allowed.

Community matters. People who move into rural trailers out of economic necessity may not have access to the support systems they need. They are isolated from jobs, healthcare, and social services. That isolation also makes integration into the existing community difficult, especially if some of the newcomers are not invested in long-term stewardship of the land or relationships with neighbors. Sadly, our community has seen increases in drug use (and the detritus associated with drugs), aggressive dogs, trespassing and theft, and it is not unreasonable to link some of those challenges to past efforts to allow unregulated housing.

And, if the proposal passes, the county will attract even more people whose primary residence is an RV, exacerbating all of the problems we highlight, while at the same time depleting the tax base that provides county services.

From an aesthetic and environmental perspective, we moved to Banner Mountain to be part of a quiet, forested community—not a sprawling campground. Allowing long-term RV residency threatens the very character of our neighborhoods. It is a change that would undermine the values of those who have invested in and cared for these lands over many years and is antithetical to the very reason we moved here.

We all care deeply about solving the housing crisis and we want to invest in solutions that work. But this proposal is not it. The County should focus on real, sustainable housing options that come with local community support services: affordable housing developments, mental health services, job training, easy access to employment and transitional housing with wraparound care. Legalizing trailers in the forest does not solve homelessness—it only hides it, while creating new, serious problems. It widens the footprint of the problem, marginalizes the people needing our community support and means that it becomes more difficult for social services to identify problems and help those in need.

Please reconsider this path. Our forests, our safety, and our community depend on responsible planning.

Sincerely,
Anthony D. Barnosky
Elizabeth A. Hadly
14990 Red Dog Road
Nevada City, CA 95959

Tyler Barrington

From: Lewis Robertson <lewis.owlcove@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 27, 2025 5:56 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Opposition Letter - Campers as Residences on Rural Parcels

You don't often get email from lewis.owlcove@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

DATE: May 27, 2025

TO: ALL Nevada County Planning Commission Members
ALL Nevada County Board of Supervisors Members

FROM: Lewis & Rachel Robertson
District 1
Tahoe National Forest Areas Zone

Dear Nevada County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors,

Many members of our community will be writing in, and after weeks of kicking around our thoughts on this topic, we have put together the below letter to outline our feelings, so you may see some similar letters, but know these are the thoughts of the nearly 40 people that were a part of these discussions. Thank you for your attention to this matter. I'll include my phone number at the bottom of this note as well.

We are writing to express our strong concern regarding the County's proposed plan to allow Campers, Van Conversions, and Recreational Trailers as primary residences on rural parcels, particularly in the forested areas of Banner Mountain. While we recognize and respect the urgency of addressing homelessness in our county, we do not believe this proposal offers a responsible or effective solution.

The safety implications of this proposal are alarming. Our mountain community is already at high risk of wildfire. The addition of transient or inadequately equipped vehicles on narrow, winding roads like Red Dog X and Buckeye Road could dramatically impact emergency evacuation efforts. It only takes one unmaintained trailer or disabled tow vehicle to block an evacuation route and endanger lives. This is not hypothetical—we have witnessed this before. One such vehicle was left abandoned on Red Dog X, obstructing the road and requiring highway patrol intervention. In a fire scenario, that could be catastrophic.

Furthermore, the forest infrastructure is not designed to support long-term habitation by individuals living in RVs or campers without proper sewage, water, and waste systems. Sentic systems are expensive and highly regulated for a reason, and it is unrealistic to assume that someone who cannot

afford traditional housing will be able to install or maintain a permitted system. The result will likely be increased illegal dumping, environmental degradation, and a burden on neighbors and emergency services.

There is also the issue of enforcement. How will zoning and code compliance be monitored? Who will ensure that generators are not running at all hours, that trash is removed, and that human waste is managed? If the County lacks the capacity to enforce these rules now, it certainly won't be able to once many more unregulated dwellings are allowed.

Community matters. People who move into rural trailers out of economic necessity may not have access to the support systems they need. They are isolated from jobs, healthcare, and social services. That isolation also makes integration into the existing community difficult, especially if some of the newcomers are not invested in long-term stewardship of the land or relationships with neighbors. Sadly, our community has seen increases in drug use, aggressive dogs, and theft, and it is not unreasonable to link some of those challenges to past efforts to allow unregulated housing.

From an aesthetic and environmental perspective, we moved to Banner Mountain to be part of a quiet, forested community—not a sprawling campground. Allowing long-term RV residency threatens the very character of our neighborhoods. It is a change that would undermine the values of those who have invested in and cared for these lands over many years.

We all care deeply about the housing crisis and want solutions that work. But this proposal is not it. The County should focus on real, sustainable housing options that come with community support services: affordable housing developments, mental health services, job training, and transitional housing with wraparound care. Legalizing trailers in the forest does not solve homelessness—it only hides it, while creating new, serious problems.

Please reconsider this path. Our forests, our safety, and our community depend on responsible planning.

Sincerely,

Lewis & Rachel Robertson
(707) 410-6084

Tyler Barrington

From: joao rodrigo <j0a0r0drig0@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 27, 2025 5:45 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Allow RV Trailers for alternative housing

You don't often get email from j0a0r0drig0@yahoo.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

RVs and trailers should be allowed for permanent housing at all locations that houses/ADUs/Tiny houses! And need to follow the rules!

Thanks

John Rodrigues

Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone

Tyler Barrington

From: mary lee <m2dlee@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 29, 2025 2:41 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Alternative housing/recreation vehicles

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

You don't often get email from m2dlee@yahoo.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Dear Tyler Barrington,

I am writing to you regarding my concerns about the use of recreation vehicles as an alternative to "standard" housing. I am sympathetic to those persons who are unhoused or have no alternatives for safe housing. That being said, I live in the Peardale (for 50 years) area of Nevada County and have witnessed in my neighborhood, people living well beyond the current guidelines of a 90 day stay in a recreation vehicle. As an example, the property adjacent to mine has an RV on it that has been there for several years. The people were responsible and put in a septic system but they are 20 feet from my property line and no permits were obtained. My fear is that the next time that RV Motorhome is started (as it is mouse infested) that it will catch on fire due to the faulty electrical system caused by the rodent problem! Poof, there goes my house and property.

Down the hill from me is another RV Travel Trailer that has no working bathroom or septic system. Instead, they have had a porta potty delivered and now we get to look at it! The property owner has done nothing to mitigate the trash, debris, fallen trees, fallen down sheds, etc. that sit within 4 feet of the trailer. Mind you, I have to drive by it daily as it is the only way to get down the road and in an evacuation or wildfire event, we will be in deep trouble if that place ignites!

Recreation vehicles as an alternative to housing pose numerous issues: health and safety, solid waste disposal problems, decreased home values, wildfire risks, potable/safe drinking water, to name just a few.

Our homes and safety should not be put at risk.

Thank you,
Mary Lee
13389 Little Meadow Court
Grass Valley, CA 95945

Patrick Eidman

From: CEO
Sent: Friday, May 30, 2025 7:58 AM
To: Patrick Eidman
Subject: FW: RV's

Forwarding constituent request

- Shannon

-----Original Message-----

From: Rebecca Rickey <becca4255@icloud.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 29, 2025 4:22 PM
To: CEO <CEO.Info@nevadacountyca.gov>
Subject: RV's

[You don't often get email from becca4255@icloud.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Hello.

I'm a native Californian planning to move to your area. I have been marooned in Arizona for a while. Since I know you are considering this as possible permanent housing on private property, will you please read through the letter and the reasons why I think that should be possible? it was directed at Arizona lawmakers which just fell on deaf ears. That is one of the reasons why I want to move back California is much more open minded. Your feedback would be greatly appreciated, and acknowledgment that you have received this document.
Thanks,
Rebecca

Rebecca Rickey

Wishing You The Best in Life

INRODUCTION:

I want to thank the Senator for meeting with me today. My name is Rebecca Rickey and I'm a disabled senior citizen and I am a semi retired Realtor in Yavapai County. I currently have an active building permit which I may have to abandon due to construction loan requirements.

Since I cannot live on my property unless I build according to current zoning laws, I may be homeless soon. There is currently no down payment, or closing costs assistance with construction loans, which is making building out of reach.

With my background in Real Estate and community development, I've seen firsthand how zoning laws, housing policies, and enforcement practices shape our neighborhoods.

PERSONAL IMPACT:

These issues aren't just affecting my clients and neighbors, they've directly impacted me.

Due to restrictive zoning policies and selective enforcement, it has become unaffordable for me to live in my own community. In fact, because I wasn't allowed to live on my own property without an active building permit,, I was forced to live out in the national forest when RV parks lacked vacancy or where prohibitively expensive.

This isn't just a policy issue- The current zoning restrictions create real problems that need solutions. I'd like to discuss key legislative and zoning issues that impact affordability, and fairness in enforcement.

AGENDA BREAKDOWN

PURPOSE: (10-12 minutes total)

KEY ISSUES:

SB1229 HB2319

1. HOUSE BILLS, SET BACK REQUIREMENTS, BUILDING MATERIALS AND DESIGN RESTRICTIONS; TINY HOMES, CASITAS AND RV RESTRICTION; LIMITED FLEXIBILITY AND HOUSING OPTIONS

PERSONAL EXPERIENCE: In my county, the rear set back is 25 feet, which takes up a third of my property. After allowing for a septic system which is in the front of the property, and the ten feet distance between the septic and the house, the building envelope and parking space is cramped.

WHY IT MATTERS:

These unnecessary restrictions such as the 25 foot rear setback, reduce the use of smaller properties and make building more difficult, driving up costs and reducing housing availability.

SOLUTION;

Support legislation to allow more reasonable flexibility and housing design. For lots smaller than an acre setbacks should be reduced to 10 feet front and rear, and side setbacks of 7 feet. That way your neighbors aren't too close.

2. CASITAS, TINY HOMES AND RV'S IN RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOODS

Many people including myself want to place casitas, tiny homes or RV's on their property and either live in them or rent them, but zoning restrictions prohibit it.

PERSONAL EXPERIENCE:

I will lose my building permit, and thus my right to live on my own property unless I raise \$75,000 additional dollars to meet the lenders needs. As a result, I will have to sell or abandon my beautiful property and move. I have looked in other areas and even other states and the same zoning restrictions apply.

As a retired senior, and disabled person, I can't work a traditional job. The ability to rent out a casita or RV on my property would provide the only passive income, more borrowing power, and thus allow me to stay in my community and thrive.

Tiny Homes or Casitas with less square footage, would allow people such as myself to build a home thereby making construction costs affordable and provide a place to live.

I could also place it in the rear of the existing set back, whereby I could build a full size home at a later date if needed or if I sold the property in the future, someone else could build a full size home. I've had many clients who wanted to buy affordable vacant land for these same reasons but zoning laws prohibit it.

SOLUTION: Remove existing government restrictions preventing living in, building, or renting Tiny Homes, RVs and Casitas on private property. Homes with a house and a casita would contribute to the overall housing values and desirability.

WHY IT MATTERS: Restricting these options limits affordable living opportunities and diversity in the neighborhood.

This restriction prohibits many people from obtaining affordable single family housing options. Not all low income people want to live in subsidized apartments!

It also prohibits the inclusion of people with low incomes or disabilities who need extra income to allow them to reach financial independence.

3. VACANT LAND USE, SNOWBIRD OCCUPANCY

KEY ISSUES: Seasonal residents and land only owners are not allowed to live in an RV on their own land at all. There is virtually nothing you can use your vacant land for, except to pay taxes. Zoning restrictions also prohibit certain utilities from being installed on vacant lots without a house building permit, rendering them useless.

HB2319-Community Garden, Produce etc should be allowed to be sold in premises, currently in Yavapai county this is not allowed.

PERSONAL EXPERIENCE: I cannot tolerate the Arizona summers, they have been exacerbating my disabilities. Since building my forever home is currently out of reach, If I were allowed to live on my own property for several months out of the year without having a house built, and then leave during the summer months, (May -Sept.), I could survive.

NO CHANGE TO THE EXISTING CHARACTER OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD: It wouldn't change the character of the neighborhood. There are already many site built homes with RV's in the driveway or on the lots and people live in them (illegally).

My lot is fully fenced and screened so it would not be an eyesore. Since an RV is not a permanent structure, it would not impact the long term development of the area or comparative housing values.

WHY IT MATTERS: Snowbirds and seasonal residents contribute to the economy and community. Allowing them to live on their own land part-time, while maintaining reasonable regulations would support homeowners without disrupting neighborhoods.

SOLUTION: Allow Zoning to allow limited seasonal RV living on private property in all zoning classifications while maintaining appropriate guidelines for health and safety. This would include development of vacant land with connections to sewer, water and electricity. This would make it easier for future homebuyers to purchase land and build without the added expense and difficulty of installing said improvements.

4. THE CURRENT SELECTIVE ZONING ENFORCEMENT AND THE ANONYMOUS COMPLAINT SYSTEM

KEY ISSUES: Zoning laws are not enforced equally. The Anonymous Complaint System allows selective targeting of certain residents, something I have personally experienced. At present, owners of vacant land are not allowed to use their property. They can only pay taxes. Placing personal objects on the property, such as rakes, shovels, wheel barrows and outdoor furniture and umbrellas and spending time there, can result in zoning violations for those who are selectively targeted by an anonymous complaint. Other people are targeted anonymously for various infractions while others are not. My county even has classes on how to report your neighbors!

PERSONAL EXPERIENCE: Prior to getting my building permit and resulting temporary occupancy status. I was targeted by the anonymous complaint system multiple times for having the aforementioned personal items on my property and I was falsely accused of living on my property many times simply because those items were on the property. I had to fight these injustices many times. Finally, I had a \$10,000 violation lien placed on my property by the county. I fought this and initially lost, but I filed an appeal and eventually won. NO ONE SHOULD HAVE TO GO THROUGH THIS.

WHY IT MATTERS: Unfair zoning enforcement creates housing discrimination and creates unnecessary burdens on many.

SOLUTION: Push for cleaner, fairer, enforcement policies that apply to everyone, not just some, and prevent anonymous complaints. The housing shortage is forcing many into unsafe and unstable living situations, and restrictive zoning makes it worse.

5. HB 2350 HOUSING ASSISTANCE, FOR THE ELDERLY & VULNERABLE

Many elderly and at-risk individuals struggle to find affordable stable housing. People living in RV's in mobile home parks or camping do not qualify for utility assistance.

WHY IT MATTERS: Many elderly and disabled people live in RV's. The RV's use propane for heating and cooking and hot water. People without electricity use generators which use gas. There are no vouchers or assistance for Propane for your RV, or for electricity if you live in an RV park, There is also no rent assistance. If you need Gas to operate your generator because you are homeless, You may get a once time voucher for \$40, from private charities for either gas or propane, but not both and it is not enough to resolve the problem. Further there is disparity between the hundreds, or thousands of dollars awarded to households that live in houses or apartments.

SOLUTION: Support HB 2350, the Smart Homes Act and Legislation to expand assistance programs, to encourage flexible housing policies for seniors and other vulnerable populations. Set up accounts at propane companies and gas stations for economically disadvantaged people to obtain realistic vouchers for gas and propane costs for RVs.

CLOSING:

These housing and zoning issues aren't just theoretical, they they're affecting many others throughout the state. If we don't take action to diversify housing solutions, homelessness will increase and housing affordability and access to homeownership, will cease to exist for many.

For people like me who are retired, disabled and unable to work traditionally, allowing Casitas, RV rentals, and Seasonal RV Living isn't just convenient; it is about survival and a solution to homelessness.

These changes would help homeowners like me to stay in their communities without negatively impacting the character of the neighborhood.

I appreciate your time and consideration and I would love to continue this discussion , to speak at the Capitol, and to provide valid input to find real solutions together.

Rebecca

Tyler Barrington

From: Nikos Hunner <nikos360@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, May 30, 2025 1:54 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Alternative housing comment

You don't often get email from nikos360@yahoo.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Hi Tyler,

I could not attend the May 27th meeting, could you please send me the draft proposal that was discussed regarding living in RVs.

I am have several concerns with allowing Nevada County Residents to live in RVs:

1. RV walls have a very low R-value, they are typically R-3 to R-5. This would lead to increased energy use in the county.
2. RVs have a lifespan of typically 10-20 years. RV roofs are very prone to leaks. I see 4 RVs on my street and they all have tarps over them. This would be an impact to our landfills.
3. I am concerned that RV septic may be adequate or that people would not use them properly. This would increase septic pollution.
4. I am concerned that electrical supplies to RVs may be inadequate leading to increased fire risk.
5. I am concerned that RV fridges could cause fires. This happened to me personally and I had to have the fire department respond.
6. I am concerned that provisions to mitigate these impacts may not be enforced adequate. Or that people be confused over what is allowable.

I urge you to not allow permanent residence in RVs. Instead I suggest the planning department streamline the process for building tiny houses. It would be great if the planning department hired an architect to design several tiny homes that could be easily constructed, then provide those plans free to Nevada County residents. Also I encourage the planning department to write a 1 or 2 page PDF guide that summarizes camping and living in RVs on public land. It is very confusing for many people to understand the code law regulations.

Thank you for your consideration,

Nikos Hunner

Tyler Barrington

From: Paul Platner <paul@engagedservices.org>
Sent: Monday, June 2, 2025 3:03 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Alternative Housing

You don't often get email from paul@engagedservices.org. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Hello Tyler,
Thank you for spearheading the Meeting on the 27th.
I didn't see my point mentioned (maybe for a good reason) and I wasn't articulate in my question.
My question was, given that there is money for low income housing and it takes a minimum of ten years to complete and an average \$500,000 per unit, would there be money made available to help mitigate some of the problems mentioned by the NIMBYs and help people come into compliance with water, sewer, power, safety, etc.
Let me know your thoughts if you have time.
Sincerely,
Paul



Paul R Platner
EnGaged Services
(530) 277-7251
Paul@EngagedServices.org
www.engagedservices.org

"There is an inherent moral dimension to the generation, distribution, and utilization of wealth and resources." ~The Universal House of Justice

Tyler Barrington

From: Jaymae Wentker <jaymae1964@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 10, 2025 6:08 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: RV Housing

[You don't often get email from jaymae1964@gmail.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

If you are proposing to open a secure area for RV's for people to live in a safe environment , then I am for it. If your proposal is to allow people to live in Rv 's in neighborhoods, commercial areas, etc. then I am against your proposal!!!
Thanks

Jaymae
#NOT my President!!

Sent from my iPhone

Tyler Barrington

From: Donna Zacamy <dmzacamy@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 15, 2025 7:23 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Fwd: Alternative Housing

You don't often get email from dmzacamy@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Donna Zacamy <dmzacamy@gmail.com>
Date: Sun, Jun 15, 2025 at 7:18 PM
Subject: Alternative Housing
To: <tyler.barrington@nevadacountyca.gov>
Cc: <heidi.hall@nevadacountyca.gov>, <robb.tucker@nevadacountyca.gov>

13980 Countryside Ranch Road
Grass Valley, CA 95949
June 14, 2025

Tyler Barrington, Principal Planner
950 Maidu Avenue, Suite 170
Nevada City, CA 95959

Dear Mr. Barrington,

I am writing regarding the anticipated County Alternative Housing ordinance, which would allow RV's to become permanent housing. As a resident of rural South County, I have many concerns, as do my neighbors. Many of us are conflicted between the need for affordable housing versus the degradation of the open space around us. Agricultural zoning promises the preservation of open space for agricultural use. Our own CC&R's prohibit RV's as permanent housing. Additional population density will lead to additional infrastructure load and additional cost to us to maintain our private roads.

Currently Nevada County approves the use of RV's as housing in limited circumstances. RV's as permanent housing would be a big change. Many will see it as an opportunity for rental/commercial use, and in any case, it will have the effect of increasing density. This brings up many resource, safety, health and nuisance issues:

- Significant septic issues, leach field and other environmental health concerns
- Well depletion or decreased production on surrounding properties
- General safety issues like wiring and careful wiring at a well pump
- Space between structures to prevent fire.
- Compliance with WUI, maintaining defensible space and minimizing wildland fire hazards
- Compliance with all permanent housing Building Codes
- Increased population density causing more stress on electric grids
- The traffic effect on shared private roads requiring more maintenance placing an unfair monetary burden on existing residents
- Violation of current CC&R's, such as ours
- Opening the door to commercial use
- Potential unsightliness of trailers, litter, etc.

As you write your ordinance, please address these concerns.

Also please consider:

- Requiring RV's to be placed where they are not visible from the streetscape.
- Limiting the number of permanently habitable RV's to one per parcel.
- Allowing permanent RV housing only on land zoned AG40 or above. This would aid in unobtrusive placement and defensible space. Many AG10 (or less) zoning areas are residential, regulated subdivisions, which makes unobtrusive placement more difficult and runs headlong into subdivision violations.
- Prohibiting permanent RV's on privately maintained roads and regulated subdivisions.
- While an RV would be considered a permanent residence, there would still be a likelihood that the residents of the RV could be transient, especially if the parcel owner is using the RV as a source of income. Please prohibit commercial use, except for seasonal agricultural use. Other issues that non-owners bring to an area would require some additional measures, such as fines to owners for transgressions on their land.
- Encouraging ADU's, modular and manufactured non mobile structures (for which you already have requirements) would be a better way to meet housing shortages, and they are likely more appropriate for families. Modifying County fees on these living units would be a better alternative than mobile metal trailers dotting the countryside.
- Our open land is a unique and precious national resource. Those of us who live in and work it respect that. It is also what supports our property values, and preserving home values contributes to the County's tax base. Driving our beautiful rural streets is still a draw to Nevada County that benefits all residents.

I am uncomfortable with rural/AG zoning being used as a means of density building - if that's what's happening here. AG zoning should be, as it has been, a means to protect open space and agricultural use; it's not meant to invite cheap rental housing. Notwithstanding the current popularity of "tiny homes on wheels", this RV ordinance could become an invitation to commercial use, noise, nuisance, unsightliness, monetary burdens and critical safety issues. That would be an affront to our current and sought after family oriented agricultural community. Please don't let that happen.

