

1 **NEVADA COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION**
2 **NEVADA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA**

3
4 **MINUTES** of the meeting of November 19, 2015, 1:30 PM, Board Chambers, Eric Rood
5 Administration Center, 950 Maidu Avenue, Nevada City, California
6

7
8 **MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chair Duncan, Commissioners Poulter, Aguilar, James and Jensen
9

10 **MEMBERS ABSENT:** None.

11
12 **STAFF PRESENT:** Planning Director, Brian Foss; Principal Planner, Tyler Barrington; Senior
13 Planner, Patrick Dobbs; Senior Planner; County Counsel, Alison Barratt-Green; Administrative
14 Assistant, Janeane Martin
15

16
17 **PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

- 18
19 1. Business Park - GP15-002; GP15-003, Page 1, Line 45
20 Z15-003, ORD15-002, EIS15-012
21

22 **STANDING ORDERS:** Salute to the Flag - Roll Call - Corrections to Agenda.
23

24 **CALL MEETING TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order at 1:30 P.M. Roll Call was
25 taken.
26

27 **CHANGES TO AGENDA:** No changes.
28

29 **CONSENT ITEMS:**

- 30 1. Acceptance of Minutes for 09-24-2015
31

32 **Motion** to approve the Consent item by Commissioner James; **second** by Commissioner Jensen.
33 **Motion carried on a voice vote.**
34

35 **PUBLIC COMMENT:** Members of the public shall be allowed to address the Planning
36 Commission on items not appearing on the agenda which are of interest to the public and are
37 within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Planning Commission, provided that no action shall
38 be taken unless otherwise authorized by Subdivision (6) of Section 54954.2 of the Government
39 Code. None.
40

41 **COMMISSION BUSINESS:** None.
42

43 **PUBLIC HEARING:**

44
45 **GP15-002, GP15-003, Z15-003, ORD15-002, and EIS15-012:** Proposed General Plan Land
46 Use Map re-designation and Zoning District Map rezone of parcels in 8 of the 16 existing BP
47 (Business Park) zoned site locations. Also, General Plan and Zoning Ordinance text amendments

48 for the BP zone district that would: remove Comprehensive Master Plan development
49 requirements for parcels zoned BP within approved Area Plans; cleanup inconsistent Code
50 language regarding outdoor manufacturing/material storage, and permit requirements for mini-
51 storage facilities; add schools as a permissible use; and relax current BP site development
52 standards for building setbacks and maximum impervious coverage, consistent with other similar
53 intensity land uses. **LOCATION:** 16 clusters of property zoned Business Park through the
54 unincorporated area of Nevada County. **RECOMMENDED ENVIRONMENTAL**
55 **DETERMINATION:** Negative Declaration **PLANNER:** Patrick Dobbs, Senior Planner
56

57 Senior Planner Dobbs began his presentation by introducing himself and welcoming the
58 commissioners and the public. He outlined the project with a Power Point presentation. He
59 began his presentation with a reminder that the direction received from the Commission at the
60 July 23rd workshop led to the recommendations that he would present to the Commission today.
61 Today's action by the Commission would be a recommendation to be heard by the Board of
62 Supervisors on January 12th, 2016, as currently scheduled. He noted that there is no specific
63 project proposed on the properties at this time. He added that Staff would welcome an
64 application but there is no such project is proposed at this time. The current proposal is to make
65 changes to the zoning district of some parcels along with changes to the General Plan and Zoning
66 Ordinance text.
67

68 Planner Dobbs gave an explanation of the designation as well as the history of how it came to be.
69 The Business Park (BP) designation is the least intensive of the three industrial uses, intended for
70 businesses involved in research and development and light manufacturing. The land use
71 designation was introduced in the 1995 comprehensive General Plan update. It includes
72 progressive guidelines that encourage innovative creative design with a variety of employment
73 oriented uses in a spacious and extensively landscaped setting reflecting a campus character with
74 a high level of onsite amenities; a great place to work. The designation was introduced at a time
75 when technology was booming and it was hoped that the success in the Bay Area would flow to
76 the County. In 1997 the Zoning Ordinance was updated and approximately 850 acres of land the
77 majority of which was M1 was rezoned to BP.
78

