

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

3
4 **MINUTES** of the meeting of June 22, 2023 1:30 p.m., Board Chambers, Eric Rood Administration Center,
5 950 Maidu Avenue, Nevada City, California
6

7
8 **MEMBERS PRESENT:** Commissioners Duncan, Milman and McAteer
9

10 **MEMBERS ABSENT:** Chair Greeno and Commissioner Mastrodonato
11

12 **STAFF PRESENT:** Principal Planner, Tyler Barrington, Assistant County Counsel, Trevor Koski, Deputy
13 County Counsel, Doug Johnson, Senior Planner, Kyle Smith
14

15
16 **PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

- 17
18 1. Housing Ordinance Amendment
19 PLN23-0059; ORD23-1; GPT23-0001
20

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

23 **CALL MEETING TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order at 1:31 p.m. Roll call was taken.
24

25 Principal Planner, Tyler Barrington, advised Chair Greeno and Commissioner Mastrodonato are absent.
26

27 **CHANGES TO AGENDA :** Chair Duncan asked if there are any corrections to the agenda.
28

29 Planner Barrington advised there were no changes to the agenda.
30

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

36 Chair Duncan opened public comment at 1:35pm. With none coming forward, public comment was closed
37 at 1:35pm.
38

39 **COMMISSION BUSINESS:** None
40

41 **CONSENT ITEMS:**
42

43 **PLN23-0057; MIS23-0006:** Annual review of the Development Agreement (DA) for the Harmony Ridge
44 Subdivision.
45

46 *Approved at hearing.*
47

48 **PLN23-0065; MIS23-0007:** Annual Review of the Terra Alta Subdivision Development Agreement (DA)
49 for the Deer Creek Park II Final Map.
50

51 *Approved at hearing.*
52

53 Commissioner McAteer thanked Andy Cassano and Mr. Amaral for all the work they have done at Deer
54 Creek Park II and improved for fire season.

55

56 **PUBLIC HEARING:**

57

58 **1:30 p.m. PLN23-0059; ORD23-1; GPT23-0001.** Recommendation to the Board of Supervisors to amend
59 Chapter II of the Nevada County Land Use and Development Code, Chapter IV of the Nevada County Land
60 Use and Development Code to reduce barriers to housing production including the following topical areas
61 and corresponding Land Use and Development Code (LUDC) Sections: Accessory Dwelling Units, Junior
62 Accessory Dwelling Units, and Second Dwellings consistent with Government Code Section 65852.21
63 (Section L-II 3.19); Density Bonus (Section L-II 3.16); Emergency Shelters (Land Use Tables 2.2-2.6);
64 Employee Housing (Section L-II 3.10); In-Home Family Daycares (Land Use Tables 2.2-2.6); Junior
65 Accessory Dwelling Units (Section L-II 3.19.1); Legacy Parcel Road Frontage Standards for Boundary
66 Line Adjustments (Section L-II 4.1.3); Low-Barrier Navigation Centers (Land Use Tables 2.2-2.6);
67 Medium Density Residential Maximum Density Standards (Section L-II 2.2.2); Minimum Parking
68 Requirements Nearby Transit and Residential Parking Standards (Section L-II 4.9); Residential Care
69 Facilities (Land Use Tables 2.2-2.6); Residential Ground-Mounted Solar Arrays (Section L-II 4.2.5 and
70 4.3.13); Mixed Use Density and Residential Housing in Commercial Zones (Land Use Tables L-II 2.4
71 and 2.5); Senior Citizen or Disabled Persons Housing Allowances (Section L-II 3.16); Technical Cleanup
72 and Other Minor Changes (Various); Transitional and Supportive Housing (Land Use Tables 2.2-2.6 and
73 Section L-II 3.20); and Urban Lot Splits (Section L-IV), and to amend Chapter 1. Land Use Element of
74 the General Plan to increase allowed residential density increases from 6 to 8 units per acre in Urban
75 Medium Density General Plan designations within Spheres of Influence (Policies 1.2.1.b, 1.2.4.b, and
76 Table 1.3) and from 4 to 6 units per acre for mixed use residential development in Commercial and
77 Industrial General Plan designations within Community Regions (Table 1.3) to maintain consistency
78 between policy documents. **RECOMMENDED ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION:**
79 Recommend that the Board of Supervisors find the project statutorily exempt pursuant to Sections 15274
80 and 15282(h), and categorically exempt pursuant to Section 15061(b)(3) the California Environmental
81 Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. **RECOMMENDED PROJECT ACTION:** Recommend that the Board
82 of Supervisors adopt the amendment to the Nevada County Zoning Ordinance (ORD23-1) and approve
83 the General Plan Text Amendment (GPT23-0001). **PLANNER:** Kyle Smith, Senior Planner.