With respect,

Donna Zacamy, resident of South County

Cc: heidi.hall@nevadacountyca.gov

robb.tucker@nevadacountyca.gov

Tyler Barrington

From: Stacy Waters <luceroshakti@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, June 20, 2025 5:32 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Public Comment for Alternative Housing as Permanent Housing

You don't often get email from luceroshakti@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

I would like to add my input for the public comment for the Board of Supervisors' exploration of the Proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment to Consider Allowing Alternative Housing as Permanent Housing Such as Recreational Vehicles as Permanent Housing (PLN25-0084; ORD25-1; EIS25-0005).

I recently explored the idea of putting an ADU on my property in Grass Valley to house a relative who was in need, however, the brakes got put on this when I discovered it would cost about \$400k for a small dwelling. It would be nice for there to be some other options that are legitimate, rather than just having zero options unless you have millions in the bank.

Sincerely,
Stacy Waters

RECEIVED

JUN 24 2025

NEVADA COUNTY
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Dear Nevada County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the County's proposal to allow campers, van conversions, and recreational trailers as primary residences on rural parcels—particularly in the forested areas of Banner Mountain.

While we fully acknowledge the urgent need to address homelessness in Nevada County, this proposal is not a responsible or effective solution. In fact, it raises serious concerns about safety, environmental impact, community cohesion, and long-term planning.

Wildfire and Public Safety Risks

Banner Mountain is already at high risk of wildfire. Introducing more vehicles—especially those that may be transient, poorly maintained, or immobile—onto narrow, winding roads such as Red Dog X and Buckeye Road poses a direct threat to evacuation efforts during emergencies. We've already seen firsthand how a single abandoned vehicle on Red Dog X blocked access and required CHP intervention. In a wildfire scenario, such an obstruction could be deadly.

Lack of Infrastructure and Environmental Harm

Our rural forested areas were never designed to support long-term residential use by RVs, campers, or converted vans. These vehicles typically lack permanent plumbing, approved sewage systems, and reliable access to potable water—necessities for safe and healthy living. Installing permitted septic systems in these remote locations is often cost-prohibitive and physically challenging due to rocky soils, steep grades, or seasonal water tables. It is unrealistic to assume that individuals already struggling with housing insecurity will have the means to meet these requirements.

Without appropriate infrastructure, the result is predictable: waste disposal through unpermitted means, including illegal dumping of gray and black water into the environment. This can contaminate local wells, creeks, and groundwater, threatening both public health and the integrity of our watershed. In an area like Banner Mountain, where many residents rely on private wells and where terrain funnels runoff into shared drainage systems, the risk of contamination is high.

Additionally, the accumulation of solid waste—trash, discarded belongings, and construction debris from makeshift shelters—has already become a growing problem in areas where informal RV encampments have occurred. These conditions not only degrade the natural landscape but also attract vermin and increase fire fuel loads, compounding the wildfire risk.

Energy access also poses an issue. Without proper electrical infrastructure, residents will likely rely on gas-powered generators, which contribute to noise pollution, air quality degradation, and present a fire hazard—particularly in high-risk fire zones. Solar alternatives, while quieter and safer, require significant upfront investment and technical setup, which again, may be out of reach for most people relying on mobile or transitional housing.

In short, our region's ecology, water systems, and existing infrastructure are not equipped to handle unregulated, long-term occupancy of rural parcels by vehicles. The environmental consequences are not speculative—they are observable, recurring, and cumulative.

Enforcement Challenges

The County already struggles to enforce existing zoning and code compliance. Without significant new resources, how will it ensure proper waste management, noise control, fire safety, and responsible land use under this new policy? Enforcement cannot rely solely on neighbor complaints. If the County cannot manage the current volume of issues, it certainly cannot manage more.

Impact on Community and Quality of Life

People who are forced to live in remote, unregulated settings often do so without access to transportation, healthcare, employment, or support services. This can lead to further isolation and, unintentionally, perpetuate cycles of poverty and instability. Meanwhile, long-time residents face increased concerns around theft, aggressive dogs, and drug activity—trends our community has unfortunately already begun to witness.

We chose to live in Banner Mountain for its quiet, natural environment and strong community values. Turning these rural areas into de facto campgrounds undermines the character of our neighborhoods and the well-being of those who live here—housed and unhoused alike.

A Better Path Forward

We urge the County to pursue housing solutions that are sustainable, supportive, and integrated into the fabric of the community. These include:

- Affordable housing developments
- Transitional housing with wraparound services

- Mental health and addiction support
- Workforce development and job training programs

Legalizing trailers in the woods is not a solution—it's a short-term fix with long-term consequences. It does not address the root causes of homelessness, and it jeopardizes the safety, environment, and cohesion of our community.

Please reconsider this proposal. Our forests, our families, and our future depend on responsible planning.

Sincerely,

Derek Ramirez

District 1 Resident



Friends of Banner Mountain Est. 1984



FBM
PO Box 833
Nevada City, CA 95959

Board of Directors

President
Edward Sylvester

Vice President
George Olive

Treasurer
Chip Wilder

Secretary
Susan Sanders

Communications
Maureen Graber

Membership
Jeff Peach

Firewise Coordinator
Jeff Peach

Members At Large
Andrew Wilkinson



Spotlight on 2025 Goals

- Education and Outreach. Please visit our webpage for information on maintaining the beauty and safety of our mountain.
- Meeting you in person! Learn more about our Firewise Community by joining us at the Madelyn Helling Library on Tuesdays at 5pm, on Jan 28, April 29, July 29, and October 28.

June 24, 2025

Tyler Barrington, Principal Planner
Nevada County Planning Department
950 Maidu Avenue, Suite 220
Nevada City, CA 95959

Dear Mr. Barrington,

The Board Members of the Friends of Banner Mountain (FBM) appreciates this opportunity to provide input on the proposed ordinance to allow recreational vehicles (RVs) as primary dwellings on Banner Mountain. FBM is a 501(c)(3) organization whose mission is to **“Protect Banner Mountain and its natural and cultural resources for the benefit of residents, visitors, and future generations.”**

We understand that Nevada County is seeking public input on appropriate zoning, parcel size, and other considerations to ensure the proposed RV ordinance is consistent with community character and addresses the needs of the citizens of Nevada County. The FBM Board appreciates the Board of Supervisors’ intent to provide affordable living spaces for the unhoused. We believe such an endeavor must be approached with great caution in our very high wildfire risk area to avoid unintended consequences such as increased traffic congestion on already inadequate evacuation routes off Banner Mountain. Increasing the numbers of RVs that are occupied year-round in Banner Mountain’s dense forests, particularly in areas without fire hydrants, water tanks or safe evacuation routes, amplifies the wildfire risk for RV occupants and all of us on Banner Mountain. FBM is also concerned that without appropriate guidelines and enforcement this ordinance could adversely affect the safety and quality of life in Banner Mountain’s rural community. FBM requests the Planning Department and the Board of Supervisors ensure that the ordinance includes a process for permitting year-round RV occupancy and for monitoring compliance with those permit conditions. In addition to complying with Nevada County Code Section 12.03.150 - *Recreational Vehicle Use and Temporary Occupancies*, please consider including the following suggestions as you develop the proposed ordinance:

- Defensible space requirements of 100 feet from RVs to mirror the legalized cannabis grow ordinance.
- Proposed RV location has close access to a fire hydrant or Fire Marshall approved water tanks.
- Proposed RV location has close access to an evacuation route that can support the increased vehicle and RV traffic load during an emergency.
- Placement of RVs proposed for full-time occupancy should be limited to:
 - an owner-occupied or owner adjacent parcel.
 - certified connection to a septic system.
 - a certified electrical connection which will also ensure generators will only run during power outages.
 - one RV per parcel within the density options allowance.

RECEIVED

JUN 25 2025

NEVADA COUNTY
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

- Restrictions on blight that may be reported to code enforcement for remedy.
- Restriction on noise, between 10pm-8am, that may be reported to code enforcement for remedy.
- Restrictions on using full occupancy RVs as rentals or on platforms such as Airbnb and VRBO.
- Definition of RV is a recreational vehicle in good operational condition and equipped with full bathroom and kitchen facilities.

Implementation and enforcement of this ordinance would require a consistent and reliable funding source to support permitting and annual monitoring to assess compliance with permit conditions. FBM believes that the County should commit to staffing to assure owner/landlord compliance with this ordinance, similar to the dedicated Code Enforcement officer that monitors permitted cannabis grows.

FBM strives to support our community with initiatives that are in alignment with our mission and the efforts of our dedicated Banner Mountain Firewise Community volunteers. Supporting good neighbor interactions and neighborhood safety are core values. We appreciate the opportunity to assist the County in ensuring the ongoing success of this innovative alternative housing proposal.

Sincerely,

Edward Sylvester

/Edward Sylvester, President

cc: Brian Foss, Planning Director

Danny Milman, District 1 Representative, Planning Commission

Heidi Hall, Chairperson, District 1 Representative, Board of Supervisors

President
Jo Ann Fites-Kaufman

Vice President
Vacant

Treasurer
Bob Long

Secretary
Maureen Graber



Members At Large
Monty East
Linda Ferguson
Bill Greeno
Terry Hastings
Wanda Mertens
Marcia Salter
Erin Tarr

June 25, 2025

Tyler Barrington, Principal Planner
Nevada County Planning Department
950 Maidu Avenue, Suite 220
Nevada City, CA 95959

RECEIVED

JUN 25 2025

NEVADA COUNTY
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Dear Mr. Barrington,

The Fire Safe Nevada County Coalition (FSNCC) Board appreciates this opportunity to provide input on the proposed ordinance to allow recreational vehicles (RVs) as primary dwellings within Nevada County. The FSNCC is a 501(c)(3) organization whose mission is to ***“Support and empower residents, visitors, and communities - especially Firewise Communities - through mentoring, sharing best practices, fire safety projects, and education. Through collaboration, we strive to create a more resilient landscape and community.”***

The FSNCC is comprised of fire scientists, foresters, realtors, businesspersons and experienced Firewise Community leaders and volunteers. We strive to support activities and initiatives that promote wildfire risk reduction, defensible space, home hardening, and safe evacuation for all Nevada County residents. As the Planning Department, Planning Commission, and ultimately, the Board of Supervisors assesses the appropriateness of RVs as alternative housing in our very high wildfire risk county the FSNCC urges an abundance of caution as this ordinance is developed. There are additional risks posed by potentially less permanent or professional electrical set ups, and additional evacuation traffic from larger and potentially less reliable vehicles.

With residents' safety in mind, the FSNCC recommends that the ordinance include:

- RV electrical connections, generator setups, and wood stoves that meet all local and state safety requirements that greatly reduce the likelihood of wildfire ignition.
- Defensible space requirements to meet or exceed CAL FIRE PRC 4291.
- Assessment of the impact of additional evacuation traffic load from RVs. This includes guidance on how these RVs will be managed during an emergency evacuation. For example, the road capacity for the RV to be easily and safely left by the side of the road, allowing other evacuees to pass by. This is needed if the

County plans to permit older and potentially less reliable RVs that are more likely to break down during an evacuation.

- Landowner education on their responsibilities to ensure the permitted RV maintains adherence to all local and state fire preparation and prevention ordinances, such as defensible space requirements.

Implementation and enforcement of this ordinance will require a consistent and reliable funding source to support permitting and annual monitoring to assess compliance with permit conditions. The FSNCC recommends the County commit to staffing to ensure landlord/owner compliance with this ordinance, similar to the dedicated Code Enforcement Officer position that monitors permitted cannabis grows.

Both the FSNCC and the County have the same goal; to ensure the safety of our residents through responsible wildfire risk reduction practices and safe evacuation routes and processes. We also understand that there is an affordable housing shortage in the area. We look to our County leaders to utilize the Community Wildfire Protection Plan, Local Hazard Mitigation Plan, Wildfire Risk Assessment, and Evacuation Study when determining how to balance the RV as alternative housing ordinance within our very high wildfire risk county.

Sincerely,



Jo Ann Fites-Kaufman, President

cc: Brian Foss, Planning Director
Danny Milman, District 1 Representative, Planning Commission
Heidi Hall, Chairperson, District 1 Representative, Board of Supervisors

Tyler Barrington

From: Taylor Donovan <docdonovan@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 26, 2025 3:45 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: RV Ordinance

You don't often get email from docdonovan@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Hi Tyler,

I am a Nevada County resident in support of passing and formalizing an ordinance that would allow people to live on land legally and safely in RVs.

The fact of the matter is that many people already live in RVs because the cost of affordable housing in Nevada City is too high for many.

Passing an RV Ordinance could allow Nevada County to collect more taxes and fees that would greatly benefit many undersupported civil services.

Thanks for your time and consideration,

Taylor Donovan

Tyler Barrington

From: Woniya Thibeault <woniya@buckskinrevolution.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 26, 2025 11:20 AM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: RV ordinance

You don't often get email from woniya@buckskinrevolution.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Greetings Tyler,

I am a Nevada City resident and rural land owner and I wanted to reach out in support of the ordinance about RVs as permitted permanent housing.

Given that there are already so many people living in unpermitted RVs in the county, I think this is an ordinance that would greatly benefit both the county and its residents. As an owner of undeveloped property in Nevada City myself, I know this ordinance would make a huge difference in my ability to begin living on my land with my family sooner rather than years in the future, which would likely be the case if we were limited to building a conventional home.

Thank you taking my feedback and for your efforts to see this ordinance through to fruition!

Woniya Thibeault

Tyler Barrington

From: Jane Loomis <janeloomis@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Thursday, June 26, 2025 7:07 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Alternative Housing

[You don't often get email from janeloomis@sbcglobal.net. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Dear Mr. Barrington:

I am very opposed to any zoning ordinance allowing RVs or any other non traditional housing to be considered as permanent or semi-permanent housing on private property in Nevada County.

The risks to community health, fire danger, and environmental contamination of such an ordinance would be disastrous.

Thank you.

Jane Loomis
10266 Donner Trail Rd

Truckee

Sent from my iPhone



PO Box 972, Cedar Ridge, CA 95924-0972
www.cea-nc.org / email: info@cea-nc.org

June 30, 2025

Comments Regarding Use of Trailers and RVs for Alternative Housing

Nevada County has a housing shortage, and affordability is a big issue. CEA Foundation recognizes that there are many people currently living in various motor vehicles. However, outside of mobile homes in mobile home parks, there is a lack of ordinances which provide for using a motor vehicle as a residence. The implementation of code to provide a legal means of using a motor vehicle as a dwelling could help address a number of issues, allow existing occupants to come into compliance, and provide some additional housing opportunities. However, there also are a lot of issues surrounding allowing long term usage of vehicles for dwellings which should be addressed.

The standards used in the THOW ordinance should be met or exceeded, and, because of the variable and limited quality of motor vehicles, additional constraints are appropriate. For example, while tiny homes on wheels are required to have the appearance of conventional housing, this is not the case with trailers and RVs. Thus, visual impacts need to be mitigated.

Criteria should include:

- Conformance with setbacks **plus** site based additional setbacks and/or shielding for visual aesthetics
- Conformance with zoning and density limitations
- Current DMV Registration and Operating Permit
- Paved or gravel parking area and access
- Screening of utility boxes, panels, wheels, etc.
- Safety standards for wildfire ingress, egress
- Fire prevention elements, including defensible space, access roads, etc.
- Snow load and structural integrity requirements
- Health Department approved sewage disposal systems (See NC code Title 15, Chapt 3, 4)
- Health Department approved water supply
- Basic residential functions such as kitchen facilities, bathroom and sleeping area
- Conformance with existing CC&R's
- Prohibition of short-term rentals.
- Adequate means to heat and/or cool within safe temperature ranges
- Three year sunset clause subject to renewal

Thank you,

Ralph Silberstein
CEA Foundation

Tyler Barrington

From: Bevan Iredell <ibevanbob@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 5, 2025 12:23 AM
To: Planning
Subject: Full time RV, taping into existing lichfield.

Some people who received this message don't often get email from ibevanbob@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

If the permitting is every two years, to assess continued defensibility.

Could it also assess the health of a septic leach field if an RV has tapped into the existing leach field. I have maintained aerobic and anaerobic septic systems and understand with a little education I can push the productivity of a leach field way beyond its capacity.

I have a 3 bed 2 bath and during Covid had twice the number of people in my house, that my septic was built for.

(I have never added anything to the system that is over 30 years old. Just No bleach. No toilet paper.)

Simply adding an additional fee, for septic inspection, every two years, when existing systems have been modified, (tapped into) would be a huge help for home owners that have a healthy existing system where the current occupants usage, can pass an inspection that can establish its maximum capacity based on existing flow rate.

(During Covid, I ran 17 gpm for 72 hours without any back up. I did this before I allowed 14 people to come into my house. My septic is designed for seven, I think.(3 bed - 2 bath)

I hope all is running smoothly on this.

Side note;

When i spoke, i was under the assumption that we where opening up RV housing, to the same density as tiny homes (six for acre)

My comment were simply addressing the potential abuse this would create.

Imagine, driving up the 49 seeing an endless line of RVs, 30 feet off property line.

Lol.



Bevan iredell
(951) 662-2600

Tyler Barrington

From: Dennis Tucker <dennis@drdennistucker.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 12, 2025 9:27 AM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Alternative housing

You don't often get email from dennis@drdennistucker.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Guardedly yes. The housing crisis is undeniable. Stakeholder concerns are many; sanitation, blight, property values and utilities. I share these concerns but if we look past Nimby, we can mitigate these concerns and provide the most available and affordable solution for the unhoused and the increasing portion of our society that are at high risk of becoming so. Variances for land owners to provide access on single family parcels, enforceable restrictions regarding sanitation and blight are a necessary foundation, but this will also require a variance for composting toilets to provide affordable access. Hook up to power and potable water is already covered by existing regulations. But available options like solar or potable water storage are readily available and have the potential to greatly lessen the up front financial burden to the applicant. Within this broad framework all of the stakeholders will submit comments to the county and a regulatory framework will be further debated in a public forum and some form of general variance will be ultimately be established. Let's not let this opportunity to provide a partial solution to a critical lack of housing to go unheeded.

Sincerely,
Dennis Tucker

Dennis Tucker, Ph.D., L.Ac.
dennis@drdennistucker.com

July 12, 2025

To the Nevada County Planning Commission,

I am writing to express my concern regarding the All Homes on Wheels/AHOW/All RVs ordinance which is now being developed. This proposed ordinance has the potential to further exacerbate an already extremely serious emergency wildfire evacuation on Banner Mountain and Cascade Shores, for the following reasons:

The February 2024 OES Fire Evacuation Study has described a possible future emergency fire evacuation in stark terms: **“it is possible that vehicles queued up on Red Dog Road, Banner Quaker Hill Road, and the other roads leading to Highway 49 would be overrun by the firefront.”**! The fire evacuation traffic flow map (below) shows that evacuation routes leading to highway 49 will have “stop and go” traffic. See the key roads marked in RED (“stop and go”) on the OES Study traffic flow map below.

This OES Study and its dire predictions are not based on emotional sentiment, but rather on standard analysis techniques and actual residential data. It relies on well-established traffic analysis techniques employed by traffic engineers, and upon the assessment of wildfire behavior, by professional firefighting specialists, and evaluates the overgrown vegetation state along many or most of the evacuation routes.

The traffic analyses are based upon established, accepted and standardized techniques of traffic engineers and the fundamental idea that roads and highways have definite traffic flow capacity – the more traffic on a given road, the slower the traffic; eventually, with too many vehicles, traffic becomes bumper to bumper - stop and go – that is what is shown in RED in the evacuation traffic flow map below. In traffic analyses, it is all about how many vehicles are on a road or highway. And, more residences, conventional or THOW or ALL RVs, result in more vehicles and more traffic.

The overgrown condition of the evacuation routes is well known to anyone who has driven along Banner Lava Cap, Red Dog Road, or Idaho Maryland. The concern expressed in the OES study is that vegetation, i.e. trees, brush, etc. is so dense that in the event of fire the intensity of the flames would be so severe that the radiant heat would be fatal to car occupants! There have been calls and intent to thin the roadside vegetation, but, to date, there has been little, if anything, done to improve the situation. My estimate is that it will take a *very long time* to make these critical fire evacuation routes safe.

The OES study sets the stage for a possible emergency evacuation in the near term – it is extremely risky during times of extreme fire weather, i.e. low humidity and windy, gusty north, north-east or east winds... conditions that are NOT unusual in the fall on

Banner Mtn. However, the study warns of conditions under current residential density, and does not account for likely residential growth (residential density) in the future .

Approval of an ordinance that would allow AHOWs/All RVs on any parcel zoned for “Single Family” use (most parcels) could make the fire evacuation conditions much worse. That’s because any future new AHOW ordinance builds on state law concerning ADU (additional dwelling units), as well as recent county ordinance approvals such as ADUs, and THOWs. Basically, these laws and ordinances taken together, allow up to THREE residences (ADU, JADU and primary residence) on a single parcel. In fact, most parcels in Nevada County, and in particular, on Banner Mtn. and Cascade shores would be allowed to have 3 residences. That creates the potential for greatly increased housing density on Banner Mtn./Cascade Shores, because the category of ADU could now be filled by a THOW, or AHOW. These types of permanent (proposed) residences can greatly reduce the cost of an ADU permanent residence from hundreds of thousands of dollars, to a few tens of thousands. It is not rocket science to suggest that such reduction in costs would enable substantial growth in residential density – And vehicle traffic!


Each new permanent residence enabled and created by a THOW or AHOW ordinance will place more vehicles on roads (with limited traffic capacity) during a possible future emergency fire evacuation... this is on top of the already potentially perilous emergency evacuation outlined by OES in 2024.

Any new ordinance providing for permanent residences in AHOW should exempt Banner Mtn./Cascade Shores and other critical areas identified by the OES study. To do otherwise is to push the current fire evacuation scenario beyond the *extremely risky category*, and endanger current and future residents even further.

If the source of the wildfire is too close, the location of the source cuts off critical evacuation routes, or the evacuation warning too late... emergency evacuants will probably die... resulting in an evacuation scenario equal to or worse than the 2018 Camp Fire!