79 Planner Dobbs moved on to discuss the 16 sites that are currently zoned BP throughout the
80 County. He noted that the sites are spread throughout the County with 15 of them in Western
81 Nevada County and one in Eastern Nevada County, next to the County airport. In March of
82 2014 the Board of Supervisors issued a work order to the Advanced Planning Division for Phase
83 2 of the General Plan Land Use Element Update. The directive was to analyze the effectiveness
84 and appropriateness of the Business Park land use designation and zoning district throughout the
85 County.
86

87 Planner Dobbs stated that when he started with the County in March of this year, he reached out
88 to property owners seeking to gain their input on whether they were satisfied with their current
89 zoning. Staff presented their preliminary recommendations to the Commission on July 23rd. The
90 Commission accepted the modest changes proposed to development standards and non-
91 substantive cleanup language and directed Staff to focus on these 8 sites with regards to the
92 zoning changes.
93

94 Planner Dobbs explained the reasons for Staff to review the BP land use designation. Beyond
95 the Board of Supervisors direction to review the designation, there has been a lack of investment
96 across the board; demands have changed; the vacancies at the Nevada City Tech Center and
97 former site of Grass Valley Group are telling of current demands for larger scale manufacturing
98 companies. Since the rezoning in the 1980's there have been complaints about the shortage of
99 M1 zoned land. The review included analyzing which of the sites should be zoned back to M1.
100 The desire was not to change the BP definitions and site development standards to make it just
101 like M1; Staff wanted to keep BP its own district.

102
103 Planner Dobbs stated that the project description was two-fold; changes to maps and changes to
104 text language within the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance. The proposal is to rezone one or
105 more parcels in 8 of the 16 current BP locations. He explained that a rezone of a site would
106 require a General Plan map change and presented a slide showing Site #1, Streeter Road – as an
107 example of what the General Plan map change would look like. He presented another slide
108 showing an example of changes to text within the General Plan.

109
110 Planner Dobbs explained that text changes would be both meaningful changes as well as text
111 cleanups. Changes proposed include changes to setbacks and impervious coverage limitations to
112 make it more feasible to develop the BP sites.

113
114 Planner Dobbs noted that both for the meeting in July and today's meeting BP property owners
115 were noticed as well as owners within 500-feet of BP sites proposed for rezoning along with
116 notices published in the newspaper.

117
118 Planner Dobbs moved to the specifics of proposed site development standard and other text
119 amendments. Changes would include removal of comprehensive master planning requirements
120 for BP sites within approved Area Plans; modest changes to setbacks impervious coverage
121 limits; language clean up regarding outdoor manufacturing and inconsistent references to mini-
122 storage facilities; and proposing to add schools as a permissible use within the BP zoning district.

123
124 Planner Dobbs explained that currently a project within a BP district requires comprehensive
125 master planning within the entire BP site which in many cases includes other owners' adjacent
126 properties. Three of the BP sites are within approved Area Plans; Site #2 in Higgins Corner, Site
127 #6 in the Penn Valley Area Plan and Site #15 located in the North San Juan Area Plan. These
128 Area Plans represent comprehensive planning for these locations so Staff proposes to remove the
129 Comprehensive Master Plan requirement as an un-necessary barrier and allow for the sites within
130 approved Area Plans to be planned and developed independently.

131
132 Planner Dobbs stated that several of the BP sites, particularly those within approved Area Plans,
133 are smaller parcels. As such, Staff is proposing to amend the exterior yard, interior yard and rear
134 yard setbacks which will simplify the Industrial site development standards. The proposed 30-
135 foot setback is consistent with other residential setbacks from light industrial zoning. The
136 maximum impervious surface would increase from 50% to 60% which is consistent with other
137 similar intensity uses, specifically the office/professional commercial use. 60% maximum
138 impervious surfacing would leave ample room for landscaping and water infiltration.

139

140 Planner Dobbs stated that there is an inconsistency between the General Plan BP definition and
141 the Zoning Ordinance BP purpose statement. He explained that they are similar but one allows
142 outdoor uses and the other does not. Business Parks are envisioned as closed, contained
143 facilities. In the hierarchy, the General Plan trumps the Zoning Ordinance so Staff proposes to
144 delete references to outdoor manufacturing and storage in the Zoning Ordinance to protect the
145 quality of life of the surrounding property owners and also helps justify the increase in
146 impervious surface in order to keep any equipment and the business activities enclosed.

