

Jodeana Patterson

From: Kristen Thomas <kristen.thomascook@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 7, 2026 8:33 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Concerns about Alternative Housing Ordinance

You don't often get email from kristen.thomascook@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,

My apology for the late submission and I hope you will still consider my thoughts and words for this issue.

After reading the revised proposal, I have grave concerns about this proposal moving forward. It appears that in an effort to seem more sympathetic to the housing issues that currently exist, you have given zero consideration to those of us who are paying property taxes and rising insurance costs. My property when purchased, WAS NOT zoned for this type of dwelling and now you are going to force us, as well as other property owners, to live with the possibility of having our surrounding areas be more like an established RV Park. For the record, there is nothing wrong with an RV as a permanent dwelling or living situation for those that choose to do so. But an RV as a permanent dwelling on regular properties, should be thought out and planned within the city, not forced on those of us in rural areas or those of us with acreage. Those within the immediate city limits will not have to deal with this as an issue, as there isn't the space to plop a RV in their front yard. So, the impact will be felt with those of us that have acreage property. While I do believe something needs to be done about the state of affordable housing in California, it isn't fair that tax-paying property owners bear this burden.

This ordinance will most likely devalue our property and increase our property insurance costs, which is already a major issue for those of us in High Risk Fire areas. I was forced to go on the Fair Plan, as a lot of us were forced to do in this area, and we are already facing a significant rise in our premium next year. What happens when standard insurance companies (who are already leaving California) refuse to insure properties in areas that allow these types of RV Dwellings? When the Fair Plan is unaffordable and people cannot insure their homes? Not to mention RV's that catch on fire spread at a higher rate than traditional or even modular homes and pose a higher safety threat. This is a major issue and has been brought up several times by Real Estate Professionals in the area, and you have not adequately addressed these concerns. It has also not been established that the owners of the RV and/or property owners have to guarantee and show proof of insurance before establishing these RV's as permanent dwellings. What happens if a fire breaks out on an uninsured unit and the neighboring property loses everything? Without the guarantee that the dwellings will be covered by insurance, you are asking people to risk everything, their livelihoods, in order to solve the housing issues we faced. It was even stated by some of you at a meeting last year, that the insurance issue "wasn't your problem and would be up to the Board of Supervisors to decide". I feel this is negligent to put forth a plan that you willingly admit doesn't address these serious concerns and puts home owners at great risk. This also constitutes passing the

buck and shows a lack of responsibility as well as an inconsideration for the constituents that put you in your position.

You are also removing the Administrative Development Permit requirement for initial approval, which is concerning. While I can appreciate the desire to lower the cost of those wanting to establish this type of dwelling, there needs to be that additional oversight if this plan moves forward. The objectives for a site plan/building permit may not take into consideration where the RV would be located from a neighboring property owner's standpoint and only be concerned with the technical specifications that are required. If you really are that concerned about costs, then that should be handled at the County/Planning level, not throwing out much needed regulations that are there to ensure the safety of our county. It was previously discussed that Nevada County might not have the man-power to enforce the regulations as they are written, but the answer isn't to deregulate this ordinance, or to ask homeowners to report violations. This will lead to unsafe situations for neighborhoods by pitting neighbor against neighbor and people potentially having to deal with retaliation for turning in those that violate the ordinance. In addition, the fact that you are also requesting this ordinance be categorically exempt pursuant to Sections 15303, and 15305 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines is deeply troubling. This isn't a "minor alteration" and absolutely has the potential to increase the density of not only people, but also gas, emissions, water usage, sewage usage, etc. With NID just being given the go ahead to hike their rates, what kind of an impact will this have? With you now saying that it is ok to have alternate forms of sewage dumping and/or "waterless toilets" for those not on city water/sewage, this could lead to real health and safety hazards and is grossly negligent. Who is going to enforce that these standards are maintained? And it isn't just the physical health and safety concerns. This will change the look of neighborhoods and rural communities. Requesting to be exempt from the guidelines is unsafe and less than truthful, for the purposes of wanting to fulfill the requirement of creating a solution to the housing issues we face. Also, With the "short term" housing requirement being set at such a low minimum of 30 days, there is potential for very high turnover, so how can that possibly be considered a "minor alteration"? I also didn't see any specification that if they are used more in line as rentals, that home owners would be required to register these dwellings as a business with the county and obtain a Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT) certificate as required with rental properties.

Furthermore, you are asking to change zoning for those of us ALREADY established, and creating this ordinance for those that may or may not be looking to have a permanent residency. The compromise has been suggested that the County find and establish RV areas for these types of dwellings so that property owners won't have to see their beloved property and neighborhoods become an establishment of RV living. These locations could be regulated and more readily overseen, while still providing a relief for those waiting/trying to find affordable housing. That should be the ultimate goal, correct? There is nothing wrong with an RV as permanent housing, or choosing the RV life, but those of us who don't want that, and didn't choose our property with that in mind, shouldn't be forced to acquiesce to that lifestyle. And, if the goal is temporary/affordable housing to address the housing crisis, establishing county wide locations to provide this, and to not dangerously impact homeowners, would be the responsible thing to do.

Lastly, I have some concerns about the integrity of the survey results you are reporting. When I attended the initial meeting at the Veteran's Memorial Hall, I thought I heard it mentioned that the majority of responses had major concerns about this proposal and were not in favor as is, if at all. It is curious to me that you report that 72% were in favor. Again, I possibly could have misheard, but the fact that the majority of in person responses at that meeting, as well as the meeting where you voted to move the proposal forward WERE NOT in favor of this, makes one wonder. Especially since you say they "widely varied", which I would propose is not an accurate recollection of events. Even the correspondence you

have provided seems to support those of us who are opposed to this ordinance and provides you with very specifics as to why.

Thank you for considering my words and I hope you sincerely take into consideration the long-term impacts of your decision. Not just the image that you are trying to establish, or the money you are looking to get from the state for meeting the affordable housing requirements. There are better ways than to disregard the rights of established property owners.

Kind regards,

Kristen Thomas Cook

Jodeana Patterson

From: Andy Cassano <andy@nevadacityengineering.com>
Sent: Monday, July 6, 2026 3:19 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: RV Ordinance Comments
Attachments: RV Ordinance Comments.pdf

You don't often get email from andy@nevadacityengineering.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.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Please accept the attached comments regarding the revised, proposed RV Ordinance. It looks like my comments are late as I misread the deadline. I hope that they can still be considered.

Thank you, Andy

Andrew R. Cassano

Professional Land Surveyor
Town and Regional Planner
P. O. Box 700
Cedar Ridge, CA 95924
530-913-8485
andynevada@gmail.com

ANDREW R. CASSANO

PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYOR * RURAL LAND PLANNER

POST OFFICE BOX 700
CEDAR RIDGE, CA 95924

(530) 913-8485

andynevada@gmail.com

July 2, 2026

Planning Department
COUNTY OF NEVADA
950 Maidu Avenue
Nevada City, CA 95959

REGARDING: RV Ordinance Comments

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Please accept the following comments and suggestions regarding the proposed RV Ordinance now under consideration:

Housing Needs Significance

First, it is so critical to recognize the importance of this ordinance. This is an opportunity to take the first meaningful step toward housing affordability in decades. Nothing can compare to the affordability of a travel trailer or similar RV. Looking at Marketplace, a complete living unit can be purchased for between \$10,000 and \$20,000. No other housing options even come close.

I applaud the Board's direction to require that RV occupancy be for lower income individuals. This is clearly the part of society that needs this option the most.

I also applaud the decision to drop the 3-acre minimum requirement. RV unit housing will be most effective when it can be established as close to public transportation as possible.

Goal of the Ordinance Planning Process

All decisions and actions in planning take into consideration the potential impact of the land use on neighboring properties. RVs are routinely parked on many properties. The goal of this ordinance should be to allow normal occupancy of RV units with little or no noticeable impact on neighboring lands or the public at large.

Suggested Changes or Additions:

Skirting. On the one hand, the ordinance properly requires RVs to remain mobile as vehicles with the tires and wheels on. Requiring skirting seems at odds with tire maintenance and unnecessarily adds to costs.

Parking. The draft ordinance addresses the surfacing for parking, but it should make it clear that one off-street parking space is required, in addition to the two spaces or other required parking for the house and any other existing uses.

Septic Capacity. For units connected to existing rural septic systems, it would defeat the goal of affordability to require an expensive expansion of the leach field or the construction of a new septic tank and leach field. I suggest that a deed restriction could require that one bedroom of the on-site house not be occupied, in order to provide capacity for the RV to connect to the existing septic tank/leach field system without modifications.

Outside Storage: Outside storage associated with the RV unit should not be allowed. Outside the unit, only parking and typical patio/barbeque furniture should be allowed. Letting an outside accumulation of junk would be an unfair impact on surrounding properties. The County Codes allow for the construction of small storage sheds and they could be constructed for ancillary storage.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment and thank you for your continued work on this important legislation.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Andrew R. Cassano". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Andrew" being the most prominent part.

Andrew R. Cassano

3 July 2026

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 the presence of humans, 95% of all fires in California are started by people. The ignition risk is likely to increase significantly because those living in RVs are much more likely to be cooking with propane, on barbeques 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. 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, hours after we witnessed this event. This type of behavior (increase in trash—some dumped repeatedly in front of our home on Red Dog Road, 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 (some on our property), trespassing and theft, and it is not unreasonable to link some of those challenges to past efforts to allow unregulated housing.

And, if the new (more relaxed!) 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 reconsider this path. Our forests, our safety, and our community depend on responsible planning.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth A. Hadly

14990 Red Dog Road

Nevada City, CA 95959

Jodeana Patterson

From: Anthony Barnosky <tonybarnosky@me.com>
Sent: Friday, July 3, 2026 8:23 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Opposed to RV Ordinance - Comments

You don't often get email from tonybarnosky@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.

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

I am writing to express my serious concerns about the current draft of the RVs as Permanent Housing Ordinance. As I understand the draft, it stipulates the following items, all of which present dangers to the Banner Mountain community and/or are discriminatory.

1. Tenants restricted to a low income requirements. *This is discriminatory—what applies to one income group should apply to all income groups.*
2. Parcel size limitation of a 3 acre minimum removed. *This is dangerous and potentially leads to unsanitary conditions, with too many people being crammed onto parcels that have inadequate utility and sewage capacity.*

Neither does the revised ordinance address the many important concerns raised in comments about the earlier draft.

Dramatically increased fire danger.

1. There is insufficient capacity for emergency responders to reach the interior of parcels where campers would be, and certainly an insufficient number of fire hydrants or other water resources for quenching spot fires before they become major fires. Already campers have started several fires in the Banner Mountain area and elsewhere in the community.
2. Insufficient evacuation routes for current population let alone additional population,
3. Increased evacuation congestion risk as RVs are not permanently placed on jacks but kept with wheels attached. Personal observation indicates that many of the RVs people are living in (illegally presently) and their vehicles are in poor shape and liable to break down and clog evacuation routes.
4. Increased wildfire start risk due to outdoor cooking and generator use,
5. No accompanying nuisance ordinance to address noise and lights in rural areas. Among the already persistent problems that Code Enforcement does not have the capacity to address are frequent gunshots, fireworks, and barking and loose dogs, the latter of which have killed chickens and severely injured dogs of tax-paying residents.
6. No analysis on impact to homeowner's wildfire insurance costs and impact on non-participating homeowners' equity valuation.

7. Allowance of human waste pumping services (in lieu of attachment to septic system) without any landlord to requirement to ensure such an expensive service will be properly utilized. Again, personal observation indicates that frequently waste is simply dumped on the ground from RVs in many cases. I have already put in complaints to Code Enforcement about this issue.

In summary, allowing permanent residence of RVs clearly is a major danger in terms of wildfire, sanitation, and general community safety, as well as degrading property values for residents who are invested in their communities. I strongly oppose any measure to allow RVs to be used as permanent dwellings in our local area and Nevada County in general.

Thank you for considering these comments and in ensuring that our community remains safe.

Sincerely,
Anthony D. Barnosky
14990 Red Dog Road
Nevada City, CA 95959

Jodeana Patterson

From: C. M. Eldon <cmeldon1952@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 2, 2026 11:58 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance; alrvordiance@nevadacountyca.gov
Subject: Proposed RV Ordinance Concerns For Nevada County

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 Board Chairperson Swarthout, Board of Supervisors and Nevada County Planning Department Director Brian Foss,

I have several concerns and comments regarding the newly revised Alternative RV Living recommendations as have been recently proposed.

- What is the maximum Occupant Capacity for a 400 sf RV as a home and is that in the recommendations? Who is going to enforce the occupancy limits?
- Did I understand correctly that Temporary RV living does not require permanent Water, Sewer and Electric hook up the same as permanent living?
- Is Temporary RV Housing presumed to be moved from the premises after 90 days? If not and a new individual tenant comes into live in the existing RV how is that different from permanent housing except it's a different person?
- If the Temporary RV Housing is a revolving Door, then shouldn't there be mandatory permanent hook ups for utilities? Permanent sewer or septic would eliminate the risk of a toxic spill.
- Did I also understand that no rent may be charged or collected for any of the temporary housing? How does that help the landowner? I'm confused.
- Reducing the Five Acre property size to Three Acres will obviously help additional landowners and tenants but, at the same time it will increase the population density and the ability to evacuate the additional people in the event of a fire. Think Paradise... not enough roads to evacuate all of the people. People died.
- Reducing the property acreage requirement will also place additional strain on Medical, Fire, Police, Electrical, Sewer and Water providers. More People but still the same number of providers.
- Are you aware that there are only two Firefighters per engine that respond to fires? Two Firefighters can't do much to put out a fire. Adding one more Firefighter to an Engine could help mitigate fires without having to wait for the second Engine to arrive.
- There are new guidelines for Fire Truck access to properties in regards to width of roads, weight carrying ability the roads for Fire Equipment and vegetation removal for access to allow two Fire Trucks to pass. Will those guidelines be met before RV housing moves in?
- Are you aware that there are no or limited Fire Hydrants in some unincorporated areas of the county? Think Private Roads that NID does not service.

- Are you aware that there was just an RV Fire on Loma Rica Rd, very near the Airport that could have progressed into catastrophe if the road would have become impassable to the Cal Fire Pilots?
- Are you aware that RV's are made of extremely combustible material that once ignited can spread fire to the surrounding area before the Engine with two Firefighters can get to it to wait for the second Engine to arrive so they can fight the fire?
- How will the Homeowners fire insurance be affected by having a permanent Combustible RV situated on their property? Remember the Engine with two firefighters has to wait for another Engine to adequately and safely fight a fire.
- Until the Fire Insurance Questions can be answered there should be NO RV Ordinance finalized.
- It is quite noble for Nevada County to be on the forefront of housing the homeless and lower income individuals but, possibly with a more centralized approach in having a designated area such as an RV Park near the Fairgrounds versus spread out with individuals all around the County. However, being noble set aside, little Nevada County may not be the best County in the State to try something of this possible magnitude. A forested rural area with non-existent public transportation and limited Fire Engines might be a recipe for disaster. Think the Highway 49 widening project will be completed in 2028. Will that project be adequate when finished if more people come to the County? Is that one road widening going to save everyone?
- Question... How did all of the homeless and low income indigent folks get here in the first place and why weren't they helped when they arrived? My bet is the County is so small with insufficient resources for mental health programs that there was really no help.
- How are the homeless and transients going to be evacuated in case of fire when they have no means of transportation or poorly kept vehicles that fail and are left by the side of the road?
- Question: How many homeowners do you really believe will want to pay tens of thousands of dollars to install permanent utilities on their property and then have a mandated low income person be their only source of income?
- How many low income individuals are we talking about? The recent homeless count?
- Remember that the taxes that the county gets from the taxpayers that really want to live, work and play here will dry up if the supervisors ram an ordinance down our throats that increases our property taxes and especially the ever increasing Fire Insurance Rates just to placate some individuals that perhaps made poor life choices in their past. Don't allow any ordinance to pass until the Fire Insurance Rates can be determined for those of us that are responsible for paying taxes.
- I'm confused that the ordinance can legally specify a maximum income that a landowner must accept from a tenant. Isn't setting a maximum income for a tenant violating the landowners rights to earn from fair trade unless the housing is designated in some fashion as low income only?
- I believe you also would be violating the rights of higher income individuals that just want a smaller compact way to live.

Thank you for your time and consideration of my comments.

Christine M Eldon

District 1

July 2, 2026

Board Chairperson Swarthout
Members of the Board of Supervisors
Planning Director Brian Foss
Nevada County Planning Department

Dear Chairperson Swarthout, Members of the Board, and Director Foss:

As you deliberate on the proposed ordinance amendment, I urge you to carefully evaluate several important facts and consider an alternative approach to providing housing to low-income residents.

First, many unincorporated areas of Nevada County lack fire hydrant infrastructure. Second, human activity is the leading cause of many wildfires. Increasing the number of residents in unincorporated areas inherently elevates wildfire risk. Permitting additional occupancy in recreational vehicles (RVs), often accompanied by semi-camping lifestyles and reliance on fuel-powered generators, will further increase the likelihood of fire ignition.

Numerous studies, reports, and planning documents already acknowledge the significant wildfire vulnerability faced by Nevada County's rural communities. These include:

- The California State Fire Marshal's designation of Nevada County as an area of extreme wildfire risk.
- Title 4 Fire Safety Regulations contained within Nevada County Ordinances.
- The 2024 Nevada County Hazard Mitigation Plan.
- The 2024 Nevada County Evacuation Study.
- The 2025 Nevada County Community Wildfire Protection Plan.

In addition, Nevada County has experienced multiple RV fires during the past year. Following one such incident, a local fire official observed that "with motorhome fires we are behind the curve as soon as we are dispatched—they go up extremely fast." RVs and motorhomes are commonly constructed with lightweight materials such as fiberglass and thin metal components to facilitate transportation, making them particularly susceptible to rapid fire spread. Notably, the County previously maintained that RVs were unsuitable for permanent habitation for similar safety reasons.

The proposed ordinance revision also fails to adequately address recently adopted roadway ingress and egress standards applicable to rural areas. These standards require a minimum roadway width of 44 feet, including a 20-foot driving surface, two-foot shoulders capable of supporting 44,000 pounds, and ten feet of managed vegetation clearance on each side. No additional residential occupancy should be approved unless these roadway safety requirements are fully satisfied.

Board members and County representatives have participated in numerous wildfire preparedness forums, statewide working groups, and public discussions emphasizing the importance of reducing wildfire exposure and addressing the growing homeowners insurance crisis. Those concerns are directly relevant to this proposal.

The California FAIR Plan has obtained approval for substantial insurance rate increases affecting policyholders in wildfire-prone regions, including Nevada County.