Sincerely,

Morris Hervey



Tyler Barrington

From: M Sz <msz0005@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 13, 2025 10:51 AM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: RVs =homes

[You don't often get email from msz0005@yahoo.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

No

Public Open Letter to Tyler Barrington, Nevada County Planning Department

Subject: Supporting a Clear, Oversight-Focused Pathway for Legal RV Occupancy

Dear Mr. Barrington,

Thank you for your continued leadership and openness to community input as Nevada County works to develop a thoughtful and responsible **Alternative RV Housing Ordinance**. It is encouraging to see that the County recognizes what many of us already know: for hundreds of residents in Nevada County, RVs are not just temporary shelters—they are their only homes.

The Planning Department's public outreach process, survey, and scheduled meetings are critical first steps. Many of us have long anticipated this moment—where the County formally explores how to create a safe, legal, and oversight-based framework that aligns with current housing needs. Your work brings the conversation forward, and I write today to offer my full support along with a few detailed recommendations based on practical experience and community feedback.

Policy Recommendations for a Functional RV Housing Ordinance

1. Clean and Clarify the Permitting Process

The County should streamline and modernize its existing permit structure to allow 12-month RV occupancy permits, renewable for additional 12-month periods upon successful inspection. A clean, consistent process is essential—not only for participation, but for transparent oversight aligning the 12 months for construction and six month family and friends permissible uses, in other words— it's the same permitting process for any occupied RV.

2. Tie Occupancy to Safe and Legal Wastewater Management

RV units approved for habitation must have a legally compliant system for managing wastewater, with two permitted options:

- Connection to an existing permitted septic system, supported by a letter from a licensed engineer verifying the system's capacity to handle the additional effluent, or
- Installation of a dedicated 1,500-gallon holding tank, with documentation of an active contract with a licensed pump service to empty the tank at least once per month or more frequently as needed.

This dual-path approach allows flexibility for landowners while ensuring environmental and public health standards are upheld. It also reduces the risk of illegal or unsanitary dumping.

3. Permit Applications Must Be Landowner-Initiated

To ensure accountability, only the property owner should be eligible to apply for RV occupancy permits on their land. This avoids third-party misuse or informal, undocumented arrangements.

4. Use Existing Setbacks and Codes as the Standard

RVs should conform to existing zoning and setback requirements—no exceptions. There's no

need to create new zoning overlays or carveouts. Instead, align this ordinance with what already exists and ensure County oversight is simple, fair, and consistent.

5. RVs Must Be Safe, Registered, and Occupied Responsibly

Permitted RVs must:

- Be currently registered with DMV,
- Be road-ready and safe, and
- House no more occupants than they were designed for.

These baseline standards promote health and safety without overcomplicating the ordinance.

6. Ensure Safe and Code-Compliant Electrical Connections

All RVs must be connected to power using electrical systems that meet both the manufacturer's specifications for the RV and all applicable building and electrical codes for the RV service. Any RV electrical hookup to a house or service panel must be installed to code, including grounding, overload protection, and appropriate amperage. This protects the safety of both the RV occupant and the property.

7. Modernize the Code—Don't Reinvent It

Rather than create an entirely new class of rules, the County should review, consolidate, and clarify existing ordinances that already address temporary structures, utilities, setbacks, and sanitation. Cleaning up what's already on the books will do more to support long-term oversight than layering on new complexity.

8. This Ordinance Must Not Be a Loophole

People living in substandard or unpermitted RVs that pose a health or fire risk must not be shielded by this ordinance. County oversight of existing violations should continue in parallel. For responsible landowners, this ordinance should create a legal pathway forward—not an excuse to overlook violations or enable unsafe living conditions.

In Appreciation

I deeply appreciate that the County is finally addressing a reality that has existed quietly for decades. While some may view RV housing as unconventional, for many people—including seniors, workers, and families—it is the only attainable and autonomous option in a market with skyrocketing costs. By regulating it responsibly, you're helping people stay housed, safe, and connected to their communities.

Thank you again for your efforts to include the public in this process. I hope these recommendations can help shape a final ordinance that is as practical and compassionate as it is grounded in thoughtful oversight.

Sincerely,
Michael James Taylor

Tyler Barrington

From: Michael Taylor <mjt4you@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 14, 2025 9:31 AM
To: Tyler Barrington
Cc: Heidi Hall; Lisa Swarthout; Hardy Bullock; Sue Hoek; Robb Tucker; Trisha Tillotson; George Schureck; Matt Kelley; Lee; Tom Durkin; Pauli Halstead
Subject: Alternative RV Housing Ordinance
Attachments: Updated_Public_Letter_Tyler_Barrington_RV_Ordinance.docx

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Dear Mr. Barrington,

Thank you for your continued leadership and openness to community input as Nevada County works to develop a thoughtful and responsible **Alternative RV Housing Ordinance**. It is encouraging to see that the County recognizes what many of us already know: for hundreds of residents in Nevada County, RVs are not just temporary shelters—they are their only homes.

The Planning Department's public outreach process, survey, and scheduled meetings are critical first steps. Many of us have long anticipated this moment—where the County formally explores how to create a safe, legal, and oversight-based framework that aligns with current housing needs. Your work brings the conversation forward, and I write today to offer my full support along with a few detailed recommendations based on practical experience and community feedback.

Policy Recommendations for a Functional RV Housing Ordinance

1. Clean and Clarify the Permitting Process

The County should streamline and modernize its existing permit structure to allow 12-month RV occupancy permits, renewable for additional 12-month periods upon successful inspection. A clean, consistent process is essential—not only for participation, but for transparent oversight aligning the 12 months for construction and six months for family and friends permissible uses, in other words— it's the same permitting process for any occupied RV.

2. Tie Occupancy to Safe and Legal Wastewater Management

RV units approved for habitation must have a legally compliant system for managing wastewater, with two permitted options:

- Connection to an existing permitted septic system, supported by a letter from a licensed engineer verifying the system's capacity to handle the additional effluent, or
- Installation of a dedicated 1,500-gallon holding tank, with documentation of an active contract with a licensed pump service to empty the tank at least once per month or more frequently as needed.

This dual-path approach allows flexibility for landowners while ensuring environmental and public health standards are upheld. It also reduces the risk of illegal or unsanitary dumping.

3. Permit Applications Must Be Landowner-Initiated

To ensure accountability, only the property owner should be eligible to apply for RV occupancy permits on their land. This avoids third-party misuse or informal, undocumented arrangements.

4. Use Existing Setbacks and Codes as the Standard

RVs should conform to existing zoning and setback requirements—no exceptions. There's no need to create new zoning overlays or carveouts. Instead, align this ordinance with what already exists and ensure County oversight is simple, fair, and consistent.

5. RVs Must Be Safe, Registered, and Occupied Responsibly

Permitted RVs must:

- Be currently registered with DMV,
- Be road-ready and safe, and
- House no more occupants than they were designed for.

These baseline standards promote health and safety without overcomplicating the ordinance.

6. Ensure Safe and Code-Compliant Electrical Connections

All RVs must be connected to power using electrical systems that meet both the manufacturer's specifications for the RV and all applicable building and electrical codes for the RV service. Any RV electrical hookup to a house or service panel must be installed to code, including grounding, overload protection, and appropriate amperage. This protects the safety of both the RV occupant and the property.

7. Modernize the Code—Don't Reinvent It

Rather than create an entirely new class of rules, the County should review, consolidate, and clarify existing building codes and ordinances that already address temporary structures, utilities, setbacks, and sanitation. Cleaning up what's already on the books will do more to support long-term oversight than layering on new complexity.

8. This Ordinance Must Not Be a Loophole

People living in substandard or unpermitted RVs that pose a health or fire risk must not be shielded by this ordinance. County oversight of existing violations should continue in parallel. For responsible landowners, this ordinance should create a legal pathway forward—not an excuse to overlook violations or enable unsafe living conditions.

In Appreciation

I deeply appreciate that the County is finally addressing a reality that has existed quietly for decades. While some may view RV housing as unconventional, for many people—including seniors, workers, and families—it is the only attainable and autonomous option in a market with skyrocketing costs. By regulating it responsibly, you're helping people stay housed, safe, and connected to their communities.

Thank you again for your efforts to include the public in this process. I hope these recommendations can help shape a final ordinance that is as practical and compassionate as it is grounded in thoughtful oversight.

Sincerely,
Michael James Taylor

Sent from my iPhone

Tyler Barrington

From: Pam Amato <pam@pamamoto.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 17, 2025 1:14 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: RV's as permanent housing

You don't often get email from pam@pamamoto.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Tyler,

I realize we are in a period of severe shortage in housing and to be human to our fellow citizens want them to have shelter for health and safety-

I think the use of Rv's does provide this however, it should not be a permit solution for housing indefinitely. Rv's are much like vehicles they wear out and not intended for permanent living.

IF an ordinance for RV housing is passed it should be limited in time.

Also, not a parking campground of RV's.

This is my opinion as a realtor advocate for housing.

Pam Amato, Broker Associate, CRS, SRES

Lic: 00687475 - since 1979

COLDWELL BANKER GRASS ROOTS

Ofc Lic: [00873741](#)

Direct/Cell: [530-913-1102](#)

Tyler Barrington

From: Mark Triolo <marktriolo@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 18, 2025 10:08 AM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Mobile Home ordinance

You don't often get email from marktriolo@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Hi Tyler,

I wanted to provide my opinion on the Mobile Home ordinance being considered. I have already taken the survey but felt it was also important to send you this message.

Allowing mobile homes to be used as residences will populate our area with many, many unsightly properties. While we are all sympathetic to finding a solution for the homeless, I think we must consider the rights of residents that already live here. We all live here because of the beautiful environment. To diminish that, reduces the standard of living and property values for all of us. It seems to me that this decision is being made without enough consideration for the rights of existing home owners. We have a right to enjoy our town and the properties we have spent significant money to purchase and all of the work it takes to maintain them.

Please consider our rights when making this decision. We need to give all residents equal treatment.

Please say no to this ordinance.

Sincerely,

Mark Triolo

Tyler Barrington

From: Darlene Mariani <dee@deemariani.com>
Sent: Friday, July 18, 2025 1:10 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: RVs as residences

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

You don't often get email from dee@deemariani.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Hello Tyler,

I do not think mobile RV residences on land is the solution to our housing shortage. RV living on personally owned land has typically been a short solution while permanent housing is built. If the RV is intended to be permanent then it should be on a foundation built to code, and approved by the county. This would also include permitted septic, well, proper setbacks, etc.
D~

Darlene "Dee" Mariani, REALTOR

Masters Club, Certified RE Negotiator, Sterling Society

Global Luxury, Graduate Real Estate Institute

O: (530) 273-7293 | M: (530) 913-7396

167 South Auburn St | [Grass Valley, CA, 95945](#)

[DeeMariani.Com](#)

License #: 1386476



COLDWELL BANKER

**GRASS ROOTS
REALTY**

Tyler Barrington

From: Darlene Mariani <dee@deemariani.com>
Sent: Friday, July 18, 2025 1:10 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: RVs as residences

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

You don't often get email from dee@deemariani.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Hello Tyler,

I do not think mobile RV residences on land is the solution to our housing shortage. RV living on personally owned land has typically been a short solution while permanent housing is built. If the RV is intended to be permanent then it should be on a foundation built to code, and approved by the county. This would also include permitted septic, well, proper setbacks, etc.
D~

Darlene "Dee" Mariani, REALTOR

Masters Club, Certified RE Negotiator, Sterling Society

Global Luxury, Graduate Real Estate Institute

O: (530) 273-7293 | M: (530) 913-7396

167 South Auburn St | [Grass Valley, CA, 95945](#)

[DeeMariani.Com](#)

License #: 1386476



COLDWELL BANKER

**GRASS ROOTS
REALTY**

Tyler Barrington

From: Micah Panzich <mpdesignlb@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 21, 2025 11:42 AM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: RV living proposal

You don't often get email from mpdesignlb@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Hello,

I am a homeowner and I live in Grass Valley, CA (Alta Sierra). I want to express my complete opposition to this proposal. I think this is a horrible idea. There is so much wrong with this idea, I don't know where to start. Please do not go forward with this.

There are plenty of people living in RV's already. All along rattlesnake road, Lime Kiln Road, Oak Drive, North Bloomfield Road, and along the 49. Even some neighborhoods in Alta Sierra. If this cannot be regulated by the county - why should we expect that having even more of these RV units will be properly regulated by the county? I have no confidence in this. Why would the county even want to take on this responsibility? Where is the waste and sewage going for all these RVs (even grey water from dish soap etc can be harmful to the environment)? When they dont have proper electrical service - are they going to run generators all day? What value would this bring to our county/neighborhoods? Can the county really handle an influx of more low income people that this proposal would certainly attract?

There are plenty of affordable homes available. Half the homes in my neighborhood are for sale. These homes are very inexpensive when you look at other places in the state.

Why not provide these people with opportunities to educate themselves so they can get better jobs - so that they can afford these houses (some sort of education programs or education vouchers would be great). People complain that they can't afford something - then they refuse to do anything to change their life so that they can afford it. So the county wants the people that can afford it to pay the price? With their neighborhoods filled with beat up old RV's? Please do not turn my neighborhood into a giant homeless camp.

I have had to move many times to fit my budget. It is called life and that is the way it is. I have moved several times so that I could afford what I needed. That is how I ended up here. Nevada County is very affordable in comparison to other places. If they can't make it here - then they are going to have a hard time in this life.

Please don't put our property values at risk. (Nobody is going to buy your home - when your neighbors have a bunch of people living in RV's next door). This proposal puts our property values in danger - without adding any value to the county.

I would also add that there needs to be more enforcement for all the people currently living in RVs. Facebook is already filled with posts with people advertising their land for RV use.

Nevada County has already made an effort to address low income housing with the tiny house option they have provided. We need to keep Nevada County beautiful. Please do not go forward with this proposal.

Thank you for your time.

--

Thank You,
Micah Panzich

17986 Wallis Drive
Grass Valley, CA 95949

Tyler Barrington

From: Carolyn <gmacarolynj@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 17, 2025 3:46 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Rv's

[You don't often get email from gmacarolynj@gmail.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

RV's should be allowed as permanent homes as long as the RV's are kept in good condition. There also should be a restriction on the age of the RV.

Sent from my iPad

Tyler Barrington

From: Carolyn Battaini <crosjb@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Monday, July 14, 2025 7:04 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Cc: Carolyn Battaini
Subject: Do not allow RVs to become permanent housing unless in a designated area

[You don't often get email from crosjb@sbcglobal.net. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

We have major concerns of allowing permanent RVs for full time living. Environmental concerns & safety in the county, such as potable water, proper draining septic waste, proper electrical connections to avoid electrical fires, safety in fire evacuations, lack of fire hydrants in the county, and lastly short lived building materials used to make RVs, then what do you do with a deteriorating piece of junk? Once they allowed you can't turn back.

Our thoughts are that most of the county lacks sufficient infrastructure for this type of living. Most roads are private, not maintained by county, significant lack of evacuation outlets, questionable well water capabilities, insufficient communications via phone, and an h to ordinances are lax.

Please consider an organized area for RVs that can handle all of the concerns listed above.

For these concerns we favor a sort of mobile home like park area that has proper septic and electrical hookups, fire fighting support nearby, sufficient space for emergency evacuations.

Thank you for your consideration
Carolyn & Steve Battaini
14027 Liquidambar Ln
Grass Valley
650-996-1939

Tyler Barrington

From: Rebecca Rickey <becca4255@icloud.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 23, 2025 10:44 AM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: RV's should be allowed
Attachments: The Smarter Way I Made Home Happen 2.pdf

[You don't often get email from becca4255@icloud.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Please read this and consider the impact. Although this was written for an Arizona audience, it is still valid and should be considered when you make your recommendations.

Thank you for your consideration.

The Smarter Way I Made Home Happen

by Rebecca Rickey

Copyright 2025 – Written July 19, 2025

I didn't buy land just to own it. I bought it so I could relax, take in the view, and not be told what I could and couldn't do.

I bought raw land in Northern Arizona with the intent of building a home—eventually. From 2018 until I got my building permit in 2024, I was living in the national forest, off-grid, and occasionally in campgrounds or RV parks—because I couldn't live on my own land. It wasn't legal to. And that wore me down.

It wasn't about sitting still. It was about finally having a place to breathe.

The national forest was quiet, raw, and beautiful. But it was also exhausting. Hauling water. Dumping septic. Watching the weather, tracking solar gain, fighting dust storms. And always watching the calendar to meet the two-week requirement—even if that place was in the middle of nowhere.

I kept moving. I kept trying. I kept building—both a life and the infrastructure for one. I had no address. No utilities. Just some dirt and a deed.

But I wasn't idle.

I cleared brush by hand. Dug trenches. Laid water and septic lines. I fenced the perimeter myself. I even planned where to plant trees—because they take a long time to grow, and someday, I wanted a shaded yard.

The only thing I didn't install myself was the electric—not because I couldn't, but because they make it so hard to get.

I wasn't allowed to get mail there. I couldn't register to vote using that address. I couldn't list it as my residence. This, despite the fact that I paid property taxes and was actively improving the land.

Despite the fact that I paid property taxes and was actively improving the land, I had to get a permit for everything. I got a permit to dig the driveway. A permit to build a fence. A permit to run a waterline. I followed all the rules and did everything by the book, but it still wasn't enough.

Worse, in the beginning, I couldn't even keep garden tools on-site without it being a problem. The county wouldn't let me have a shed or even a shade tarp—basic, temporary things—without triggering a violation. Eventually, I was told I could apply for a “community garden” permit. But it wasn't a garden for the community. It was just the name of the permit required if I wanted to grow food, keep a rake or shovel there, or build a small shed.

And when I did finally get the shed, it sparked another anonymous complaint. Someone falsely accused me of living there—which I wasn't.

Then came the weeds. The county cited me for tall weeds, but the photo they used was of my neighbor's lot. I pointed it out. They shrugged and told me that unless I filed a complaint against my neighbor, they wouldn't enforce it. That's how the anonymous complaint system works in Yavapai County. It's entirely complaint-driven. Code enforcement doesn't patrol or investigate proactively. They respond to reports—anonymous, unverified, and unaccountable. So while people with obvious zoning violations get to keep going, someone like me—with permits, utilities, and a clean property—gets flagged repeatedly. It's not about fairness. It's about who complains first. And that's what makes it so dangerous: selective enforcement by design.

Eventually, they tried to fine me.

But I fought back.

I attended a county hearing, I lost. Then appealed all the way to the top. The Board of Supervisors voted unanimously in my favor at the hearing. I told the truth. And I won. Unanimous vote in my favor.

Not Off-Grid—Just Off-Beat

By 2024, I had full utilities: water, septic, internet, electric. I even had solar. I wasn't "off-grid." I was legal. I had my permit. I had a clean, fenced property with a view people pull over to admire. I was living in my RV on my own land—with septic, electric, and water—all fully installed and permitted.

The Permit & the Deadline

In 2024, I secured a building permit for a 1,500-square-foot home. Real plans. County-approved. But foundations cost money. The lender wanted more reserves. I didn't have them.

Every six months I had to show progress. I kept trying.

Now, my final extension runs out in December 2025. If I don't build by then, I have to leave.

In a site-built neighborhood like mine—and really, no matter what the zoning—you can't legally live in an RV unless there's already a house or manufactured home. Even visiting in one isn't allowed unless there's a home or an active building permit.

So my permit is what made it legal to be there. And when it expires, I'll be treated like a trespasser again—on my own land.

Even with permits in place, I've been treated like I don't belong. And when that permit runs out, the complaints will start again. I already know it.

The Truth About Real Estate

The irony? I've had my real estate license since 2015. I used to sell million-dollar homes in Sedona while I couldn't legally stay on land I owned. People assume realtors are wealthy. Most of us aren't. We hustle. We adapt. We survive.

I didn't build this life because I failed. I refuse to fail. To me, having a home is everything.

A Smarter Way to Make Home Happen

I didn't break the rules. I worked around them. I didn't squat—I invested. I didn't give up—I fought back.

What I built works. It's clean, private, safe, sustainable—and mine.

Maybe the problem isn't how I'm living.

Maybe the problem is that the rules haven't caught up yet.

I'm not writing this just to vent or complain. I'm writing it because people need to understand what really goes on—how outdated zoning laws, selective enforcement, and complaint-driven systems are hurting people who are trying to live responsibly. I want to see real change. I want this kind of thing to stop happening.

Tyler Barrington

From: Ursula Donofrio <ursdonofrio@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 22, 2025 5:14 PM
To: Tyler Barrington; Heidi Hall
Cc: Ursula Donofrio
Subject: Re: campers/rvs as permanent housing on private property

You don't often get email from ursdonofrio@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

It might be helpful for folks working on the draft ordinance to drive up Cement Hill (Heidi Hall is my county supervisor) and along some of the many long, narrow, windy, private "shared" driveways serving multiple houses not on wheels. We live at the top of such a long narrow driveway. Two cars cannot pass each other on this narrow drive due to steep drop offs and/or large trees, necessitating that one driver back up to a wider point to enable another car to pass. This driveway is a challenge for the residents of three homes during a non-evacuation normal period. It is not meant to serve additional drivers renting homes on wheels, and it would be horrific during the chaos of a mandatory evacuation....and that's not even taking into account the possibility of folks trying to evacuate in their campers and trailers. I understand proponents of Permanent Camping Everywhere counter those pesky NIMBY's by touting that driving a home on wheels during an evacuation would be illegal. Yet one of their reasons for pushing the Permanent Camping Everywhere movement in the first place is that folks are "doing it already".....but suddenly the rules will matter? And law enforcement will further delay panicked drivers trying to flee to safety during an evacuation by ticketing a "home on wheels" driver on narrow and windy Cement Hill Road as a fire approaches? That's absurd. I consider myself a law-abiding citizen, but if I have the opportunity to evacuate with my home and (likely uninsured) belongings, I would seriously consider doing so.