147
148 Planner Dobbs continued with a discussion on mini-storage language. Within the permissible
149 uses list for Business Parks the mini-storage language is confusing. Staff proposes to revise the
150 table to require a Use Permit for a mini-storage as is required within the other industrial districts.
151 Site #2 on Woodridge Drive has an existing mini-storage facility.

152
153 Planner Dobbs stated that the final text amendment would be to add schools as a permissible use
154 within the BP zoning district. Staff recognizes the nexus between campus development,
155 education and research and development. Site #12 is part of the former Grass Valley Group
156 campus and a portion of it is currently home to the Nevada City School of the Arts. This has
157 been a good match. While not all BP sites would be conducive to this, some might be. It is
158 proposed that a Use Permit would be required for schools within the BP District. The idea of
159 schools as a permissible use was discussed at the July meeting. There was some talk at that time
160 about limiting schools to trade schools however Staff proposed a broader use so as not to exclude
161 groups such as Nevada City School of the Arts.

162
163 Having completed his discussion on proposed text amendments, Planner Dobbs turned to a
164 discussion regarding specific sites proposed for rezone. Site #1 Streeter Road – is a 9.6 acre site
165 comprised of 20 parcels. The site is built out with industrial, commercial and office/professional
166 uses and has direct access to Highway 49. Given the existing development and number of owners
167 it is unlikely that it would ever be redeveloped as BP. The site is buffered from potential
168 incompatible uses. With the existing uses and direct access to Highway 49 the site is much more
169 aligned with the M1 light industrial use. As such, Staff proposes to rezone the entire site from
170 BP to M1-Light Industrial, maintaining the Scenic Corridor (SC) combining district due to its
171 proximity to Highway 49.

172
173 Site #4 is located between Highway 49 and LaBarr Meadows Road near the southern gateway to
174 the City of Grass Valley. The site is 50 acres, comprised of 5 parcels and about ½ of them are
175 currently developed. These are some of the highest industrial uses within the County; Kilroys,
176 Rare Earth, Hansen Bros. The site has good access to major roadways without passing through
177 residential neighborhoods. The annexation process to the City of Grass Valley is underway and
178 the City has pre-zoned the site for industrial use. The County's proposed corporation yard is
179 anticipated directly south of Site #4. The site has had intense industrial uses for decades and
180 Staff feels it is appropriate to rezone it back to M1.

181
182 Commissioner Aguilar asked if the M1 zoning district allows outdoor storage.

183

184 Principal Planner Barrington said that district does allow outdoor storage, the change
185 Commissioner Aguilar is thinking of is to the BP district text to clarify that it does not allow
186 outdoor storage.

187
188 Planner Dobbs discussed Site #6 in Penn Valley. The site is comprised of two parcels and totals
189 over 11 acres. The site is located between the Penn Valley commercial core and Ready Springs
190 School. The vacant parcel is owned by the Penn Valley Community Foundation and is the
191 anticipated site of the future Penn Valley Cultural Center. The other parcel, closest to the school
192 is improved with a single family residence. Staff is recommending rezoning the Penn Valley
193 Foundation property to C2 as it is adjacent to other commercial uses and it will provide more
194 flexibility for the cultural center community benefit project. There are no zoning changes
195 proposed for the southern parcel which will stay BP and act as a buffer between the commercial
196 district and the school. The SP combining district would remain on the parcels as they are
197 regulated by the Penn Valley Area Plan.

198
199 Planner Dobbs explained that the next three sites were split apart for the project analysis. These
200 three parcels were historically considered a part of a larger mixed use project area known as
201 Kenny Ranch, near the Rough & Ready Highway and Ridge Road intersection, west of the City
202 of Grass Valley. Site #8 is west of Twin Cities Church and includes approximately 26 acres,
203 currently zoned BP. Site #9 is across the street from Twin Cities Church. It includes about 23
204 acres of BP divided by Open Space. Site #10 is located east of Twin Cities Church, includes
205 about 38 acres of BP on the 130 acre parcel. These sites have received a lot of attention during
206 this project. Initially the property owners wanted Staff to look at the entirety of zoning within
207 the Planned Development. Neighbors have stressed the difficulties of developing on the lava
208 cap. Other stakeholders have emphasized the importance of the wildflowers known as Hell's
209 Half Acre. Comments received today specifically speak to maintaining the protections of the
210 sensitive resources on the site. There is no proposal to change the Open Space (OS) district on
211 the sites. The proposal is in part based on input from the current owners and represents the long
212 held vision that residential development is more likely for this area. For Sites #8 & #10, the BP
213 portions on the north side of Rough & Ready Highway are proposed to be rezoned to Residential
214 Agriculture (RA). For Site #9, the western polygon of BP is proposed to be rezoned to General
215 Agriculture (AG). Consistent with previous projects in this Planned Development, including the
216 Twin Cities Church, Hospice of the Foothills and more recently the Yuba River Charter School,
217 the proposal would amend the SP combining district requirements and would allow the
218 remaining properties to be planned and developed independently and require a Use Permit for
219 future development.