84

85 Senior Planner, Kyle Smith, introduced himself and began his presentation for the 2023 Zoning Ordinance
86 Amendments to remove barriers to housing production. Planner Smith described the project background
87 which requires an annual review for regulations and statutory compliance. He stated one of the Board
88 Objectives is housing and homelessness. He went on to describe changes in state law for housing and
89 advised in 2021 the Board of Supervisors adopted Resolution 21-018 and directed staff to apply for a REAP
90 Grant (Regional Early Action Planning Grant) in which the grant was awarded to County Planning Staff.
91 The final contract award was received in late fall of 2022. He explained the outreach, engagement and
92 notification that was completed during this project which started in the fall of 2022. Planner Smith went on
93 to describe the project description and intent of the Ordinance Amendment which includes updates to
94 comply with State Law and the Statutory updates which includes ADU updates, Senate Bill 9, CA State
95 Density Bonus Law, Employee Housing, In-Home Family Daycares and Fair Housing. Planner Smith
96 described Housing Element Implementation and Technical updates. He advised there are 2 land use
97 entitlements which include amendments to the Land Use and Development Code and General Plan Land
98 Use Element. He went on the explain the Notice of Exemption for CEQA and the requirement for all future
99 housing development to require a CEQA review. Planner Smith finished his presentation and offered to
100 answer any questions.

101

102 Commissioner Milman asked if SB 9 increases the FAR ratios for the County for allowable housing.

103

104 Planner Smith advised the County does not have floor-area ratios in the site development standards, as the
105 County uses impervious surface coverage requirements, which achieves a similar intent by a different
106 metric. He explained the zoning ordinance amendments does not amend the impervious surface requirement

107 and will still apply. Duplex or lot splits or developments are required to be consistent with local
108 development standards as long as they are objective in which the impervious surface is considered since it
109 is percentage based.

110
111 Commissioner Milman asked if the Fair Housing does not require a public comment period at this point.

112
113 Planner Smith advised Fair Housing is treated like other housing developments, such as other multifamily
114 residential developments, and will require some level of public hearing even if it just for a design review.
115 These housing types would be treated in similar fashion. If any of these developments were proposed in a
116 single-family residential unit then there would be no hearing or discretionary approval required.

117
118 Commissioner Milman asked Planner Smith to explain further what Consistent with Underlining General
119 Plan or Zoning densities means.

120
121 Planner Smith advised if a certain parcel would be allowed to have 2 units consistent with density. For
122 example, if the parcel is in a RA-3 zone, which is a residential agricultural zoning with a 3-acre minimum
123 parcel size but if this parcel was to be 6 acres, they would be allowed to have 2 residences because the
124 County's density is based on the minimum parcel size. Similarly, if the parcel was 15 acres in a RA-3
125 district, a property owner would be allowed to have up to 5 units on that parcel through several different
126 mechanisms, such as traditional multi family residence or dwelling groups. If the parcel was to be
127 subdivided there must be enough acreage to support each residence.

128
129 Commissioner Milman asked if the change in the ordinance would allow 10 homes instead of 5 in the RA-
130 3 district.