Having recently attended a Ready Nevada County Fire Safety event at Pioneer Park and being bombarded with almost daily emails and news blurbs about fire safety, I cannot believe the county is seriously considering campers and rvs in the woods as permanent housing. Aside from the fire and fire evacuation risks, what about current agreements pertaining to shared costs for private paved driveways? Will the county renegotiate our "shared driveway" agreement and force those who rent out campers to pay a greater share? I suspect if someone is renting out trailers, money is tight and they will not cover the additional wear and tear on said driveways by their renters. When my husband and I bought our home three years ago, we looked very closely at zoning in the neighborhood, especially the currently vacant neighboring lot. We also considered the shared maintenance agreement for a .25 mile paved driveway. We would not have purchased a home in Nevada County had we known zoning and property codes might be tossed out the window. We are those pesky NIMBY's who each worked full-time for 40 years (my husband is still working), saved and saved, drove sensible cars, saved some more, and spent two years looking at homes in Nevada County before purchasing a dream property we could afford. Actually, I think the real NIMBY's are folks who have unused bedrooms in their homes that are not being rented

out.....but yet they support this Permanent Camping Everywhere movement. Then again, this movement is not just about an affordable roof over your head. If so, the THOW's compromise would be enough. But it's not. They want to place their camper or trailer or school bus wherever, regardless of zoning or public safety. If trailers appear on the property next to us, we will erect a tall wooden fence to block not only the trailer but the things that accompany a permanent homestead: the outdoor living space and cooking area (because it's really hot in a camper in the summer and one tiny burner doesn't always cut it for dinner), the "easy up" to protect tools and toys from rain, the portable sewage/waste container because they are already fighting back against those burdensome septic tanks, but ultimately, we would leave Nevada County.

What about garbage service? What about utilities? These are the reasons RV parks exist. Build some low-cost, no frills, rv/trailer parks in areas off roads that can accommodate two cars driving in opposite directions and near major evacuation routes. That's a compromise that addresses the high cost of housing while promoting fire safety and respect for current zoning and property codes. Otherwise people who moved here for the charm and beauty of Nevada County will leave and be replaced by "Vanlords" who will maximize their profits at the expense of the community. You cite counties like Placer (the county we left) as a reason to capitulate to the Permanent Camping Everywhere movement, but why not also consider cities like San Jose and San Francisco, which just recently passed ordinances to counter "Vanlords" renting out any dilapidated camper they can buy cheap on Facebook Marketplace? I recognize their situations are somewhat different. Vanlords are mostly renting out "homes on wheels" on city streets, but the profit motive at the expense of your community will flourish wherever it is permitted to flourish. I researched why such progressive cities like San Francisco and San Jose passed ordinances against Vanlords. They believe that normalizing trailers and RV's as permanent housing will disrupt and derail their efforts to get people into suitable apartments or tiny homes. People will stop trying to achieve that and permanent camping will become the norm. Why turn Nevada County into a giant campground? People will come here from all over California to partake in the Permanent Camping Everywhere movement if you promote it. It will ultimately destroy the quality of life here and place everyone in great fire peril. And if Nevada County burns, none of us will have a home.

Ursula Donofrio, Cement Hill Homeowner

On Tue, Jul 22, 2025 at 2:33 PM Tyler Barrington <Tyler.Barrington@nevadacountyca.gov> wrote:

Hi Ursula,

There is not one scheduled at this point. The Planning Dept. is working with your partner agencies in the Community Development Agency to prepare the draft ordinance. It is a goal of mine that it will be released for public comment in early-mid August; at which point and time we will schedule public meetings to discuss the draft.

If you haven't done so yet, you can sign up to receive notifications on the project by adding your email here (at the bottom of the page: <https://www.nevadacountyca.gov/4102/AlternativeRV-Housing>

Best,

Tyler



Tyler Barrington

Principal Planner- [Planning Department](#)

Interim Director- [Housing & Community Services](#)

Office: 530.470.2723 Housing Cell: 530.913.3306

www.NevadaCountyCA.gov

**I am out of the office every other Friday as follows: 7/25, 8/8, 8/22 and 9/5*

This message is for the designated recipient only and MAY CONTAIN PRIVILEGED OR CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION. If you have received it in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete the original. Any other use of this E-mail is prohibited.

From: Ursula Donofrio <ursdonofrio@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 22, 2025 2:18 PM
To: Tyler Barrington <Tyler.Barrington@nevadacountyca.gov>
Cc: Ursula Donofrio <ursdonofrio@gmail.com>
Subject: campers/rvs as permanent housing on private property

You don't often get email from ursdonofrio@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

When is the next county meeting on the above topic? --Ursula Donofrio/Cement Hill Homeowner

Tyler Barrington

From: Jan and Mike Weaver <jm.mp31@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 23, 2025 11:20 AM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: RV for housing crisis
Attachments: RV Living.docx

You don't often get email from jm.mp31@hotmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Thank you for taking the time to listen to those who live here. Attached please find my thoughts on the matter.

JANET WEAVER
10818 Gunsmoke Road
Grass Valley, CA 95945
(530) 477-5521

To: Tyler Barrington
tyler.barrington@nevadacountyca.gov>

re: RVs to help with housing crisis

We own 18 acres and we would be more than happy to help with the housing crisis, but in good conscience could not allow one more person to live this far out with the lack of an adequate evacuation route. As you may or may not know, Greenhorn has the distinction of being in the top five for worst evacuation routes in Nevada County. The County continued to allow residential buildings here without a secondary way out.

Along with fire prevention, during the 10 drought years, water was a real issue. NID/fire hydrants end within the first mile of Greenhorn, therefore, most properties here are on wells and several had gone dry resulting in homeowners to purchase water. Adding more residents could drain this much needed resource.

There are many other issues as to sanitation, power and phone service. Who will monitor these problems?

Please consider an organized area for RVs that can handle all of the concerns listed above.

Tyler Barrington

From: Jeanne Franklin <jeanneaf@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 23, 2025 4:39 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Cc: jennyrice@wizwire.com; Marianne Boll-See; Scott Thomsen; ajyoder12@yahoo.com; cworden33@gmail.com; djweger333@gmail.com; dmzacamy@gmail.com; encoregsd@yahoo.com; fenfrond@yahoo.com; jderobertis@att.net; lbarhydt@yahoo.com; lori.anne.long@gmail.com; miprechter@gmail.com; osburg530@gmail.com; pepper911.sp@gmail.com; rmcmanaman50@gmail.com; rockinr4364@sbcglobal.net; rprfray@hotmail.com; rwf1954@yahoo.com; sage@silcom.com; scheevelr@yahoo.com; segremarcia@gmail.com; tatuela48@gmail.com; ted_holden@hotmail.com; thelmao530@gmail.com; tmccutcheon@prsd.us; wildisdeb@aol.com; ziptothegold@aol.com
Subject: Should RV's be Homes, the answer is NO

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Hello Tyler,

"Should RV's be Homes", let's think about the ramifications:

1. Will Nevada County create a committee to do random/unannounced checks to ensure that RV's are tapped into a septic systems AND not pulling too much water from local wells?
2. How can the county identify and ensure that "RV's as homes" doesn't constitute as a local marijuana grow bypassing the county rules?
3. Will "RV's be Homes be scrutinized to ensure that "riff raff" including citizens on probation, etc. not be approved?
4. What is the proposal for the number of RV's to property size? The last thing our county needs is to degrade our demographic.

Tyler Barrington

From: Louise C <louiseemail@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 23, 2025 2:18 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: RVs and housing.

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

You don't often get email from louiseemail@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

I agree that RVs should be allowed as housing, with these caveats:

1. RVs used as primary housing, not rental units, (except for immediate family needs,) on private land.
2. No more than one RV per private property, to avoid the accidental or deliberate usage as a caravan camp.
3. RVs on private acreage must be hooked up to a septic system, either a tank or public line.
4. RVs on private land must have access to potable water.
5. RVs need to be serviceable, liveable, and meet safety and public health standards.
6. RVs need to be registered either as a road worthy vehicle, or a nonoperative vehicle, to the property owner.

I've lived in an RV type vehicle, which was viable temporary housing as we built a permanent structure. Modern RVs are designed for comfortable living, and are a definite alternative in a bloated economy.

Louise Caulfield
louiseemail@gmail.com

Tyler Barrington

From: Court Worden <cworden33@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 25, 2025 4:56 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Cc: Sue Hoek
Subject: RVs as permanent residences..a recipe for disaster

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Tyler,

I'm writing to express my discontent with the 'RVs to homes' proposal in Nevada County.

I appreciate the county's ingenuity trying to be creative in search of affordable housing, however this initiative will have a detrimental impact to the vast majority of homeowners already living in NC and the taxpaying patrons who spend time throughout NC.

First, affordable housing can only be achieved when utilities and gas prices are affordable. These two factors drive home construction and ultimately set the standard for affordability. If the BoS aspire for affordable housing then they need to spend time in Sacramento lobbying at the governor's headquarters.

The two immediate and transparent impacts transient 'RV homes' will present to Nevada County residences is an elevated fire risk and attracting criminals who maintain a transient, hard to pin down pattern of life.

This proposal will further burden NC homeowners with more risk to their homeowner's insurance at a time when neighbors are constantly being notified of insurance cancellation as a result of fire hazards. Permanently living in an RV throughout the county will present even more imminent danger of fire because of the construction characteristics of an RV along with a limited power source in most RVs resulting in daisy-chaining extension cords.

Lastly, crime can not be overlooked in this proposal. It is proven that outlaws and career criminals prefer to live a life with a transient address so law enforcement can't track down suspects. If the BoS desires to turn NC into a transient trailer park with minimal property tax revenue then this is the ideal solution, otherwise please reject this proposal for the betterment of our county.

Respectfully,
Court Worden

-----Original Message-----

From: Peter brost <pnbrost@comcast.net>

Sent: Saturday, July 26, 2025 9:48 AM

To: Heidi Hall <Heidi.Hall@nevadacountyca.gov>

Subject: Newsletter/input

I received your newsletter and found the information interesting. My wife and I are on Banner Lava Cap and thus within District 1.

We would both like you to know we are strongly opposed to the issue under consideration allowing permanent living in trailers and RVs. We know of absolutely no one in our neighborhood or our sphere of influence who supports this outrageous proposal.

You, who have been so actively involved in the wildfire and fire safe communities along with home insurance problems, must absolutely know what a foolish idea this is. It smacks in the face of everything all the Fire Wise communities are advocating; it adds significantly more threat to every neighborhood; further crowds our roads and already dangerous evacuation routes; will result in insurers further raising their rates (as my broker assured me was inevitable); and needless to say has great potential to lower neighborhood home values.

Most people I talk with about this issue can't believe it is even being considered, given the county's history and extreme concerns with wildfire.

Please do not let suicidal empathy get in the way of making long-term, responsible and sound decisions for ALL the citizens of Nevada county.

Thank you, Pete Brost

Sent from my iPhone

Tyler Barrington

From: Richard C. <richardlc@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, August 2, 2025 12:12 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: RV Ordinance Comment

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

You don't often get email from richardlc@yahoo.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Hello Tyler,

I believe the county should pass an ordinance that allows residents to live in RVs and other safe dwellings. It has become harder for individuals in this county to find affordable homes and a new ordinance that would make RV's legal permanent homes could benefit many people. I also think it could help many homeless individuals get off the streets and out of forests and encampments. This is an important step to make our county less likely to have a wildfire started from a cooking or camp fire at one of these encampments. Please try your best to keep the entry barriers to this type of home as minimal as possible so the most people can be homed and off the streets and those already living in a RV can feel safe and secure and not have to continually worry about code enforcement removing them from their home.

Thank you,

Richard Coddig

Tyler Barrington

From: Robert Norman <bnorman@ix.netcom.com>
Sent: Saturday, August 2, 2025 7:06 AM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Housing

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

[You don't often get email from bnorman@ix.netcom.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

I strongly support housing the homeless. Everyone needs a place to live, whether will kill them and if it's RV or any other kind of shelter it's the humane thing to do.

Sincerely,

Bob

Norman

Sent from my iPhone

No Place To Go Project Talking Points – 8/10/25

THE CASE FOR ALTERNATIVE HOUSING

- We have a homeless/housing emergency. Redefining legal housing to include RVs & trailers just makes sense. It might not be the ideal solution, but it is the best solution for *right here, right now* to help our unhoused citizens.
- People who have private property and the right hookups can rent space to people who have their own RV/trailers.
- According to state Housing and Community Development, redefining housing to include RVs & trailers will improve the county's Prohousing Designation, making Nevada County eligible for funding to build more affordable housing units.
- Nevada County can mitigate the homeless/housing crisis by making RVs & trailers safe, available and affordable without having to build anything or spend millions of dollars.
- Working-age adults coming out of homelessness need RVs & trailers as first-step, transitional housing on their way to better housing once they get stabilized.
- RVs & trailers are a last resort for older and disabled people on fixed incomes who can't find housing.
- Currently, RVs & trailers are the only truly affordable housing out there that doesn't require government subsidy (our taxpayer dollars) to be affordable.
- Housing is healthcare. People in housing have far fewer medical and mental problems than people living in the wild. This saves taxpayers money.
- AltDUs provide lifesaving health & safety living conditions.
- Renting homes on wheels on private property is what *housing for the people by the people* is all about.

ALTERNATIVE HOUSING ORDINANCE

- The alternative housing ordinance should reflect the same rules as the already established tiny homes on wheels ordinance.
- The alternative housing ordinance must not be so expensive and restrictive that hardly anybody can qualify. It's a waste of taxpayers' money to write an ordinance that is only housing on paper and not on the ground.

FIRE SAFETY

- Alternative housing lowers the risk of a homeless campfire burning down the whole community.
- Because of the potential for dangerous traffic congestion or blockage, moving a tiny home on wheels or other AI on wheels during a wildfire evacuation warning or order must be prohibited with a severe penalty for violation.
- Renting an AltDU to responsible people on the same basis as any other rental transaction could provide extra income to pay for fire insurance.
- Getting people out of the woods is in everybody's best interests.

WATER AND SEPTIC

- Each AltDU must have code or code-equivalent septic and water management approved by Environmental Health.
- If an AltDU is given a three-year grace period to build a septic system or dig a well, the landlord and tenant must provide to the Nevada County Environmental Health Department proof of a signed contract with a water delivery company and/or septic pumping company to remove biohazardous wastewater (aka blackwater).

CODE COMPLIANCE

- So many people already live in trailers that code enforcement would have to remain complaint driven.
- Complaints must have merit. The Code Compliance Director must exercise his authority to reject a malicious or meritless complaint.
- Code Compliance's priority should be keeping people where they are and assisting them to come into compliance if necessarily. Forced relocation/evictions should be a last resort.
- Code Compliance must report the demographics of all the individuals who are forced to relocate.

NOT IN MY BACKYARD

- Most opposition to the alternative housing ordinance is based on fear, ignorance and prejudice.
- People are afraid of who and what they don't know. Landlords and tenants must establish friendly relations with their neighbors.
- We must work with people who oppose us, not fight them. We may not be able to change some people's minds, but we can at least acknowledge

their fears. They need to feel heard and understood. And done respectfully, we can change some minds.

- No one has the right to deny other people housing.

DATA POINTS

- According to the California Statewide Study of People Experiencing Homelessness (CASPEH) from the University of California, San Francisco, 63% of homeless people became homeless because of the lack of affordable and available housing.
- Although public perception is higher, a survey of credible studies indicate just 25% to 37% of homeless people are regular drug users.
- International studies estimate 67% of homeless people suffer some form of mental illness, ranging from severely disabling conditions like schizophrenia and bipolar disorders to conditions like depression and anxiety, which are often caused by homelessness.

RIGHTS & WRONGS

- A person's property rights end at his property line. No one is forcing him to put an AltDU on his property, but he cannot prevent his neighbor from exercising her right to rent one out on her property.
- The regulations must not be so restrictive and expensive that nobody can comply. Overly stringent regs would become nothing more than housing on paper – a waste of staff time and taxpayer money.
- Resisting RVs & trailers is implicit class discrimination. Just because we live in AltDUs because that's all we could find or afford doesn't automatically make us "trailer trash."
- Most unhoused people just need housing they can afford.
- If there is no housing, we must at least establish safe places for people to camp or park with toilet facilities and garbage cans.
- *Having a safe place to live is a human right.*

Tom Durkin, Director
No Place To Go Project

530-559-3199

tom@noplacetogoproject.com
www.noplacetogoproject.com



8/29/25

Planning Development
950 Maidu Ave. suite 170
Nevada City CA 95959

Re: ALTRVO ordinance

We are strongly against the proposed ordinance that would allow RVs or ADUs on property over three acres. The increasing density of housing on these parcels will greatly increase the risk of fire and demand for other community services. It will also change the character of our community for the worse. The end result will be a rich cultural and environmental community turned into one with county and city services stressed and the quality of the community marginalized.

We have had an experience in our neighborhood of an RV moved on to a neighbor's lot. Initially a few people lived in the unit. Then the rear window was broken out and people began dumping trash in and around the unit. Code Compliance eventually had the unit removed. Unfortunately, it was simply towed to a different location and continues to collect trash.

Thanks for considering our experience and comments as you consider this draft RV housing ordinance.

Take care,

Dan & Dee Desmond

10500 Hawke Lane
Nevada City, California 95959

Jodeana Patterson

From: gprich@ltoI.com
Sent: Monday, November 3, 2025 7:24 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Comment

[You don't often get email from gprich@ltoI.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Comments for proposed Nevada County Alternative/RV Housing Ordinance before the Planning Commission.

I was disappointed but not surprised at the 3 acre parcel size limit, 1 acre allows many more parcels to be eligible.

The process is very heavy on permitting, perhaps some streamlining might be added later. If an RV and site passes the 2 year inspection with no issues, perhaps the next inspection could be 5 years, not 2 years until the next inspection.

RE; B. Definitions 1. b There are 5th wheel trailers that are built to 430 square foot, as approved by the RVIA, This limit should be looked at and possibly modified. 400 SF applies to travel trailers.

I support the Ordinance, with adaptive modifications later, if it does not produce a substantial increase in functional housing.

Thank You
Gordon Richards
11070 Brockway Rd #60
Truckee, Ca 96161

Jodeana Patterson

From: james beale <teampeps@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 4, 2025 7:21 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Regarding the RV living

[You don't often get email from teampeps@gmail.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

My name is James and I have several issues on top of the septic and water issues are these RV gonna have to pay for Fire insurance for living in RVs ? if not, I'd rather tear down my house and save 10 grand a year. The other issue that I have is what about the abandoned RVs left on properties because of the people can't handle the RV living specially, living in our climate Sent from my iPhone

Jodeana Patterson

From: Jo Ann Rebane <jarebane@msn.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 5, 2025 12:50 PM
To: Planning; Lisa Swarthout; Sue Hoek; Alt RV Ordinance; Robb Tucker; Heidi Hall; Hardy Bullock
Cc: Jo Ann Rebane
Subject: Public comment on Alternative/RV ordinance
Attachments: Revised Updated Public comment on RV for ADU 2025.pdf

Some people who received this message don't often get email from jarebane@msn.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Attached, please find revised and updated comments in opposition to the Alternative/RV ordinance coming before the county planning commission on Thursday, November 13, 2025.

I have personal experience living in an RV and some familiarity with what it would cost to fully comply with the proposed ordinance even in its unacceptably vague terms. Unless the county has discovered new, unlimited funding sources available to the planning department, environmental health department, and compliance offices, the proposed ordinance reads like a disaster waiting to happen.

It worries me that commissioners and supervisors from our cities may not take the potential negative and inadequate aspects of the proposed ordinance on the more rural yet residential areas of the county seriously.

Hopefully, all commissioners and supervisors will see the wisdom of scuttling the proposed ordinance to allow current efforts to increase the county's housing supply time to be utilized.

Respectfully,
Jo Ann Rebane

Cement Hill Rd,
Nevada City, CA
530-263-4623 mobile

Updated and Revised Comments: Alternative/RV Dwelling Ordinance

Jo Ann Rebane – 5 November 2025 - Cement Hill Rd., Nevada City, 95959

1. It is premature to entertain permitting people to live permanently in an RV. Recent attempts by the county to increase the affordable/low-cost/low-income housing supply have NOT generated evidence of acceptance. According to Brian Foss, County Planning Director, in two years, only 2 ADUs have been permitted, no pre-approved ADU plans have been used. Only 4 “tiny homes on wheels” have been permitted. And only six Title 25 dwellings have made use of the lessened building codes. Clearly, Nevada County property owners have no appetite for utilizing tools like this proposed ordinance.
2. The county and local helping agencies have many programs available to the poor. There are existing and programs on the horizon to manage/assist our neighbors who have addiction and mental health problems. The county already offers alternative housing options. We must give ourselves time to realize the benefits of utilization. A split-use psychiatric care facility is coming here. The county has grant funding available to repair and replace manufactured/mobile homes. New housing developments have a new financing tool for infrastructure buildouts. Look for developments like Cashin’s Field or the project underway in Penn Valley.
3. This RV dwelling draft seems reasonable until one studies it closely. The cost of compliance could easily exceed \$25,000 which will not incentivize anyone to undertake all required steps to comply with these rules. If the measure is passed as is, without penalties and enforcement provisions spelled out, it will encourage and continue scoff law RVs and continuation of the known health and safety/fire safety issues and dangers well known to all who live and work in Nevada County.
4. It appears that the county is being pushed into allowing permanent residency in travel trailers/RVs by a tiny set of vocal people without adequate input from the vast majority of property owners who will bear the brunt of this ill-conceived idea. The silent majority doesn’t even know that the planning commission and supervisors have this ordinance under consideration.

5. Everyone who has seen an RV wreck knows that the walls and roof are paper thin and that the construction barely holds together. Trailers and RVs are NOT meant to be permanent residences.
6. Living in an RV for months with fully permitted and operational utilities is not easy. I know this from personal experience, having lived in a 5th-wheel trailer with my family on the site of the construction of our home in the Santa Monica Mountains. The utility connections, especially the “dumping” of sewage is very tricky and requires smart use of grey water, additives, and timing. Rain and wind presented enormous problems with the propane pilot system for heat and water heating. Wind and rain drove us off the mountain more than once to seek safe conditions in town. Heavy rain, snow, and cold here in Nevada County will cause unsafe and difficult times for people living in an RV full-time. Uninsulated water lines will freeze and burst.
7. How will having an RV as an ADU affect property owner’s property tax assessment? How has the Assessor been involved with drafting the ordinance? Will property values plummet?
8. What enforcement is contemplated? Which agency will respond to what kind of complaints? How many additional staff will be needed?
9. Who will pay for enforcement activities – property owner, county agency, taxpayers? Will there be required performance bonds?
10. I OPPOSE passing this RV dwelling regulation. Below I have commented in RED on each provision which will be expensive for the property owner to implement and/or where the language of the numbered section is unclear or needs to be significantly changed or expanded.