220
221 Planner Dobbs stated that similar to the sites within Kenny Ranch, Site #11 received extra
222 attention. The site is east of the City of Grass Valley, bordered by Idaho Maryland Road and
223 Whispering Pines to the north and East Bennett to the south. The site includes 31 parcels
224 totaling approximately 185 acres. As with all the sites within Grass Valley's Sphere of Influence,
225 Staff has coordinated their recommendations with the City's Community Development Director.
226 Most of the site is vacant, though there is some commercial and industrial development. Senior
227 housing units are under construction adjacent to the western boundary of Site #11. Early on the
228 City of Grass Valley has expressed their desire to continue the medium to high density
229 residential pattern into the western portion of Site #11. Grass Valley's 2020 General Plan

230 indicates medium residential density for the southern half of Site #11. The idea for residential
231 zoning for a portion of the western parcels was presented at the July meeting but there was no
232 clear consensus regarding the potential density or where the district boundaries should be
233 located. There is broad support to rezone much of Site #11 back to M1. Staff supports that
234 proposal given the majority of surrounding uses are higher intensity commercial and industrial
235 development; no changes are proposed to the 5 westernmost parcels which constitute
236 approximately 30 acres of the 185 acre site.

237
238 Recently the Board of Supervisors took action on parts of the Housing Element Update project.
239 During those discussions the City of Grass Valley spoke in support of spreading out some of the
240 State mandated high density residential zoning capacity from the Brunswick area and locating
241 some of that zoning on one or more of the westernmost parcels of Site #11. With this, it is likely
242 that some of these parcels may be analyzed to be rezoned to residential in the future, but with
243 this project, the proposal is to leave the current BP zoning on the westernmost parcels, while
244 rezoning the rest of Site #11 back to M1.

245
246 Planner Dobbs stated that Site #12, the largest of the BP sites at over 325 acres, comprised of 6
247 parcels and located alongside Bitney Springs Road, is the former site of Grass Valley Group.
248 This is the quintessential BP site. It was comprehensively planned from the beginning. It is self-
249 contained with its own water filtration and wastewater disposal systems. Most of the site is
250 vacant however the Nevada City School of the Arts has occupied a portion of the buildings for
251 several years. The parcels are owned by the same entity. The development is consistent with BP
252 and Staff is not proposing to change the zoning except for a small ½ acre parcel on the eastern
253 edge of the site which is owned by Penn Valley Fire District and operated as a rural fire station.
254 As is the case with other public service facilities, Staff proposes to rezone just that portion to
255 Public, leaving the majority of the site as BP.

256
257 Site #14 is along North Bloomfield Road; not normally the type of location that would be
258 expected to find a BP type business. The site is known as the old nail factory and had
259 manufacturing going on for decades, most recently for window and glass manufacturing. Site
260 #14 does not involve rezoning. Staff is proposing to reconfigure the existing zoning district
261 boundary to coincide with the reconfigured property boundary resulting from a recent lot line
262 adjustment. The proposal is to remove the BP that is now part of a residential parcel,
263 approximately 8 acres, leaving the rest of the site intact as BP.

264
265 Planner Dobbs reiterated that Staff is not proposing to eliminate BP as a zoning district. Staff
266 feels there is a need for this district in the County. He expressed willingness to discuss the sites
267 that are not proposed for rezoning if the Commission would like him to do so. The issues were
268 analyzed; Staff coordinated with the City of Grass Valley and spoke with both PG&E and NID.
269 This is not a growth inducing project that requires additional public services and facilities.
270 Certainly transportation and circulation will be reviewed if and when a project comes along but
271 these are program level changes. The land use issues considering community, character and
272 compatibility were the biggest considerations. Staff prepared an Initial Study and Draft Negative
273 Declaration that was available from October 16 to November 16. No public comments were
274 received regarding adequacy of the document during the public review period, though there
275 might be a few to that effect in the comments that were received today. The existing local, State

276 and Federal regulations that are in place have built in protections for these environmental
277 resources and those would result in less than significant impacts.