Despite community inquiries, County representatives have not clearly explained how this ordinance could affect wildfire-risk modeling conducted by the FAIR Plan and admitted insurance carriers, nor how it might influence future insurance premiums.

Similarly, County representatives have not provided meaningful analysis regarding the potential impact of this ordinance on nearby property values and homeowner equity.

Beyond these concerns, I believe the proposal lacks several critical safeguards for existing residents, including:

- Adoption of a comprehensive nuisance ordinance covering unincorporated Nevada County.
- Additional funding and staffing resources for Code Compliance enforcement. While Director Kelley has expressed confidence in existing staffing levels, the volume of future complaints generated by this ordinance is currently unknown.
- A mitigation strategy addressing evacuation-route deficiencies identified in the Nevada County Evacuation Study.
- Requirements that RVs used as permanent residences be installed on stabilizing systems or otherwise regulated to prevent their use as temporary evacuation housing during emergencies.

I understand why RV owners and prospective landlords may view this proposal favorably. However, there is a substantial risk that some property owners will either misunderstand or intentionally disregard ordinance requirements. This could contribute to an increase in unauthorized encampments as individuals from outside the County seek affordable housing alternatives. Nevada County is already confronting similar challenges, and experience has shown these situations are often difficult, time-consuming, and costly to resolve.

California has 58 counties. By population, Nevada County ranks approximately 36th. Given its limited infrastructure and severe wildfire exposure, it is reasonable to question why Nevada County should serve as a testing ground for an unproven policy approach. A more prudent strategy would be to observe how larger, better-equipped counties with lower wildfire risk implement and manage similar policies, learning from their successes and failures before applying such changes locally.

Residents look to their elected officials to reduce wildfire risk, protect public safety, and help stabilize the cost and availability of homeowners insurance. In my view, this ordinance advances none of those objectives.

Ultimately, the proposed ordinance conflicts with the findings of existing studies, established planning documents, and widely accepted wildfire-risk reduction principles. Given the extensive body of information already available, approving the ordinance despite these concerns could reasonably be viewed as a failure to exercise due diligence. I therefore encourage each of you to weigh this decision carefully and consider its long-term consequences for the residents you represent.

The alternative housing for low-income residents, which I urge you to consider, is a centralized solution similar to Oakland's Operation Dignity, <https://operationdignity.org/our-programs/community-cabins-low-barrier-shelter-for-oakland-residents/>, where unhoused residents are provided shelter, fresh drinking water, bathrooms, meals, along with access to mental and physical health care, and support to find permanent housing. This is a substantially better alternative to housing homeless individuals in trailers located far from town, where access to essential services such as water, electricity, and sewage is unavailable.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Janet Banner

Resident, District 1

Jodeana Patterson

From: Donna Rogers <4donnarogers@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 2, 2026 3:39 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: RV ordinance

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

[You don't often get email from 4donnarogers@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.

Dear Supervisors,

I am against this ordinance for the following reasons:

- 1). Fire danger and insurance rate hikes across the board.
- 2). Nuisance RV renters (smoking weed/ cigarettes outside, noise, floodlights, etc)
- 3.) Changing the rural lifestyle.

Paving Paradise?

Sincerely,

Donna Rogers

July 2, 2026

Board Chairperson Swarthout
Board of Supervisors' Members
Nevada County Planning Department Director Brian Foss

Dear Chairperson Swarthout, Board Members, and Planning Director Brian Foss:

There are several facts that you should each consider very carefully when making your decision on this proposed ordinance revision. These facts are readily available to all Board Members. They are as follows:

1. Many unincorporated areas of Nevada County do not have fire hydrants.
2. People create wildfires. Adding people to unincorporated areas increases wildfire risk. Adding people in highly combustible RVs, with a quasi-camping lifestyle and the use of gas generators, increases this risk further.
3. There are multiple reports and studies available to the Board of Supervisors that confirm unincorporated areas of Nevada County are particularly vulnerable to loss of homes and life due to wildfire risk. These reports include:
 - a. The State Fire Marshall rating of Nevada County at the highest wildfire risk level.
 - b. The Title 4: Fire Safety Regulations, Nevada County Ordinances
 - c. The 2024 Nevada County Hazard Mitigation Plan
 - d. The 2024 Nevada County Evacuation Study and the
 - e. The 2025 Nevada County Community Wildfire Protection Plan
4. There have been multiple RV fires in Nevada County over the last year alone. When speaking during an interview about a recent RV fire, a local fire official stated that, "with motorhome fires we are behind the curve as soon as we are dispatched. They go up extremely fast." Motorhomes are usually built with very light construction, to allow easier transport, usually sheet metal or fiberglass. Interestingly, the County's initial position was that RVs were not appropriate for fulltime living in Nevada County for similar reasons.
5. The proposed ordinance revision does not allude to the new road ingress/egress requirements for at least 44ft of roadway in rural areas. This includes 20ft of road surface, 2ft shoulder able to withstand 44,000 pounds and 10ft on both sides of managed vegetation. No new living quarters should be approved unless these new roadway requirements are met.
6. Board members and their representatives have participated in many wildfire panels, statewide committees, and speaking engagements extolling the importance of wildfire risk reduction and the concerns with rising homeowner's insurance costs relative to this risk.
7. The CalFAIR Plan successfully submitted a request to the California Department of Insurance to raise Homeowner's Insurance costs by an average of 29% for our area in 2026.

8. Nevada County representatives have been unable to clarify how this proposed ordinance will impact CalFAIR Plan, and other admitted carriers, risk modeling and associated policy cost increases.
9. Nevada County representatives have been unable to clarify how this proposed ordinance will impact the resell value (equity) of impacted nearby homes.

In addition to these facts, I am also concerned that this proposal does not include appropriate protections for homeowners, including:

1. A comprehensive nuisance ordinance for the unincorporated areas of Nevada County.
2. Additional funding for Code Compliance. While Director Kelley believes he has sufficient staff to address community concerns, the number of potential future complaints is unknown currently.
3. Mitigation plan for lack of sufficient evacuation routes as highlighted in the Nevada County Evacuation Study.
4. Requiring RVs to be permanently placed on stabilizing jacks so they cannot be utilized to evacuate during an emergency.

I understand the excitement of RV dwellers, and potential landlords, to hear that Nevada County welcomes RV permanent living in rural areas. Unfortunately, landowners may not read, or may choose to ignore, the ordinance requirements resulting in the proliferation of unlawful encampments as people from other counties flood into this area. This is already occurring in Nevada County and is proving to be a difficult, complex, and very lengthy issue to resolve.

There are 58 counties in California. Based upon population Nevada County is ranked 36. Why is this small county on the bleeding edge of an unproven proposal? The more appropriate approach is to see how a county with better infrastructure, and lower wildfire risk, navigates this issue. Learn from their experiences before applying to a county with poor infrastructure and very high wildfire risk. I look to our supervisors to reduce wildfire risk and assist in stabilizing the homeowner's insurance market. This proposed ordinance revision does neither.

Bottom line, this ordinance revision is contrary to currently available studies, reports, and common-sense wildfire risk reduction principles. With all the information available, to approve this ordinance revision rises to the level of government negligence. Vote carefully as you will be held to account.

Thank you.

Maureen Graber
District 1

Jodeana Patterson

From: Morris Hervey <morris.hervey@att.net>
Sent: Thursday, July 2, 2026 2:48 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Alternative RV Housing Ordinance

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.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I want to offer the BOS a plea and a serious warning against approving the Alternative RV Housing Ordinance. My plea and warning are based on an informed position against the ordinance:

The BOS has consistently moved to make more and more housing available to the low-income and homeless people EVERYWHERE in Nevada County. While most would agree that we want as many people as possible to have a permanent shelter, the Board's consistent efforts in this area - ignoring warnings from organizations such as the Nevada County OES, and the history of catastrophic wildfire evacuations in the last 10-15 years (Camp Fire and many others in California and around the globe). The BOS should also be aware that many in Nevada County plan alternate evacuation routes through private property and carry bolt cutters to break through private property barriers - a dicey proposition at best!

- Referring to emergency wildfire evacuation, a Nevada County OES representative at a Friends of Banner Mountain meeting in December 2025 said : **"Expect chaos"**!
- The Nevada County OES fire evacuation study of two or three years ago spelled it out in stark terms: The resulting evacuation maps for areas like Banner Mtn., Cascade Shores and Alta Sierra showed extremely congested traffic, and at least in the case of Banner Mountain evacuation (paraphrasing), "The congested traffic along the evacuation routes could be overtaken by a fast moving fire"! The evacuation study was based on input from wildfire experts as well as traffic engineers!

People may die in their cars trying to evacuate, and probably will, in an emergency evacuation scenario created by very dry and windy conditions - conditions all too likely to occur with increasing frequency in the years ahead.

Please do NOT approve this ordinance! Doing so will place additional evacuation traffic on an already potentially catastrophic evacuation scenario - fast moving wildfires on limited and overloaded evacuation routes.

Sincerely,

Morris Hervey

Nevada City

Jodeana Patterson

From: Jo Ann Rebane <jarebane@msn.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 2, 2026 2:55 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance; Sue Hoek; Lisa Swarthout; Hardy Bullock; Heidi Hall; Robb Tucker
Cc: Jo Ann Rebane
Subject: Public comment - Draft RV Dwelling Ordinance
Attachments: Opposition to Draft RV Dwelling Ordinance final.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.

Attached is my opposition statement listing reasons why the ordinance should be defeated along with detailed comments , numbered section by numbered section, pointing out lack of specificity/clarity and lack of stated consequences for non-compliance.

Jo Ann Rebane

Jo Ann Rebane
Nevada City, CA
530-263-4623 mobile

Opposition - Draft RV Dwelling Ordinance – Sec. 12.03.150

Jo Ann Rebane – 29 June 2026 – Cement Hill Rd., Nevada City, 95959

1. There are legions of people who want someone else to spend lots of money to comply with the RV ordinance and host a tenant in an RV at their home. Online comments and testimony at public hearings tell another story. Not ONE property owner has stepped forward to say, "yes, I'll spend a lot of money to comply with the RV Dwelling Ordinance in order to host a "hardship" or any kind of tenant in an RV at my house."
2. Rudimentary financial feasibility analysis shows that there's no reasonable way for a property owner to recoup the initial costs of setting up an RV as a permanent dwelling including the ongoing costs of maintaining an RV dwelling. The property owner who elects to purchase a mid-priced used RV to rent out and experiences higher utility/installation costs along with annual ongoing costs will, per the illustration below, likely elect to charge monthly rent of about \$2,450 which would price out individuals who meet the "hardship" criteria specified in the draft ordinance. Even if the RV is an older, cheap one and installation costs are low, monthly rent of about \$1,700 could be expected. See spreadsheet below:

RV Ordinance Financial Feasibility High/Low
gjr - 2jul26 All costs in K\$

Initial Investment			Yrly Ongoing Costs		Rent Calculation	
	High	Low			High	
RV/Trailer	\$ 75.00	\$ 10.00	Maintenance	\$ 5.00	Mortgage Interest	7.00%
Driveway/Access	\$ 5.00	\$ 3.00	RV&PropInsurance	\$ 3.00	Mortgage Term	10
RV Pad	\$ 4.00	\$ 2.00	Property tax	\$ 2.00	Mortgage	1.52
Water	\$ 8.00	\$ 5.00	Water	\$ 1.00	Ongoing costs	\$ 11.00
Electricity	\$ 8.00	\$ 1.00			Profit	5.0%
Propane	\$ 10.00	\$ 5.00	Total	\$ 11.00	Hi Monthly Rent =	\$ 2.48
Septic	\$ 10.00	\$ 5.00			Annual Rent =	\$ 29.80
Permits, etc	\$ 6.00	\$ 3.00				
RVLicense/Insurance	\$ 1.00	\$ 0.60				
Added PropertyTax	\$ 2.00	\$ 1.50				
Added HomeOwnerIns	\$ 2.00	\$ 1.00				
Total	\$ 131.00	\$ 37.10				

$$P_N = \frac{A_0 r_m}{1 - (r'_m)^{-N}}$$

High r_m = 0.0058
 High r'_m = 1.0058
 Low r_m = 0.0050
 Low r'_m = 1.0050

	Low
Mortgage Interest	6.00%
Mortgage Term	5
Mortgage	0.73
Ongoing costs	\$ 11.00
Profit	5.0%
Low Monthly Rent =	\$ 1.70
Annual Rent =	\$ 20.37

3. This version of Sec.12.03.150 encourages and promotes the proliferation of scoff-law RVs in the county. It is well known that our “code compliance” department doesn’t have the resources to enforce current regulations. Without language specifying fines for non-compliance, authorizing unannounced inspections and non-judicial evictions, bond requirements, and property liens, the ordinance is just words on paper.
4. I searched Rentals.com and Zillow.com for apartment rental figures on June 29th and found 38 apartments available to rent in Nevada County. Monthly rents ranged from \$750/mo for a Tiny Home (with an outside pit toilet) and up to \$3,600 for an apartment with 3 bedrooms. From the list of 38 apartments for rent, the average rent/mo is \$1774. Thirty-eight apartments available in one day is more than the total number of ADUs, JrADUs, Tiny Homes on Wheels, and Title 25 dwellings permitted in any year since adoption of those ordinances. Local apartments exist today and are located in and near the cities where services and transportation are readily available.
5. Why would you adopt the proposed RV Dwelling Ordinance when you know that RVs are VEHICLES and that allowing persons legally to live in a vehicle will not/does not help the County meet state mandated housing goals for any low-income population category? Also, a person who reports that they live in an RV during the Point-in-Time homeless count is categorized as “unhoused”. No help there either. Vehicles are not houses.
6. Important questions remain unanswered. Do any homeowner’s policies cover an RV as a dwelling? Will the FAIR Plan cover a residence where a tenant lives in an RV on the property? How will an RV on one property affect the insurance rates of neighboring properties? How will having an RV as an ADU affect owner’s property tax assessment? Will property values plummet? How many additional staff will be needed at what cost to administer/enforce the ordinance? What penalties for non-compliance are contemplated? How would being the only county in California to permit RV dwelling affect the county’s fisc?
7. I want to be in favor of something, but this is not it. Pursuit of permitting permanent occupancy of a recreational VEHICLE is at best a futile exercise in virtue signaling and at worst, a fool’s errand. The Draft RV Dwelling Ordinance should be defeated.

A. Purpose: Provide for temporary and long term occupancy of RVs for needed housing for county residents. This purpose invites extensions of the current temporary RV uses while doing NOTHING to satisfy State mandated increases to Acutely, Extremely, and Very Low housing goals.

B. Definitions: Should also prohibit many truck mounted RV as these slide-in-campers usually do not include a full bathroom.

C. Standards for long term RV dwelling:

1. Verified income. Why require tenant to demonstrate income not to exceed 50% of Area Median Income when the Regional Housing Authority apartments in the county use 30% of AMI? 50% of AMI for a single person is \$50,000. Does that person really meet the "hardship" category this revised ordinance was meant to assist? In general, I oppose incentivizing people to stay poor.

2. Zoning & Density: I oppose dropping the 3 acre minimum in RA zone. According to Planning Director Brian Foss, the number of parcels in all rural zones which would qualify to host an RV tenant has now been increased from 10,843 to 18,024. I oppose allowing both a secondary dwelling (ADU or Tiny Home) and an RV in addition to the primary residence. Just imagine the water and sewage management needs of 3 users of those systems. Also, properties distant from transportation and services are not appropriate for hardship cases who need to get to work or the doctor.

3. Permitting: This section should also require that the RV must be removed w/in 10 days of permit expiration. Fees or bond should cover cost of removal if property owner fails to remove or a tax lien should be placed on the property if the county removes the RV. How much will the permit and inspection fees be?

4. Inspections: What do the inspections cost? Who schedules and pays for the multiple inspections? Does the county need more inspectors?

5. Certifications: This requirement has little merit. 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 at what cost?

6. Deed restriction: What does it cost to prepare and record a deed restriction? 30 consecutive days is NOT long enough to be considered long-term. Who would go to all the trouble and cost of complying with this ordinance and endure the nuisance factor of hosting revolving tenants?

7. Accessory Structures (detached & permitted): How will this be enforced? What consequences for un-permitted add-ons?

8. Foundation: (paving & no leveling blocks): This requirement mandates conditions found in top-notch RV parks and will be very costly to implement.

9. Screening : This won't make the trailer look like a stick built house and adds more cost. Why require? Who checks at what cost?

10. Habitability: This section includes the MOST important requirements for health and safety and the most expensive requirements to implement.

a. Live & sleep w heat & light – yes, of course

b. *24 hour on-site dedicated access* – **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 an address different from the primary residence?

d. Detectors – Unclear – Who checks, tests, and certifies good working order? Self reporting? Consequences?

e. Fire extinguisher – Who checks? Who bears responsibility in case of fire – property owner or tenant?

f. Solid Waste – of course comply with laws/codes, locate leach field far from water well, assure that septic system large enough to accommodate residence

& RV if shared. This is a major health & safety concern if not implemented properly.

g. Utility connections & mechanical equipment

1. Water – permitted, inspected, good working order – yes! (a) if well, gpm requirement & possible storage tank – yes! Will be costly to implement and maintain.

2. Sewage disposal – permitted, inspected, good working order – yes! Watch out for grey and black water disposal. Assume alternative septic using 55 gallon drum NOT permitted. Likely costly to implement and maintain.

3. Dedicated electrical equipment, panels, meters. Generator prohibited – Yes! Definitely expensive to provide.

4. Fuel – permitted propane/natural gas – Site preparation, connections, and tank rental costs money. Any consequences if no permit obtained? Who checks?

5. All utility connections (water, sewage drain, electrical, fuel supply) conform to state & local regulations, inspected, & permitted. What consequences if this step omitted?

6. Wood stove prohibited – OK

h. Modifications to any part of RV system must protect health, safety, and welfare of occupant, neighbors, and environment. Permits and ANSI certifications required. What consequences if changes not approved, permitted, inspected? How would anyone know about modifications? Self reporting?

i. Wind and snow loads – OK – costly to implement-

11. Driveway meet fire safe standards – Which agency checks compliance? Any consequences for non-compliance?

12. Fire protection plan approved by County Fire Marshal & filed w county planning dept. & appropriate fire district. Who qualified to write protection plan? How are representations verified? Any bond required? How is compliance

monitored after permit issued and by which agency? What consequences for non-compliance?

a.-f. No objections but realize compliance requires property owner and RV occupant's adherence. Who checks? Consequences for failure to comply?

g. Provide fuels management plan. a.-e. - Who prepares the plan – property owner, master gardener, forester? High fuel loads exist in the entire county – more specificity needed here. Does property owner describe and promise to create defensible space or must he contract with approved provider? Does property owner certify/promise to hire weed whackers and foresters yearly? Must owner provide signed contracts and to whom? Can property owner promise to do the defensible space work himself? Which agency checks compliance?