131
132 Planner Smith stated the change is to allow for different types of housing. Currently R1 and RA districts in
133 the Land Use and Development code does not allow duplexes, duets, or fourplexes to be developed outside
134 of community regions. The Land Use and Development Code would require 5 individual single family
135 residential units instead of allowing one structure or multiple structures which gives homeowners or
136 builders the opportunity to build different housing types which this amendment would allow.

137
138 Commissioner Milman stated SB9 would allow a parcel 2 units regardless of if it is a duplex or not. She
139 asked if this amendment is allowing something different than that.

140
141 Planner Smith stated SB9 does allow for a duplex on the parcel that previously only allowed one unit. He
142 stated this would increase the potential density for those R1 units in the urbanized clusters.

143
144 Commissioner Milman asked since RA-3 is not in an urban area so it would not apply to them.

145
146 Planner Smith advised that is correct. SB9 allowance only applies to the urbanized areas and only applies
147 to R1 zoning district.

148
149 Commissioner Milman asked if septic tank capacity is based on how much can perc or what size the tank
150 is.

151
152 Planner Smith stated both apply. He explained the length of the leach field and the soils that exist along
153 with how quickly it can perc plus also the size of the tank to incorporate the number of bedrooms. It is
154 essentially a function of both the tank and the disposal field.

155
156 Commissioner Milman asked if all development would be subject to CEQA or if there are some exemptions.

157
158 Planner Smith stated there are a number of housing types that are exempt to CEQA and those exemptions
159 generally make the assumptions that the development would have minimal or no impacts to the environment

160 which includes ADUs, JADUs, Fair Housing and those types of development as long as they are a
161 residential development units and consistent with the CEQA exemption.
162
163 Commissioner Milman asked if there are changes to the multi-family districts.
164
165 Planner Smith stated most of the changes apply to residential dwellings, generally, so it could be single
166 family or multifamily homes. Most of the zoning changes are in RA or R1 district except the R2 district
167 increase to density within the sphere of influence of the City, trying to be consistent with the General Plan
168 and promote housing development.
169
170 Commissioner Milman asked with all of these changes, what types of impacts would be anticipated.
171
172 Planner Smith advised the hope is for it to be easier to build housing developments in some of these
173 community regions and throughout the County. He stated they are anticipating housing project proposals
174 to be submitted for development. The zoning changes would allow for multi-generational housing and the
175 ability to build housing types that were previously not allowed.
176
177 Commissioner Milman stated other jurisdictions have approved floor plans or manufacturers in advance,
178 so the applicant doesn't have to go through the same review process.
179
180 Planner Smith advised that the REAP Grant that funds this project also funded an ADU workbook project
181 and the Building Department have released some preapproved master plans that are available on a
182 significantly reduced price point. There are 3 are preapproved and stamped plans which would help reduce
183 the cost of housing production.
184
185 Commissioner McAteer asked how many people attended the workshops and if there was interest in this
186 out in the Community.
187
188 Planner Smith advised there were 12 attendees at the workshop on June 8th prior to the close of the public
189 comment period. He also stated there were also stakeholder round tables.
190
191 Commissioner McAteer asked if the changes described in the presentation are required because of the law
192 changes in Sacramento.
193
194 Planner Smith advised the additional housing types, fair housing and development standards were due to
195 the state law changing. The other housing implementation updates are not necessarily required by law, but
196 it is the County implementing Housing Element Policies and technical updates are clean up.
197
198 Commissioner McAteer asked if bullet point 1 of the presentation is Sacramento telling us how things are
199 going to run in California, if bullet point 2 is staff asking people what they would like to see out there and
200 these ideas were created and if that is a correct statement.
201
202 Planner Smith stated the REAP Grant award was granted for us to be able to comply with state law and
203 since the zoning code was going to be updated, the Community was asked for input, then made other
204 changes that would essentially reduce barriers.
205
206 Principal Planner Tyler Barrington added the County is bound by many state laws and applicants are often
207 referred to other state laws and part of the process is to put that information into our code to make it easier
208 for the applicant to find the information needed.
209
210 Commissioner McAteer asked how the 3 cities in the County work together on this topic.
211
212 Planner Smith stated the cities and county generally work together on housing policy as it is developed
213 however, due to each jurisdiction being in different stages of compliance, this was not worked on

214 collaboratively. Planner Smith explained the Town of Truckee just recently adopted their housing element
215 and are ahead of where the County is at. City of Grass Valley has already made changes as well. Each
216 jurisdiction can choose to implement the changes as they come up.