278
279 Staff recommends that the Planning Commission recommend approval of the Resolution for the
280 Negative Declaration EIS 15-012; recommend approval of the Resolution for the General Plan
281 text amendments GP15-003; recommend adoption of the Zoning Ordinance text amendments
282 ORD-002, recommend approval for the General Plan land use map amendments GP15-002; and
283 recommend adoption of the Ordinance for the rezoning of the parcels Z15-003 to the Board of
284 Supervisors.

285
286 Chair Duncan thanked Planner Dobbs for his presentation.

287
288 Commissioner Jensen asked for confirmation that the purpose for the project is to remove
289 restrictions for a more business friendly atmosphere to encourage investment in the County to
290 create jobs.

291
292 Planner Dobbs stated that this project is about creating jobs and realigning those parcels with
293 their functional surroundings.

294
295 Commissioner Jensen asked if there was any feedback from the public during the six to eight
296 months the Commission had been involved in the project stating that this will work.

297
298 Planner Dobbs said that owners have mentioned that current rules are holding them back and
299 they are ready to make investments in these properties that are more in line with M1.

300
301 Chair Duncan remembered from the earlier meeting that there were concerns from the individual
302 property owners about trying to come up with a comprehensive plan involving other property
303 owners which was an impediment to getting the type of investment that they wanted to move
304 forward with. She asked if there were other questions.

305
306 Hearing none, Chair Duncan opened the public hearing at 2:01.

307
308 Ms. Jan Fleming introduced herself as President of Ironhorse Homeowner's Association located
309 off of Bennet Street. She asked about the thirty western acres of Site #11 that Staff is proposing
310 to keep as BP. Planner Dobbs had said that the Board of Supervisors was dealing with that
311 particular parcel also so she was interested in finding out what the relationship between what is
312 happening today and what the Board of Supervisors is doing.

313
314 Chair Duncan noted that questions would be answered at the end of the public hearing.

315
316 Mr. Roy Holcum asked what would be needed to change Site #3 in part from commercial to
317 residential.

318
319 Ms. Susan Chalpin of Chicago Park asked if Hell's Half Acre was delineated to be preserved as
320 was thought in the original Kenny Ranch or would that protection be eliminated due to the
321 change in ownership.

322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366

Chair Duncan closed the public hearing at 2:06.

Principal Planner Barrington stated that the Housing Element Update action is not interrelated at this time. Staff recommends that the area that is being considered as potential high density at the direction of the Board remain as BP with no change being requested at this time which would allow Staff to continue to pursue potentially rezoning those to high density residential. The two properties in question from the Board would allow the potential for retaining a buffer of BP between the areas of M1 and potential future high density housing. Staff's direction is to look at the larger of the two which has an even greater buffer to achieve the housing density number. If for some reason the County was unable to achieve the necessary high density housing numbers, Staff would look at the second property. Staff does not feel that there is any issue in going forward today in terms of the Housing Element project.

Planner Dobbs reiterated that Staff just wants to disclose that the conversations are going on currently.

Planner Dobbs addressed the question regarding Site #3. This site is located along Magnolia Road, very close to the bed base of Lake of the Pines and adjacent to the schools which are sensitive receptors so Staff is cautious of any up-zoning in that area. Staff sees the site as a potential cottage industry site in the future. It does have some topographical type constraints. Given the existing surroundings and the proximity to the large bed base Staff did not further pursue rezoning Site #3. Should the property owners want to pursue that independently they could go through a similar process regarding General Plan and Zoning Ordinance amendments.

Chair Duncan mentioned the current residence there.

Planner Dobbs confirmed that there is a residence there. He stated that there was interest expressed in previous conversations about possibly being able to subdivide or expand the residential development. He explained that the existing BP zoning would not allow subdivision of the parcel but would allow additional housing if it was secondary to the purpose of the property. It is an existing non-conforming use.