Jodeana Patterson

From: Tom Durkin <tdurkin@vfr.net>
Sent: Thursday, July 2, 2026 12:34 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance; Lisa Swarthout; Heidi Hall; Sue Hoek; Hardy Bullock; Robb Tucker
Cc: Alison Lehman; Brian Foss; Ryan Gruver; Tyler Barrington; Trisha Tillotson; Code Compliance
Subject: Response to revised Alt/RV ordinance
Attachments: NPTGP response to revised RV ord_FINAL.docx
Importance: High

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.

Dear Ladies and Gentlemen:

In the spirit of getting everyone of the same page, I have attached the No Place To Go Project's formal position paper, as approved by our Board of Directors, on the county's revised draft RV Housing/Alternative Dwelling Ordinance. As you will see, we do not and cannot support the revised draft as written.

We have already met with or hope to meet with each of you in the coming weeks before the July 28 public re-hearing of the ordinance. We are happy to discuss our reasons with you and are interested in hearing your rationale for this ordinance. Even if we do not agree, we very much want to keep our lines of communication open with civility and respect.

On behalf of our board, respectfully,

Tom

Chair of the Board of Directors
and Executive Director
No Place To Go Project



It is in the shelter of each other that we live.

	No Place To Go Project 231½ S.Church St. Grass Valley,CA 95945 530-559-3199 www.facebook.com/SRNPTGP www.noplacetogoproject.org	<i>The No Place To Go Project is an arts-based 501(c)(3) nonprofit dedicated to social justice for homeless and other at-risk people.</i> <i>FEIN 39-3896801</i>
---	--	--

No Place To Go Project position paper on the revised Alternative Housing/RV Dwelling Draft Ordinance – 7/2/26

Dear Nevada County Supervisors Swarthout, Hall, Hoek, Bullock and Tucker:

With great sadness, we must inform you that the No Place To Go Project cannot support the revised 6/1/26 Draft RV Dwelling Ordinance as written.

Essentially, the revised ordinance creates nothing but paper housing. It's a prohibitive quagmire of rules, restrictions and fees that appears to be designed to discourage and even prevent people from living in RVs and trailers.

Why spend more than a year of staff time, taxpayer money and public input to codify regulations that look good on paper but will produce no actual affordable housing on the ground?



We at the No Place To Go Project brought this RV Ordinance proposal to you to serve people who cannot find or afford housing. It's not their fault they're unhoused. It's the fault of a society that is willing to tolerate people living in their cars, living on the ground and in other places not fit for human habitation.

We watched you celebrate a "compromise" March 10. You didn't compromise with us. This is not your ordinance. It is the people of Nevada County's ordinance. Your own 2025 survey revealed 72% of your constituents support allowing people to live in RVs and trailers, yet you appear to be more responsive to the minority opposition who have no actual stake in this other than their own self-informed self-interests and mostly imaginary fears.

The actual stakeholders – tenants and landlords – are not served by this ordinance.

While we understand you are bound by law to require certain health & safety standards and other codes, you have imposed two entirely arbitrary and restrictive conditions that are dealbreakers for us:

- Two-year permit renewal and inspection with fees ranging up to \$350.
- Only allowing people whose income is below 50% of the of the AMI (area median income) to live in RVs and trailers

Led by the No Place To Go Project, a social justice nonprofit for unhoused, homeless and at-risk people, Nevada County citizens have rallied in peaceful, democratic support of housing for the people (tenants) by the people (property owners). We urge you to **listen to your constituents**.

Our intent was to make it easy to live in RVs on private property because they comprise the only truly affordable housing currently available – and because an estimated several thousand folks already live in them because that's the only housing they could find or afford. It's a proven solution for our homeless/housing crisis.

THE PROBLEM WITH TWO-YEAR RENEWAL

Removes incentive for tenants to invest in property improvements that are a waste of time, effort and money if they're at risk of being forced to move after two years.

Two-years is not enough time for low-income tenants to save enough money to afford other, more expensive living conditions, much less to save for a down payment on property or a house.

The possibility of having to move after two years imposes a **psychological and financial hardship** on already stressed-out residents.

There is no place to go that is comparably affordable or “better” than an RV. In fact, it is often more expensive and less desirable.

If a sunset must be imposed, it must not be an arbitrary date. It must be based on data-driven affordable housing availability.

It is highly unlikely that there will be enough available, affordable housing in two years.

Per an informed source, renewal inspections and fees every two years could cost tenant/landlord as much as \$350.

There are absolutely no incentives to landlords or tenants to voluntarily seek a permit from the county. Many people will be willing to take the risk of living underground. Landlords would be free to be slumlords and exploit desperate tenants.

THE PROBLEM WITH INCOME RESTRICTION

To restrict to people below 50% of AMI eliminates the affordable opportunity to people who need to keep their housing costs low so they can, among other things:

- Pay off debt and build credit
- Save to buy property or a house
- Invest in their business, art, sport, charity
- Live within their means
- Pay for college or training

Making landlords demand proof of low income (less than 50% of Area Median Income) from tenants is a burden on landlords and an invasion of privacy of tenants.

A modest increase in income could force tenants out of the only housing they can afford because rents are so high and scarce that they wouldn't qualify for any form of housing. They could be forced into homelessness by making too much to live in a trailer but not enough to live anywhere else.

If the county or developers invested serious money into the construction of affordable housing, it might be reasonable to restrict tenants to those whose income is less than 50%.

This ordinance, however, does not require construction or investment by the county. As advocated by the No Place To Go Project, this ordinance should be open to anyone who wishes to live in an RV without income restrictions or periodic inspections.

THE ORDINANCE IGNORES REALITY

This ordinance will effectively discourage and prevent new RV housing. The people who will be most affected by the ordinance are those who are already living in RVs and who are the subject of a Code Compliance complaint. The ordinance completely ignores this reality.

Will people already in RVs be grandfathered in? Will they be given time to comply? Will they be given assistance? If tenants must move because the property owner doesn't want to – or can't – comply with arbitrarily prohibitive restrictions, fees and inspections, will tenants be offered comparable, legal housing?

REASONS FOR THE ORDINANCE

This ordinance is not trying to change Nevada County culture. It's trying to **preserve it** against gentrification. Many successful, long-term citizens started out in alternative housing. We are a rural county where this kind of low-income housing has long been the norm. The opposition wants to eliminate entry-level and last-resort housing. To be against this ordinance is to be against our cherished rural culture.

This isn't an ordinance about housing. **It's about people.** According to UC San Francisco, lack of affordable housing is the main cause of homelessness because of low wages and high rents. To be against this ordinance is to support the status quo of homelessness.

The county's motto of Live, Work and Play in Nevada County rings hollow when there is no housing for low-wage and fixed income residents.

Some people become homeless because of addiction and mental disorders. Some people become addicts or mentally ill because of being homeless.

Housing is health care.

We have a **housing crisis**. It may not be an emergency for you, but it's a daily disaster for unhoused people. Allowing people to live in RVs & trailers is a **right-**

here, right now mitigation. There is no other initiative out there that offers a better option as quickly and inexpensively. A three-year waiting list is not housing.

Living in an RV is not a “hardship.” Living in a car or a tent or your ex-husband's couch (real-life incident) is a hardship.

This ordinance is for unhoused young people, students, emerging entrepreneurs, self-employed/freelance creatives, low-wage essential workers, single-parent & low-income families, elderly & disabled, and other at-risk folks.

This ordinance is not for chronically homeless street people who pose the risk of drugs, violence and property damage. We have a separate safe-camp plan to assist them in becoming housing ready.

This ordinance is for permanent housing, not Airbnbs. This is **housing for locals, not tourists**. Short-term rentals are disruptive to neighborhoods. We recommend **minimum rental term of 90 days, not 30**.

Because we have a housing crisis, we must redefine Alt/RV housing because that is the only near-term mitigation of this crisis.

With a simple redefinition of housing, RVs & trailers can be right-now housing for low-income people and could meet RHNA requirements – which are not being met now.

Just because the state and regional housing authority don't currently recognize RVs & trailers as housing doesn't mean that can't be changed in response to the immediate need to mitigate our housing crisis.

Even if RVs are not currently recognized under RHNA, legalizing RVs still would create safe, affordable dwelling units for unhoused people. **The idea is to get people safely inside regardless of whether it qualifies as “housing” for statistical purposes.**

Nevada County is not risking. It's leading. We have the opportunity to show other counties and the state how to significantly impact the rural homeless/housing crisis. It's not a total solution, but it is meaningful action.

RVs & trailers are just another form of ADU. They should not be treated any differently. The tiny homes on wheels ordinance has already established that.

RVs &-trailers that are legal in trailer parks should be legal on private property if they meet the same or equivalent health & safety standards as a trailer park. RVs on private property must not be held to a higher standard than what is allowed in trailer/mobile home parks.

The RV Ordinance is a rural solution, not an urban one.

PROPERTY RIGHTS

Your property rights end at your property line. You do not own the view, and you do not have the right to dictate what your neighbor legally does on her property.

Many property owners feel it is their right to rent an RV responsibly on their property. The county should not deny that right. It should defend it.

Realtors are split on whether this ordinance threatens property value. Some feel it enhances it. They use it as a sales point.

A Nevada County Economic Resource Council meeting on housing revealed that about half the board members felt renting was the only way people could afford their property. (The other half felt low-income people should be shipped off to Marysville or Sacramento.)

The ordinance zoning excludes the majority of people in Alta Sierra, Lake Wildwood and Lake of the Pines. They should not be allowed to dictate what happens in other parts of the county.

MYTHS

RV owners will invade the county. As Supervisor Hall, noted Nevada County's progressive actions on cannabis and homelessness have not resulted in outsider impact. This is confirmed by boots-on-the-ground experience from Hospitality House, SPIRIT and the No Place To Go Project.

RV and other alternative housing dwellers are "homeless." No. They are specifically excluded from the point-in-time count.

Trailers are shelter, not homes. Hospitality House and other congregate living situations are shelter. Alt/RV housing are homes if they are single occupancy with kitchens, bathrooms and sleeping quarters.

State HCD and Regional Housing Authority do not accept RVs & trailers as homes. This is not true. Trailer parks are acceptable for long-term, permanent living. Nobody is forcing those residents to move, be inspected or saying they are not housed. The RV Ordinance governing private property residency meets or exceeds the same standards as trailer parks.

Including RVs on private property as housing is basically a matter of political will. Unhoused citizens are depending on you to do the right thing.

RV dwellers are, by implied definition, in need of county services. This is not true. Some people just need a place to live and to be left alone. It is patronizing and insulting to assume all RV dwellers are the same and must be ghettoized into a trailer park near county services. (Where? The former juvenile hall property?)

RV dwellers need to be "connected." Some people do better living alone; congregate living is too stressful for them. We do not object to a trailer park close to services for those who need them, but a park is not an alternative to private property occupancies. A park would be an additional option, and that is not within the purview of this ordinance.

RVs are uninsurable. Not true for either RV owners or renters. Insurance is readily available from major carriers.

RVs on neighboring property raises insurance rates on nearby property. This is a specious argument. Nobody has offered proof beyond conjecture.

RV dwellers are low-class undesirables. This is pure prejudice based on fear, ignorance, classism and cherry-picked bad examples. When responsible, housing-ready people cannot find affordable housing because there is no affordable housing, it's not their fault. Choosing to live in RVs & trailers because they have no other option does not automatically make them low-class people. There are plenty of trashy people living in houses – and many well-kept houses are only that way because the trashy owners pay low-wage workers to make them look good.

LEGAL INTIMIDATION

If supervisors allow themselves to be threatened by lawsuits, it's an open admission to opponents that anything they don't like can easily be stopped by threats of litigation.

Allowing the county to be intimidated by legal action is an admission of little faith in county legal counsel whose job it is to make ordinances legally defensible.

Many of the threats to the RV Ordinance at the March 10, 2026, hearing were clearly fear-mongering, like saying creating safe, affordable housing for low-income folks is "unconstitutional."

Spurious, bad-faith lawsuits against the county should be countersued for legal costs and damages. The county must stand its ground against legal intimidation.

FINAL ARGUMENTS

We don't see any need for a pilot program. The need is **housing now**.

Our goal is for people to have the option to live in RVs indefinitely/permanently under common rental agreements for as long as the residents and property owners decide. Except for specific, due cause, they should not be subject to extended county interference, oversight, inspections or fees after initial permitting.

An unintended consequence of the revised ordinance is that the No Place To Go Project will not support the ordinance if two-year occupancy or other county-imposed income restrictions negatively impact residents. While we would not advise anyone to break the law, we understand why landlords and tenants could believe they would be better off by not voluntarily complying with the law unless/until they are forced to comply by Code Compliance.

Nobody should be forced to move unless equivalent or better housing at no significant increase in rent is available. Nobody should be forced into a congregate (trailer park or apartment house) living situation against their will and mental health.

Regardless of whether the ordinance is passed or rejected, we must consider a ballot initiative that enables Alt/ADUs, not prevents them. We will propose an Alt/ADU housing ordinance that is far more liberal (e.g., yurts, shipping containers) than the revised ordinance.

In summary, our intent has been to lead a peaceful grassroots effort to permit people to live in RVs and trailers. This ordinance effectively prevents that. Therefore, we do not support this revised ordinance without the elimination of the onerous two-year renewal/inspection and the arbitrary income restriction.

Respectfully,

Board of Directors
No Place To Go Project

Tom Durkin
Kathy Ferguson
Donn Harris
Jennifer Morrill

Jodeana Patterson

From: Scott Knorp <scottknorp@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 1, 2026 3:23 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Opposition to Expanding the Alternative RV Housing Ordinance to Parcels Under 3 Acres

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

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

Members of the Nevada County Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed Alternative RV Housing Ordinance, particularly the recent change that would allow permanent RV residences on properties smaller than three acres.

When this proposal was first introduced, the three-acre minimum at least acknowledged that rural infrastructure has limits. Reducing that threshold fundamentally changes the scope of the ordinance. Instead of affecting a relatively limited number of rural parcels, it dramatically increases the number of properties eligible for permanent RV occupancy and the potential impacts on surrounding neighborhoods.

Nevada County already struggles to enforce its existing code. Planning Commission discussions acknowledged a backlog of approximately 300 code enforcement cases. If the County cannot effectively enforce current regulations governing illegal RV occupancy, septic violations, and unsafe electrical installations, how can it realistically enforce an ordinance that creates thousands of additional opportunities for non-compliance?

The ordinance also continues to rely on "guardrails" that are difficult—or impossible—to monitor. Portable sewage systems, generator use, water supply, and electrical safety all become significantly more challenging as housing density increases on smaller parcels. Many residents depend on private wells, and any increase in improper wastewater disposal creates additional risks to groundwater quality.

As the Firewise lead for my neighborhood, I am especially concerned about wildfire safety. Nevada County has spent years encouraging residents to create defensible space, reduce ignition sources, and improve evacuation planning. Expanding permanent RV occupancy onto smaller parcels moves us in the opposite direction. RVs are not constructed to residential building standards, are more susceptible to fire, and introduce additional fuel sources such as propane, gasoline, and portable generators. At the same time, additional residents on rural roads increase evacuation complexity during fast-moving wildfires. The new language about wildfire safety is not going to solve these issues.

This proposal also raises broader questions of fairness. Homeowners who construct legal accessory dwelling units must comply with building codes, utility requirements, inspections, and often higher property tax assessments. Under this ordinance, RVs that do not meet the same standards could become long-term residences while avoiding many of those costs and requirements.

I fully recognize that Nevada County faces a housing affordability crisis. However, redefining RVs as permanent housing is not a substitute for creating safe, code-compliant affordable housing. Communities that have successfully reduced homelessness have done so by investing in permanent housing, supportive services, and coordinated housing strategies—not by normalizing RVs as residential dwellings.

The decision to reduce the minimum parcel size from three acres makes this ordinance substantially more consequential than originally proposed. Before moving forward, I respectfully ask the Board to carefully consider the cumulative impacts on wildfire safety, water quality, code enforcement, infrastructure, and neighborhood character.

I urge you to reject the ordinance in its current form and pursue housing solutions that protect both vulnerable residents and the long-term safety and quality of life of everyone who calls Nevada County home.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Scott Knorp
Nevada City

Scott Knorp
916-871-6772

Jodeana Patterson

From: Ursula Donofrio <ursdonofrio@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 1, 2026 3:16 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Cc: Ursula Donofrio
Subject: Public Comments-Ursula Donofrio, District 1
Attachments: Public Comments-Alt-RV Ord-July 1-2026-U Donofrio.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.

Why I'm still against the proposed Alt-RV Ordinance: Ursula Donofrio, Homeowner, District 1

Illegal RV occupancy has gone largely unchecked in unincorporated Nevada County. I see it every day. Code Enforcement cannot investigate complaints without property owner (alleged RV Landlord) consent, making the proposed ordinance effectively unenforceable.

By eliminating the 3-acre minimum parcel size, the "revised" Alt-RV Ordinance nearly doubles eligible parcels to approximately 18,000 while still failing to offer a single meaningful enforcement mechanism. Without enforcement, every single regulation is just words on paper.

This ordinance will "normalize" permanent RV living/"camping" in rural neighborhoods without any enforceable protections for our environment and my shallow well on an adjacent parcel. A vote for this ordinance is a blatant disregard for those of us who rely on wells as our only water source. Do we matter?

The ordinance will complicate wildfire evacuations as RVs clog our narrow winding rural roads during a stressful and dangerous mandatory evacuation. We receive almost daily fire and evacuation safety emails and notices because this is the most critical concern for our county.

This ordinance will potentially affect homeowners' ability to obtain fire insurance. A "yes" vote is rolling the dice on driving up fire insurance premiums even further for struggling homeowners. You are altering the risk profile of our already high fire-risk area by filling it with flammable RVs not designed for or recognized by the insurance industry as permanent dwellings. You are also encouraging homeowners to jeopardize their insurance coverage if you pass an ordinance "endorsing" RV Rentals. Why do this? Supervisors have stated "It's on the homeowner to know their insurance constraints." I'd counter with "It's on you!" if you pass an ordinance "codifying" RV rental situations not recognized by the insurance industry.

After the March 10 Hearing, rural homeowners naively waited patiently for a narrow "hardship" category to be added to the other temporary and well-defined RV allowances for 1) building with an active permit, 2) temporary accommodations for a caregiver providing 24-hour onsite medical care, or 3) security on public sites. Instead, the county almost doubled the number of eligible parcels from about 10,000 to 18,000 with no enforceable safeguards. The No Place To Go (NPTG) Project reported that they had many meetings with county personnel regarding the ordinance "rewrite." That is crystal clear: potentially double the RV campsites in our rural neighborhoods without a single enforcement mechanism; set no time limits; and have a tenant "income" ceiling that likely does not eliminate anyone currently living in an RV. The annual income limits are \$49,150 to

\$70,200 (depending on family size). Do you know how many retired county homeowners on fixed incomes would love those incomes?