Section 12.03.151 Recreational Vehicle Dwelling

- A. Purpose - Reasonable regulations – use of RV to provide needed housing for county residents
- B. Definitions –
 1. (d) Should prohibit Truck-mounted RVs. These are slide-in-campers which usually do not include a full bathroom.
- C. Standards: permits, site inspections, 2 yr -
 1. Administrative Development Permit - Permit valid 2 yrs, fee, site inspection, unoccupied w/in 10 days of permit expiration AND should

be removed w/in 10 days. Fees or bond should cover cost of removal if property owner fails to remove or tax lien placed on property if county removes.

2. Inspection – OK - \$ Who schedules and pays for the multiple inspections? Need more inspectors?
3. Certifications – OK - \$ Are the labels and ANSI stickers still stuck to the RVs? What if the labels have loosened or worn off? Who verifies the RVs status/compliance?
4. Current DMV registration – OK - \$ Who will check that the sticker is current? What consequence if registration out of date?
5. Deed Restriction – recorded - \$ What does it cost to prepare and record a deed restriction? 30 consecutive days is NOT long enough to be considered long-term use. Who would go to all the trouble and cost of actually complying with this ordinance and endure the nuisance factor of hosting revolving tenants?
6. Zoning – RV can be an ADU in RA and R1 zones & all Rural zones on minimum 3 acres (allowing on any R1 acreage is inconsistent with preserving the rural character of county and should NOT be permitted.)
7. Location – no comment
8. Site Development Standards – no comment
9. Accessory Structures – detached & permitted thru final - \$ How enforced? What consequences for unpermitted add-ons?
10. Foundation: keep wheels on and inflated:
 - a) Paved / gravel surface – strict thickness / compactness / slope - \$\$ This requirement could easily cost around \$5,000 or more.
 - b) Use chocks & jacks, no leveling blocks – Preventing the use of leveling blocks assumes that the paved/gravel surface is absolutely level like one would find in a top-notch RV park.
11. Screening – cover undercarriage, wheels, solid & fixed – OK - \$
12. Habitability –
 - a) Live & sleep w heat & light – Yes.

- b) Require 24 hour on-site access to hot and cold potable water, a kitchen, toilet, bathing facilities, and lavatory sink...
Unclear – is the RV required to be equipped with and provide or does the property owner’s residence or out-building provide good water, kitchen, toilet, bath and lavatory sink?
- c) Street address – does the RV have a separate street address from the primary residence?
- d) Detectors – OK – Who checks for the required detectors, tests them, and certifies continuous good working order? Self reporting? Consequences?
- e) Fire extinguisher – OK – Who checks? Who is responsible if there’s a fire – property owner or tenant?
- f) Solid Waste – \$\$\$ What does a perc and mantle cost? A leach field could cost more than \$2,200 and the septic tank, its installation, and the clean out connection much more than \$3,500. The septic system must be located at a prescribed distance from any water wells and be sized according to the number of bedrooms/occupants.
- g) Utility Connections & Mechanical Equipment
 - 1. If RV connected to existing permitted water supply and onsite sewage disposal serving existing single-family dwelling – permits and inspections required. \$ Who confirms existing septic capacity adequate?
 - 2. Existing permitted water supply & sewage disposal meeting all regulations including alternative/temporary septic & water – approved, permitted, inspected. \$\$\$ - Alternative or temporary septic disposal methods including, for example, a 55 gallon drum must NOT be permitted. As written, an environmental disaster is allowed and encouraged. Same objections to the idea of a temporary water supply – hose from the house? Take water from a fire hydrant? What consequences if connections are not approved, permitted, inspected?
 - a. Well production and storage tank – OK \$\$

- b. Keep systems in good working order – OK Watch out for grey and black water sewage disposal. Does Environmental Health Dept have extra inspectors ready to do these inspections and at what cost to taxpayers? Respond to complaints?
- 3. Electric utility connections (equipment, panels, meters) require building permit. No extension cords. Off-grid electrical system OK if permitted. Generator not allowed as primary electrical source. - OK \$\$\$ - Installation of 30 or 50 amp service, meters and supply lines could cost between \$800 and \$3,000 or more. Off-grid electrical solar panels and batteries are costly to install correctly. What consequences if connections are not approved, permitted, inspected?
- 4. Building permit required for ground mounted propane tank. OK - \$\$ Site preparation, connections, and tank rental. Who inspects? What consequences if no permit obtained?
- 5. All utility connections (water, sewage drain, fuel supply) must meet regulations and be inspected prior to permitting. – OK - \$\$ - What consequences if connections not approved, permitted, inspected?
- 6. No wood burning heat sources – OK
- h) Modification of RV must be to ANSI standards, inspected & approved. – OK - \$ - What consequences if changes not approved, permitted, inspected? How would anyone know about modifications to the RV? Self reporting?
- i) Wind and Snow loads –
 - 1. Above 3,200 ft. an approved, engineered ramada or snow shelter required (or proof that RV meets load standards) – \$\$ - What consequences if snow shelter not approved, permitted, inspected?

2. Above 3,200 ft. snow removal maintenance agreement required – OK - \$ - Building department must keep a file? Will it check for compliance and issue fines?
13. Driveways must provide minimum fire safety access – OK - \$ - Which agency checks compliance? Any consequences for non-compliance?
14. Fire Protection Plan – RV must comply
 - a) Applicant for Administrative Development Permit must submit a Fire Protection Plan, approved by County Fire Marshal prior to approval of Administrative Development Permit. Planning Dept keeps original & fire district gets copy. Fire Protection Plan must be site specific & address issues:
 - \$ - Who qualified to write protection plan? How are representations verified? Any bond required? How is compliance monitored after permit issued and by which agency? Any consequences for non-compliance?
 - b) Issues:
 1. Distance to fire dept & possible response time – OK
 2. Description of access road conditions – OK
 3. Identify RV's emergency water supply – OK
 4. Location of required fire extinguisher – OK, but will the tenant keep it there?
 5. Identify evacuation routes – OK
 6. Describe Fuels Management Plan requiring:
 - a. Defensible space design – Who prepares this – property owner, master gardener, forester...?
 - b. Identify high fuel load areas – What proximity? 20 Ft or 100 yds? High fuel loads exist in the entire county – this requirement needs to be much more specific.
 - c. How defensible space will be ensured – Does property owner describe and promise to do this? Contract with some provider?

- d. Mechanism for maintenance of defensible space –
\$\$ - Does property owner certify/promise to annually hire weed whackers and foresters to comply? Must owner provide signed contracts with weed whackers and tree service companies? Can he promise to do the work himself? Which agency checks compliance?
- e. Evacuation plan/safe routes – no comment

Jodeana Patterson

From: Lance Goddard <lancegoddard@mac.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 5, 2025 1:39 PM
To: Planning
Subject: Alternative/RV Dwelling Ordinance

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Gentlepersons,

I have already sent in my comments concerning this ill-advised plan. My concern is that the opinion of the attendees at the public meeting might be considered more than those who don't attend the meeting.

Regards,

Lance Goddard

Jodeana Patterson

From: Steve and Carolyn Battaini <crosjb@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Wednesday, November 5, 2025 2:10 PM
To: Planning
Cc: Jodeana Patterson
Subject: Re: PC 11.13.25 meeting agenda: Alternative/RV Dwelling Ordinance (PLN25-0084, ORD25-1 SR)
Attachments: 2025-11-13 PC Agenda.pdf

You don't often get email from crosjb@sbcglobal.net. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

I have written my opposition to the proposed ordinance, which you have in your records, and hopefully read and considered. I have not changed my opinion against the ordinance. My last words to this effect are: "Don't let temporary people do permanent damage." By that I mean if his alternative dwelling can do harm to our wonderful county. To keep the negative aspects in check, please add all appropriate safeguards for fire safety, environmental, and public safety with laws and people to man them. Otherwise you'll have a much bigger problem than what you are trying to resolve.....

Carolyn Battaini
14027 Liquidambar Ln
Grass Valley, Ca. 95945

On Tuesday, November 4, 2025 at 10:07:34 AM PST, Jodeana Patterson <jodeana.patterson@nevadacountyca.gov> wrote:

Good morning,

Please find attached the agenda for the upcoming Planning Commission public meeting on Thursday, November 13, at 1:30 p.m. The location will be 950 Maidu Avenue, Board of Supervisors Chambers.

Respectfully,

Jodeana Patterson

Jodeana Patterson

From: Melissa Clark <gvrider@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 6, 2025 7:11 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Rv as residence.

You don't often get email from gvrider@yahoo.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Hi there,

I am all for this passing. However it should be only if it is set up correctly. Power, septic etc. We have a neighbor who has lived in his for over two years. No septic, power running from a generator. Water pumped from a well via generator power.

Despite MANY neighbors the county has not enforced the current law. He allows everything to run into the creek. This is unacceptable and the county needs to enforce current laws.

His address is 21861 Golden Pines Court. Auburn 95602.

I truly hope the county abides by its laws and enforces them. I would really like a conversation with you regarding this situation.

Thank you,
Melissa Clark
530-575-8060

[Yahoo Mail: Search, Organize, Conquer](#)

Jodeana Patterson

From: cofnevco@gmail.com
Sent: Thursday, November 6, 2025 4:23 PM
To: Planning
Subject: Opposed to the proposed Alternative/RV Dwelling Ordinance

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Dear Chairman and Commissioners of the Nevada County Planning Commission,

Thank you for hearing my concerns regarding this proposed ordinance,

I have been a Nevada County resident for most of my life. In that time, I have been a 2-time business owner, property owner, improved property, including replacing an existing septic system, resold same property, and have been a large contributor of my earnings through the years to help the homeless in Nevada County improve their situation. This ordinance does not help the homeless, nor improve anybody's situation longterm. It is an attempt to change the economic status of the County by seeking cheaper rents by allowing substandard dwellings. I am highly concerned that the Planning Department is over zealous in seeking exemptions and speedy passage of this controversial County wide ordinance that could largely affect the safety and health of every citizen here. The proposal should require a proper Environmental Review with such far-reaching exemptions of basic building codes, not exempt it.

Without responding to public concerns provided or during Townhall meetings, the Planning Department remained completely silent, but then sent out the latest notice received, wherein Nevada County Planning seeks to claim this project exempt from any Environmental Review that would be normally be required by a plan that involves 1) any major density increase, or 2) have any effect on Environmental factors such as solid waste disposal. CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act) states that any project that might have a significant environmental impact (like a major increase in density) must undergo a thorough environmental review. A density revision that applies to the entire County is a major density increase. As stated, this project seeks our Board of Supervisors to supersede this fact, and vote in the exemption anyway. I count on the wisdom and experience of our Board of Supervisors to differentiate between a 'minor' and 'major' increase. Perhaps CalEPA should have been consulted for proper application of the exemption rather than just a referring to it.

Short of having performed an Environmental Study and Report for the proposed County-wide increase in density, the notice goes on to seek the BOS find the project exempt (from an Environmental Review), which is provided for projects that have minor alterations in land use with NO change in density. Nor will the exemption apply to any project with a slope of 20% or more. The ordinance has no limit to slope. In addition, Mr. Foss, himself, refers to Nevada County's trees, vegetation, and slopes as a difficulty in fighting fires in Nevada County during his interview with KCRA. How can both of those statements be true? At face value, it would appear that approval is sought for the Board of Supervisors to accept exemptions that are being claimed that clearly do not qualify as "minor". This project seeks NO modifications to existing septic systems for solid waste disposal before connecting this third dwelling unit, even though it could add usage similar to a 3 Bedroom home that was limited as adequate for only that main home's maximum volume, or have 24/7 access to shower, toilet, kitchen... all facilities that produce waste disposal. Is proper waste disposal of any kind no

longer required? While Placer County adopts stiffer building code standards to mitigate fire risk and efficiency, Nevada County lowers theirs.

Readily published documents for California state that a residential septic system size is often based on 150-200 gallons of wastewater per day for a 3-bedroom home. Sewage tanks in RVs can hold from 15 to 40 gallons of **concentrated** black water (sewage). Septic systems are designed to handle a continuous flow of wastewater, not the large sudden volumes dumped from RVs. If there is no upgrade to the septic required, it suggests that everybody's septic system is either much more than sufficient for more bedrooms than Nevada County has permitted us for, or this plan is inadequate in allowing NO modification for increased usage. The people you are proposing to live there really do exist, and use water and utilities just like all of us! Clearly, the 1000+ RV's that have already been established illegally within our county, if they are hooked up to a septic at all, are likely hooked up to a dwelling that has already been built with the number of rooms they were allowed with their existing septic system and leach field, and are currently misusing permitted improvements by increasing the load without increasing the capacity to handle the load. Although smaller in living space, the size of the RV does not change the water usage or septic needs per individual. If the RV can sleep 6 people (and some sleep 8), then it will produce at least as much wastewater and sewage as a 3-bedroom house or more. Adding that onto a septic designed to handle the needs of just the main house is a design for failure, by Nevada County's own usage standards. Additionally, because the RV has a holding tank, chemicals are used that destroy the beneficial bacteria that a septic system relies on to break down waste. Without the proper bacterial action, the waste in the septic tank will not decompose correctly, and may cause solids to build up faster, leading to a clog in the leach field. You have no even acknowledged the human use in your plan. Finally, bulk downloads to an existing septic can actually destroy a leach field.

There is no specification in regards to a water supply, except that it provides no less than 3 gpm. No specifications except for the amount of water supply. No codes to comply with in regards to plumbing?

The Draft Ordinance lists only extension cords for electrical supply!?! How can you think we're not lowering our standards with this ordinance? Any failure to acknowledge this as a fire danger is irresponsible. This plan looks to house people cheaper in tiny tin boxes with substandard construction, substandard water supplies, hazardous electrical situations, and high energy situations to stay warm in. This is such a short-sighted plan for Nevada County and its people, and it puts us all in danger. I wonder how quickly folks from our surrounding counties will be moving into Nevada County's new home model.

Nevada County has a high cost of living. Any publication will tell you that. But trying to lower our cost of living by pretending that RVs and camper trailers are residences is preposterous. RVs and trailers are not recognized as homes for continual habitation by either the DMV, the RV manufacturers, or Insurance agencies, as they are only recognized as vehicles. Life does not offer us the choice to live wherever we want we rely heavily on the generosity of those around us just to survive. We always have a choice to improve our lifestyle. Many of us who have been in our homes here in Nevada County for many decades can no longer afford it. It's a sad state of affairs, but our situation is not unique to Nevada County. Economics make it necessary for many to uproot and seek out areas that are affordable, as I am. But I am truly frightened that the County Seat has overstepped its purpose by lowering health and safety, and endangering the County at large.

In spite of our attempts to avoid what Study Area Assessments state that **"Alta Sierra has the most significant potential for a catastrophic wildfire event", (along with 4 other areas)** as cited by Supervisor Ed Scofield in October 2024, Alta Sierra is **STILL** trying to identify and improve the insufficient evacuation routes for fire events to serve the existing allowable density. There are still sections of our area that have not qualified for Firewise Certification, requiring cooperation from entire neighborhoods. After 4 years of extreme tree removal by PG&E, we're left at the mercy of Cal Fair Insurance from year to year, **IF** we are even offered the last option of insuring our homes with Cal Fair Fire Insurance (at the 500% increase to our premiums). It continues to make home ownership unaffordable to all of us, not just renters. Has there been any contact with Cal Fair regarding this new ordinance? Will they continue to insure our homes even after density increases and legalizing RVs and camper trailers as homes? Will Cal Fair pay on any claims that involve an

RV/camper used as a home? My mortgage requires insurance, and the lack thereof makes my mortgage subject to foreclosure. Why would Nevada County pass laws that jeopardize the financial safety of its citizens?

I am asking that our Board of Supervisors and our Planning Commissioner instruct our Planning Department to provide an Environmental Review to determine the real effects on Nevada County at large.

There are currently over 1000 illegal RV's now, and I see social media posts daily offering "RV parking" (sometimes several spots on the same parcel). Even attempting to correct these infractions would go a long way in decreasing our fire danger rating, and thus our cost of living in Nevada County, but there is no code enforcement unless citizens file individual complaints against particular properties, so that publicly proclaimed lawbreakers are not even afraid to proclaim their infractions. Advertisements for rental of legal RVs and campers appear on local social media daily.

There is no question of the substandard housing provided in an RV or camper trailer. That is why it is not ever suggested to be used for full-time habitation. Standard RVs are normally built with materials that are easily penetrated by rodents. Beside the health dangers of rodent infestation, the rodents chew on the easily accessible wiring and create dangerous situations for residents and neighbors of electrical shorts and fire danger. RVs are rarely salvageable after serious damages. They have fewer outlets and a smaller load capacity than a home, a common occurrence of loose connections, vibrations causing bad ground connections and propane system leaks, water leaks and mold, they are hard to keep warm, require continual use of space heaters in a small space, and have warnings against any unattended cooking. RVs and trailers are not homes, nor do they improve your property like a home or ADU. They are personal property assets, like cars, that begin to depreciate to zero value as soon as you put them in service.

I additionally have concerns for the tenants in these situations. As stated, these are the most "at risk" and without a surplus of money to cover an emergency. In response to the postings that have now become familiar is from families who are suddenly homeless because their "home" contained mold. Common problems involving any of the systems (plumbing, electrical, solid waste and freedom from molds) arise with RV's, and when they do, they often leave the RV unfixable and unusable. Those that provide these tenants with this kind of housing should understand the risk, and that they may be required to provide other provisions for their tenants until the home is replaced or repaired, in addition to any losses to their property.

The Planning Department heard from realtors that having a view of an RV from a neighbor's established home instantly reduced the value of that home \$10,000, along with its salability. That means that just by making this decision, your plan promises to make every home owner in the County that much poorer, and we're wondering how we can afford the next stage of our life. Is there a plan to offset this loss?

Your proposal has no size restrictions on any accessory structures to these "RVs", so that decks, porches, sheds, gazebos, and ramadas could all easily double and triple the footprint of the RV/camper itself, becoming quite large. None of these structures should be visible from the existing homes of adjoining neighbors. Those homes were built with a certain amount of privacy. Fencing and/or camouflage screens should be required if parking any of these units means they are visible from already existing homes, the owners who have already invested long-term into Nevada County.

The proposed permits could last for a period of two years, but inspections should take place annually, thereby covering the same length of time as that of DMV registrations, and most tenants' leases. If Nevada County is too busy to enforce it, they should not allow it. Additionally, such structures should require a separate liability policy for tenants' actions to protect neighbors.

The Ordinance of 2023 allowing ADU's and JADU's specifically excludes RV's because they are not designed for year-round occupancy, yet now you claim that statement is incorrect in less than a year... An Environmental Report should be just the thing to clear up the truth.

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to an issue that affects everyone's desire and ability to live here.

Jodeana Patterson

From: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: FW: FW: Local internet advertising

From: cofnevco <cofnevco@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 7, 2025 10:38 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance <AltRVOrdinance@nevadacountyca.gov>
Subject: RE: FW: Local internet advertising

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Thanks so much for that information. Very useful.

It's really unfortunate that you can't even see the site information for the hundreds of these RVs and trailers that are placed illegally, even though it's by one individual who advised the fact.

It's really a question of hope whether any of these meet any fire standards or aren't already burdened with mold or other safety issues. As space heaters are used in cramped quarters, I won't be sleeping very soundly when I think of the fire danger to themselves first, and the community at large.

Thank you again,

Charisse Lolli

Sent from my Galaxy

----- Original message -----

From: Alt RV Ordinance <AltRVOrdinance@nevadacountyca.gov>
Date: 11/7/25 10:17 AM (GMT-08:00)
To: cofnevco <cofnevco@gmail.com>
Subject: RE: FW: Local internet advertising

Hi again, Charisse:

Your concerns are valid and have been noted. Our Code Compliance agents are restricted to responding only to complaints submitted to them by members of the community. I've attached the Nevada County Code Compliance summary, which provides rationale for this model, which was recommended by a 2001-2002 Grand Jury report and adopted by the Board of Supervisors. *Please note that the fees noted in that summary are most likely outdated.*

I can also personally attest to the fact that I observe our Compliance team responding to complaints and issuing citations every day, since I share a workspace with them. If you are seeing specific violations to our municipal code occurring, I recommend submitting a complaint on their website or reaching out to them directly, and I promise you, they will respond.

Please let me know if I can answer any further questions.

Respectfully,

Jodeana Patterson

Administrative Assistant II

Clerk to the Planning Commission

Clerk to the Zoning Administrator



[Planning Department](#)

950 Maidu Ave, Suite 170

PO Box 599002, Nevada City, CA 95959-7902

Main 530.265.1222, Direct 530.470.2526

Jodeana.Patterson@nevadacountyca.gov

Hours 8:30-5:00 Monday – Friday (12:00 – 12:30 lunch)

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to which they are addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message.

From: cofnevco <cofnevco@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 7, 2025 9:57 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance <AltRVOrdinance@nevadacountyca.gov>
Subject: RE: FW: Local internet advertising

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

It was just another example of the daily listings on 6 or 7 local public Facebook pages offering rental of RV spots, RVs, or others that exist because there is no enforcement whatsoever even though it's always been illegal. It's just meant to show you that the community doesn't care what you vote for they're gonna do whatever they want, knowing that you won't do anything about it.

Thanks for letting me know you never saw this email.