217
218 Commissioner McAteer asked if he has a house in R1 and he has decided... he went on to explain in the
219 Bay Area there is a huge issue that you convert your garage into living space. He asked if that is being
220 changed due to these laws.

221
222 Planner Smith stated essentially it is as that garage could be turned into a JADU (Junior ADU) which would
223 allow for a residence inside the existing walls as long as it is fewer than 500sq ft. If the garage was over
224 500 sq ft or detached, it could be converted into an ADU. These changes do allow for an ADU or JADU
225 developed on every lot that allows residential housing.

226
227 Commissioner McAteer asked if outside form the garage, to give another example of a JADU and if that is
228 just adding a room onto an existing house.

229
230 Planner Smith advised that a JADU cannot expand the footprint, but it is essentially for what is called an
231 in-law unit such as a garage or an apartment over the garage.

232
233 Commissioner McAteer asked if he can push out from his house to increase the footprint.

234
235 Planner Smith advised that changing the footprint of the residential structure would be considered an ADU
236 as the expansion of an existing structure is limited to 150 sq ft.

237
238 Commissioner McAteer asked if he can push out without regulations if it is under 150 sq ft.

239
240 Planner Smith advised both the JADU and ADU are still required to comply with development standards
241 such as setbacks, hazardous vegetation clearance, and impervious surface coverage. This law is to allow for
242 those additional types of housing.

243
244 Commissioner McAteer asked what a separate mother-in-law unit is called.

245
246 Planner Smith advised an Accessory Dwelling Unit.

247
248 Commissioner McAteer asked if he was to have a separate stand-alone mother-in-law house, he would have
249 to be able to fit that structure on the property conforming to setbacks and asked if there are additional
250 allowances for that.

251
252 Planner Smith stated there are allowances for ADUs are allowed to encroach into the setback as much as
253 up to 4 feet from the side and rear property line, but the County front yard setbacks would still apply.

254
255 Commissioner McAteer asked if he had ¼ of an acre with a residential house and wants to add a mother-
256 in-law house, how big can it be.

257
258 Planner Smith stated of the house if detached the maximum size of an ADU is 1200 sq ft.

259
260 Commissioner McAteer stated the ADU could potentially be tied to the current septic system and the
261 setbacks are down to 4 feet on the side and rear. He asked if he missed anything in talking about this from
262 an R1 community standpoint.

263
264 Planner Smith stated in addition to ADU and JADUs; SB9, lot splits and additional density allowance. In
265 an urbanized area, the R1 lot could potentially be split into 2 lots and a duplex, or 2 units put on each lot.

266
267 Commissioner McAteer asked what size the lot would have to be in order to be split.

