

## Tine Mathiasen

---

**From:** Tiffany Ramirez [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 14, 2025 6:24 AM  
**To:** Heidi Hall; Hardy Bullock; BOS Public Comment; bdfsupervisors  
**Subject:** Tiny Homes on Wheels (THOW) Ordinance Proposal

Some people who received this message 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.**

Dear Supervisors Hall and Bullock,

My family and I live in unincorporated Nevada County. I am reaching out to you today in order to express my concern regarding the proposed updates to the Tiny Homes on Wheels Ordinance Proposal. While we acknowledge a need for affordable housing, we urge you to consider a safer and more responsible approach - especially in regards to fire safety as we watch the devastating fires in Los Angeles.

We urge you to reconsider the restrictions of the original proposal, as we view the more recent allowances to pose serious danger to our homes and community. Specifically, the following:

**Please do not allow trailers and RVs to be included in this ordinance.**

- These dwellings are by nature more combustible and pose a higher fire danger.
- We are also concerned about the "camping" nature of this lifestyle with cooking and warming outside on open fires.
- We already do not have sufficient evacuation routes and these types of vehicles will cause traffic jams. Watching bulldozers push cars off the road in the Los Angeles fires is an example of what could happen.
- There will be no additional plan, nor staffing, to manage the waste associated with these types of dwellings.

We are looking to you, as our elected officials, to make decisions that impact the greater good of your constituents. Please, we urge you to make decisions that mitigate the risk of fire to our homes and community.

Thank you,  
Tiffany Ramirez

## Tine Mathiasen

---

**From:** Megan Worden [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, January 13, 2025 9:27 PM  
**To:** Tyler Barrington; BOS Public Comment  
**Subject:** Public Comment for Tiny Home Ordinance

Some people who received this message 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.**

To whom it may concern,

First the updated public notice is not published on the Nevada County public hearing website--the notice for the November hearing is still there so there really ought to be another hearing for the community to have more adequate time to discuss this disastrous proposal.

Key issues with the ordinance--

--no restriction on how many people can be dwelling in one 400 foot tiny home.

--no specifics on what is meant by having an aesthetically pleasing outside that blends with the neighborhood. What does that mean? Who decides this? The neighbors? The county? There should be specific standards that are objectively applied

--since the main argument here is this measure is mainly due to and solely for housing affordability, a tiny home should not be able to count towards the residency requirement for a commercial cannabis permit.

--what is the enforcement mechanism to evict those not complying with the ordinance. As with cannabis we have to have enforcement figured out before we go forward with these potentially hazardous programs.

--property taxes must be paid prior to issuing any permit for a tiny home.

Many more issues as described in the most recent union article on this topic.

Overall this is a horrible idea that is made worse if possible by the lack of well thought out ordinances which is typical of Nevada County--look no further than the poorly thought out and implemented cannabis regulations and plans.

We are watching as Southern California burns while most people residing in Nevada County can barely get fire insurance. Is it really a good idea to be the one of the first counties to basically invite a swath of low income and homeless people dealing with a range of issues from mental health to violence to drug addiction into our community given the extreme risks we already face with fire and funding?? We are literally saying we can house homeless people on properties in neighborhoods instead of using hotel vouchers. The hotel owners must be rejoicing as they've seen how horrible that idea was.

Tourism is a main source of revenue in our area and that will only continue by county leadership making consistent and thoughtful approvals geared toward keeping Nevada County thriving. This Tiny Home ordinance is not right for Nevada County at this time and as a homeowner and taxpayer I ask you to protect these investments and not to pass this proposal.

Respectfully,  
Megan Worden

## Tine Mathiasen

---

**From:** Tyler Barrington  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 14, 2025 7:17 AM  
**To:** Tine Mathiasen  
**Subject:** Fw: Tiny homes on Wheels and related add on's

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

---

**From:** Lora A. Moore [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, January 13, 2025 8:08:32 PM  
**To:** Tyler Barrington <Tyler.Barrington@nevadacountyca.gov>  
**Subject:** Tiny homes on Wheels and related add on's

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.**

I realize this may be late to include in your meeting tomorrow, but I would like to go on record as strongly opposed to the tiny homes on wheels.

I am very concerned that this will have the potential to get out of hand especially in the rural areas where there already are people living in tiny sheds and motorhomes. Many of these are not permitted and do not have proper water, electric or sewer hook ups.

I know of people who rent "space" for motorhomes and charge up to \$1,000 a month. This is hardly affordable. And it puts people living in conditions that can be unsanitary and have the potential to become nuisances.

We have fire risks and I don't see this as a solution to clear the homeless camps.

I will be unable to attend the meeting tomorrow due to work but I strongly urge you not to approve this ordinance.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

*Lora A. Moore*

[REDACTED] Nevada City, CA 95959

## Tine Mathiasen

---

**From:** Tyler Barrington  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 14, 2025 7:17 AM  
**To:** Tine Mathiasen  
**Subject:** Fw: THOW... BUT NO on RV'S and Campers!