Charisse Lolli

Sent from my Galaxy

----- Original message -----

From: Alt RV Ordinance <AltRVOrdinance@nevadacountyca.gov>

Date: 11/7/25 9:44 AM (GMT-08:00)

To: cofnevco@gmail.com

Subject: FW: Local internet advertising

Good morning, Charisse:

Apologies for the delay in responding to this email; it somehow ended up in our spam folder. I clicked on the link you provided, but was unable to view the content.

The County Code Compliance Department's enforcement model is strictly complaint-based; you may submit a formal complaint via our website: <https://www.nevadacountyca.gov/1306/Code-Compliance-Division>. Then scroll down to this button:



You may also reach out to our Code Compliance team directly at (530) 265-1222, ext. 4. Or you can email them at CodeCompliance@nevadacountyca.gov.

Please let me know if I can be of any further assistance.

Respectfully,

Jodeana Patterson

Administrative Assistant II

Clerk to the Planning Commission

Clerk to the Zoning Administrator



[Planning Department](#)

950 Maidu Ave. Suite 170

PO Box 599002, Nevada City, CA 95959-7902

Main 530.265.1222, Direct 530.470.2526

Jodeana.Patterson@nevadacountyca.gov

Hours 8:30-5:00 Monday – Friday (12:00 – 12:30 lunch)

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to which they are addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message.

From: cofnevco <cofnevco@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, October 11, 2025 8:20 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance <AltRVOrdinance@nevadacountyca.gov>
Subject: Local internet advertising

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/204Goodmor2957092697218/permalink/4301856330140605/?mibextid=rS40aB7S9Ucbxw6v>

Just an example of our local advertising...

Please pass this on to code enforcement. I'm happy to provide others as they are listed daily.

Thank you,

Sent from my Galaxy

Jodeana Patterson

From: Rona Seabrook <nonarona@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 7, 2025 4:21 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance; Heidi Hall; Lisa Swarthout; Hardy Bullock; Sue Hoek; Robb Tucker
Subject: RV/Alternative Housing Ordinance

You don't often get email from nonarona@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Dear Supervisors and Planning Commission,

Included is a letter I recently wrote to our Union Newspaper in Support of The RV/ Alternative Housing Ordinance.

Personally, I have a cozy, comfy, safe home. My property is under 3 acres. Even if it were over 3 acres, I have no interest in adding an alternative home.

I encourage you to support The Ordinance. I believe it is good for our fellow citizens, our county and ourselves.

I do have a question regarding the Alta Sierra area. How many homes are in Alta Sierra 'residential' and 'outlying' Alta Sierra? How many or what percentage of the properties are over 3 acres? Thank you.

Sincerely,
Rona Seabrook

After reading "Guardrails derailed in the RV Ordinance" (10/29/25) and "The Bird Feeder" (10/31/25), I felt sad. Both of these Other Voices op-eds made unproveable assumptions and catastrophic claims while ignoring the human benefits the Alternative/RV Housing Ordinance will provide to our fellow citizens.

For decades, alternative housing has been how many successful businesses and beloved community members first established themselves in Nevada County.

Right now, the alternative housing market is unregulated, offering neither landlords nor tenants legal protection.

The Alternative/RV Housing Ordinance is designed to set minimum health & safety standards for full-time living in RVs & trailers. This is not setting the stage for an imaginary land rush of undesirable people moving here in rundown RVs.

Thousands of people already live in RVs, trailers and converted buses throughout Nevada County. They are who will be most affected by the ordinance. Not newcomers.

Like the ordinances for owner-built, rural housing (Title25) and tiny homes on wheels, the costs and requirements of the Alternative/RV Housing Ordinance are so stringent that few can afford to comply - or even qualify to comply.

Regardless, to be against this ordinance is to be for maintaining the status quo of our steadily worsening homeless/housing crisis.

The ordinance is not designed for chronically homeless street people with substance abuse, mental health and/or antisocial issues. The No Place To Go Project is working on a safe camp for them.

The Alternative/RV Housing Ordinance is designed for housing-ready people: Friends and relatives of property owners, aging & disabled people, youth abandoned by their families, college students, low-wage essential workers, and the self-employed creatives – actors, writers, musicians, artists, poets, sculptors, muralists and other artisans who make Nevada County such a special place for us all.

Please support the Alternative/RV Housing Ordinance at the Planning Commission Thursday, Nov. 13, at 1:30 p.m. in the Rood Center in Nevada City. It's the right thing to do for our fellow human beings.

Rona Seabrook
Grass Valley

Jodeana Patterson

From: Pam Emick <emickster@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, November 8, 2025 1:12 PM
To: Planning
Subject: Proposal to allow neighborhood to be trashed

You don't often get email from emickster@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

There are areas that trailer parks are prevalent. That is necessary I can see. Neighborhoods that have fought (almost completely against the county) to protect the value of our property and neighborhood has been thwarted by extremely poor choices the county makes. The degrading decisions forces on these neighborhoods needs to be considered for a law suit stating the Nevada County is lowering the values in private neighborhoods. I can see that it does not affect you personally so does not matter. What you FAIL to realize is you should NOT be representing Yourselves, but rather the county members. Not just the less fortunate and lazy but one would think that retaining the contributing members would be a smart move.

Why not try for once to make Nevada County an attractive location to live.

Please keep your low values out of our neighborhood!!! You have no business destroying the value of our County. If you feel that you don't need to protect the people get the Hell out of politics in our county and bring your poor choices back to the city. We live out here to get away from politicians with the values you propose.

Pam Emick

Jodeana Patterson

From: Jeanne Franklin <jeanneaf@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, November 8, 2025 5:35 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Fw: Please reject RV's as Permanent Housing
Attachments: IMG_1188.jpg; Public Comments for Nov 13-2025 Planning Commission Meeting (1).pdf

You don't often get email from jeanneaf@yahoo.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Please see below email and confirm receipt.

Thank-you.

Jeanne Franklin

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Jeanne Franklin <jeanneaf@yahoo.com>
To: heidi.hall@nevadacountyca.gov <heidi.hall@nevadacountyca.gov>; hardy.bullock@nevadacountyca.gov <hardy.bullock@nevadacountyca.gov>; lisa.swarthout@nevadacountyca.gov <lisa.swarthout@nevadacountyca.gov>; sue.hoek@nevadacountyca.gov <sue.hoek@nevadacountyca.gov>; robb.tucker@nevadacountyca.gov <robb.tucker@nevadacountyca.gov>; clerkofboard@nevadacountyca.gov <clerkofboard@nevadacountyca.gov>
Sent: Saturday, November 8, 2025 at 02:35:19 PM PST
Subject: Please reject RV's as Permanent Housing

Dear Planning Commissioners -

As a homeowner in Nevada County, I am asking that you vote against the RV ordinance.

My reasons are simple; we have seen in other CA counties how lowering the permission structure and allowing RVs to be full-time residences destroys the social fabric. Once word gets out around CA that Nevada County allows full-time living in campers, those who are currently living in RVs are not going to pay attention to the 3-acre limitations or the hooking up to electrical and septic requirements in the draft ordinance. The county doesn't have the resources to police the hundreds of people who are living illegally in RVs now, so how will that improve when we get more of this flouting of the laws?

I am a homeowner against THE PROPOSED RV'S AS PERMANENT HOUSING ORDINANCE.

I have countlessly contacted our County Compliance department, filled out "anonymous" complaints as to not have issues with the only family on our road (22747 Swenson Ravine) and the Compliance complaints come back with "unfounded".

"The property owner states nobody is living in the RV's, that they "get together in them at night to drink beers". See attached picture where a person skedaddled into the trailer once our phone started to take pictures during the day.

Unless I can support my complaints of multitude cars and people going up and down our road even the wee hours of the morning (I only know this due to taking our puppy out on potty breaks) can this be warranted as our county cannot survey complaints that they deem "unwarranted".

IF our county thinks RV Housing is "good for the community" think again. WHAT manpower does the county have to ensure Porta Potties are present, being cleaned out and most importantly electrical is installed vs a daisy chain of cords from primary residence to a multitude of RV's? Fire is a HUGE concern as is waste "dumping".

Our neighbor does NOT pay for garbage pick up and I have never seen any sign of trailers on the property having a service to remove waste.

I stand behind the following already addressed to our board of supervisors sent in from another concerned resident.

Please vote No. Thank you for your consideration.

Jeanne Franklin

In January Nevada Co passed the Tiny Houses on Wheels as Permanent Housing Ordinance. The county website clarifies that the ordinance does not permit RVs to be used as permanent housing because RVs are not intended to be used for long-term occupancy and are built to different standards. This distinction ensures that housing options meet the safety and durability standards required for permanent living. So what changed? RVs are still notorious for inadequate wiring; an overloaded circuit (or kitchen fire) can engulf an RV in minutes. RVs do not protect occupants from dangerous smoke; they lack the insulation and seals of a permanent dwelling. During an evacuation, what happens when RVs clog our narrow winding roads? No one will be stopped and cited during an active evacuation. If you support this ordinance, you are not serious about fire safety in Nevada County...or public health. The RV ordinance offers a few "hypothetical" guardrails to protect the environment and our quality of life, but it allows exceptions to almost every guardrail. Hooking up to septic or sewer lines—too burdensome and expensive! Undefined workarounds will be allowed. These will undoubtedly include portable sewage tanks; we'll have to rely on folks struggling financially to pay to have full sewage tanks pumped rather than desperately draining black water after dark. Such draining, which is very likely, will contribute to contaminated soils and contaminated underlying or adjacent water sources such as wells, creeks, and rivers. What about residents whose only water source is a well? Do we have a right to clean drinking water? If portable sewage tanks are appropriate for a residential community, why not allow them for all homes in the county? A dedicated electrical box for the RV has also been deemed too burdensome by supporters. Though a gas generator is not supposed to be the primary power source, the ordinance sets no limit to the number of hours RV tenants can run a gas generator. So when their roll-up solar panel runs out of juice, neighbors (and ditch/canal trail hikers) will listen to loud gas generators for hours on end. No mandatory utility hookups seems like permanent camping to me. If you turn the unincorporated county into a glorified campground then I'd like my property taxes to reflect that. Currently they do not. Many folks already live illegally in RVs, even on smaller parcels, because Code Enforcement is mostly absent—even when neighbors complain. Countless property owners have received the Complaint "Unfounded" email, lacking any details of how that determination was made. What kind of "sewage arrangements" do these illegally-occupied RVs have? Outhouses? Chemical toilets? Where is our Environmental Health Department? Let's face it—without enforcement, any guardrails are irrelevant. If this ordinance passes, a handful may spend the time and money on permits, but the majority will not. Who will bother them? No one. This ordinance will be an open invitation for more RV folks to flock here because we're desperate enough to achieve our affordable housing numbers by simply redefining an RV as a Permanent Dwelling. How innovative--normalizing camping as permanent living! If we already have hundreds of folks living illegally in RVs, imagine how many we'll have when it's legal. In reality you'll be creating as many problems as you solve. Can property owners get liability coverage for an RV rental? Not likely. They could lose everything when a tenant trips on an extension cord. Will RV-lords charge tenants fair rents or might some take advantage of folks with marginal credit? Yet they escape the additional property tax assessments that befall those who build ADUs to real permanent dwelling standards. I don't know what it's like to be housing insecure...but I do know what it's like to work fulltime for over 30 years. I know what it's like to move for more-affordable housing. I know what it's like to carefully review property codes and zoning before making the biggest investment of my life. When the Board of Supervisors rejected Rise Gold's mining permit, one reason cited was current zoning and regulations. Will you continue to respect regulations and zoning? Homeowners beyond the exempt enclaves of incorporated Nevada City, incorporated Grass Valley, the Town of Truckee, and outside the gated communities with enforced HOA's,

are counting on you to respect the regulations and zoning in place when we made the biggest investment of our lifetime.

Jodeana Patterson

From: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: FW: Proposed ousing ordinance Alternative Dwelling Ordinance (PLN25-0084, ORD25-1 SR)

-----Original Message-----

From: Joseph Lisoni <wtrmtr@earthlink.net>
Sent: Tuesday, November 11, 2025 8:19 PM
To: Heidi Hall <Heidi.Hall@nevadacountyca.gov>
Subject: Proposed ousing ordinance Alternative Dwelling Ordinance (PLN25-0084, ORD25-1 SR)

[You don't often get email from wtrmtr@earthlink.net. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Heidi Hall Supervisor: We the undersigned residents of Nevada County write to encourage you to VOTE NO on the proposed Housing Ordinance captioned above. The housing issue is serious, but the housing programs newly adopted need time to succeed before introducing the subject RV Housing Ordinance. Please VOTE NO on the proposed Housing Ordinance! Thank you for your service to Nevada County! Joseph Louis Lisoni, Esq. Gail Landtbom Lisoni, Esq.

Jodeana Patterson

From: Ursula Donofrio <ursdonofrio@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 12, 2025 1:14 PM
To: Danny Milman; Steve French; Terence McAteer; John Foley; Jo Garst; Clerk of Board; Alt RV Ordinance; Heidi Hall; Hardy Bullock; Lisa Swarthout; Sue Hoek; Robb Tucker
Subject: PLEASE VOTE NO ON RVs AS PERMANENT HOUSING

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

<https://www.sierrathread.com/thread/rv-ordinance-nevada-county-supervisor-planning>

The RV Ordinance Isn't Compassion — It's a Step Backward

Nov 7

Written By [Mac Young](#)

Nevada County is full of people who care deeply about this place. We look out for one another. When a neighbor's fence falls down in a storm, we show up. When someone's barn roof leaks, a pickup truck full of tools appears before sunrise. We solve problems together.

And we are all aware of our current housing struggle. People who grew up here are being priced out. Seniors can't keep up with rising costs. Young working families are being pushed toward Sacramento or Reno. Nobody denies that something needs to change.

But the proposed RV Dwelling Ordinance is not the solution. It does not fix housing. It does not make living here more affordable. It does not give people stability. What it does is normalize survival living and call it housing policy.

We deserve better than that—and so do the people most impacted by this crisis.

Let's talk plainly. RVs are not houses. They were never meant to be. They are made for camping trips, seasonal travel, vacation weekends, and temporary stays. Their insulation is thin. Their electrical systems are light-duty. Their roofs are not built for our winters. Their materials are flammable. Their plumbing systems were never designed for year-round use.

No ordinance changes those physical facts.

And yet the County is proposing to classify RVs as long-term dwellings in rural neighborhoods, provided owners go through a stack of permits, upgrades, inspections, and renewals every two years. On paper, this may look orderly. In real life, it's a program built on assumptions that simply do not reflect reality on the ground.

The RV ordinance will harm people in our community. Already, 17,000 plaintiffs who lived in FEMA trailers after [Hurricane Katrina](#) have alleged damaging health consequences, from respiratory problems to dozens of deaths and cancer cases, in a federal class-action lawsuit naming 64 trailer makers and the federal government. Many of the plaintiffs were drawn from the roughly 350,000 people who unsuccessfully filed claims against the Army Corps of Engineers over the levee breaches that flooded New Orleans. Living in a trailer is detrimental to the health of our neighbors and not a long-term solution to homelessness.

Consider the fire danger. We live in one of the most wildfire-prone regions in the state. Fire districts are already stretched thin. Many rural roads are narrow, steep, and difficult to evacuate under best conditions. RV siding ignites easily. Propane tanks rupture. Embers can take a unit in minutes.

Approving more combustible dwellings in forested zones isn't compassionate. It's risky.

And then there's the winter problem. Anyone who has lived above 3,000 feet knows what snow load means: heavy, wet, crushing weight. RVs cannot handle that load. The County knows this—they included a requirement for engineered snow shelters or "ramadas" to protect RV roofs. That means if someone wants to live in an RV in our climate, they have to build a building to protect the RV.

If you need to build a building to make your "housing unit" safe, that "housing unit" is not safe.

Now let's look at cost—because this ordinance is being marketed as an "affordable housing solution."

To legally live in an RV under this ordinance, a homeowner will have to:

- Upgrade water infrastructure or well systems
- Expand septic capacity or install new wastewater solutions
- Install dedicated electrical systems
- Prepare stabilized building pads
- Pay permit and inspection fees every two years
- And again—at many elevations—construct a snow-rated shelter structure

Anyone who can afford all of that can absolutely afford a small permanent home, cottage, modular home, or an owner-built Title 25 unit.

This ordinance does not lower housing costs. It shifts them into a different form, and in doing so, creates an illusion of affordability while locking vulnerable people into unstable shelter.

This ordinance will directly affect the people already struggling the most—seniors on fixed incomes, low-income families, young adults trying to remain in the community they love. These are the people who will be told, "Here, now you have a home," when what they actually have is a vehicle—one storm, one fire, one mechanical failure away from displacement.

That is not dignity. That is not stability. And it is not a reflection of who we are as a county.

If we truly want to support the people who live here, we should be focusing on:

- Streamlined, lower-cost small home building options
- Pre-approved building plans
- Fee reductions for full-time resident construction
- Title 25 owner-built rural cabins and cottages
- Modular and factory-built home legalization without red tape

These are real, permanent, rooted solutions—ones that build equity, generational stability, and pride of place.

Nevada County should not respond to the housing crisis by lowering the standard of what we call a home. We should respond by making it easier to build real homes.

We can do this. But it starts by being honest about what this ordinance really is—and what it is not.

For the safety, well-being, and dignity of our residents, I urge the Nevada County Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors to vote NO on ORD25-1.

Nevada County is worth protecting. And our people deserve housing that is worthy of calling home.

[Nevada County Board of Supervisors Planning Commission housing homeless](#)
[Mac Young](#)

Mac is a proud graduate of Bear River High School, Class of 1992. He is a member of Sierra Thread.

Jodeana Patterson

From: Bill Zoller <zollerbill@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 13, 2025 7:02 AM
To: Jodeana Patterson
Subject: Re: Notice of Public Hearing (for PC 11/13/25 meeting): Alternative/RV Dwelling Ordinance (PLN25-0084; ORD25-1)

You don't often get email from zollerbill@yahoo.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

I strongly oppose this ordinance. Please don't adopt it.

Bill Zoller
116 Starling Circle, Grass Valley CA

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone](#)

On Friday, October 24, 2025, 9:24 AM, Jodeana Patterson <Jodeana.Patterson@nevadacountyca.gov> wrote:

Good morning,

Please see the attached Notice of Public Hearing of the Planning Commission on Thursday, November 13, at 1:30 p.m. for a proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment to add Section 12.03.151 to the Nevada County Code Title 12 Zoning Regulations to establish health and safety standards, permitting and certification requirements, and site development standards allowing for recreational vehicles as an additional residential unit on developed properties subject to the permitting and standards outlined in the draft Ordinance, for your review and comment.

For questions, please contact Planning Director Brian Foss at (530) 265-1256 or Brian.Foss@nevadacountyca.gov. Please submit any comments to AltRVordinance@nevadacountyca.gov.

Respectfully,

Public Comment & Key Points – Nevada County RV Dwelling Ordinance (ORD25-1)

Submitted by: Michael James Taylor

Date: November 13th, 2025

Public Comment

Chair and Commissioners,

The Planning Commission exists as the firewall between staff and policy — the checkpoint that ensures Nevada County’s land-use decisions align with the General Plan, building standards, and common sense. When a proposal drifts from those principles, it’s this Commission’s duty to stop it and send it back for correction. The proposed RV Dwelling Ordinance is one of those moments.

Let’s start with a basic fact: RVs and Tiny Homes on Wheels (THOWs) are both DMV-licensed vehicles, not permanent dwellings. They are built to vehicle codes, not building codes. The County’s effort to turn them into permanent housing by layering exceptions, renewals, and permits is not planning — it’s patchwork policy.

Nevada County already has a clear path to permanent housing through its Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) ordinance. That’s the appropriate tool for adding long-term residential capacity with a concrete foundation. THOWs and RVs, on the other hand, should remain what they are — temporary, movable shelters.

If the County truly wants to provide flexibility and affordability, the solution isn’t to redefine vehicles as houses; it’s to clarify how they can be temporarily and safely accommodated on properly prepared, permitted pads.

That means:

1. Permitted RV/THOW pads that are permanent improvements — with clear standards for grading, setbacks, surface materials, and drainage.
2. Safe utility connections — approved electrical, potable water, and wastewater hookups.
3. Simple, temporary permits allowing DMV-licensed RVs or THOWs to occupy those pads for limited periods, such as two years.
4. Conversion clarity — if someone wants a permanent residence, the path is already there: build or convert through the ADU program and the California Building Standards Code.

This approach keeps housing policy coherent, enforceable, and consistent with public safety and infrastructure planning. It also protects homeowners’ flexibility without creating new enforcement headaches or health hazards.

The current RV ordinance, by contrast, is riddled with contradictions. It normalizes substandard, combustible structures as housing in wildfire-prone areas, requires “snow

shelters” just to make RVs livable, and will burden staff with an unmanageable, permit-renewal treadmill.

Approving it would lower Nevada County’s housing standards and dilute the meaning of “permanent home.” That isn’t compassion — it’s confusion.

I urge this Commission to fulfill its oversight role and reject the ordinance as written. Send it back to the Planning Department with direction to build from a real foundation: a pad-based permitting system that honors safety, consistency, and the County’s own existing housing framework.

Thank you.

Michael James Taylor

Key Points Summary

1. The Planning Commission's Duty

- The Planning Commission is the firewall between County staff and policy drift.
- Its responsibility is to ensure that all proposed ordinances align with the General Plan, building codes, and sound planning principles.
- When a proposal departs from those standards, it must be sent back for correction.

2. The Core Problem

- RVs and Tiny Homes on Wheels (THOWs) are DMV-licensed vehicles, not permanent dwellings.
- Attempting to redefine them as long-term housing creates contradictions with building, health, and fire codes.
- The proposed ordinance introduces unnecessary complexity, inconsistent permitting, and unmanageable enforcement burdens.

3. Safety and Structural Risks

- RVs are not built for permanent occupancy: thin insulation, light-duty electrical and plumbing systems, and flammable materials.
- Fire danger and snow load risks are significant in Nevada County; requiring a "snow shelter" to make an RV safe underscores its unsuitability as housing.
- Approving more combustible dwellings in wildfire zones endangers both residents and first responders.