The only thing the Hardship category accomplishes is possibly providing “cover” to Supervisors who vote for this by pretending this is a narrow, well-defined hardship category. Those of us in the unincorporated county know we are being treated unfairly with this complete disregard for our rural neighborhoods. This would never be imposed on incorporated Grass Valley, Truckee, or Nevada City. They have double representation (City or Town Council AND County BOS) and they demand flushing toilets!

This odyssey started with a \$69,000 grant administered by the Nevada County Arts Council (with county encouragement?) to the NPTG project to lobby for code compliant camping for “arts based” folks. Is it truly a hardship for artists and musicians to live their truth and follow their dreams? Another hardship is putting yourself through college, working (to pay back your student loans) and saving your entire life--often in stressful non-dream jobs--moving when necessary for work and/or cheaper housing, and making the biggest investment of your life in Nevada County—only to have the county change the rules and throw protections for you, your rural neighborhood, and your investment out the window. That’s the hardship you choose to ignore if you vote for this ordinance.

Will RV landlords take advantage of folks with marginal credit? If you are genuinely concerned about hardship, why aren’t income limits accompanied by Monthly Rent Limits? Will RV Landlords prorate rent when RVs fill with smoke and become uninhabitable during a smoke event? I know people who lived through this scenario and the answer is “No.” This ordinance is more about codifying a way-of-life while offering no assistance to live in a real dwelling. How many security deposits could that \$69,000 grant have covered?

No other California county has redefined RVs as permanent housing because they were never intended to serve that purpose. This ordinance is not a novel idea. It is a “crackpot” idea (per NPTG—alas we agree on something!) that will adversely and irreversibly alter one of the most beautiful places in the world. This ordinance is also incredibly dangerous in such a high fire-risk area. Please do the right thing and VOTE NO.

--Ursula Donofrio, Homeowner, District 1, Unincorporated Nevada County

Jodeana Patterson

From: Gale Peach <ghpeach@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 1, 2026 8:42 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Proposed RV Ordinance

You don't often get email from ghpeach@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.

A couple of questions:

1. Will a permit for placing an RV on a parcel be required to meet the new **driveway/road standards** as required by CALFire (44-50 ft of roadway) and the **easement requirements** proposed by the county/state? I have been told meeting these requirements for a permit is needed for RVs but I don't feel this has been made clear in the Alternative Housing/RV Dwelling Draft Ordinance. This ordinance seems to be viewed as a solution for low income housing but the expense of meeting the requirements is quite high.

(How does this help our population that needs housing?)

2. Is the requirement for a deeded easement vs a prescriptive easement a state regulation or a county regulation?

(On a personal note we are dealing with the new regulations as our son is wanting to get a building permit. We have lived here 40 years, paid taxes, and have had five building permits during that time. We are being required to meet these regulations that people getting a permit along a county road do not need to meet while many of our county roads do not meet the regulations. Why are we being held to a higher standard?)

Thank you for your time,
Gale Peach

Breathe...and celebrate what is...

(Sent from my porch...from an undisclosed location, deep in the forest...)

Jodeana Patterson

From: Kathy Comerate-Thomas <kcomeratethomas@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 30, 2026 8:48 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: RV Ordinance
Attachments: RV ordinance.pdf

You don't often get email from kcomeratethomas@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 of Supervisors,

I am writing to you about the proposed RV Ordinance. What's wrong with the ordinance is that it creates the appearance of allowing RV living, but the actual requirements make it nearly impossible for most people to comply. Everything in the staff report that I've read points to an ordinance that is technically permissive but functionally prohibitive.

The ordinance says an RV must be connected to:

A permitted well producing 6 gpm or a storage tank

A permitted septic system meeting LAMP/OWTS standards

Dedicated electrical equipment requiring a building permit

Approved propane or natural gas installations.

This means off-grid RVs are not allowed, even though off-grid is how most people survive in rural Nevada County. For many parcels, installing septic + well upgrades + electrical infrastructure costs \$40,000–\$100,000+ — more than a small house. This isn't affordable and but we have to have these laws enforced.

Before you can live in the RV, you must pass inspections from:

Building Department, Environmental Health, Planning, Fire Agency, Code Compliance and you must repeat this every two years. The ordinance claims to "provide needed housing," but the process seems to be more burdensome than building an ADU.

The ordinance requires:

Proof the RV meets Title 25 snow load requirements, OR Construction of an engineered ramada/snow shelter, Most RVs do not meet snow load requirements.

A compliant engineered ramada can cost \$15,000–\$40,000.

The RV must sit on 2" asphalt over 4" base, OR 4" reinforced concrete over 4" base, OR 4" engineered gravel base plus the slope must be under 2%.

For the people who actually need RV housing — fire survivors, low-income residents, displaced renters, seniors, and rural families — this ordinance is not a solution. It is a regulatory trap.

I don't see this as an affordable way to house low income people. I live above 3200' and in the last 5 years, 2 parcels close to me have non compliant trailers living off the grid. Laws are great if there's any enforcement behind it. Wouldn't be a better idea to create trailer spaces with all the amenities so it is actually geared towards low income affordability.

Thank You

Kathy Thomas

Jodeana Patterson

From: Vida Santos <vidasantos1@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 28, 2026 9:46 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: RV amendments to ordinance

You don't often get email from vidasantos1@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 do not understand why one's income is of interest to the ordinance changes. Not the business of government is it?
It infers that only people of little means will use this accommodation. Vida Santos

Alternative Housing RV Dwelling Draft Ordinance

Dear Nevada County Planning Department and Heidi Hall, District 1 Supervisor,

I am writing to you regarding the proposed Alternative Housing RV Dwelling Draft Ordinance. It is apparent that all participants in the process of trying to find solutions to affordable housing have been working hard to come to a resolution or compromise. In my view, keeping the existing ordinance makes the most sense for the overall good of the entire Nevada County community.

Allowing RVs as a solution to low-income housing will be opening Pandora's box. The problems include impacts on private property rights, wildfire safety, noise, and environmental issues when codes are not met. Personally, I have been negatively impacted by multiple illegal RV living situations in my immediate neighborhood. Code Compliance responded to a complaint that resulted in the removal of an RV, the build-up of trash was removed, the sheets and blankets used as fencing were removed, the porta potty was taken away, and the noise issues stopped! The neighbors were no longer worried about the potential fire hazards, and our property values were restored once the eye sore was gone. Code Compliance will not be able to keep up with the complaints that will pour in if RVs are allowed as a permanent solution to the housing problem. Does the County have the funds to hire more Code Compliance officers?

State regulations addressing ADU's and tiny homes are clear and meet particular safety regulations. RVs and trailers do not meet the standards for safe housing. Do we want to be the only County in California to allow RVs and trailers as dwellings? The cities of Nevada City and Grass Valley will not be bearing the brunt of the misguided proposals, all of us in rural Nevada County will. "Seeing how it goes" in passing this ordinance is not a strategy, it's a recipe for disaster.

Removal of the three-acre minimum parcel size will only increase the density of RVs in the county. There should be a 5-acre minimum with only one allowable RV. The most disturbing suggestion is to allow RV's to be rented for a period of 30 days or more! What? Now having an RV on one's property turns into a money maker for the property owner. Trying to sell one's home in the county will become more difficult and home values will plummet due to the increased number of RVs. Personally, our realtor came to our property to give us a valuation on our home and when she saw the illegal RVs close by her comment was "The RVs just dropped your price for selling by \$70-100,00 dollars!" This is real, not

theoretical and who among us can afford a dramatic drop in value in an already difficult housing market? Please don't turn a blind eye to this reality.

As a member of a Firewise Community and a member of the committee, I just completed a non-scientific three-year evaluation of 34 homes. The most serious weaknesses I observed were roads with less than 12" of egress/ingress, roads with no turnarounds, and many one lane roads. The emergency vehicle access will be chaotic and insane during a wildfire evacuation. Let's be real, do you honestly think that people living in an RV are not going to attempt to drive out in their RV during an evacuation? It would be naïve to assume that they would not!

Let's look at alternatives to any RV ordinance. How about a voucher system that would allow RV dwellers to use the Fairground campground, or local campgrounds, on a limited/temporary basis. Let's find a permanent county property that could be designed to accommodate all the needs of the unhoused or low-income people who can't find housing. Yes, it would be expensive but not impossible. I would support a permanent site and participate in its construction.

I do not support RV living on private property. I am not interested in my neighborhood becoming part of a pilot program or a social experiment.

I oppose the passing of any part of the Alternative RV ordinance. The face of this community will be forever changed if this ordinance passes.

I have lived here for 50 years; I am not a newcomer!

Regards,

Mary Lee

(530) 272-1651

Mailing:

PO Box 782,
Cedar Ridge, CA 95924

Physical:

13389 Little Meadow Court
Grass Valley, CA 95945

Jodeana Patterson

From: cofnevco@gmail.com
Sent: Thursday, June 25, 2026 12:00 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Comments to Board of Supervisors

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

Do not click links or open attachments 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

June 25, 2026

Board of Supervisors (General): BOS.PublicComment@nevadacountyca.gov
District 1 (Heidi Hall): Heidi.Hall@nevadacountyca.gov
District 2 (Robb Tucker): Robb.Tucker@nevadacountyca.gov
District 3 (Lisa Swarthout): Lisa.Swarthout@nevadacountyca.gov Chair
District 4 (Susan Hoek): Sue.Hoek@nevadacountyca.gov Vice-Chair
District 5 (Hardy Bullock): Hardy.Bullock@nevadacountyca.gov

COMMENTS for the Board of Supervisors regarding PLN252-0084, ORD25-1
Recreation Vehicle Dwelling

First, I would like to thank The Chair and Board of Supervisors for hearing and responding to common sense and your supporters' wishes by voting against the proposed RV Ordinance. Although I appreciate your combined attempt to provide new direction to the Planning Department to keep the issue of affordable housing for low-income residents in the foreground, it's a shame that so much time and resources have been used to promote a foundationally flawed ordinance. Instead of quickly providing the desperately needed and publicly supported Safe Parking projects, that would enable safe and legal parking of vehicles and trailers used as domiciles, close to the services needed, thousands of illegal RV's and trailers are now being concealed within private properties, without any upgrades required for all permitted or inspected installations for sewage, water, electric, fire safety, or habitability. Without intervention, this activity endangers every resident of Nevada County.

Our foremost concern is Fire Danger. With our fire season ramping up, evacuation has to be our first concern. At this time, every outlet for Nevada County is experiencing road construction... from road closures, to reductions of open lanes for travel. The widening project of Highway 49 is not slated for completion until December of 2028. At present, there are miles of the highway that have been reduced to only one very narrow lane of traffic in each direction. Until that project is completed, we all live in very real and imminent danger of NOT getting out of Nevada County in time during evacuations, even without these additional density issues. Protecting the Health and Safety of our residents should look at reducing illegal density and construction, but this Ordinance does the opposite. It ignores the fact that existing homeowners that carry proper fire and liability insurance are anticipating premium increases of 29% this year. So many homes are already in non-mitigated dangers because of the limited access for firefighting equipment along their roadways, yet this carries no such restriction for RV/Trailer placement. These new changes to our land use and density

will increase risks, and those additional increases further threaten to leave many without insurance, and making “affordability” impossible. This is movement in the wrong direction! We encourage you to secure Nevada County’s safety and our continued access to home and fire insurance.

Upon approving the “land-use” question, the Planning Commission asked the Planning Department to answer two questions to you, our Board of Supervisors, regarding issues of concern with this ordinance. Let’s review those answers...

1. What is Code Compliance’s plan for being able to handle all of the current Code Compliance issues along with the new issues that will arise from this Ordinance... The answer... “Code staff is confident they can enforce and respond to complaints based on this ordinance”. “Confidence” is not a plan. With over 350 Code Compliance cases currently being handled by staff, that answer does not explain how staff can suddenly handle that number of complaints doubling and tripling. If the County Code Compliance Department cannot handle the compliance of an ordinance, it should not enact a new one. Where is the financial analysis showing costs of enforcing this plan?
2. There are questions about how this will affect the insurability or denial of insurance or claims for homes who are insured by the Cal Fair plan as the only resource for fire insurance. The concerns are for the neighboring homes that may be denied insurance or payment of any claim, because their neighbor is renting out a Recreational Vehicle as a home. Insurance for RV’s is NOT offered by traditional insurance companies. The Planning Department reported that “RV full-time living” liability insurance policies were available, but not that this was only offered to ‘traveling RVers’, and offers very low limits of liability coverage. In conclusion, there is no answer to our insurance questions, but I think that we can agree that this will not help, and indeed stands to hurt us by making insurance unobtainable.

Supervisor Hoek commented that she did not see a financial analysis of this matter. None of us have, and wonder why we have not. It would directly answer how Code Compliance would be able to handle tripling their work load, in addition to what happens with assessed values and tax rolls as property values decline due to RV placement, and how that directly affects the County Budget and revenue stream.

We all share concerns and the desire to help those in need, but we disagree that overriding our General Plan, and ignoring Community’s Health and Safety is the way to do it. As stated by Supervisor Swarthout, the purpose of this modification of direction was for the purpose of reaching “more of a consensus”, not less. In addition to expanding the area of influence for RV habitation by reducing required parcel size, this ordinance seeks to circumvent the already existing State rental assistance program for low-income households... a well-established program and agency that thoroughly upholds compliance with program requirements, and proper reporting and accountability to run it. Additionally, the existing agency strictly enforces the living standards for those who live in these rental units. This new proposal offers no criteria for vetting recipients, administering accountability, ensuring ongoing habitability, or reporting on any of the activity. Nevada County already provides hardship exemptions for those who require a caregiver. Medical necessity is true hardship.

Since the Proposal’s announcement, RV and Trailer influx into the county has been rampant, and freely publicized throughout social media for these illegal ‘units’ and “parking spaces” for rent, regardless of adequate or permitted status. Because we are the first and only County considering something like this, we have become the “magnet” that we were all warned about. Every one of these units is on private property without hardship exemption, and has been installed and operates illegally without proper insurance. Not one of these property owners have gone through any of the legal processes already available to construct secondary housing. This ordinance only promotes more illegal behavior. The County’s abandonment of building codes in Nevada County has identified the process as little more than a guideline. Surely these residences were not originally built with a septic system larger than what was needed!

I join others of your supporters by urging our County Board of Supervisors to finally vote this proposal down, and instead proceed with direction towards a Safe Parking program for individuals with their own 'homes', or a tiny home community made available as was already presented to our residents. These programs should comply with our County's already existing General Plan, and make use of city utilities for the whole of the Communities Health and Safety, and eliminating most of the developmental costs required with this ordinance.

Should there be a new Ordinance proposed, I hope that it will seek unified community approval by supporting our already approved health and safety codes. The success of The Hospitality House demonstrates how a program to help those in need works successfully within the existing laws of the Community. I would like to see new adults who are on their own have a safe place to call home while they increase their education and skills to make more money in the career of their choosing, but I think they are smarter than we have given them credit for. I see many of them taking advantage of renting a room/bath in a house, or co-renting a house that they can afford now. Even though I was well-employed, this is what I had to do until I was able to buy my first home well into my 30's after I was married and there were 2 incomes! Home ownership hasn't been affordable to the young in a very long time. The costs of upkeep, insurance, and required upgrades makes the income required unobtainable to most. How is offering an RV or trailer to rent giving these folks help to take steps towards their success?

Nevada County has one of the highest costs of living in California. But trying to lower our cost of living by declaring that RVs and camper trailers are residences is ignoring the truth. It doesn't work, especially when the community does not have the employment available to support its residents. RVs and trailers are not recognized as homes for continual habitation by either the DMV, the RV manufacturers, or Insurance agencies, because they are vehicles. I plead that our County Departments prioritize the health and safety of all of Nevada County's populations.

Of course, the many previously stated factors opposing this proposal are still relevant, and are thoroughly addressed in the public responses and discussions provided by you. I've hi-lite 2 of those issues here:

- A. RVs and camper trailers provide substandard housing in comparison with our building codes because they are engineered with materials that are much less robust. They are easily penetrated by rodents, have easily accessible wiring with lower load capacity that create dangerous situations for electrical shorts and fire danger. Common complaints include loose connections, propane system leaks, water leaks and mold. Cooking in confined areas encourages outdoor cooking during high fire risk season and frequent use of gas-powered generators. RV living may appear glamorous when you're younger, but for an older individual, it is a hard life. Shouldn't we set a better life for the seniors in our community?
- B. As personal property, a vehicle depreciates to a zero value as soon as you put them into service. Ironically, the neighboring property who has a view of this structure will surely experience a decrease in value and salability of their substantial investment, as well. That investment took place on the assurance of a reliable General Plan that would work for everyone in the county... a promise to property owners of a standard to be upheld on their property. This new ordinance would allow up to 3 generators per property, in addition to additional lighting, noise, and pet ownership issues to neighboring properties. We are not creating homes, but nuisances in rural neighborhoods.

As eloquently stated by Ms. Dashant (sp?), the Vice-Chairman of the Land Use Committee of 1996 of Nevada County: The most important recommendation by their committee was adopted by Nevada County, and stated that **"development should be directed into established community regions in order to efficiently manage public services and infrastructure, while preserving rural, agricultural, and natural areas from suburban sprawl."** Allowing this ordinance does the opposite. It shifts the burden of housing policy into rural neighborhoods that lack the needed protection and utilities. Instead of connecting those in need with services, it isolates them from those services.

Thank you for hearing my concerns regarding this Proposed Ordinance. I hope that you consider the unintended issues that this has already allowed to go un-checked, and vote it down today.

Charisse Lolli
Alta Sierra, CA

Jodeana Patterson

From: Nicole Johnson <nic_johnsc@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 24, 2026 2:47 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Cc: scoutburton1@yahoo.com
Subject: Public Comment-District 3-RV Ordinsnce

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.

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed Alternative RV Housing Ordinance.

My husband and I chose to purchase our home in rural Nevada County because we value the rural character and quality of life that our communities provide. Like many residents, we have made a significant financial investment in our property and are concerned that this ordinance could have unintended long-term consequences for established neighborhoods.

I appreciate that the proposed ordinance includes a permitting and renewal process. However, I do not believe these measures adequately address the practical realities of long-term RV occupancy. RVs are designed for temporary use and travel, not as permanent housing. As they age, they inevitably deteriorate. Once they become inoperable or uninhabitable, they can be expensive and difficult to remove, leaving abandoned or dilapidated units on properties for years.