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

---

**From:** C. M. Eldon [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 14, 2025 1:25:46 AM  
**To:** Tyler Barrington <Tyler.Barrington@nevadacountyca.gov>  
**Subject:** RE: THOW... BUT NO on RV'S and Campers!

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.**

Mr. Barrington,

I deeply share your concerns for the lack of affordable housing and the unhoused in Our Nevada County. The Tiny Homes on Wheels was a great proposal to help those in need of housing as well as those in need of supplemental income from a THOW's tenant.

The permits mandating Electrical and Septic hookup were spot on!

However, once the permit was processed, there was no further County inspection of the installation of Power and Septic. The lack of accountability on Code Standard Work is a sure sign that there will be multiple suspect "contractor's" vying for the opportunity to do a cut rate job at a cut rate price that could put all of the County residents in peril. I was so floored at no final inspections that I missed if there was even a proposal for a permanent water hook-up in the initial plan.

A real plan for Water, Power and Septic to follow Code as if a THOW were a primary permanent residence to benefit the individuals of the County with appropriate setback and adherence to building codes to protect the entire County from disease, contamination and blight is noble. But, to stop after the permit without further County involvement in the completion and inspection of the work is irresponsible to the entire community. Any of our wells or homes could be potentially contaminated by non standard uninspected work. A DIY septic field could spell disaster.

The initial THOW with final inspections would continue to keep our Beautiful County Safe.

Limiting one THOW on every parcel is a must to prevent over housing and Septic Discharge and reduce the risks of fire to the surrounding communities.

My family and I are proud to be residents on Banner Mountain off of Red Dog and Red Dog Cross.

We value our privacy and safety and know that our neighbors have similar values.

Our neighborhood has been subject to several individuals that have multiple Code Violations and unscrupulous individuals who have unduly put our lives and homes at risk.

One major property owner has illegally allowed according to County Codes, individuals to live on his property without power, septic and water and collect rent from them. He has been irresponsible to our neighborhood in his actions of allowing campers, tents, RV's, Trailers and vehicles to be lived in on his property for his financial gain and risk to our community. When told to remove a trailer/camper from one of his properties, he complied, but subsequently moved

them to another one of his properties. One of his tenant's started a fire which necessitated a County Fire Department Response late at night back in the forest which was well away from our limited fire hydrants.

Banner Mountain has limited evacuation routes with Banner Lava Cap, Banner Quaker and Red Dog Road being the only means of escape. Had the fire in the forest gone unchecked, we on Oak Ridge Road, Lolas Echo, Red Dog Road and Buckeye would have been trapped with no easy escape.

The Original THOW Proposal was responsible, however tacking on Campers, Fifth Wheels and Recreational Vehicles and trailers as an afterthought has soured me to the THOW. Adding additional temporary residences to the County would invite more congestion to the areas with limited evacuation routes in the event of a disaster. The recent and ongoing Palisades Fire with images of bulldozers pushing abandoned vehicles off of the roadways is frightening. It is truly amazing that the death toll is as low as it is within the densely populated areas of Los Angeles. Unfortunately, the death toll in Paradise and Magala was multiples over the current recent deaths with less densely populated areas but limited evacuation routes similar to Banner Mountain.

Adding the additional temporary housing units would be an invitation for an influx of individuals that would tax our already strained Health Care options, Police, Fire, Mental Health support and Food Banks making our area feel like a revolving Camp Ground instead of a stable home in the beautiful Sierra Foothills.

Please reassess and reject the addition of the transient housing including RV's, Trailers, Campers and any non permanent residence that is movable and reevaluate the need to follow through on inspections of Water, Septic and Power Hook Ups.

Thank you,

Christine M Eldon

Michael A Eldon

[REDACTED]  
Nevada City, CA

95959  
[REDACTED]

## Tine Mathiasen

---

**From:** Tyler Barrington  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 14, 2025 9:39 AM  
**To:** Tine Mathiasen  
**Subject:** FW: Homes on Wheels Proposal



**Tyler Barrington**  
Principal Planner- [Planning Department](#)  
Interim Director- [Housing & Community Services](#)  
Office: 530.470.2723 Housing Cell: 530.913.3306  
[www.NevadaCountyCA.gov](http://www.NevadaCountyCA.gov)

*\*I am out of the office every other Friday as follows: 1/10, 1/31\*, 2/7, 2/21*

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:** Court Worden [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 14, 2025 9:35 AM  
**To:** Tyler Barrington <Tyler.Barrington@nevadacountyca.gov>; Sue Hoek <Sue.Hoek@nevadacountyca.gov>  
**Subject:** Homes on Wheels 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.

BOS,

It is not pertinent to be the first county to approve Homes on Wheels. However it is vital Nevada County BoS protect their constituents who have worked tirelessly for decades to secure fire-safe residences in the foothills. After a diligent analysis including the elevated fire risk, elevated crime rates and deterring aesthetics in alternative living communities comprised of tiny homes and homes on wheels it is evident this proposal may give refuge to a few residents in a time of need but the overall impact to Nevada County residents will be detrimental.