Chair Duncan asked if they could have an additional housing unit, in support of the BP use with the approval of a Use Permit.

Principal Planner Barrington stated that the code does allow for residential use on a BP property as an ancillary use to the purpose of the property at a density of four units per acre.

Planner Dobbs stated that the Open Space designation over Hell's Half Acre was specifically located in response to the sensitive resources that are on that parcel and there are no changes to the designation at this time.

Chair Duncan asked if there is acknowledgement that it is a scenic resource in the area.

367 Planner Dobbs replied that it was not only scenic but particularly the wildflowers are very unique
368 species and that the lava cap creates specific conditions. This is in part why the lines were
369 drawn there in 1997.

370
371 Commissioner Jensen asked for clarification on the changed zoning. Would a full review of
372 Planning Department and Planning Commission be required for development?
373

374 Principal Planner Barrington confirmed that depending on what type of project was proposed it
375 would have to go through the typical review process such as a Use Permit.
376

377 Commissioner James asked if Staff could point out where Hell's half Acre is specifically located.
378

379 Ms. Chalpin helped show where it was.
380

381 Staff recommends that the Planning Commission recommend approval of the Resolution for the
382 Negative Declaration EIS 15-012; recommend approval of the Resolution for the General Plan
383 text amendments GP15-003; recommend adoption of the Zoning Ordinance text amendments
384 ORD-002, recommend approval for the General Plan land use map amendments GP15-002; and
385 adoption of the Ordinance for the rezoning of the parcels Z15-003.
386

387 **Motion by Commissioner James** to recommend approval of the Resolution for the Negative
388 Declaration EIS15-012 to the Board of Supervisors; **second by Commissioner Jensen. Motion**
389 **carried on a voice vote 5/0.**
390

391 **Motion by Commissioner James** to recommend approval of the Resolution for the General Plan
392 map amendments GP15-002 to the Board of Supervisors; **second by Commissioner Jensen.**
393 **Motion carried on a voice vote 5/0.**
394

395 **Motion by Commissioner James** to recommend approval of the Resolution for the General Plan
396 text amendments GP15-003 to the Board of Supervisors; **second by Commissioner Jensen.**
397 **Motion carried on a voice vote 5/0.**
398

399 **Motion by Commissioner James** to recommend approval of the Resolution for the Zoning
400 Ordinance map amendments (Z15-003) to the Board of Supervisors; **second by Commissioner**
401 **Jensen. Motion carried on a voice vote 5/0.**
402

403 **Motion by Commissioner James** to recommend approval of the Resolution for the Zoning
404 Ordinance text amendments (ORD15-002) to the Board of Supervisors; **second by**
405 **Commissioner Jensen. Motion carried on a voice vote 5/0.**
406

407 Chair Duncan thanked Staff and the audience for their participation.
408

409 Discussion ensued regarding potential hearing scheduling. Nothing is on schedule for the 10th.
410 If something is pressing a special hearing could be scheduled.
411

412 Commissioner Jensen asked about the status of the North Star water project.

413
414 Planning Director Foss said the appeal was heard by the Board of Supervisors last week and the
415 item was continued to allow Staff to present additional information on December 8th regarding
416 some engineering and structural issues.

417
418 Chair Duncan asked if that meant that Newmont missed their State Water Board deadline.
419

420 Planning Director Foss said yes; it was supposed to have been built and running by the end of the
421 year. He noted that the Water Board had been closely involved in the process and should be
422 aware of the status.

423
424 Commissioner James asked about the status of Area Plan updates as directed by Staff, and what
425 the status is. A discussion ensued regarding the Soda Springs Area Plan and the potential to
426 move to the Penn Valley and Higgins Area Plans after Soda Springs had been wrapped up.

427
428 Additional discussion was held regarding by-right zoning for homeless shelters as well as zoning
429 for adult businesses.

430
431 **Motion by Commissioner Jensen; second by Commissioner James to adjourn. Motion**
432 **carried on voice vote 5/0.**

433
434 There being no further business to come before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at
435 2:24 p.m. to the next meeting to be at a time and date yet to be determined in the Board of
436 Supervisors Chambers, 950 Maidu Avenue, Nevada City.

437
438 _____

439
440 Passed and accepted this day of , 2015.

441
442 _____
443 Brian Foss, Ex-Officio Secretary