I am also concerned that the ordinance transforms what has traditionally been a temporary solution into a permanent land use policy. Allowing RVs for short-term emergencies, construction projects, or temporary hardships is one thing. Creating a broad framework for long-term RV dwellings throughout rural residential areas is another. Over time, the cumulative effect could substantially alter the character of established neighborhoods in ways that are difficult to reverse.

Another practical concern is enforcement. Nevada County staff already have significant responsibilities and limited resources. County departments often operate with lean staffing levels, and adding a program that requires permitting, renewals, inspections, complaint investigations, and enforcement actions will inevitably create additional demands. Even with a permit process in place, regulations are only as effective as the County's ability to consistently enforce them. If enforcement falls behind, neighboring property owners may bear the consequences of abandoned, deteriorating, or poorly maintained RV dwellings.

I am also concerned about the cumulative impact on surrounding property owners and the quality of life in rural communities. Many residents made substantial investments in their homes with the expectation that existing zoning and land use policies would preserve the rural character of their neighborhoods. This ordinance has the potential to create long-term land use conflicts and increase blight concerns without adequate assurance that future problems can be effectively addressed.

Housing affordability is an important issue, and I support efforts to find practical solutions. However, I do not believe that widespread long-term RV occupancy is an appropriate or sustainable approach for rural residential neighborhoods. The County should pursue housing policies that balance affordability with the preservation of community character and the practical realities of long-term administration and enforcement.

I respectfully urge the Board of Supervisors to reject the proposed ordinance. At a minimum, the County should carefully evaluate its long-term enforcement capacity and the cumulative impacts this policy could have on rural neighborhoods before adopting such a significant change to existing land use practices.

Thank you for your consideration.

Todd & Nicole Burton
Dog Bar Rd.
District 3 Constituents

Jodeana Patterson

From: Paul Schwartz <psschwartz21@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2026 12:32 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Cc: Planning; Lisa Swarthout; Heidi Hall; psschwartz21@gmail.com
Subject: Alternate RV Ordinance Comments

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.

Board of Supervisors:
RE: Revisions to the proposed RV Ordinance.

There are a few parts to the revised RV Ordinance I recommend be removed or amended.

1. C1- Remove any reference to income as a condition to permitting an RV. There are many reasons why this is a bad idea. The biggest reason is that it prevents a young family unit starting out from accessing affordable housing while they build a financial future that would allow them to access more traditional housing. Building a financial future includes saving money to invest in or grow a business, accumulating a down payment for a home or land. Keeping overhead cost low while paying for tuitions and college expenses. There are many reasons an income might be higher than 50% of AMI and affordable housing such as an RV is the desired option. The RV ordinance should not be framed as part of a welfare program. In our world today, in Nevada County, RVs could be the affordable housing solution for many people.
2. C9- Screening makes access to utility connections cumbersome. Screening also slows down the process to quickly remove the RV to safety in an emergency situation such as a wildfire. C8- Ensuring the tires are in good shape and ready to roll conflicts with the requirement to screen them from view.
3. 12E- Security Housing- I see no reason to treat Security Housing classification conditions different from basic Affordable RV Housing classification. The conditions should be the same. Keep it simple.
4. Add language that provides a path for existing RVs to be permitted.

A personal observation: The BOS over the last few years has been outstanding. There was visible respect during hearings and discussion. Consensus thus seemed to unfold through a transparent understanding

of the information and associated challenges. The new BOS revealed in the last hearing on the RV Ordinance, that those times may be over. There were agendas at play that were not transparent. There was fear that doing the right thing would bring unintended consequences. Being a leader in the affordable housing experiment of our times will be a challenge and require a willingness to block out the NIMBYs and the narrow-minded fear mongers. Be bold. There will not be a tidal wave of RV permit applications. Over the next 5 years I would guess at less than fifty.

Respectfully, Paul Schwartz

Jodeana Patterson

From: Barbara White <bjwhite1411@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 18, 2026 2:30 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: RV housing

You don't often get email from bjwhite1411@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 husband and I would like to point out the drawbacks of adding more RV housing in our Golden Oaks HOA. We are very much against this idea for a variety of reasons:

1. It would lower the quality of life for residents of the HOA
2. It would increase noise levels
2. It would increase the cost of road repair related to increase traffic
3. There is a danger of inability to evacuate safely in case of fire due to the increase of population
4. Who is going to see that water, electricity and sanitation is up to code? Current homeowners are not always aware of the codes let alone know how to get it done correctly.
5. What effect would it have on current residents and the homeowners who rent out their property on property taxes?
6. It may cause current residents to move from the HOA as they didn't move here to be part of a trailer park.

Please don't move forward with this plan.

best regards Ray and Barbara White

Jodeana Patterson

From: Sandy Herve <sherve23@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 18, 2026 11:20 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: We oppose the new RV Ordinance

You don't often get email from sherve23@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.

We oppose the no minimum acreage requirement and no enforcement mechanism. We are very concerned that the new ordinance does not address the fire evacuation issue or the environmental concerns. Please stop this travesty. This is not the best way to help the housing or homeless issues in Nevada County!
Raymond and Sandra Herve

Jodeana Patterson

From: RockieRose <racheliwegman@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 17, 2026 3:55 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: My comments on this ordinance

You don't often get email from racheliwegman@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 very unhappy to hear about the changes to this ordinance.

I feel that the county should be responsible for finding safe places for RVs and other alternative living situations. The proposal here, puts that responsibility on homeowners. There is way too much property tax paid here in this county for this to become the responsibility of homeowners.

As I'm sure you know, not all homeowners and neighbors are great!

The fact that inconsiderate homeowners will have potential to lower the property values of the homes around them with crappy, looking RVs and other living situations, makes this proposal a problem. And trust me, this will happen!

I'm also very concerned about people with RVs trying to get out in the case of an emergency. Thinking of all of the RVs that could potentially be living down Lake Vera Purdon or North Bloomfield, or really any of our rural tight roads, and then trying to get out in the case of an emergency like a wildfire?! Talk about clogging up the roads unnecessarily. These people will not be leaving their homes to let them burn. They will be putting other people in danger so they can save their home and themselves.

I have a neighbor right now that, has been taking advantage of this moratorium on this ordinance. She has a man living in the side lot of her house, with two dogs that are constantly barking and off leash. Sometimes he tethers them up, which is also illegal.

His piles of junk look like crap. He's posted up there like he plans on being there for life, he has two cars that he's constantly shuffling all around the neighborhood, and he seems like an unpredictable loose cannon.

The neighbors that have to see this pile of crap all of the time, are so upset. They came here to retire, and bought their perfect home in this neighborhood. Now the other neighbor gets to post up some pile of crap with no regard. Should my nice neighbors want to sell their dream house to get away from this trashy neighbor, they will find it much harder to sell. I sure as heck wouldn't buy a house with that man's pile of crap across the way.

We are finally in the market to look for a home right now. It's very scary to think that the county I have always dreamed of buying in, doesn't want to take responsibility for something they should be responsible for.

I think that the county should find solutions for this. Whether it be large lots that are donated or purchased, with proper hook ups, and disposal sites. Maybe it could be its own separate community. In any case, this definitely shouldn't be put into our residential neighborhoods. Inside or outside of city limits!

Outside of city limits already has a difficult time finding help with the issues that arise, and this is just putting it over the top.

I'd also like to throw out there, RVs are not meant for long-term living! There needs to be better solutions and your residents deserve better.

Thanks for reading,
Rachel

Jodeana Patterson

From: Mark Triolo <marktriolo@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 17, 2026 11:36 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: RV 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 ask that you **DO NOT** approve the RV Ordinance as currently proposed.

My reasons:

- lifting of the 3 acre minimum will allow RVs to proliferate in residential areas of the community - this will be a blight on our beautiful, rustic area
- insurance companies will not insure homes with wheels, so these units will be uninsured
- the cost to properly install (electrical, plumbing, sewer, etc) and get permits is prohibitive for the prospective RV resident - so they will do it with extension cords, etc. This will significantly raise the fire danger in this area.

Main point: I don't know how anyone in our local government can justify increasing our fire risk!! We want more housing but we must find a way that does not so heavily impact all of the current residents of the county. We need to pay some attention to the current residents that are here.

Please do not pass this ordinance.

Regards,
Mark Triolo
15472 Shannon Way
NC, 95959

Jodeana Patterson

From: Paul Elias <ppcpaule2000@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 15, 2026 7:00 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance; Lisa Swarthout; Sue Hoek; Alison Lehman
Subject: Revised RV Ordinance Comments and What's Still Missing. ...

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.

Nevada County Planning Department:

I am writing regarding the proposed RV dwelling ordinance currently under consideration. While the ordinance is intended to address housing needs, I believe several important issues should be clarified before it is adopted.

First, I understand the revised ordinance may include income qualifications for occupancy. If a property owner meets all applicable health, safety, water, septic, access, and fire protection requirements, it is unclear why income should determine whether someone may reside in an RV on private property. I would appreciate an explanation of the purpose and legal basis for any income-based eligibility requirements.

Second, the ordinance reportedly allows occupancy for “three months or longer.” The phrase “or longer” appears ambiguous and could be interpreted in different ways. If the intent is to allow permanent occupancy, the ordinance should clearly state that intent so property owners, residents, and neighboring landowners fully understand the scope of the program.

I also request clarification regarding individuals who are already living in RVs on private property. Will existing occupants be required to obtain permits and come into compliance with the new ordinance? Will there be a grace period? How will the County address situations where water, septic, fire safety, access, or other requirements are currently not being met?

Another issue that appears to have received limited public discussion is insurance and liability. If an RV is used as a long-term residence, what responsibilities will fall upon the property owner? Will specific insurance coverage be required, and if so, what standards will apply?

Additional questions remain. How many RVs may be occupied or rented on a single parcel? Could multiple RVs be rented on the same property? Will neighboring property owners receive notice and have an opportunity to comment before permits are issued? Will inspections be required before occupancy and periodically thereafter to ensure continued compliance with health, safety, water, septic, and fire protection standards?

Because this ordinance affects private property rights, housing policy, public health, wildfire safety, and potential neighborhood impacts, I believe it warrants careful review and broad public participation. Clear standards and transparent implementation procedures will help avoid confusion and unintended consequences.

Thank you for considering these comments. I respectfully request that these questions and concerns be addressed as the ordinance moves forward for further review and consideration.

Sincerely,

Paul Elias

Jodeana Patterson

From: Doug Farrell <doug55@msn.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 14, 2026 8:10 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: RV Ordinance Comments

You don't often get email from doug55@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.

Dear Board of Supervisors,

I am opposed to the proposed RV ordinance.

Building codes and construction standards are important factors in making our neighborhoods and infrastructure safer and more resilient. The Uniform Building Code has been in effect in California for nearly 100 years and has been updated every few years to take into account lessons learned. This proposal to allow camping vehicles to be considered as legal residences would create a category of homes which are exempt from these codes and standards.

Although this may benefit a small group of people who are unable to afford traditional housing in our community, I think the overriding question is: Will this ordinance be an improvement to housing and neighborhoods in our community or will it degrade our community? In my opinion, allowing people to legally live in camping vehicles will likely lead to degradation. And any ordinance that benefits a small group and causes negative effects on the rest of the community is an idea that should be abandoned.

Nevada County has excellent Housing and Planning staff. Instead of directing them to chase down individual ideas as they pop-up, such as this RV ordinance, turn them loose to develop an affordable housing plan containing realistic options, priorities, timelines and funding opportunities that will hopefully help us to zero-in on both affordable housing and homeless transitional housing.

Thanks for the opportunity to comment.

Doug Farrell
District 1 Resident

Jodeana Patterson

From: nikki panzich <nicolepanzich73@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 14, 2026 6:19 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: VOTE NO ON THE REVISED DRAFT ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT

You don't often get email from nicolepanzich73@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,

As a resident, homeowner, and tax payor of Nevada County, I strongly oppose the Revised Draft Zoning Ordinance Amendment. This revised proposal is worse than the original version. While I recognize the need to address housing challenges/affordability in Nevada County, I do not believe this proposal adequately addresses the potential consequences for public safety, neighborhood quality, and resources. For these reasons, I respectfully ask that you reject this RV Ordinance and vote No on the Revised Draft Zoning Ordinance Amendment.

Main concerns include:

1. Public Safety:

A. Fire Safety: Nevada County already faces significant wildfire dangers, and I believe this ordinance could increase those risks. Recreational vehicles can present fire hazards, especially when aging, poorly maintained, or improperly stored. Given the financial challenges many residents face, I question whether all vehicle owners will have the resources necessary to maintain these vehicles safely over time.

B. Emergency Evacuation: During a wildfire or other emergency, our roads must remain clear and accessible. If an RV were to break down or become disabled during an evacuation, it could create dangerous delays and potentially put lives at risk. This possibility should be carefully considered before adopting any policy that could increase the number of RVs in residential areas.

2. Neighborhood Quality: I am concerned about the potential impact on surrounding neighborhoods and property values. Many residents purchased homes in these communities with certain expectations regarding neighborhood character and residential use. Allowing additional RV occupancy near property lines may affect the desirability and marketability of nearby homes and could create conflicts between neighbors.

3. Resources: This ordinance will likely place additional demands on county resources that are already limited.

I appreciate your time and consideration.

Nicole Panzich
562-883-3392

Jodeana Patterson

From: Micah Panzich <mpdesignlb@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 11, 2026 11:28 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: RV Dwelling Draft Ordinance

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, homeowner, and worker in Alta Sierra, Grass Valley, and I strongly oppose the Revised Draft Zoning Ordinance Amendment. In my view, this revised proposal is even more concerning than the original version, and I respectfully urge you to vote **No** and discontinue moving forward with this ordinance.

My primary concern is public safety, particularly wildfire risk. Nevada County already faces significant wildfire dangers, and I believe this ordinance could increase those risks. Recreational vehicles can present fire hazards, especially when aging, poorly maintained, or improperly stored. Given the financial challenges many residents face, I question whether all vehicle owners will have the resources necessary to maintain these vehicles safely over time.

I am also concerned about emergency evacuation scenarios. During a wildfire or other emergency, our roads must remain clear and accessible. If an RV were to break down or become disabled during an evacuation, it could create dangerous delays and potentially put lives at risk. This possibility should be carefully considered before adopting any policy that could increase the number of RVs in residential areas.

In addition, I am concerned about the potential impact on surrounding neighborhoods and property values. Many residents purchased homes in these communities with certain expectations regarding neighborhood character and residential use. Allowing additional RV occupancy near property lines may affect the desirability and marketability of nearby homes and could create conflicts between neighbors.

I am also concerned that this ordinance may place additional demands on county resources that are already limited. Housing affordability is a serious challenge throughout California and across the United States, but I do not believe this ordinance offers a meaningful long-term solution to that complex issue.

While I recognize the need to address housing challenges, I do not believe this proposal adequately addresses the potential consequences for public safety, neighborhood quality, infrastructure, and

property owners. For these reasons, I respectfully ask that you reject this RV Ordinance and vote No on the Revised Draft Zoning Ordinance Amendment.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Micah Panzich
Alta Sierra, Grass Valley

--

Thank You,
Micah Panzich

Ph: 562.397.9738

Jodeana Patterson

From: Claire Chapple
Sent: Wednesday, June 10, 2026 4:34 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Cc: Catrie Levenson; Amy Irani-Leaverton
Subject: Alternative Housing/RV Dwelling Comment

- 1. 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.*

This language conflicts with other sections of the Nevada County Code. For example, section 15.05.040 says each “service connection” must have at least one gallon permit minute. Also, section 15.05.060 says that for each service connection less than three gallons per minute, a 1,000-gallon storage tank is required for each habitable structure. Can this section be amended as follows?

Potable water supply, if provided by a residential well, must be provided in accordance with Title 15 of the Nevada County Code, Chapter 5 Water Supply and Resources, General Provisions.

Thank you,



Claire Chapple (she/her)

Environmental Health Specialist IV

Environmental Health Department

Office: 530-265-1449

[Environmental Health | Nevada County, CA](#)

nevadacountyca.gov

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail message, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential or privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure, or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message.

Jodeana Patterson

From: Mike Lawrence <mikelaw11017@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 8, 2026 4:18 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: RV ordinance

You don't often get email from mikelaw11017@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.

This ordinance needs to be defeated. Property values have already plunged in this County due to fire insurance costs. There's been a 15-20% decline in values. Allowing someone to live in a trailer will exasperate the issue. Home prices will decline again. What about property tax revenues? I'm not willing to subsidize the County's budget for someone who lives in a Winnebago and sucks up County services.

Jodeana Patterson

From: Mike Wasky <mwasky@suddenlink.net>
Sent: Sunday, June 7, 2026 3:08 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Ill conceived plan

[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.

Hello,

I am against this ordinance. You've even dropped the 3 acre parcel requirement which is crazy. The environmental issues on this are horrible. And the fire danger along with fire evacuation issues are still a huge concern. I'm flat out against this.

Mike Wasky

Sent from my interplanetary galactic device.....

Jodeana Patterson

From: RM Fraley <rmf525@att.net>
Sent: Sunday, June 7, 2026 10:17 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Calif. County May Allow RVs to be Used as Permanent Dwellings

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,

1. Will we see more drug activity and fires in our wooded areas because of this?
2. Have you increased Fire, Law Enforcement and Inspection staffing to be able to handle the influx the RV populations, that will occur, to remote wooded areas in Nevada County?

Regards,

Mike Fraley – Home owner

Nevada City, Ca.

Jodeana Patterson

From: julie petersen <julie.811@att.net>
Sent: Sunday, June 7, 2026 8:46 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: WE OBJECT

You don't often get email from julie.811@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.

We object to the Alternative RV Proposal.

It eliminates the minimum acreage requirement, has no enforcement mechanism, does not address the fire evacuation issue nor environmental concerns.

Thank you for your consideration,
Julie and Glen
Alta Sierra Residents

Jodeana Patterson

From: John Roth <jaroth1@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, June 6, 2026 6:54 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Living in RV'S

[You don't often get email from jaroth1@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.

This is such a bad idea, I can't even believe that anyone who lives in Grass Valley would support it. Let them park on YOUR property, and let's see how long that works out well! An RV is a "recreational vehicle", not a "home" that is hooked up to a sewer line or septic tank. There is no shortage of case studies that argue against people living in RVs on "residential"-zoned property.

John Roth

Jodeana Patterson

From: David Brose <djbrose@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, June 6, 2026 6:20 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: RV proposal

[You don't often get email from djbrose@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.

Sent from my iPad

We are very disturbed by this proposal. We had decades of a neighborhood that had people living in an RV on his property. Along with that her hoarded many things. He passed away last August and as we watched the family deal with 14 non running cars, two trailers and an RV this property is finally cleared up and sold. We have lived here 46 years and 30 years we were plagued by this horrific mess.

What makes you think this wont happen in every corner of this county. We never could figure out where all the sewage and garbage went.