4. There Is Already a Path to Permanent Housing

- Nevada County already provides a clear, regulated route for long-term housing through its Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) program.
- ADUs are permanent, inspected, insurable, built on foundation structures that add real housing capacity.
- THOWs and RVs should remain temporary, movable shelters, not be reclassified as permanent homes.

5. The Constructive Solution – A Pad-Based Approach

- Return the ordinance to staff and rebuild it around a permitted pad system that provides clarity, flexibility, and safety.
- Key elements:
 - Permanent, permitted pads with clear standards for grading, setbacks, surface materials, and drainage.
 - Utility requirements: safe electrical, potable water, and wastewater hookups.
 - Temporary use permits allowing a DMV-licensed RV or THOW to occupy the pad for a limited term (e.g., two years).
 - Conversion path: permanent dwellings should follow existing ADU and Building Code procedures.

6. The Right Path Forward

- The current draft should be rejected and remanded to Planning staff with direction to:
 - Eliminate conflicting standards between RVs, THOWs, and ADUs.
 - Clarify temporary use permits through a standardized pad model.
 - Align all housing ordinances with existing building, health, and fire safety codes.

Summary:

This ordinance lowers Nevada County's housing standards and creates a false sense of affordability while increasing risk and confusion. The Commission's responsibility is to protect the County from poorly conceived regulation and insist on clear, enforceable policy built on solid ground.

Jodeana Patterson

Administrative Assistant II

Clerk to the Planning Commission

Clerk to the Zoning Administrator



950 Maidu Ave. Suite 170

PO Box 599002, Nevada City, CA 95959-7902

Main 530.265.1222, Direct 530.470.2526

Jodeana.Patterson@nevadacountyca.gov

Hours 8:30-5:00 Monday – Friday (12:00 – 12:30 lunch)

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to which they are addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message.

Jodeana Patterson

From: Debbie Porter <imreel2@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 13, 2025 7:41 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Today's hearing on homes on wheels

You don't often get email from imreel2@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Good morning. Please do not support the ordinance to allow anything on wheels to be used as permanent housing. At the very least exclude Golden Oaks Association from allowing this. We are private roads not designed for more use. Most properties use wells. Fire is our very real worry. It makes more sense for the county to create a "camping" area that provides water, power, sewage and rules. Please do not force this problem on rural neighborhoods.
Debbie Porter
10701 Sharmiden Way, Grass Valley, CA 95949

Jodeana Patterson

From: John Mills <jcmills01@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 13, 2025 10:09 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Cc: bajabon@gmail.com; stevbelch@yahoo.com; sandy belch
Subject: RV Housing Ordinance

You don't often get email from jcmills01@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

From: John Mills <jcmills01@gmail.com>
Subject: RV Housing Ordinance
Date: November 13, 2025 at 10:02:24 AM PST
To: "AltRVOrdinance@nevadacounty.gov" <AltRVOrdinance@NevadaCounty.gov>
Cc: "bajabon@gmail.com" <bajabon@gmail.com>, "stevbelch@yahoo.com" <stevbelch@yahoo.com>, sandy belch <sandy1belch@yahoo.com>

I am opposed to this ordinance. There are no guardrails in place to keep occupants from dumping directly onto property for street where they squat. We have fallen behind in supervision of our already impacted community of residents, and overwhelmed by the homeless individuals who already take advantage of our generosity as a community.

My husband and I have owned rental properties for many years, 3 of them are low income properties. The costs we incur to just clean up after our low income tenants triples the cost of their deposit, at the least. This new policy the county is hoping to adopt will only draw more transients and I know very few people who are willing to do the dirty work of dumping and cleaning up their left behind mess (think of the abandoned non running vehicles left behind too!!!).

Please protect this community. We have been residents of Nevada County since 1985. We bought 2 of our properties in 1974 and 1976.

I am a firm no.

Thanks for reading this and considering the implications.

Caroline Mills

15797 Shannon Way
Nevada City, CA

Jodeana Patterson

Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Clarification Needed on Disposal of Dilapidated Travel Trailers and RVs=\$5000?!?

From: Paul Elias <ppcpaule2000@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, November 17, 2025 7:59 AM

To: Rachel Haines <rhaines@wm.com>

Cc: David Garcia <David.Garcia@nevadacountyca.gov>; Trisha Tillotson <Trisha.Tillotson@nevadacountyca.gov>; Lisa Swarthout <Lisa.Swarthout@nevadacountyca.gov>; shelley.romrielle@nevadacountyca.gov; Alexander Zalasky <azalasky@wm.com>; Planning <Planning@nevadacountyca.gov>; Alison Lehman <Alison.Lehman@nevadacountyca.gov>

Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Clarification Needed on Disposal of Dilapidated Travel Trailers and RVs=\$5000?!?

You don't often get email from ppcpaule2000@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Thanks for the research and information Rachel.

So when GV city mgr Tim Kiser said a \$5000 "security-deposit" is needed in the RV/Trailer ordinance allowing year-round, permanent living, because that's about the cost to haul off, and tow to a out-of-county landfill and pay for disposal.

Thanks,

Paul Elias

Sent from my iPhone

On Nov 14, 2025, at 10:13 AM, Haines, Rachel <rhaines@wm.com> wrote:

Good morning Paul,

I spoke with the transfer station manager Eric regarding this clarification and RVs, or vehicles (automobiles and trucks) are too big for MRTS and should be sent to wrecker or a landfill where they bull dozer them in the active face.

Small Trailers and boats can come to MRTS however, any small trailers or boats will also need a DMV Junk slip that must accompany the trailer or boat if it has ever been registered. (Except small rafts, canoes and or kayaks)

All Appliances, Generators, Water Heater, propane tanks, bulbs, TV's ETC. and any liquids must be removed before hand. The trailer or boat will be charged as MSW as well as charged for the tires.

Rachel Haines

Public Sector Services Manager

C: (530) 906-2871

rhaines@wm.com

WM – Northern California/Nevada Area

13083 Grass Valley Ave

Grass Valley, Ca 95945



Access WM 24/7
with [My WM](#)



From: Paul Elias <pccpaule2000@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, November 14, 2025 9:31 AM

To: Haines, Rachel <rhaines@wm.com>

Cc: David Garcia <David.Garcia@nevadacountyca.gov>; Trisha Tillotson

<Trisha.Tillotson@nevadacountyca.gov>; Lisa Swarthout <Lisa.swarthout@nevadacountyca.gov>;
shelley.romrielle@nevadacountyca.gov

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Clarification Needed on Disposal of Dilapidated Travel Trailers and RVs

Hello Rachel -

Hope you're doing well.

I attended the Planning Commission meeting yesterday afternoon regarding the RV-travel trailer living ordinance. During the discussion, I believe there may have been a misstatement by County Code Compliance staff suggesting that dilapidated travel trailers—possibly including RVs—could be hauled to MRTS for disposal, making this a NC-Waste Management issue.

Could you please clarify whether travel trailers are considered MSW for disposal at MRTS? I already understand the answer as it relates to RVs, but I would appreciate confirmation specific to travel trailers.

Additionally, what options does a property owner have countywide for disposing of a trashed travel trailer or RV? My understanding is that no junkyard in the county accepts either, due to their low scrap value.

Thank you, and I look forward to your response.

Paul Elias

District 3

Sent from my iPhone

Jodeana Patterson

Subject: FW: Letter to Editor: Enforcement and Fire Risk Cannot Be Ignored in RV Ordinance

From: Paul Elias <ppcpaule2000@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, November 14, 2025 10:06 AM

To: Planning <Planning@nevadacountyca.gov>

Subject: Fwd: Letter to Editor: Enforcement and Fire Risk Cannot Be Ignored in RV Ordinance

You don't often get email from ppcpaule2000@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Please also fwd to Planning commissioners.

Thxs!

Paul

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Paul Elias <ppcpaule2000@gmail.com>

Date: November 14, 2025 at 9:46:24 AM PST

To: planning@nevadacountyca.gov, Lisa Swarthout <Lisa.swarthout@nevadacountyca.gov>, Alison Lehman <Alison.Lehman@nevadacountyca.gov>, Heidi Hall <Heidi.Hall@nevadacountyca.gov>, Trisha Tillotson <Trisha.Tillotson@nevadacountyca.gov>, Hardy Bullock <Hardy.Bullock@nevadacountyca.gov>, Tom Ivy <tivy@cityofgrassvalley.com>, Sue Hoek <sue.hoek@co.nevada.ca.us>, Robb Tucker <Robb.Tucker@nevadacountyca.gov>

Cc: David Brennan <dd4brennan@hotmail.com>

Subject: Fwd: Letter to Editor: Enforcement and Fire Risk Cannot Be Ignored in RV Ordinance

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Paul Elias <ppcpaule2000@gmail.com>

Date: November 14, 2025 at 7:28:36 AM PST

To: Readers The Union <readers@theunion.com>

Subject: Fwd: Letter to Editor: Enforcement and Fire Risk Cannot Be Ignored in RV Ordinance

Here's revised edit adding Commissioner McAteer was a no vote. Thank you!

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Paul Elias <ppcpaule2000@gmail.com>
Date: November 14, 2025 at 7:01:11 AM PST
To: Readers The Union <readers@theunion.com>
Cc: ppcpaule2000@gmail.com
Subject: Letter to Editor: Enforcement and Fire Risk Cannot Be Ignored in RV Ordinance

To the Editor:

The recent Planning Commission's 3–2 vote, recommending an ordinance to allow permanent RV/Travel Trailer living on 3 acres or more, may appear to address our housing challenges, but it overlooks the most important fact raised during the hearing: the county openly admits it cannot enforce the ordinance.

Code enforcement staff stated they are complaint-driven, understaffed, with only four officers, and already dealing with 351 open cases. They also acknowledged that if a landowner with an already illegal RV or trailer begins the compliance process and then stops because of cost, “there's not much” the county can do.

Despite this, Commissioner Danny Milman said enforcement isn't the Commission's concern. But land-use decisions are meaningless if the county lacks the capacity to enforce them. Passing rules we know can't be applied on the ground isn't planning—it's wishful thinking. It's no different than leaving your door unlocked and saying break-ins are only a police problem.

Commissioner Terry McAteer, a no vote, was correct: once property owners discover the real costs of compliance—utilities, grading, septic, driveway standards—many will simply “skirt the county.” Staff

essentially confirmed they could do so with little consequence.

This doesn't create a pathway to compliance; it creates more unregulated RV living in our rural areas.

Just as concerning, it was revealed no fire district submitted comments on the draft ordinance that will increase ignition sources (generators, propane, RV systems) and human activity in some of the most wildfire-prone zones in the state.

Nevada County absolutely needs creative housing solutions. But they must be practical, enforceable, and fire-safe. This ordinance, as written, does not meet that standard. Before moving forward, the county must address enforcement capacity, wildfire risk, and the very real likelihood that the rules will be ignored.

Good intentions alone do not make good policy.

Sincerely,

Paul Elias

District 3

Sent from my iPhone

11-8-25
Saturday
Gross Valley

Terence McAtie
Planning Commissioner
District III

Enclosed find a copy of a compelling Editorial I read in "The Union" on October 29th of this year.

The author makes a very compelling case for the need for "Guardrails" to protect residents of Nevada County from serious problems from the loss of significant law dealing with the subject of our County's RV population.

Please give the author your serious consideration!

Joseph Louis Lisone, ESQ.
Gail Landman LICM, ESQ.

11-8-25

Saturday

Gross Valley

Steve French

District 11

Planning Commission

Enclosed find a copy of a compelling Editorial I read in "The Union" on October 29th of this year.

The author makes a very compelling case for the need for "Guardrails" to protect residents of Nevada County from serious problems from the loss of significant law dealing with the subject of our County's RV population.

Please give the author your serious consideration!

Joseph Louis Disoni, ESQ.
Gail Sandborn Disoni, ESQ.

11-8-25
Saturday
Gross Valley

Danny Milman
District 1
Planning Commission

Enclosed find a copy of a compelling Editorial I read in "The Union" on October 29th of this year.

The author makes a very compelling case for the need for "Guardrails" to protect residents of Nevada County from serious problems from the loss of significant law dealing with the subject of our County's RV population.

Please give the author your serious consideration!

Joseph Louis Lisone, ESQ.
Gail Jonathan Lisone, ESQ.

11-8-25
Saturday
Gross Valley

Jo Gaust
Planning Commission
DISTRICT IV

Enclosed find a copy of a compelling Editorial I read in "The Union" on October 29th of this year.

The author makes a very compelling case for the need for "Guardrails" to protect residents of Nevada County from serious problems from the loss of significant laws dealing with the subject of our County's RV population.

Please give the author your serious consideration!

Joseph Louis Lisone, ESQ.
Gail Sandborn Lisone, ESQ.

11-8-25
Saturday
Cross Valley

John Foley
Planning Commissioner
District IV

Enclosed find a copy of a compelling Editorial I read in "The Union" on October 29th of this year.

The author makes a very compelling case for the need for "Guardrails" to protect residents of Nevada County from serious problems from the loss of significant law dealing with the subject of our County's RV population.

Please give the author your serious consideration!

Joseph Louis Lisone, ESQ.
Gail Sandborn Lisone, ESQ.

IDEAS & OPINIONS

THE UNION

SCOTT CONLEY, Publisher | sconley@theunion.com 530-477-4201
ELIAS FUNEZ, Editor | efunez@theunion.com 530-477-4230
editor@theunion.com

The opinions expressed on this page are those of the individual authors who express them and do not necessarily reflect the views of The Union. If you would like to share your thoughts with The Union, email letters@theunion.com. See policies below for information.

Guardrails derailed in the RV Ordinance

In January, Nevada County passed the Tiny Houses on Wheels as Permanent Housing Ordinance. The county website clarifies that the ordinance does not permit RVs to be used as permanent housing because RVs are not intended to be used for long-term occupancy and are built to different standards. This distinction ensures that housing options meet the safety and durability standards required for permanent living. So what changed?

RVs are still notorious for inadequate wiring; an overloaded circuit (or kitchen fire) can engulf an RV in minutes. RVs do not protect occupants from dangerous smoke; they lack the insulation and seals of a permanent dwelling. During an evacuation, what happens when RVs clog our narrow winding roads? No one will be stopped and cited during an active evacuation. If you support this ordinance, you are not serious about fire safety in Nevada County...or public health.

OTHER VOICES *Ursula Donofrio*

mostly absent—even when neighbors complain. Countless property owners have received the Complaint “Unfounded” email, lacking any details of how that determination was made. What kind of “sewage arrangements” do these illegally-occupied RVs have? Outhouses? Chemical toilets? Where is our Environmental Health Department?

Let’s face it—without enforcement, any guardrails are irrelevant. If this ordinance passes, a handful may spend the time and money on permits, but the majority will not. Who will bother them? No one. This ordinance will be an open invitation for more RV folks to flock here because we’re desperate enough to achieve our affordable housing numbers by simply redefining an RV as a Permanent Dwelling. How innovative—normalizing camping as permanent living! Mission accom-

ty...or public health.

The RV Ordinance offers a few "hypothetical" guardrails to protect the environment and our quality of life, but it allows exceptions to almost every guardrail. Hooking up to septic or sewer lines—too burdensome and expensive! Undefined workarounds will be allowed. These will undoubtedly include portable sewage tanks; we'll have to rely on folks struggling financially to pay to have full sewage tanks pumped rather than desperately draining black water after dark. What about We the People whose only water source is a well? Do we have a right to clean drinking water? If portable sewage tanks are appropriate for a residential community, why not allow them for all homes in the county?

A dedicated electrical box for the RV has also been deemed too burdensome by supporters. Though a gas generator is not supposed to be the primary power source, the ordinance sets no limit to the number of hours RV tenants can run a gas generator. So when their roll-up solar panel runs out of juice, neighbors (and ditch/canal trail hikers) will listen to loud gas generators for hours on end. No mandatory utility hookups seems like permanent camping to me. If you turn the unincorporated county into a glorified campground then I'd like my property taxes to reflect that. Currently they do not.

Many folks already live illegally in RVs, even on smaller parcels, because Code Enforcement is

living! Mission accomplished! If we already have hundreds of folks living illegally in RVs, imagine how many we'll have when it's legal.

In reality you'll be creating as many problems as you solve. Can property owners get liability coverage for an RV rental? Not likely. They could lose everything when a tenant trips on an extension cord. Will RV-lords charge tenants fair rents or might some take advantage of folks with marginal credit? Yet they escape the additional property tax assessments that befall those who build ADUs to permanent dwelling standards.

I don't know what it's like to be housing insecure...but I do know what it's like to work full-time for over 30 years in non-arts-based jobs. I know what it's like to move for more-affordable housing. I know what it's like to carefully review property codes and zoning before making the biggest investment of my life. When the Board of Supervisors rejected Rise Gold's mining permit, one reason was current zoning and regulations. Will they continue to respect regulations and zoning? If rules, environmental integrity, water quality, community aesthetics, and quality of life no longer matter, then revisit the Rise Gold permit request. If we're desperate enough to consider the RV Ordinance, we really need those good-paying jobs!

*Ursula Donofrio
is a homeowner in
unincorporated Nevada
County.*

"A company with blood on its hands."

A True Story

WHERE THE RUBBER MEETS THE ROAD

The Bridgestone/Firestone Conspiracy
of Death & Destruction

Joseph Louis Lisoni and Gail Landtbom Lisoni

WTRMTR
1606 Mulberry Drive
Grass Valley, CA 95945

Mill City Press Authors, Attorneys of the Bridgestone/Firestone Recall, Share Their Story

Readers get the inside scoop on the largest privately financed tire recall campaign in U.S. history.


GRASS VALLEY, CALIF. (PRWEB) MAY 25, 2019

Husband-and-wife law team Joseph Lisoni and Gail Lisoni spearheaded the Bridgestone/Firestone Steeltex Recall Campaign in the early 2000s, resulting in 11 million Steeltex tires being removed from the roads and highways of the United States. They tell their side of the story in their new book, *Where the Rubber Meets the Road: The Bridgestone/Firestone Conspiracy of Death and Destruction* (\$23.95, paperback, 9781545655962; \$10.99, e-book, 9781545655986; \$34.95, hardback, 9781545655979).

Specializing in product liability and personal injury cases, Lisoni and Lisoni seemed the ideal team to take on the tire tycoon and seek justice for the hundreds of deaths allegedly caused by the company's shortcuts.

"This book tells the story of the largest privately financed defective tire recall campaign in U.S. history - 11 million defective Firestone Steeltex tires - and how Bridgestone/Firestone was forced to stop manufacturing the tire line," said Lisoni.

Joseph Lisoni earned his undergraduate degree from Saint Mary's College of California and his law degree from the University of California Hastings College of the Law. Gail Landtbom Lisoni attended Dominican College and University of West Los Angeles Law School. They have practiced law as spouses and partners for over 30 years.



This book tells the story of the largest privately financed defective tire recall campaign in U.S. history

Jodeana Patterson

From: Joan Ramsey <joanramsey@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 13, 2025 10:12 AM
To: Planning
Subject: Alternative/RV Housing Ordinance
Attachments: All housing on wheels letter.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Please read attached.letter. Thank you

11/13/2025

Nevada County Planning Commission

Nevada County Board of Supervisors

My name is Joan Ramsey. I am a mental health professional living and working in Nevada County since 1985.

I am very concerned about the lack of affordable housing that has driven young and low-income working people and disabled people into living illegally in recreational vehicles. Many people are currently living under the threat of being discovered and forced out with nowhere else to go. Many of these existing situations include children. I am concerned about the mental health consequences of the anxiety created by never knowing if you are about to be forced out of your home, and the huge stress when it finally happens. People can be forced into the woods, which is far more dangerous for both them and the community.

I am in favor of this ordinance to allow recreational vehicles to become legitimate homes. I would prefer that the ordinance allow pre-existing inhabited wheeled homes to be brought into alignment with a health and safety conditions that has flexibility for unique circumstances. Some might meet all requirements to insure health and safety and neighbor concerns, but not exactly meet the letter of the ordinance as written. For example, an already existing situation that is safe and not bothering anyone but is located on a 2.5 acre lot. I believe that the 3 acre lot size limit is too restrictive. I would like for the ordinance to allow for common sense and compassion, with enforcement aimed at supporting bringing existing living situations into safe conditions acceptable to immediate neighbors, as opposed to eviction.

I am in support of all the amendments to the projected ordinance that have been suggested by Tom Durkin, including the recommendation that allows the removal of wheels in order to make the home eligible for Section 8 housing assistance.

Thank you.

Joan Ramsey, LCSW
123 Grove St.
Nevada City 95959
530 648-6105

Jodeana Patterson

From: psschwartz21 <psschwartz21@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 13, 2025 1:31 PM
To: tdurkin@vfr.net; Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: RE: FYI for today's hearing

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Great work. Thanks for your commitment and your voice. Good luck today. Remind the Planning Commission the folks who need this housing grew up with them. Serve the in stores and restaurants. Fix their stuff. These are our children, our bothers and sisters, our neighbors, and our friends.
Paul

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

----- Original message -----

From: Tom Durkin <tdurkin@vfr.net>
Date: 11/13/25 12:42 PM (GMT-08:00)
To: AltRVOrdinance@NevadaCountyCa.gov
Subject: FYI for today's hearing

Sorry this is late. I just now wrote it. Up all night. I'll have hard copies at the hearing. Hope to see you at the hearing!

Tom



Jodeana Patterson

From: Eric Gorman <ericgorman88@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 13, 2025 1:45 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Public Comment

You don't often get email from ericgorman88@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

With the cost of housing trapped in a perpetual uptick, wage stagnation, and a lack of industry in our community, I believe it's essential to consider alternative housing as an effective means of keeping our community housed.

Our society criminalizes the unhoused as though it's their choice to lack shelter, and we should be doing more to ensure that everyone has some sort of sanctuary to keep them safe from the elements. Tiny homes, RV's, and van life aren't a first choice for most people, but they're becoming increasingly more common out of a necessity to have a modicum of comfort and safety in a world that has consistently abandoned our most vulnerable communities.

Without providing solutions to housing insecurity in our community, we create a community that demonizes those who are struggling and subjects them to a myriad of potential traumatic experiences from alienation, abuse, isolation, arrest, or even succumbing to the elements.