268
269 Planner Smith stated there are mineral parcel sizes defined by state law. However, the lot splits would have
270 to meet site development standards which would need to have an adequate area for septic disposal and
271 100% repair area.
272
273 Commissioner McAteer asked if he was to build a 1200 sq ft ADU on the back of his property, could he
274 also get a lot split and have it be a separate taxable lot.
275
276 Planner Smith stated if the lot split was to occur in an urbanized area, there could be a primary residential
277 home and an ADU on each lot.
278
279 Commissioner McAteer asked if urbanized areas are within the County and where they are located.
280
281 Planner Smith advised urbanized areas are located in the areas surrounding Nevada City, Grass Valley, the
282 Town of Truckee, part of Alta Sierra, Lake of the Pines and Lake Wildwood.
283
284 Commissioner McAteer would like to know where all the urban clusters exist within our jurisdiction.
285
286 Planner Smith provided a map from the Sate that shows the areas around Grass Valley and Nevada City as
287 urbanized clusters.
288
289 Commissioner McAteer asked if the urbanized clusters are only in the cities and not within the County's
290 sphere of influence.
291
292 Planner Barrington advised the map shown might not be entirely accurate as the map the originally used,
293 which showed census date from 2010 identified other locations outside the cities as urbanized cluster areas.
294
295 Commissioner McAteer asked if the land owned by BLM, which is sitting fallow, and the state is not dealing
296 with, this amount of empty unused land could be used for housing. He stated the BLM land near his home
297 is fire hazard and a nonproductive piece of land. He asked Planner Smith if he could comment on that.
298
299 Planner Smith stated the federal government trumps both state and local law and are allowed to do with the
300 land as they are directed. He also advised the state has adopted the surplus lands act which allows state
301 entities to start to identify surplus land for housing which will eventually trickle down to the local agencies.
302
303 Commissioner McAteer stated just because the federal government, essentially BLM, owns thousands of
304 acres of land within Nevada County that it's a shame that everyone says its federal land and leave it at that.
305 He stated there needs to be some leadership to deal with the BLM bits and pieces out there that could be
306 used for housing or set up as a land trade. He stated it is a lost opportunity and fire hazard as BLM lands
307 are torch pockets within this community.
308
309 Chair Duncan stated the proposal today does give the County the option to increase affordable housing. She
310 asked if a consultant was hired for the grant award that was received.
311
312 Planner Smith advised the grant funds were allocated to several areas and some consultants were hired for
313 some areas such as for the ADU workbook, but the ordinance amendments were done in house by Planning
314 Staff. He continued by explaining the ADU workbook is a joint effort with other foothill counties and a
315 consultant was hired for that project. Also, consultants have been hired to work with the Cities to undertake
316 some analysis on infostructure to support future housing.
317
318 Chair Duncan asked if that also included the energy grid to support future housing.
319
320 Planner Smith advised the analysis is more on water than on energy.
321

322 Planner Barrington advised the pass-through grant is focused on wastewater. He advised Nevada City, City
323 of Grass Valley and Town of Truckee were all awarded funds through the REAP Grant to look at some of
324 their key areas to look at where they would like to build housing.

325
326 Chair Duncan stated the County needs to consider where the energy is going to come from as we currently
327 have unmet needs for energy, and we are talking about increasing density and the energy source needs to
328 be looked into. She stated there has been a lot of talk lately about CC&Rs and how communities that have
329 CC&Rs probably have no clue increased density is coming. She advised that community meetings are
330 intended to alert the community and understand how they may be impacted. She voiced her concern with
331 the lack of participation and attendance at the meeting. She voiced concern about Community Workshops
332 and the Community tends to not understand what that means to participate and attend. She would like to
333 see things to be broken down into understandable language for the Community to understand and participate
334 in the process. Chair Duncan stated County Care Homes has been a hot topic without public notification.
335 She voiced her concern about the lack of information sent out to the Community to let them know the new
336 laws may impact them. She would like to see more Community meetings as 12 people from the Community
337 attending the workshop, is not enough. She voiced her concern that Community meetings and notification
338 needs to be improved which the Planning Department may want to take on. She stated the better public
339 outreach and participation in needed.

340
341 Commissioner Milman asked how many of these changes were dictated by the State and how many were
342 Planning Department changes.

343
344 Planner Smith advised the majority, approximately more than 60%, are requirements in order to be
345 consistent with State law, 30% are Housing Element implementation updates, and 10% are technical
346 updates.

347
348 Planner Barrington stated the Housing Element is a policy adopted by the Board of Supervisors which has
349 a number of programs and policies that the Board intended for Planning to implement. He stated the
350 Planning Department took the opportunity to use State funding to help implement some of those policies
351 and programs.

352
353 Commissioner McAteer asked if he could see where the R1 changes are within the Counties jurisdiction so
354 that we can see if we need to do outreach to the Community so they can understand what is available or
355 provide to their homeowner's association. He stated the Planning Commissioners need to know the areas
356 that are affected.