Thank you

David and Judy Brose
539-559-5832

Jodeana Patterson

From: Erik <mreheinrich@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, June 6, 2026 4:00 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: RV ordinance comment

You don't often get email from mreheinrich@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 name is Erik Heinrich, a property owner, tax payer and voter in an unincorporated part of Grass Valley within Nevada County. I oppose the proposal to permit the proposal for alternative housing use of RV (i.e., "recreational vehicle", by definition). My immediate concerns are the impacts on the safety impacts of additional residents without proper city planning. Second, I am concerned about the impacts of adding higher density population without proper city and county planning around the increase in. Finally, I am concerned about the potential for added tax burden on existing residents as the City and County look for the necessary funding to pay for all the required inspections listed in Nevada County Ordinance Sec. L-II 3.15 that are required for each RV to be approved for use under the ordinance.

First, is the issue of the increased safety risks created by additional population in areas with single lane roadways, and increased demands on emergency services is not addressed. Many roadways are single lane, and are already constrained in supporting emergency evacuation in emergencies such as wildfire. The added residents in these alternative housing RVs are likely to own/use vehicles for daily transportation needs. These added vehicles require safe parking areas (gravel/paved) and add traffic to already over crowded escape routes during emergencies.

Second, recreational vehicles (RVs) are by design, not intended for long term residence. All of their services (power, water, sewage and garbage) require significant maintenance and proper facilities/hookups. This ordinance sets a precedent for unplanned population growth and very likely will result in an increase in unpermitted alternative living situations, with very real impacts on your existing property owners who chose their property based on the quality of life of single family properties with multi-acre minimum subdivision limits.

Finally, in order for the alternative RV sites to be permitted as outlined in **Nevada County Ordinance Sec. L-II 3.15**, there will be significant added workload on multiple county public officials including but not limited to:

"Sewage disposal and water for service supply **shall be approved by the Department of Environmental Health**"

"**The County Fire Marshal or his/her designee shall inspect** the site to ensure that the placement of the recreational vehicle complies with the flammable vegetation clearance requirements of Public Resources Code 4291."

"Any water, sewage drain, electrical, fuel supply or other utility connection and installation shall conform to State and local regulations, **require inspection by the Building Department** and a permit"

"**a County code compliance officer investigating any complaint**, satisfactory evidence shall be

presented of continuing compliance with the applicable standards for temporary occupancy"

There is no assurance that the added burden of inspecting, monitoring, permitting, and potentially policing an undetermined number of alternative RV living sites will not result in added tax burden or diminished service by these public officials in other areas of their responsibility.

While this alternative RV ordinance may be an attempt at compassion or an effort to offer affordable living options, it does so at great risk to the entire population of Nevada County by increasing safety risks, increases demand on the limited infrastructure, and is likely to impact existing public services while potentially increasing future tax burden on property owners.

I ask that you do NOT move forward with this proposal that lacks consideration of the many new challenges it will create.

Thank you,
Erik Heinrich
Resident, tax payer, voter of Nevada County, CA

Jodeana Patterson

From: David Schott <schott.davidm@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, June 6, 2026 1:52 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Comment Opposing Revised Alternative Housing/RV Dwelling Draft Ordinance (PLN25-0084 / ORD25-1 / EIS25-0005)

You don't often get email from schott.davidm@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 Department and Board of Supervisors,

I am writing to comment on the revised Alternative Housing/Recreational Vehicle Draft Zoning Ordinance (PLN25-0084 / ORD25-1 / EIS25-0005) currently out for public review. I understand that, following the March 10, 2026 Board of Supervisors hearing, staff were directed to revise the ordinance to add an income limit for qualifying RV use, reformat it into the existing RV section of the code, remove the previous 3-acre minimum parcel size, and allow RV dwellings to be rented for periods of 30 days or longer. I continue to oppose this ordinance in its entirety and respectfully ask that it not be adopted.

My core objection has not changed: I do not support treating RVs as long-term or quasi-permanent housing anywhere in the county, regardless of parcel size, income screening, or rental-duration requirements. I have personally seen how RV living created long, difficult neighborhood problems when I lived in San Francisco, and I already see locally that many RVs are unsightly, broken down, and unsafe to be around. I do not want to see that pattern expanded or normalized through county zoning.

The removal of the 3-acre minimum greatly expands the number of eligible parcels and pushes RV dwellings into smaller, more constrained neighborhoods and road networks, including areas with already-documented evacuation and fire-safety challenges. Even with paper standards, adding more combustible, mobile structures into forested residential areas increases fire risk and complicates evacuations on narrow rural roads. In my view, this runs counter to the County's broader fire-safety messaging and evacuation-planning work.

I am also very concerned about the practical realities of enforcement. County code compliance is already largely complaint-driven, and the existing record shows persistent challenges enforcing current rules on illegal RV living even without adding a complex new permitting and inspection program. In that context, a detailed ordinance will mostly be followed by a small number of "good actors," while many others will continue to ignore the rules, leading to more unregulated RVs, more neighborhood conflict, and more pressure on already-limited enforcement staff.

The wastewater, water-supply, and environmental risks are not theoretical. Both the draft ordinance framework and outside agency comments acknowledge the need for fully code-compliant water and

wastewater solutions and, in some cases, additional state permitting. In practice, the combination of high installation cost, complaint-driven enforcement, and the financial reality of very low-income tenants creates a strong incentive for improper hookups or outright dumping, with obvious consequences for wells, creeks, and downstream users.

I am also uncomfortable with the new income-restriction approach. By design, the ordinance now channels households at or below 50% of Area Median Income into the least robust form of housing the County regulates, while at the same time expecting them and their hosts to navigate a complex, recurring permit and inspection regime. That feels backwards: the poorest residents should not be the ones asked to absorb the risks of long-term living in structures that were never intended to function as permanent housing.

Finally, I believe the County has better tools available that keep the focus on true housing rather than vehicles. The Board has already approved tiny homes on wheels as permanent housing under carefully crafted standards, and there are existing paths for ADUs, Title 25 owner-built dwellings, and conventional affordable and subsidized housing projects. I urge you to put time and political capital into making those options more attainable and into enforcing existing code, rather than opening a new front by redefining RVs as dwellings.

For all of these reasons, I do not support the revised Alternative Housing/RV Dwelling ordinance and ask the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to reject it. Please keep the County's housing efforts focused on permanent, code-compliant structures and on strategies that do not carry the fire, environmental, and neighborhood-impact risks that RV dwellings do.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,
David Schott
Grass Valley, CA

Jodeana Patterson

From: Daniel J Desmond <djdesmond@ucdavis.edu>
Sent: Saturday, June 6, 2026 6:17 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: revised Alternative Housing/RV Dwelling Draft Ordinance.

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

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.

We are strongly against this proposed ordinance. It will damage community security and serenity. It will not solve the housing problem but create another problem that will be even more difficult to correct.

Thanks,
Dan & Dee Desmond
10500 Hawke Lane
Nevada City CA 95959
707-696-8626

Jodeana Patterson

From: Steve Kessmann <stevekessmann@truckeefire.org>
Sent: Friday, June 5, 2026 1:17 PM
To: Jodeana Patterson
Cc: Dan Collins
Subject: RE: Notice of Public Comment Period: Alternative Housing/RV Dwelling Draft Ordinance (revised)

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

Do not click links or open attachments 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,

Thanks for the project routing on this. I'm pretty sure that we have made this comment in prior iterations but we would want to memorialize that an RV being used for the purposes outlined in the zoning ordinance would be considered "structures" and would be subject to following PRC 4291 defensible space standards and would also require some sort of addressing so that LE, fire, and EMS can easily locate the unit.



Steve Kessmann
Fire Marshal
Truckee Fire Protection District
Office: 530-582-7855

From: Jodeana Patterson <Jodeana.Patterson@nevadacountyca.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, June 2, 2026 9:04 AM
Subject: Notice of Public Comment Period: Alternative Housing/RV Dwelling Draft Ordinance (revised)

Good morning,

Please see the attached Notice of Public Comment Period for the revised Alternative Housing/RV Dwelling Draft Ordinance.

For questions or comments, please contact Planning Director Brian Foss at altrvordinance@nevadacountyca.gov.

Jodeana Patterson

From: gary@plan-aire.com
Sent: Friday, June 5, 2026 10:04 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Comments on Motorhome Ordinance

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.

Planning Department

I do not believe that motorhomes, 5th wheel RV's or travel trailers were built as intended for a full time occupancy. As such, and unlike tiny homes on wheels, which were intended for full time use are constructed to different standards. I have had three different motorhomes, and all are susceptible to rat and mice invasions which destroying the wiring in the motorhome. These motorhomes have included class C - 26', Super C - 34' and the best of the best a 45' Prevost diesel pusher. While the floor plans allow for comfort, the exposure in any of these vehicles in the engine compartment, through the tire wells and other locations are just not sealed well enough to keep these rats and mice from causing great damage to vital electrical systems when they are parked in a single location for any period of time.

Further, the costs associated with the site improvements including the electrical and septic systems are cost prohibitive in most cases, and with the complaint driven code compliance system, there is the potential for abuse of the placement of these RV's throughout the county. While I recognize that the affordable housing is a real problem, I would suggested not allowing motorhomes to be placed permanently on any residential or agricultural lot. Instead, if these types of alternative housing units are desired, separate RV parks should be created for their placement. Additionally, if a motorhome is to be considered on a residential lot, make it temporary and not long term. The owner could install a electric pedestal but instead of the costly sewer systems, keep the motorhome or trailers in sound operating condition and drive them to a waste disposal area once a week to dump the tanks. This way the wiring and electrical systems' are less prone to the damage by rodents and the motorhome can be used as intended as a recreational vehicle and not a tiny home on wheels.

Gary Baker
Grass Valley

Jodeana Patterson

From: joanne wohlfeld <irishousestudios1@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 4, 2026 7:16 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: RV houseing

You don't often get email from irishousestudios1@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 would not like to see an RV parked next door to me with people living in it, with lights and noise etc.

How about an RV park like the one on Auburn Rd. for people that must live in their RV.

If it is already a situation where all people near by are happy with. as perhaps in the past then fine but why make it legal. Then if neighbors have issues it involves police, law suits etc. It also can be quite an eye sore.

Thank you kindly,
Joanne Wohlfeld

Jodeana Patterson

From: Diane Rossi <dianerossi1950@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 4, 2026 12:51 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: comments

You don't often get email from dianerossi1950@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 have reviewed the draft ordinance. The rules appear to be reasonable.

I am in favor of the permit requirement and assume prior to issuance of the permit an onsite inspection would be conducted.

In regards to renewing the permit after 2 years, I believe a re-inspection should be a requirement as conditions can change.

Also, I would like to have a simple process for reporting of violations to the County with prompt follow up by County personnel. My biggest concerns are:

1. Failure to maintain proper fire clearances,
2. Improper handling of sewage,
3. Failure to make repairs to the RV rendering, the property uninhabitable.

Thank you,

Diane Rossi
Nevada City homeowner

Jodeana Patterson

From: Andrew Kastner <wonderboy2005@mac.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 4, 2026 10:35 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: RV ordinance

You don't often get email from wonderboy2005@mac.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 Nevada County Planning Dept.

I support Nevada County's efforts to expand housing opportunities through alternative housing solutions, including allowing recreational vehicles to be used as dwellings. Additional housing is needed, and I am not opposed to RV dwellings.

My concern is with the proposed setback requirements. I do not believe RV dwellings should automatically be subject to the same setback standards as single-family homes because they function very differently and create different impacts on neighboring properties.

I strongly believe that many property owners including myself, if they are considering putting an RV dwelling on their property, will naturally want the RV dwelling and it's occupants, as far from their own home as possible to maximize privacy. The unintended consequence is that the RV may be pushed toward a neighboring property line and a neighbors dwelling,

Consider a large rural parcel where the primary residence is located near the center of the property. Under the proposed ordinance, an RV dwelling could potentially be located a 1000 ft from the property owner and only 20 to 30 feet from a property line. If a neighboring home is near that placement, the RV dwelling could end up only 40 to 60 feet from a neighbor's residence. This seems so unfair and intrusive.

In effect, the property owner receives the benefit of separation while the neighboring property owner bears the impacts.

Unlike a traditional home, RV occupants often use outdoor living areas extensively. Outdoor cooking, dining, recreation, pets, storage, gatherings, lighting, and other daily activities frequently occur outside the RV itself. These are normal activities, but they can significantly affect neighboring properties when located close to property lines.

Many Nevada County residents chose rural properties because of privacy, quiet enjoyment, and separation from neighboring activities. Allowing RV dwellings to be located near property lines risks creating unnecessary conflicts between neighbors and could generate opposition to a program that would otherwise have broad public support.

I respectfully urge the Commission to require significantly larger setbacks for RV dwellings than for primary residences. A minimum side and rear setback of 100 feet, or greater, would better protect neighboring property owners while still allowing RV dwellings on qualifying parcels.

The County should also require additional buffering, screening, or vegetation whenever an RV dwelling is proposed in sight of an adjacent residence. I bought my home and property for the peace and serenity which includes the view. The last thing I want to look at is an RV and its inhabitants when I'm in my back yard. Front yards might be treated differently because neighbors across the street often park cars and RVs in the front. But back and side yards are for privacy.

The issue is not whether RV dwellings should be allowed. The issue is where they should be placed. Thoughtful placement standards today will prevent conflicts tomorrow and help ensure that this program succeeds for both property owners and their neighbors.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

Andrew Kastner
Grass Valley, California

Andrew Kastner
wonderboy2005@mac.com
13408 Capitol Drive
Grass Valley CA 95945
1 818 917-0200

Jodeana Patterson

From: ken bigham <krbigham@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 4, 2026 7:49 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: NC Alt 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.

Alternative RV Ordinance

Here we go again. Simply stated, this is a well-intentioned ordinance that has serious flaws and most likely uncontrolled consequences to those of us who have worked hard to make Nevada County a safe, crime and pollution-free home in a rural community atmosphere. I do not want RVs, motor homes, truck campers, camper trailers and whatever other concoctions that are allowed in my neighborhood or beside my home and property!

My first question is, "Who can possibly monitor all the requirements and restrictions included in the plan?" Please don't tell me Code Compliance; they have failed miserably over the years just dealing with the cannabis intrusion in neighborhoods i.e. wafting smell in our country air, exceeding pot grows etc. I have been told by Code Compliance that they can't go onto private property without concrete proof of a violation. This ordinance would allow guests for 90 days but doesn't say how many. Having animals, or how many and what kind, are not addressed at all. With all the fees and requirements associated with this ordinance, housing the truly homeless is not even being addressed.

In my career, I have worked with the people likely to take advantage of this ordinance and can tell you honestly, this ordinance opens up Class K Housing, which is illegal but has been allowed to continue anyway. Where has Code Compliance been all these years?

I think taking a cue from the response of our county voters in the recent primary elections, where Robb Tucker supporters outnumbered Heidi Hall supporters, should give the BOS and Planning Department an overall view of this ordinance, i.e. Heidi Hall originally voted for it and Robb Tucker against.

I think too that even spending the inordinate amount of time and taxpayer money on putting this ordinance together is a complete waste and abomination to those of us who go to work every day to pay for something we don't want.

I ask you, as a reasonable citizen who has lived here fifty-four years, to put this ordinance to rest once and for all. Sometimes we want to do the right thing, but doing right is not always the right thing to do; so here's my alternate proposal -- that is nothing new but makes sense -- have the county create a space where those wanting the proposed RV ordinance to make up their own community (trailer park) -- a place where they can afford to live, be monitored, and receive any supportive services they may need.

Thank you.

Jodeana Patterson

From: michael Miller <mlrrods@icloud.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 4, 2026 5:03 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Rv housing

[You don't often get email from mlrrods@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 absolutely insane. Fire reasons, insurance reasons ,traffic on roads and the overall appearance of properties. Our property values will go way down having this next door or on our road. This is not the solution and passing it onto homeowners isn't the answer. And who is going to inspect and follow up on these RVs? Code can't even do it now . If rvs are your solution then find a vacant area of land away from our neighborhoods and put them in there own rv resort. Ridiculous county can't even keep our vegetation down for fire as it is! Find another solution!!!!!!

Sent from my iPad

Jodeana Patterson

From: Shana Levine <levine.shana@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 3, 2026 4:42 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: opposition to the current change in ordinance

You don't often get email from levine.shana@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 my local elected officials:

While I understand the need for affordable housing, I do not believe this ordinance is the right solution.

I have serious concerns that this proposal will create significant burdens for the County while negatively impacting our roads, neighborhoods, and overall quality of life. From my perspective, I see many potential problems but very few practical solutions.

For example, the ordinance does not adequately address waste management, trash accumulation, or resources for enforcing the standards. It also does not appear to limit the number of occupants who may live in a single RV. Without clear guidelines and enforceable standards, these issues could quickly become difficult to manage.

My greatest concern is enforcement. The County already struggles to address existing problems in a timely manner. On my street, it took more than a year to remove a squatter who placed a trailer on a foreclosed property. Despite repeated calls to law enforcement, numerous court hearings, and multiple judicial orders to vacate the property, the individual remained for months. During that time, there

was constant traffic at all hours of the night, numerous people living in and around the trailer, and ongoing disturbances to the neighborhood.

Even after the court ordered the occupants to leave, it took additional months and considerable public resources to resolve the situation. When they finally departed, they left behind a substantial amount of trash and debris that created further costs and challenges.

This experience demonstrated how difficult and expensive enforcement can be. By allowing RVs to be placed and occupied on individual parcels throughout the County, I fear we are opening a Pandora's box of unintended consequences that local agencies will not have the resources to effectively manage.

Please do not impose this burden on our streets and communities.

If the County wishes to expand affordable housing options, I encourage you to consider supporting and developing additional RV parks specifically designed for RV living. I would much rather see taxpayer dollars invested in properly planned and managed RV parks, with appropriate infrastructure, utilities, sanitation services, and oversight, than allow individual parcels throughout the County to effectively become unregulated RV parks.

I respectfully urge you to reject this ordinance and pursue solutions that provide affordable housing while protecting existing neighborhoods and ensuring adequate enforcement and public safety.

Shana Levine

14377 Rollins Park Drive

Jodeana Patterson

From: HP Design <hollypesta@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 3, 2026 3:11 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: RV Ordinance Comments

You don't often get email from hollypesta@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.

In my humble opinion, you are putting the onus on homeowners to solve the housing crisis in this county. What about thinking farther outside of the box? Please see my idea in the fourth paragraph below.

I am opposed to this ordinance unless you can explain what allocations of personnel and resources you're allotting to enforce compliance. There should be very specific rules for septic removal and the number of RVs allowed on a lot. My suggestion is one RV per two acres of land. Will there be county inspections to ensure the hook-ups for the RV are up to code to avoid fire risks?