I believe that we as a community can do better to provide the access to shelter that people need, and I hope that we can collaborate to develop solutions that allow us to support those who are struggling to support themselves.

11-10-25
Nevada County

Danny Melman
Commissioner

Re: Please VOTE NO on the proposed
RV Housing Ordinance

We write to encourage you to vote NO
on the proposed RV Housing Ordinance

It is our considered opinion that the
subject RV ordinance will result in
a substantial increase in wildfire risks
and severity of wildfire impacts across
the County rural lands, increase potential
risks for injury and loss of life from wild
fires.

Please carefully consider the potential
catastrophic damage to Nevada County
should the RV Ordinance become law in
its current form!

Joseph Davis KISAVI, ESQ.

Earl Davidson, ESQ.

11-10-25
Nevada County

Re: Please VOTE NO on the proposed
RV Housing Ordinance

We write to encourage you to vote NO
on the proposed RV Housing Ordinance

It is our considered opinion that the
subject RV ordinance will result in
a substantial increase in wildfire risks
and severity of wildfire impacts across
the County rural lands, increase potential
risks for injury and loss of life from wild
fires.

Please carefully consider the potential
catastrophic damage to Nevada County
should the RV Ordinance become law in
its current form!

Joseph Davis HISSON, ESQ.

Earl Davidson HISSON, ESQ.

November 6, 2025

To: Nevada County Planning Commissioners
Mr. Danny Milman, Chair
Mr. Terence McAteer, Vice Chair
Mr. Steve French, Commissioner
Mr. John Foley, Commissioner
Ms. Jo Garst, Commissioner

RE: Please VOTE NO on the proposed RV Housing ordinance

The housing issue is serious, but the existing and newly adopted programs for housing assistance in the County need a chance to succeed before introducing RV housing, with its many incompatibilities in rural areas, most ominously the vastly increased risks of wildfire.

PROBLEM #1. COUNTY ENFORCEMENT IS INADEQUATE NOW.

If you listen to people who relay their own experiences and frustrations about the ongoing lack of enforcement, it is a perpetual problem in Nevada County. The County approves projects, gives false assurances to the concerned public that enforcement will handle any violations quickly and effectively, and then ignores complaints. Compliance Officer Matt Kelly said at the September 15th South County MAC meeting that they currently have a backlog of 300 complaints (same number as he said 3 years ago to a meeting of neighbors about the proposed cannabis ordinance).

There is no truth to the assertion that RV housing issues can be dealt with given the burden of unanswered complaints already on hold. There is insufficient staff time and budget even for the inspections required every two years, let alone doing site visits on complaints. The County response to criticisms about failure to enforce County conditions, findings and enforcement procedures was "*indicated that our problem with Code Compliance was not "relevant" to the value assessment of the RV Ordinance.*" *Planning Director Brian Foss, Housing Director Tyler at South County MAC meeting, Sept 15, 2025*

County staff are abdicating their responsibility and putting the problem back on the neighbors. If and only if the County had a committed, robust and well-funded enforcement program should the RV housing proposal be seriously considered. The majority of public comments heard in South County reported years of neglect and poor County enforcement on land issues. The lack of trust for public agency response was loud and clear this last month, based on years of on-going failures of Planning, Code and Cannabis compliance officials. County staff handling of enforcement complaints has been routinely dismissive, and ignores the most basic cooperation with those who properly file their formal complaint forms. Shifting the burden of policing is wrong. To approve an ordinance that permits RV housing when you know enforcement is beyond staff and budget limitations is wrong.

Problem #2. CEQA COMPLIANCE: New State Guidelines for Stand-alone Wildfire Element

Do not let the County agencies again ignore the 2018 requirement for a comprehensive CEQA overhaul on environmental review of Wildfire Risks. Compliance with California's new CEQA requirement for a stand-alone Wildfire Element should absolutely be required before the RV Housing ordinance is considered by our decisionmakers in 2025.

Nevada County is largely designated by CalFire as High Fire Risk area (most all of rural Nevada County falls within the high risk zone). A review of the proposed RV Housing ordinance clearly demonstrates that it meets the criteria for an EIR with stand-alone Wildfire section to be compliant with the new California Office of Planning and Research (OPR) amendment of Appendix G of California Environmental Quality Act's (CEQA) regulations ("Guidelines") adopted December 28, 2018.

RV housing is a recipe for increased fire risks of devastating intensity, since the ordinance would allow hundreds of new potential hotspots for wildfire ignition essentially all over the wildlands of Nevada County, particularly when layered upon existing deficits in County enforcement staffing levels to monitor RV housing sites annually and prevent such risks.

Nevada County questionably dodged a full Wildfire EIR assessment in compliance with the new State CEQA wildfire amendment going into in effect by December 2018 that required a Wildfire Element as a stand-alone section for the Cannabis Final EIR because its NOP was filed in August 2018. Then again ignored the requirement in the 2019 Final EIR and again in the 2022 Amendment, four years after the CEQA changes became new law. The County argued that no subsequent EIR was needed.


"The determination of whether wildfires needs to be analyzed for this project is governed by the law on supplemental or subsequent EIRs (PRC § 21166 and CEQA Guidelines §§15162 and 15163). Wildfire impacts are not required to be analyzed under those standards unless it constitutes "new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known at the time" the 2019 Final Plan EIR was approved (State CEQA Guidelines §15162(a)(3)).

Source: Addendum to the Nevada County Commercial Cannabis Cultivation Ordinance Final EIR, Addendum November 2022, Page 69-70.

It cannot be reasonably argued this way in 2025, and it should not have been in 2018 and 2022. It is obvious that RVs dotted across rural grasslands and foothills can pose new critical wildfire risks unlike standard housing, where fire access for fire trucks and tenders is specified by County regulations.

The RV ordinance will likely result in a substantial increase in wildfire risks and severity of wildfire impacts across the County rural lands, increase potential risks for injury and loss of life from wildfires, increase populations of people that would impair an evacuation from areas susceptible to wildfire, and create a substantial increase in the susceptibility to the after-effects of wildfire (increased potential for exposure to landslides, flooding, mudslides, etc.). Critical utilities in rural settings are less available to support RV living. Homeless housing further away from population centers will also isolate families from essential services making life harder than if they were closer in (employment, healthcare, schools and public school bus transit, childcare help, public transportation, postal services, laundromats, food banks, and thrift stores as examples).

Respectfully submitted,


Cindy Sage, Sage Associates
22950 Swenson Ravine, Grass Valley, CA 95949

Jodeana Patterson

From: Carolyn Battaini <crosjb@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Wednesday, November 19, 2025 12:01 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Fwd: RV ordinance NEEDS MORE RESEARCH (read until the end)

[You don't often get email from crosjb@sbcglobal.net. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

As a tax paying citizen and homeowner, I continue to be opposed to the RV ordinance for the following reasons:

- >
- > 1. Failure of our county code enforcement department to address current illegal encampments/RVs. Code enforcement admitted to a 340 + open case backlog.
- > 2. This ordinance might further increase our fire insurance/FAIR Plan premiums, no one in the hearing room had an answer. County personnel said their discussions with insurance officials have been "inconclusive" because the insurance industry does not currently recognize RVs as residential units. In the real world, the ordinance would increase density with "residential units" not built to the minimum safety standards of a permanent dwelling. Since RVs can be/will be purchased quickly and cheaply on online, you're increasing density. A few commissioners did suggest our BOS "look into" these issues before voting, but the sentiment seems to be we might have to pass the ordinance to find out.

In addition to insurance premiums, what if a fire breaks out?

Did the "planning" dept create sufficient evacuation routes? NO

Did it provide sufficient fire hydrants? NO

Does the County adequately and timely clear the sides of the county roads to create fire breaks? NO

What are the reasons other counties have not passed their own ordinance? Maybe they know that it's an approaching catastrophe on ways you haven't fully considered.

> You need to get conclusive answers that the RV Ordinance WILL NOT negatively impact our community.

> Homeowners in the unincorporated county have been an afterthought in this process; affordable housing advocates seem to be running the show.

Who are you really representing?

Think about that.

Carolyn Battaini
14027 Liquidambar Ln
Grass Valley

Jodeana Patterson

From: Paul Schwartz <psschwartz21@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 2, 2025 2:26 PM
To: Heidi Hall; Robb Tucker; Lisa Swarthout; Sue Hoek; Hardy Bullock; Planning; CEO
Cc: Tyler Barrington; Meghan Schwartz
Subject: Re: Future Agenda Item- RV Ordinance FYI
Attachments: 12-2-25 RV ordinance.docx

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

You don't often get email from psschwartz21@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Please review the attachment. My apologies for not attaching to the original.
Paul

From: Paul Schwartz <psschwartz21@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 2, 2025 2:19 PM
To: heidi.hall@nevadacountyca.gov <heidi.hall@nevadacountyca.gov>; Robb.Tucker@nevadacountyca.gov <robb.tucker@nevadacountyca.gov>; Lisa Swarthout <lisa.swarthout@nevadacountyca.gov>; Sue.Hoek@nevadacountyca.gov <Sue.Hoek@nevadacountyca.gov>; hardy.bullock@nevadacountyca.gov <hardy.bullock@nevadacountyca.gov>; planning@nevadacountyca.gov <planning@nevadacountyca.gov>; ceo.info@nevadacountyca.gov <ceo.info@nevadacountyca.gov>
Cc: Tyler Barrington <tyler.barrington@nevadacountyca.gov>; Meghan Schwartz <meghan.schwartz1@gmail.com>; Paul <psschwartz21@gmail.com>
Subject: Future Agenda Item- RV Ordinance FYI

TO: Nevada County Board of Supervisors, Allison Lehman, and Brian Foss

Attached are my views in support of the draft RV Ordinance that was approved by the Nevada County Planning Commission. The Nevada County General Plan Housing Element includes policies that support the proposed ordinance. For decades Nevada County, Grass Valley, Nevada City, Truckee and planners everywhere have struggled with how to facilitate housing for those with low incomes. There have been projects made possible with grants and subsidies. Habitat For Humanity has found creative ways to contribute to our affordable housing inventory. Policy that allows ADUs and homes on wheels have created opportunities; however, has proven to still require significant investment. RVs are clearly the affordable option, even with the added cost of access and utilities. Please consider ways to overcome the shortage of county inspectors, State regulations, the NIMBY voices, and the historical power of the single-family home planning model.

Thankyou,

12-2-2025

Nevada County Board of Supervisors

Although our intentions as Supervisors, City Council members, and planners are dedicated, increasing the stock of affordable housing over the last 45 years has been marginal. The Nevada County Planning Commission approved the proposed RV Ordinance. The Nevada County Board of Supervisors' consideration is the next step.

Section 65302(c) of the California Government Code requires every county and city in the State to include a Housing Element as part of its adopted general plan. In stipulating the content of this element, Article 10.6 of the Government Code indicates that the element shall consist of "identification and analysis of existing and projected housing needs and a statement of goals, policies, quantified objectives, and scheduled programs for the preservation, improvement and development of housing." **This legislation further states that the element "shall identify adequate sites for housing, including rental housing, factory-built housing, and mobile homes, and shall make adequate provision for the existing and projected needs of all economic segments of the community."**

Single family housing prices are prohibitively high for individuals and families with less than middle incomes. There is rental housing stock available for portions of the working class with medium household incomes. Below this group there is a severe shortage of answers. The cost of transportation, healthcare, and other basic needs compete for a share of the medium income resources. I see nothing in the economic projections that will improve or mitigate the intersection of low incomes and increased housing costs.

It is the County's obligations under State law to: 1) Provide adequate, appropriately zoned sites to meet the existing and projected housing needs of **all economic segments of the community**; 2) **Eliminate any constraints to the private development of a supply of housing to meet the needs of all economic segments of the community**; and 3) Otherwise facilitate the actions required of the development industry in providing an adequate supply of housing."

"Approximately 68% of all Extremely Low-Income owner-occupied housing units and approximately 32% of Extremely Low-Income renter occupied housing units were overpaying for housing on already limited budgets. Due to the magnitude of households overpaying for housing countywide and specifically in the Unincorporated Area, the County shall provide policies and programs that will assist these households where possible." (NC General Plan Housing Element Policy)

"Removing Constraints GOAL RC-8.1 Decrease governmental constraints and streamline the processing of housing development to expedite development of affordable housing and reduce the costs of development without compromising other General Plan objectives."

"GOAL EJ-8.2 Encourage a range of housing opportunities for all segments and income levels of the Citizens of Nevada County."

Consider that most of the workers in the service industry, such as restaurants and retail shops, do not earn a paycheck that puts them in a Nevada County middle income bracket. Those are the workers who are the backbone and infrastructure of our tourist industry.

Consider that we currently allow guest cottages, agriculture worker housing, RVs and trailers during home construction, and small homes on wheels.

Consider that there are estimates of 1000 individuals and families currently living in RVs, motor homes, and trailers in the County. These housing units are affordable solutions for low-income individuals and families. A used 25-foot trailer in excellent condition can be purchased for \$20-25,000 and financed for as little as \$300 per month. Site preparation to meet County requirements could be reasonably budgeted in the \$10-20,000 range. Compare this to any completed or proposed low-income housing project.

The inability of the County to provide inspection and oversight and the cost barrier building an RV pad and associated utilities has frequently been mentioned. Both issues are separate and apart from determining whether the RV Ordinance can provide a path for a segment of the community to find affordable and secure housing. It is not only the future residents of the RV to consider. The RV Ordinance would allow an individual or family to purchase a home knowing they could invest in an RV pad and generate rental income to offset their mortgage costs. If I'm building a home, the incremental cost to add an RV pad and utilities is marginal, yet the potential rental income could offset a meaningful percentage of my mortgage.

No housing solution is perfect. Some housing types, such as RVs, we label as undesirable and have excluded from our legal housing options. Yet, there are folks in Nevada County living in tents, RVs, lean-tos, barns, sheds, basements, and garages because that is what they can afford. The RV Ordinance can offer a path for RV housing to come out of the closet.

I support the RV ordinance approval. I would be happier if the acreage was one acre instead of three. The ordinance needs to have language added that gives existing housing units time and guidance to meet regulation requirements. The County could adopt designs for small-scale septic systems suitable for RVs. I question the conflicting need for skirting and mobility. I have installed skirting around modular buildings, and it is time consuming. It takes an equal or longer amount of time to remove the skirting. If the intent is for the units to be mobile in an evacuation scenario, skirting becomes an obstacle.

Paul Schwartz

13812 Meadow Drive

Grass Valley, CA 95945

psschwartz21@gmail.com

Jodeana Patterson

From: E Martin <emrtmail@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 18, 2025 4:14 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: (RV ADU) Excruciating Deaths for Money

You don't often get email from emrtmail@yahoo.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

The State of California limits occupancy in buildings to save lives.

Occupancy in high fire hazard neighborhoods could also be limited to save lives.

The 2018 Paradise wildfire resulted in 85 preventable fatalities. Why so many?

Women, children, elderly suffered excruciating deaths due to insufficient evacuation routes.

Too many people. Excruciating deaths.

Big wildfires will inevitably occur in Nevada County where evacuation routes are insufficient.

Allowing (RV ADU) over population and excruciating deaths in exchange for money is outrageous.

Will the blood of multitudes be on your hands when future wildfires occur?

Jodeana Patterson

From: Jansahl <jansahl47@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, January 10, 2026 3:42 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: RECONSIDER THE AltRV Ordinance

[You don't often get email from jansahl47@gmail.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

My husband and I have lived on Mayflower Drive in the Banner Mountain area for over 50 years. This has always been a quiet, friendly, safe neighborhood.

We now have a neighbor who is using their property as an alternative living area for RV's. Of course this is only one of so many throughout our county. Now we too frequently encounter unknown people walking our streets. Many with loud dogs that are barking at anything that moves!

Our concerns for the Alternative Home Ordinance are many:

Eventually will our homeowner's insurance increase due to RV's camping in the area?

Many of these RV's include multiple vehicles. They illegally park on the roadsides. The roads are very narrow and these extra parked vehicles hamper clearance for snow removal and emergency vehicles.

Wildfire is a terrorizing concern in Nevada County. Banner Mountain is just one area that has limited access for evacuation. It's a problem throughout the county.

Do the homeowners have extra insurance to cover these RV's? Do the RV owners have any insurance? Once again, does this affect our insurance?

These "renters" show up with all their vehicles and all the baggage that they bring along which is an added danger and eye sore. They are allowed to string extension cords into the property owner's home. They also run hoses into the home. NOW! There is the risk of fire. They have propane tanks to run the RV's! Those tanks are a crisis waiting to happen. Ever see one explode?

We need more sufficient code enforcement throughout the county. We are a small county that is not designed to take on additional problems that the RV's are going to require. RV's should not ever be considered as "permanent" housing".

My husband and I were both born and raised in Nevada City and have seen many changes over the years. Some good...some not so good. We are very opposed to the Alternative Housing Ordinance. We are very concerned about all the possibilities that are already occurring in the county because these RV's.

Thank you for considering our concerns. We're sure you wouldn't want one of these RV campgrounds in your neighborhood.

Andrew and Janet Sahl

Sent from my iPad

Jodeana Patterson

From: Peter Kooi <peterkooi.13@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 9, 2026 5:30 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance; planning@nevadacounty.gov; CommunityDevelopment; Planning; bdofsupervisors; Robb Tucker; Sue Hoek
Subject: AltRV Ordinance-Please Provide Updates Regarding This Ordinance

Some people who received this message don't often get email from peterkooi.13@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Hello,

My family is currently living out this (potential) ordinance in real time. While I understand the problem you are trying to address, the mode in which you are trying to accomplish this is plain wrong. It will lead to a less beautiful place to live and promote the erosion of property values, and thus, property taxes. It will promote a semi transient lifestyle and the slow decline and fracture of rural community. See below.

Notes:

Not in support of ordinance.

Excessive transient traffic, often associated with drug dealing. All hours of the day and night. Excessive speeds. "No skin in the game - not a care in the world".

Low income. Cannot afford to maintain the rural private roads that already receive limited to no funds for maintenance (where most of these potential sites are located). Because these people are renters, they abuse the infrastructure other, private families, must pay for to make up the difference. This often costs in the tens of thousands per year. One property owner has a trailer and income, 6 more families have to pay for their road - and deal with the nonsense and non rural way of life these folks (like) to exist in.

Waste deposit and collection non existent.

Must have a community means of evicting folks who don't live up to the standards and ethos of decent human and community existence.

Promotes an erosion of property value community wide. A new tenant every 6 months amongst a community of folks who have invested heavily in their rural community and lifestyle. No standards of building, look, and feel. It's an RV that is supposed to be towed behind a truck to a camping spot, not parked and lived in permanently. Think, a neighbors front yard full of trailers next to a multimillion dollar home(s). That is what this ordinance is saying YES too. Ridiculous.

I question, are any RVs designed to be permanently lived in? Also, what happens when the RV does become dilapidated? That front yard is now a junk yard. My guess is those same neighbors are going to have to pay to clean that up as well. If not, the county will and we all get to pay for it!

These tenants often pay cash. How is Nevada county going to fund and maintain this ordinance and the plethora of complaints that will arise with it?

This is a cheap "band-aid" fix. Nevada county can do better. Support the tax base, don't piss it off.

I am open to further discussion and so I my wife.

Kind regards,
Peter Kooi

Sunnyside Lane
Grass Valley, CA 95949

530-559-7829

Jodeana Patterson

From: Maria Coates <mariacoates96@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 23, 2026 12:31 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Public Comment in Support of Alternative Housing / RV Dwelling Ordinance

You don't often get email from mariacoates96@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Dear Nevada County Planning Department and Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to offer my sincere and heartfelt support for the proposed Alternative Housing / RV Dwelling Ordinance, and to share why this issue matters so deeply to me... not just as a policy question, but as a lived reality.

Like many people who are drawn to Nevada County, I am here because I believe in stewardship, community, resilience, and a more grounded way of living. I believe in caring for land, not exploiting it. I believe in contributing to the local economy and social fabric. And I believe that housing policy should reflect the realities of modern life - especially in rural communities where creativity, self-reliance, and flexibility have always been part of the culture.

For many of us, living in an RV, tiny home on wheels, or other alternative dwelling is not a temporary phase, a loophole, or a way to avoid responsibility. It is a conscious choice rooted in affordability, environmental values, and a desire to live simply and sustainably. In my case, it represents the most realistic and responsible way to care for myself while also caring for land - often land that we intend to improve slowly, thoughtfully, and with long-term commitment.

Under current regulations, people are often forced into impossible choices:

- remain technically “out of compliance” while trying to live modestly and responsibly,
- take on unsustainable debt just to meet rigid definitions of housing, or
- leave the County altogether, despite wanting to build roots here.

None of those outcomes serve the community.

I want to emphasize that allowing long-term RV or alternative dwelling use on private property does not mean abandoning health, safety, or environmental responsibility. On the contrary - clear, compassionate regulations create *better* outcomes than blanket prohibitions. When people are given a legal pathway, they are far more likely to invest in proper waste systems, water access, fire safety, and land improvements. When they are pushed into gray areas, everyone loses.

Nevada County has a rare opportunity to lead with wisdom and humanity. Rural counties across California are grappling with the same pressures: rising costs, limited housing stock, and a growing population of people who want to live simply rather than expansively. By thoughtfully allowing alternative housing, the County can support working families, caretakers, artists, builders, elders, and young people who want to stay and contribute - rather than be displaced.

I am especially grateful that the County is engaging the public, considering updates to waste disposal standards, and taking the time to do this carefully. That care shows. Please know that behind the surveys, workshops, and staff reports are real people whose lives will be directly affected by this decision - people who want nothing more than to live legally, safely, and with dignity on land they respect.

Thank you for your willingness to listen, to adapt, and to imagine solutions that reflect the realities of rural life today. I strongly encourage the adoption of the Alternative Housing / RV Dwelling Ordinance, and I hope Nevada County continues to move forward with policies that honor both community character and human need.

Please keep me informed of any new developments.
Looking forward to the March 10th hearing.

With deep appreciation for your time and service,

Maria Coates