The only reason Nevada County has the potential to blaze the trail to approve such a proposal is because other counties understand the adverse impact similar proposals have on county residents. These alternative living structures have an elevated fire risk, no matter the precautions. At a time when homeowner's insurance has risen from a few thousand dollars to tens of thousands annually this is a sure way to drive more Nevada county homeowners out of a house and home in an effort to be the first county to approve a short-sighted proposal for alternative housing.

In addition, Nevada County is a complaint-driven enforcement system, already ripe with examples of inadequacies adding alternative living structures to parcels would make this county even more susceptible to environmental hazards impacting our waterways and rural way of life.

How will you control non-residents from rushing in and purchasing property to subdivide parcels and turn once aesthetically pleasing properties into shanty towns comprised of trailers, RVs, park model homes and tiny homes? Additionally, I don't see a limit to how many people can live in one 400 sq/ft tiny home? Electrical fire hazards and cheap, light-weight flammable material are only a few reasons these structures have a history of increased fire activity.

I encourage you to seek input from other counties who have already analyzed similar proposals and smartly decided against it. Other counties in Northern California are suffering from alternative living communities so let us learn from their mistakes. For example, Siskiyou County has been inundated with illegal immigrants from around the world because of cheap living opportunities and an ideal climate for growing cannabis. Rest assured there are predators on the county's doorstep seeking to expand their illicit markets in communities fostering alternative housing options making it a prime location to expand drug and human trafficking rings. Tiny homes and RVs are ideal locations with limited capital investments to house criminals who maintain a transient lifestyle and avoid law enforcement.

Our community strongly opposes the Homes on Wheels proposal. There are numerous ways to make housing more affordable in this county but it starts with limiting regulations and fees at both the county and state level.

Your time and diligence is appreciated,  
Courtney Worden  
District 4



## Tine Mathiasen

---

**From:** Derek Ramirez [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 14, 2025 11:20 AM  
**To:** Heidi Hall; Hardy Bullock; BOS Public Comment; bdofsupervisors  
**Subject:** Tiny Homes on Wheels (THOW) Ordinance Proposal

**Importance:** High

Some people who received this message 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.

Dear Supervisors Hall and Bullock,

My family and I live in District 1 in an unincorporated part of Nevada County. We understand the need for affordable housing but in reading the change in THOW proposal seems to have taken a dangerous turn. We urge you to reconsider the restrictions of the original proposal as we have some major concerns, specifically the following:

1. No control over the amount of people living in a THOW.
2. No assurance that connections to power and septic will be monitored.
3. No increase in Code Enforcement staff.
4. No control over outside cooking / living space. This could lead to wild fires. (This almost happened to us last year, when a camping trailer was cooking on a BBQ and started a 50x50 fire in a densely forested area while we were asleep!)
5. We already do not have sufficient evacuation routes and these types of vehicles will cause traffic jams. Watching bulldozers push cars off the road in the Los Angeles fires is an example of what could happen.
6. No increase in taxes, to help pay for emergency services, code enforcement, county inspections, etc.

We are looking to you, as our elected officials, to make decisions that impact the greater good of your constituents. Please, we urge you to make decisions that mitigate the risk of fire to our homes and community.

Thank you,

Derek Ramirez

## Tine Mathiasen

---

**From:** Shanni Weilert [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 14, 2025 12:05 PM  
**To:** BOS Public Comment; Tyler Barrington  
**Subject:** NO on THOW Ordinance

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.**

To whom it may concern,

My family moved to Nevada County one and a half years ago. While we were running TO somewhere beautiful, we were equally running FROM the Bay Area, where policies like what you are currently proposing with the THOW ordinance completely destroyed our neighborhood and way of living.

While I appreciate the complexities of affordable housing and that there is a call for innovative solutions to address them, I challenge you to not jump into short-sided solutions which may have incredibly detrimental effects.

In San Jose, tiny homes were approved as a solution for the housing crisis. Along with them came an immediate influx of crime and decrease in property values in nearby residences to tiny homes communities. Break-ins and homelessness actually increased in the area, and the solution did nothing more than create new problems and cause tax-paying citizens to flee the area.

California is, quite literally, on fire. Please focus your energy on ensuring our community is fire safe and only put forth housing alternatives that are fully endorsed by fire professionals. Adding to our communities fire risk is truly the WORST thing you could be doing for our citizens right now. Please focus on solutions that will not effectively function as a trojan horse for Nevada County to become the cannabis capital of California. The solution to the housing crisis should not be that you drive everyone out of California.

At minimum, the THOW ordinance should:

- Show where dedicated funding and staffing for timely enforcement of violations is coming from
- Directly preclude from being leveraged to create housing for cannabis camps. This should be about helping existing, permanent residents of our county.
- Impose a hard limit on number of residents for each THOW and each parcel.
- Preclude subdivision of properties solely for the purpose of increasing the THOW volume
- Create strict, descriptive requirements for visual "like homes" definition

Respectfully yours,  
Shanni Weilert