Also it would be nice to have additional sheriffs to help handle any complaints of noise, drug use or illegal activities from tenants living in these RVs. I'm not suggesting that all low-income people are disrespectful but a certain percentage might be and it's not fair to subject neighborhoods to this without some kind of recourse.

How about instead the county either purchases or leases a piece of land (maybe a couple acres) and sets it up with RV hook ups and septic and then allows people to bring their own RVs in at a reduced rental rate. Also allow a second option of investors purchasing RVs, setting them up in spaces, and collecting rent from tenants. You can put a cap on what a reasonable low-income rent will be. This way you can manage the resources and have better control over the project. There is plenty of land in our county to do something like this without disrupting nearby communities.

Not managed correctly, I think this ordinance will do much more harm than good.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Holly Pesta

Jodeana Patterson

From: thomas tereszkiewicz <tomt4@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 3, 2026 1:01 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: long term RV rental

You don't often get email from tomt4@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 it is a great idea but tenants must be checked out carefully and have at least three solid referneces!

Thomas tereszkiewicz

Jodeana Patterson

From: Adams, Claudia <Claudia.Adams@pge.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 3, 2026 12:20 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Alt-RV Ordinance public comment: Claudia Adams
Attachments: Alt-RV Ordinance (Revised) Public Draft - Notice of Public Comment Period.pdf

You don't often get email from claudia.adams@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,

As the idea of this ordinance is to provide **long term** housing, I do not think it should include short term housing. As in "Allow RV Dwellings to be rented for a period of 30 days or longer"

Like any other standard rental agreement, I believe a 1-year contract is more suitable to meet the needs of those without other housing options. My concern is that people who are already well off, will buy RVs, put them on their property and use them as Air-B&B's and other money makers which may raise the rates of other RV homes, much like the housing rental issue we have today.

I don't think that tact is in the spirit of the original desire for this ordinance.

Other risk to consider:

Homeowners Insurance Usually Does Not Cover RV Rentals. If the RV is used as a short-term rental home on your property:

Our homeowners insurance will likely deny coverage for any rental-related incident.

Some insurers may even cancel your policy if they discover shorter term rental activity involving an RV.

Implication:

Fire, injury, or property damage could become our personal financial responsibility.

Respectfully,

Claudia Adams

Supervisor • Cybersecurity PMP, CISSP

Pacific Gas and Electric Company

Claudia.Adams@pge.com

530-328-8470

"While we may not be done, we are better than we were before, and that counts as a win any day." – Yusuf Ezzy

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

Jodeana Patterson

From: Melanie Bright <melaniembright@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 3, 2026 11:26 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Concerns

You don't often get email from melaniembright@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 Nevada County Planning Department,

I am writing to express concerns regarding the proposed amendments to the RV Dwelling Ordinance, particularly the removal of the 3-acre minimum parcel size requirement and the proposal to allow RV dwellings to be rented for periods of 30 days or longer.

While I understand the County's desire to increase housing opportunities, I am concerned that these changes could create significant unintended consequences for neighboring property owners, public health, environmental resources, and the rural character of Nevada County.

My concerns include:

- Increased residential density in areas that were not designed or planned for multiple dwelling units.
- Increased traffic, noise, parking impacts, and strain on infrastructure in rural neighborhoods.
- Fire safety concerns in heavily wooded areas where evacuation routes, defensible space, and emergency access may already be limited.

- Reduced compatibility with existing neighborhood character and long-established residential expectations.
- The potential for parcels to function as long-term RV rental properties without the same standards, review, and infrastructure requirements that typically apply to permanent housing developments.
- Increased burden on County code enforcement resources and neighboring property owners who may be forced to live with problems for extended periods before enforcement action occurs.

I am particularly concerned about sanitation and wastewater disposal.

Many rural properties in Nevada County rely on septic systems, have limited utility infrastructure, or are located near creeks, ravines, drainage channels, and environmentally sensitive areas. Improper handling of sewage, gray water, and solid waste can have direct impacts on neighboring properties and local waterways.

Unfortunately, these concerns are not merely theoretical. In my area, there have been instances of waste being dumped into a local creek. There is currently an individual living in an RV near the creek, and neighboring residents have no practical way of knowing whether wastewater is being properly handled or where waste is being disposed. Situations like these illustrate why strong safeguards and oversight are necessary when expanding residential RV occupancy.

I am concerned that allowing long-term RV rentals may increase the likelihood of similar situations throughout the county, particularly when occupancy changes frequently and responsibility for maintenance may be less clear. When problems arise, neighboring property owners often experience the consequences long before corrective action is taken.

The removal of the minimum parcel size requirement is also concerning. Parcel size serves as an important safeguard by providing greater separation between uses, reducing conflicts between neighbors, allowing room for proper setbacks, and supporting fire safety, sanitation, parking, and overall compatibility with surrounding properties.

I respectfully request that the County consider:

1. Retaining a minimum parcel size requirement for RV dwelling use.
2. Requiring proof of approved sewage and wastewater disposal systems before occupancy is permitted.
3. Establishing clear sanitation, trash management, and property maintenance standards.
4. Requiring meaningful setbacks from neighboring property lines, waterways, creeks, and environmentally sensitive areas.
5. Providing notice to adjacent property owners before approval of long-term RV dwelling permits.
6. Limiting the number of RV dwellings permitted on a parcel.
7. Establishing routine compliance inspections and meaningful enforcement mechanisms.
8. Requiring adequate parking, fire safety measures, and defensible space standards.

Nevada County's forests, waterways, rural neighborhoods, and quality of life are among its greatest assets. Housing solutions should be pursued in a manner that balances housing needs with environmental protection, public health, fire safety, and the rights of neighboring property owners.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Melanie Bright

Grass Valley, CA

Jodeana Patterson

From: Allen Schafer <afsarch@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Wednesday, June 3, 2026 10:10 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: RV Homes

[You don't often get email from afsarch@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.

Sent from my iPad. My experience of 50 years as an Architect, and former Director of Habitat for Humanity, is that allowing this type of variance from established Codes is counter-productive. Health/ safety conditions become unenforceable and create additional poor living conditions. Likewise, property values are compromised due to parking and declining visual conditions. Three acres should be the minimum size property allowed for a "granny unit" and the location should be unobtrusive to neighbors.

Example: Alta Sierra's unenforceable CC&Rs have compromised it's community appearance over the last ten years.
Al Schafer

Jodeana Patterson

From: Ken C <kenrc82@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 3, 2026 8:14 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Multiple RV's on Property

You don't often get email from kenrc82@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 live in rural Penn Valley. We have a neighbor that has about 7 RV's on his property with people living in them is this allowed? and there is no way any of them are on septic system. They are scattered about on the property. I don't believe the owner of the property supervises the people in these RV's either, because someone was burning a large pile of garbage about 2 days ago. I realize people are in need of housing, but I'm getting a bit concerned about the safety of living near this property. I'm concerned about contacting this owner because of any retribution that may result.

Jodeana Patterson

From: Peter Kooi <peterkooi.13@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 2, 2026 8:44 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Not In Support of AltRV Ordinance

You 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.

How is sewage and waste water being addressed? Grey water tanks and black water tanks are small, roughly 100 gallons. Are large semi style pump trucks pounding those same rural roads (weekly) I mentioned above?

There must be 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? Who handles complaints? Is the department properly staffed?

What do local fire chiefs have to say about this? Are fire departments properly equipped to handle potentially hundreds of new dwellings and thousands of new tenants? If not, who pays for the infrastructure upgrades? Correct, those same neighbors.

Parcels larger than a few acres are rural and far from town/city center(s), and thus, jobs. Why would you locate these folks there? Close proximity to jobs supports the overall goal of short term, get back on your feet, housing. Put the RV's in downtown Grass Valley and Nevada City where folks can walk to work, make and save money, and ultimately rent/buy a permanent dwelling.

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.

Kind regards,
Peter Kooi

Sunnyside Lane
Grass Valley, CA 95949

530-559-7829

Jodeana Patterson

From: mdvpyn <mdvpyn@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 2, 2026 5:06 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Alternative housing

You don't often get email from mdvpyn@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.

We feel that one acre is enough property to allow an rv to be placed on it.

Michael and Nancy Vanaman

Sent from my Galaxy

Jodeana Patterson

From: Ryan Bonomo <ryanbonomo@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 2, 2026 4:18 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Public Comment — PLN25-0084: §C.1 Income Cap and §C.2 Primary-Dwelling Requirement Exclude Workforce Households

You don't often get email from ryanbonomo@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 Nevada County Planning Department:

Section C.1 of the revised draft RV Dwelling ordinance caps tenant income at 50% AMI — **\$56,900 for a four-person household** in a County whose own 4-person Area Median Income is **\$124,600**. Section C.2 additionally requires a permitted single-family dwelling on the parcel before an RV Dwelling may be established. Together, these two provisions close the door on most of the workforce the Housing Element identifies as essential to retain, including property owners on land they already own.

The arithmetic. Section A states one of the ordinance's purposes is to "provide needed housing for County residents." The §C.1 cap, against the County's own HCD figures, shows how narrow that pathway is:

- Nevada County 4-person AMI: **\$124,600** (CA HCD, 2025).
- §C.1 cap (50% AMI): **\$56,900** (4-person); **\$39,850** (1-person).
- Low Income tier (80% AMI, 4-person): **\$91,000**.
- Moderate Income tier (120% AMI, 4-person): **\$149,500**.

In HCD's own tier language, §C.1 admits only the Very Low, Extremely Low, and Acutely Low Income tiers. **Every household from Low Income upward — including the entire Moderate Income tier and households earning at or above the County's actual median — is statutorily excluded.**

How this affects me directly. I am a Nevada County property owner. As §C.1 is drafted, I would be prohibited from occupying an RV Dwelling on my own parcel solely because my household income exceeds 50% AMI. I disclose this to show how completely the ordinance excludes property-owning workforce households, not to claim hardship.

As a matter of personal religious discipline I also do not enter interest-bearing loans (Exodus 22:25), so conventional mortgages are not available to me regardless of income — making any County-recognized mortgage-free ownership path on land I already own particularly important.

A drafting-clarity note on §C.1. §C.1 refers to "the tenant of an RV Dwelling" and §C.1.b contemplates the property owner agreeing to rent to qualifying tenants. As written, it is unclear whether the 50% AMI cap applies to owner-occupants at all, or only to non-owner tenants. If the County intends the cap to

exclude owner-occupants, the ordinance should say so explicitly; as currently drafted, owner-occupants on their own land are in an undefined position.

The anti-speculation work is already done by §C.2 and §C.6 — not §C.1. §C.2 limits RV Dwellings to one per parcel on rural-zoned land (RA, AG, AE, FR, TPZ) under existing density rules (Section 12.03.192). §C.6.a requires that any rental of these units be for 30 consecutive days or longer, prohibiting short-term rentals. That zoning ceiling and rental restriction — not the income cap — are what block an absentee-landlord business model. The §C.1 cap is therefore doing only one job: income targeting. That is the job it overshoots.

The §C.2 primary-dwelling precondition creates a Catch-22. §C.2 requires a permitted single-family dwelling already on the parcel before an RV Dwelling can be established. For property owners who can afford an RV on land they own but cannot finance a conventional rural primary dwelling — which, even modestly built, requires site work (well, septic, foundation, driveway) whose combined cost typically exceeds what households at or near the County median can secure without a conventional mortgage — the entire RV Dwelling pathway is unreachable. The ordinance recognizes RVs as legitimate long-term housing in §C — but only for residents who already have a conventional primary residence next to them. That conditions an “alternative housing” pathway on the very conventional-housing access most users of the pathway lack.

Building an ADU is not a substitute. For the households this comment describes, the obstacle is the primary build itself, not the accessory unit — without a permitted SFD on the parcel, an ADU is also unreachable. The §G seasonal exception (90 days/year, April 15–October 15, no rent permitted under §D.13) is not a long-term housing pathway and does not cure this gap. For an owner of rural land who cannot access conventional financing, an RV is the only code-recognized, cash-purchasable dwelling option this ordinance contemplates.

RHNA crediting and workforce inclusion are not in conflict. If §C.1 is calibrated to 50% AMI to support Regional Housing Needs Allocation credit toward Very Low Income obligations or Housing Element certification, that goal can be preserved without excluding the workforce. The Board could, for instance, deed-restrict a sub-tier of RV Dwelling permits — sized to the County’s actual Very Low Income RHNA obligation share — at ≤50% AMI for RHNA accounting, while opening the remaining permits to Low and Moderate Income households. Both the RHNA crediting goal and the workforce-retention goal can be met with a single ordinance.

Specific requests. Asks 1–3 (on §C.1) and Ask 4 (on §C.2) are independent; adopting either set without the other still meaningfully improves the ordinance.

Primary asks (§C.1, income cap), in descending order of preference:

1. **Raise the §C.1 cap to 120% AMI (Moderate Income tier — \$149,500 for a 4-person household).** This corresponds to HCD’s Moderate Income tier and is a standard workforce-housing benchmark in California; it captures the teachers, nurses, tradespeople, and County employees the Housing Element identifies as essential to retain.
2. **At a minimum, raise §C.1 to 80% AMI (Low Income tier — \$91,000 for a 4-person household).** This is the standard workforce-housing floor in California and sits squarely below the County’s actual median.
3. **Or restructure §C.1 as a tiered framework,** with a deed-restricted sub-tier sized to the County’s Very Low Income RHNA obligation share at ≤50% AMI preserving RHNA credit, and the remainder open to Low and Moderate Income households.

Primary ask (§C.2, primary-dwelling precondition):

4. **Amend §C.2 to allow an RV Dwelling on a qualifying rural-zoned parcel without a pre-existing permitted single-family dwelling**, where the RV is the owner's primary residence. The unit would carry all §C.4–C.12 safety, habitability, certification, fire-protection, deed-restriction, and driveway standards — including permitted independent well and septic per §C.10.g.1–2, dedicated electrical per §C.10.g.3, fire-safe driveway per §C.11, and approved Fire Protection Plan per §C.12. §C.11's fire-safe driveway standard is already actively applied to rural parcels today — including my own, where the County has asked me to add turnouts for narrow-access fire safety — and the same standard would carry through unchanged to any RV permit issued under an amended §C.2. Minor clean-up edits to §C.10.g.1–2 (which already contemplate “a new permitted water supply” and “a new permitted onsite sewage disposal facility”) would clarify that those independent-infrastructure options apply where no primary SFD exists. The one-RV-per-parcel limit and the rural-zoning restriction remain unchanged; no County enforcement cost is shifted, because the same site-infrastructure obligations that attach to a primary SFD permit would attach to the RV permit.

The other revisions in this draft — removing the 3-acre minimum, allowing 30+ day rentals (§C.6.a), integrating the RV Dwelling provisions into the existing §12.03.150 framework — meaningfully expand this housing pathway.

Pairing those expansions with a 50% AMI cap and a primary-dwelling precondition reintroduces the scarcity the rest of the revision was meant to relieve.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment, and for the Planning Department's work on this ordinance.

Respectfully,

Ryan Bonomo Nevada County Property Owner 19941 Casa Loma Dr, Grass Valley, CA
ryanbonomo@gmail.com

Jodeana Patterson

From: Rebecca Rickey <becca4255@icloud.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 2, 2026 3:44 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Draft Ordinance for RV use as Alternative Housing

[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 have sent in several public comments throughout this process. I am pleased to see that the minimum 3 acre parcel size is being removed.

I have questions as to what the "income restriction limit" is for qualifying RV use" entails.

I thoroughly agree that RV Dwellings should be allowed to be rented for periods of 30 days or longer. RV's are frequently used for long term dwellings in RV parks and there is a shortage of RV parks allowing long term use there is also a shortage of long term rental of RV parks that are affordable. Secondly, RV parks are often noisy and over-crowded, I find it akin to living in a sardine can with zero privacy. This is not a desirable quality of life.

Rv's are fully self contained, sanitary and safe for human living, and though it may not be ideal, for some it is all they can afford or maybe that is the lifestyle they want.

I would like to be able to buy land, develop it with utilities, septic, electric and water and eventually build a home on it and be able to legally live in the RV as long as it takes. Then perhaps once I have a home, I would like to be able to rent the RV on my property to generate a little extra income in addition to my retirement on social security.

Please let me know your thoughts.

Thanks,
Rebecca

Jodeana Patterson

From: Nancy Shanteau <nancy.shanteau@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 2, 2026 3:27 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Support for the development of more alternative housing options

You don't often get email from nancy.shanteau@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: Nevada County Board of Supervisors
Re: Alt/RV Ordinance

I'm glad the county has been responsive to the public outcry for more housing options. I hope to see a finalized plan and implementation schedule that allows alternative and RV housing to be a permanent part of both housing and rental dwelling spaces ongoing in Nevada County. While many of the questions were resolved for the Tiny Homes on Wheels plan, the additional questions of parcel size, septic and other situational concerns are important to address fully.

Thank you for your efforts on this project and I hope you can complete the work and set the plan in motion in the near future.

Regards,
Nancy

Nancy Shanteau
Skills for Change Coaching & Cooperative Communication
Web: www.nancyshanteau.com
<https://linkprotect.cudasvc.com/url?a=http%3a%2f%2fwww.nancyshanteau.com%2f&c=E,1,8nSzPRK7yrJj_3oXhnK919boJEmpgU7V3g73mlag1UjcZ4dnF4tZ9jTiRz9eMwqa2LJTxFktvPnREhOWxQS57fzS8aLKRig-EX8p2BjZ16xL9c8RFTs,&typo=1>
Join my mailing list: <https://tinyurl.com/NancysEmailSignUp>
<https://linkprotect.cudasvc.com/url?a=https%3a%2f%2ftinyurl.com%2fNancysEmailSignUp&c=E,1,gkpsxmyi61q6yQMIA XmjUEJ8Dwl_A1luIPWJozLxlw41jCOOcwBCH8Zfv4qHpQfMOBdviVV9kXqDmSQXyCFEB8Vzbv-ad2VT5Vf6kMy4XWqRV2aBlyw-A,,&typo=1>
Find me on Patreon: <https://www.patreon.com/nancyshanteau>
<https://linkprotect.cudasvc.com/url?a=https%3a%2f%2fwww.patreon.com%2fnancyshanteau&c=E,1,2YZc55LfBTzc46jvVns4VFSFCrpmupkClizeYjFV3Pr3JqrVA-mJ_4C57p16dklCT4RnnwE2S0EI99IPNrEQJNlKt07X9uRom_f9Ycm5pzAxPa3Z-265iLthOca,,&typo=1>
cell: 530-205-8440

Jodeana Patterson

From: Ron <rontaki32@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 2, 2026 1:53 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: NO on Proposed Revised Draft Zoning Ordinance Amendment For Alternative Housing/Recreational MCVehicles As Longte rm Housi myng

You don't often get email from rontaki32@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.

Berkeley here we come!

I moved here from the Bay Area to get away from this sort of overcrowded living style.
Should this come to pass, guess I'll be packing my bags again.

Nevada County is a beautiful place to live.

Let's keep it that way.

Vote NO on allowing RVs as alternative living quarters.

Ronald Antaki
13651 Jones Bar Rd.
Nevada City 95959
510 375-3756

Jodeana Patterson

From: Greg <gregbriggs14@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 2, 2026 1:32 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Bullet point 1 on the ordinance

You don't often get email from gregbriggs14@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,

What is meant by income restrictions? Restrictions based on income (high or low) are discriminatory and therefore despicable.

The other bullet points look good.

Jodeana Patterson

From: Tracy Huston <tracyhuston@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 2, 2026 12:54 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Feedback on revised RV Ordinance

You don't often get email from tracyhuston@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.

Planning and BOS:

I applaud the diligence and care with which the revised ordinance has been drafted. I think it does a very thorough job defining the basic health and safety standards required to preserve well being for RV residents and neighbors alike. Great work!

However, while I wholeheartedly support your intent to expand affordable housing for low income people, I feel the income cap at 50% AMI is too low. At 2025 AMI levels for Nevada County overall, for a single person at 50% AMI that is gross annual income of \$39,850. At that income level, affordable housing cost would be maximum of \$995/month including rent and utilities ("affordable" defined as no more than 30% of gross monthly income). Given high costs of propane and electric, I question whether that is realistic in most cases, and if property owners could or would keep rental costs that low--would be great if they could, but is likely too limiting. As we all know, "low income" households earning below 80% AMI are also struggling to find housing they can afford, are accutely cost burdened due to high rents in our area, and face housing insecurity as a result. Additionally, single parent households with higher incomes but also alimony and child support obligations that significantly reduce their net income are having a really tough time finding housing they can afford, as are seniors and others with high medical expenses, to cite just a couple of examples of why income restrictions might not be just and fail to serve the intent of the ordinance. AMI is a broad generalization that fails to account for what many households can indeed afford for housing. I would urge you to either scrap the income restrictions altogether or to at the least increase it to 80% AMI and with allowances for individual circumstances.

With thanks for all that you all do,

Tracy Huston
President, NevCo West CLT
www.NevCoWestCLT.org
1-310-663-1296 cell

Jodeana Patterson

From: John Timmer <jjtimmer@yubanet.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 2, 2026 12:11 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: RV Dwellings Ordinance
Attachments: jjtimmer.vcf

You don't often get email from jjtimmer@yubanet.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 those making this decision,

I feel that the encouragement of RV dwelling placement in our neighborhood would be detrimental to the safety of our area here in Peardale. The fire danger here is extreme. Our insurance rates are also extreme and demonstrate the high fire danger here. The insurance rates are going up another 30% this fall.

The Peardale area already has many unauthorized living spaces (including RVs) that do not meet fire safety rules and whose owners do little to alleviate the fire danger to our community. **Removing the 3-acre minimum parcel size for RV dwelling use** would paint a bulls eye on our neighborhood as it consists of a good many smaller parcels.

Allowing a more RV dwellings into the community would condone the lax permit enforcement that already exists and encourage more of it in the future. We need more not less concern for the fire safety of community. **Temporary residents** tend not share the concerns of more long-term residents in matters like controlling brush growth around buildings or reducing ladder fuels in a continuous forest canopy. Absentee landlords often exhibit the same lack of concern. Out of sight, out of mind.

Please do not encourage this slapdash effort to increase affordable housing in fire-prone areas. Place better alternatives for alternative housing in areas with better fire protection. Our neighborhood does not even have fire hydrants. We have one road for entry and egress during emergencies. Placing more occupied RVs here will increase the fire danger and the ability of everyone to evacuate when the time comes.

Respectfully,

John Timmer

Jodeana Patterson

From: Debbie Porter <imreel2@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 2, 2026 11:36 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Revised rv ordinance

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.

Why are you guys adding these revisions? Who supports this? I am very against the revisions. Not to happy with any of this sunce the burden is on those of us in rural areas. Did i miss the revised acreage requirements?

Debbie Porter 530-320-2172

Jodeana Patterson

From: John Kitts <john422@mindspring.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 2, 2026 11:19 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: RV ordinance

[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.

Hello

My concern is water. Additional housing is needed but only on municipal water supply systems .

Additional usage could add 12-15-% increase in water usage and it could harm those on wells .

Please there are many areas that are on city water let them add units or create a fund to help well owners deepen their wells if needed from over use.

Sincerely John Kitts

12780 Spring Rd.

Nevada City

Sent from my iPhone

Jodeana Patterson

From: Elaine Ashton <econjoura@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 2, 2026 10:56 AM
To: Planning
Subject: re: AltRVOrdinance@NevadaCountyCa.gov.

You don't often get email from econjoura@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.

This ordinance change sounds like a GREAT IDEA to me. Finally -- something GOOD for the residents of Nevada County.

Jodeana Patterson

From: Michael Taylor <mjt4you@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 2, 2026 10:29 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Cc: Planning; Brian Foss; Clerk of Board; Trevor Koski
Subject: Public Comment in Opposition – Revised Alternative Housing/RV Dwelling Ordinance (PLN25-0084; ORD25-1)
Attachments: Public_Comment_RV_Dwelling_Ordinance_Three_Page_Format_Michael_Taylor.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.

Good morning,

Please accept the attached public comment regarding the revised Alternative Housing/Recreational Vehicle Dwelling Ordinance (PLN25-0084; ORD25-1).

I respectfully request that this comment be entered into the official administrative record and provided for consideration by the Planning Department, Planning Commission, and Board of Supervisors as this ordinance moves forward.

While I support efforts to address Nevada County's housing challenges and expand reasonable housing opportunities, I oppose the ordinance as currently drafted due to unresolved questions regarding statutory authority, consistency with state housing and building standards, CEQA findings, long-term habitability, and enforcement.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide public input on this important issue.

Respectfully,

Michael Taylor

Sent from my iPhone

Public Comment Regarding Alternative Housing / RV Dwelling Ordinance (PLN25-0084; ORD25-1)

To the Nevada County Planning Department, Planning Commission, and Board of Supervisors,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments regarding the proposed Alternative Housing/Recreational Vehicle Dwelling Ordinance.

I want to begin by recognizing the importance of addressing Nevada County's housing challenges. Many residents, including seniors, working families, young adults, caregivers, and those facing financial hardship, are struggling to find attainable housing options. I support thoughtful solutions that expand opportunities while respecting rural property rights.

However, after reviewing the proposed ordinance and staff report, I believe several significant legal, policy, and implementation questions should be fully addressed before this ordinance moves forward.

1. Legal Authority to Convert a Recreational Vehicle Into a Long-Term Residential Dwelling

The threshold issue is whether California law clearly authorizes a recreational vehicle to be converted through local ordinance into a long-term residential dwelling unit outside of a mobilehome park, RV park, campground, emergency housing program, or other state-recognized regulatory structure.

California Health and Safety Code §18010 defines recreational vehicles as motor homes, travel trailers, truck campers, or camping trailers designed for human habitation for recreational, emergency, or other occupancy. However, RVs are regulated under vehicle-based standards and are not constructed under the same building, structural, energy, durability, and habitability requirements as permanent residential dwellings, manufactured homes, or mobilehomes.

The County staff report recognizes that this ordinance addresses alternative housing types not traditionally considered permanent housing. The proposed ordinance nevertheless creates a new category of "Recreational Vehicle Dwelling" and allows RVs to function as residential dwelling units.

Before adoption, the County should clearly identify the specific California statutory authority that permits a recreational vehicle — while maintaining its status as a registered vehicle — to become a long-term residential dwelling unit on private property.

2. Conflict Between Vehicle Status and Permanent Housing Requirements

The proposed ordinance creates a fundamental conflict by treating an RV as both a temporary mobile vehicle and a permanent residential dwelling.

The ordinance requires an RV to maintain DMV registration, remain towable, keep wheels and tires installed, and comply with ANSI/NFPA recreational vehicle standards.

At the same time, the ordinance applies permanent housing characteristics including dedicated water connections, wastewater/septic requirements, electrical infrastructure, residential habitability standards, fire protection plans, and renewable long-term occupancy approvals.

These requirements demonstrate the difficulty of converting a vehicle classification into a permanent housing classification without a clearly established state framework.

3. CEQA and Density Concerns

The staff report recommends finding the ordinance exempt from CEQA, stating that the ordinance does not increase density because RV dwellings would only be permitted where traditional housing could otherwise be allowed.

This conclusion deserves additional review. Creating a new occupied residential unit may result in additional residents, vehicle trips, wastewater demand, groundwater demand, wildfire evacuation considerations, and emergency service impacts.

If the ordinance creates additional residential occupancy beyond what currently exists, the County should provide a clear explanation supporting the conclusion that there is no density increase or additional environmental impact.

4. Long-Term Occupant Safety and Habitability

The proposed ordinance attempts to address safety through inspections, utility requirements, fire standards, and two-year renewals. These provisions are important.

However, they also highlight the central concern: recreational vehicles were not originally designed, tested, or regulated under the same standards as permanent housing. Residents occupying these units deserve clear protections and certainty that the housing being created meets an appropriate long-term residential standard.

5. Enforcement and Practical Implementation

The ordinance creates significant enforcement questions: Who is responsible for ensuring continued compliance after approval? How will modifications, aging RVs, deteriorating conditions, or changes in ownership be monitored? What happens when an RV no longer meets standards but remains someone's primary residence?

The County should carefully consider whether it is creating a future enforcement challenge

while attempting to solve a current housing problem.

6. A More Legally Defensible Alternative

Rather than creating a new permanent RV dwelling classification, Nevada County should consider expanding RV occupancy through more clearly recognized categories, including:

- temporary hardship housing
- senior and caregiver housing
- family support housing
- disaster recovery housing
- transitional housing
- construction-related temporary occupancy

This approach could provide needed flexibility while avoiding uncertainty regarding permanent residential classification.

In conclusion, I support innovative solutions to Nevada County's housing challenges. However, those solutions must be legally sound, enforceable, and protective of the residents they are intended to serve.

Before adopting this ordinance, I respectfully request that the County provide a clear legal analysis identifying the statutory authority, building standard consistency, CEQA basis, and long-term enforcement framework supporting the conversion of recreational vehicles into residential dwelling units.

Respectfully,

Michael Taylor

Jodeana Patterson

From: Sheila Anne Stein <sheilasteinway@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 2, 2026 9:57 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Alternative Housing/RV Dwelling Draft Ordinance (revised)

You don't often get email from sheilasteinway@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,

Having been a Realtor for 36 years in Nevada County, I support the ordinance.

Similar to the Tiny Home Ordinance, the costs are too high for most homeowners. Neighbors worried about trailers popping up all around them are slim to none.

At least there will be a legal alternative.

Cheers,

Sheila Anne Stein 01061158

CORE REAL ESTATE BROKERAGE 01943455

sheilasteinway@gmail.com <<mailto:sheilasteinway@gmail.com>> | 530.913.9377 Facebook

<<https://www.facebook.com/sheilasteinway/>> | Instagram <<https://www.instagram.com/sheilasteinway/>> | Website

<https://linkprotect.cudasvc.com/url?a=https%3a%2f%2fsheilastein.metrolist.com%2f&c=E,1,9NhrHLRZHMZD_x2GYcispRSvhzASZEO1Fzc2LeX32sCurUlma2qkMgxMdUvmB2Eftp0a8WyF4N65DpTFm8XpHAlbdkDgWX_eJcUB3ZHjWQJqLrSe3sbok92D&typo=1>

P.S.: Click here to read reviews about our client's experience and tell us about yours! Zillow

<<https://www.zillow.com/myzillow/Profile.htm>> | Google

<<https://www.google.com/maps/place/Sheila+Anne+Stein,+CORE+Real+Estate+Brokerage/@39.2604512,-120.9996662,17z/data=!3m1!1s0x809b7040c588912b:0x90b7b607e4a145a!4m1!1m7!3m6!1s0x809b71d4fb6861e9:0x53ea5b6bf03cda75!2sSheila+Anne+Stein,+CORE+Real+Estate+Brokerage!8m2!3d39.2604471!4d-120.9970913!16s%2Fg%2F11s0j4y59r!3m7!1s0x809b71d4fb6861e9:0x53ea5b6bf03cda75!8m2!3d39.2604471!4d-120.9970913!9m1!1b1!16s%2Fg%2F11s0j4y59r?entry=tту>>

"UNSUBSCRIBE HERE" <<mailto:sheilasteinway@gmail.com>>

Jodeana Patterson

From: Lora A. Moore <Lora.A.Moore@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 2, 2026 9:46 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Alternative 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 still strongly opposed to allowing RV's as alternative dwelling units on residential land in Nevada County. The changes proposed do nothing to address the problem of unregulated RV's and alternative housing which is a problem currently being overlooked by code enforcement.

The major issues are unpermitted units, sewage, fire risks and egress and exit routes blocked during times of evacuation. I think if this ordinance is approved it will be a band aid that will lead to a decline in the safety and quality of life in Nevada County.

Lora A. Moore
916-549-4449

Jodeana Patterson

From: Jeff Singewald <jeff.singewald@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 2, 2026 9:46 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Comments re: RV amendment

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

Do not click links or open attachments 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 understand why you are removing the 3 acre minimum requirement.

I highly oppose this modification. I will also comment that this entire change is a joke.

We all know that compliance to this proposal will only be done via neighborhood complaint as the compliance department has done for years with the thousands of illegal units in the county today.

The requirements of the proposal are cost prohibitive so folks that have minimal income (which this proposal is focused on) will not be able to afford the requirements and permit process and will simply bypass this and place units illegally as they have done for years without compliance organization doing anything unless complaints are filed.

Regards,

Jeff Singewald

Jodeana Patterson

From: Metzler Noelle <noellemetzler530@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 2, 2026 9:44 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: RV ordinance

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,

As a single mom the only way Ill ever be able to afford stable housing and build wealth is if this ordinance passes! There is NO housing for single parents who arent in extreme poverty. No one will rent to me because I have child even though I meet all of the qualifications.

Thank you, Noelle Metzler

Jodeana Patterson

From: Dolonda Markovina <simplifyranch@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 2, 2026 9:43 AM
To: Jodeana Patterson
Subject: Re: Notice of Public Comment Period: Alternative Housing/RV Dwelling Draft Ordinance (revised)

You don't often get email from simplifyranch@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 the information, just to be clear. Are you saying that you are going to allow RV dwellings on property... Will you require extra insurance coverage for these RV SET UPS..our area is already filled with illegal RVs and trailers... Thank you and respectfully, Dolonda Markovina

On Tue, Jun 2, 2026 at 9:28 AM Jodeana Patterson <Jodeana.Patterson@nevadacountyca.gov> wrote:

Good morning,

Please see the attached Notice of Public Comment Period for the revised Alternative Housing/RV Dwelling Draft Ordinance.

For questions or comments, please contact the Planning Department at altrvordinance@nevadacountyca.gov.

Respectfully,

Jodeana Patterson

Administrative Assistant II

Clerk to the Planning Commission

Clerk to the Zoning Administrator

Jodeana Patterson

From: Greg Chapman <gchapmanusanc@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 15, 2026 11:57 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: RV Housing Ordinance
Attachments: IMG_3991.HEIC; IMG_3990.HEIC

You don't often get email from gchapmanusanc@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: Nevada County Board of Supervisors

Please find my comments regarding proposed changes to our Nevada County RV Housing Ordinance.

On the matter of the proposed ordinance to allow RVs to be occupied as permanent housing, I am 100% opposed to this change and have serious concerns about why our BOS has not undertaken a study to determine what factors are making housing unaffordable and what solutions might address those issues. The RV Housing Ordinance seems to be someone's idea of a quick-fix solution that is being driven by a small but vocal group of people and can best be thought of as follows:

“For every complex problem, there is a solution that is clear, simple, and wrong.”

Among my concerns are that it is hard to know what unanticipated consequences may result from adoption of this ordinance. Just this morning I saw someone on Nevada County Peeps listing an RV for rent at \$1,600 per month. For most of our local service workers this monthly rent would be unaffordable. In addition, once this ordinance passes we may find that property owners begin renting their personal RVs to supplement personal income. This would likely drive home and apartment rental prices higher.

I also have concerns with the adverse impacts to neighbors and surrounding properties (both property values and quality of life could suffer). A current property owner who bought their home on a rural property to enjoy the privacy and serenity afforded by a multi-acre parcel could soon experience lights, noise, cigarette smoke, unsightly RVs, and traffic disrupting their previously quiet life.

I'm also curious how RVs would be connected to a septic tank and whether the property owners leach field would need to be extended. Since most septic tanks are close to a property owner's home, I would imagine an RV would likewise need to be located near the home so the RV can be connected to the septic tank. If a neighbor suspected that the RV was dumping raw sewage on the property, who would that neighbor call for inspection?

I also want to know how compliance will be ensured, how frequently property inspections, which organization will fulfill this mission, and who will fund this organization.

Lastly, I have concerns with this ordinance expanding into Nevada City and Grass Valley and have personal experience with how disruptive and adverse passing this ordinance would be to neighbors. Over the last 3-years my next door neighbor allowed his contractor to park a small RV in his backyard as shown in the enclosed pictures. To put it mildly, it was a disruptive nightmare. Constant noise, cigarette smoke, lights on in my backyard at night, no connection to the sewer (a 5-gallong bucket was the apparent toilet), etc.

I understand the need for more affordable housing but would like to see the BOS focus on eliminating short-term rentals and 2nd homes before bringing other solutions forward. Many second home owners also rent their houses short-term when the owners aren't in town and eliminating short-term rentals would likely make 2nd home ownership less likely.

Please stop looking for easy solutions and instead establish a commission to study the root cause of our local housing affordability issues and develop recommendations for consideration by the community. I don't want to see this grab bag of ideas being pushed on this county while knowing that an in-depth analysis has not been conducted.

Thank you,

--

Greg Chapman

(916) 216-0408 (cell)

 gchapmanusanc@gmail.com

Jodeana Patterson

From: Allen Schafer <afsarch@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Friday, March 13, 2026 1:23 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: RV Ordinance

You don't often get email from afsarch@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.

Supervisors: My experience as an Architect for 50 years has been that reducing health/safety regulations results in abuse due to non-compliance and non-enforcement; further creating unhealthy environments for individuals and families. My experience, having served on Habitat for Humanity Boards in 2 Cities, is that owners neglect the proper utility services and routine maintenance needed to maintain a healthful environment. I.E.- Necessity to relocate inhabitants from moist, moldy and often over-crowded trailers (as exposed on their Applications for housing). Al Schafer