357
358 Planner Barrington advised Commissioner McAteer's comment is noted and stated notices were sent out
359 special interest groups, including homeowner's association, which have requested notification. He agreed
360 we would like more participation but there was a very robust conversation at the Workshop regarding
361 community alternative housing. He advised there are a lot of state mandated changes, that we are required
362 to implement, even if we do not put the changes into our code, we are required to enforce those.

363
364 Commissioner McAteer stated he is not here to pick a fight over that issue. He continued with stating if the
365 Commissioners had a map which said these are the areas that are really going to be affected in this R1
366 changes. He stated that is where the issue is going to be, not in an industrial district.

367
368 Commissioner Milman stated she wants to make sure the Commission is aware these changes have already
369 gone into effect via the State laws. She advised this is just a codification for our own local laws.

370
371 Commissioner McAteer stated he does not know where these urbanized areas are. He stated that is all he is
372 looking for.

373
374 Planner Barrington stated he does agree a map would be helpful and that Commissioner McAteer's
375 comments have been noted.

376
377 Chair Duncan asked Commissioner McAteer if he is wanting to hold over the action until the next meeting.
378
379 Commissioner McAteer stated that since we are codifying the state law, he would still like to see a map of
380 what communities would be affected. He would like to be able to direct staff to visit the affected
381 communities and advise them of law changes.
382
383 Planner Barrington stated staff can commit to looking at the urban cluster map and create a list of property
384 owners for notifications.
385
386 Chair Duncan stated she is surprised only 12 people showed up to the Workshop and the affordable housing
387 folks must have been satisfied. In years past, the room would be filled or near capacity when items like this
388 are being discussed. She stated staff must have met with folks and satisfied their questions since none of
389 them showed up at the hearing.
390
391 Planner Barrington advised it was approximately a 2.5-hour in-depth discussion.
392
393 Commissioner McAteer stated his concern is that the people in Echo Ridge association have no clue what
394 is about to happen to them.
395
396 Chair Duncan said she suspects Lake Wildwood and Lake of the Pines will not understand what is
397 happening. She asked how State law trumps CC&Rs.
398
399 Commissioner Milman stated State law does indeed trump CC&Rs as it is stated clearing in SB9. She stated
400 the conversation right now is about potential things that could happen to someone but on the other hand
401 there is potentially a lot of people that live in these areas that would like to be able to build an ADU and
402 have their kid, mother-in-law, a renter, etc to be able to live in them. This option is now available to them
403 that was not available previously without potentially being turned into Code Compliance.
404
405 Chair Duncan agreed there will be people that are happy about it and some will not, but people still need to
406 be aware. She stated she is concerned the homeowner's associations do not know about this.
407
408 Planner Barrington advised notifications did go out to Homeowners association on our list and went out to
409 over 200 entities. He also advised several years back state law was changed so CC&Rs cannot prohibit
410 ADUs.
411
412 Planner Smith advised even though there was a formal outreach, there is a lot of conversations and informal
413 discussions that happen at the counter when people come in wanting to build ADUs and are not allowed or
414 people want to ask questions about code compliance. He stated staff does a good job at educating each
415 community member they speak with.
416
417 Chair Duncan stated it is still a small percentage of the community at large. She stated she is concerned
418 ADUs do not have to comply with the fire improvements if the existing dwelling was developed prior to
419 these conditions. She stated adding sprinklers have always been a cost factor when building an ADU.
420
421 Planner Barrington stated the exterior of the home still needs to meet wildland urban interface criteria such
422 as defensible space.
423
424 Chair Duncan opened public comment.
425
426 Mimi Simmons, resident of Nevada City, stated she is a broker and deals with a lot of people that want to
427 have ADUs. She advised she is on a committee to try and make the County more friendly to consumers and
428 taking steps to be more proactive. She currently has a guest house, and even though she never rented it out,
429 she decided she wanted to make it a legal ADU, and the County was great to work with. She did have some

430 processes to go through and her big concern is that one of the bedrooms in the main house was converted
431 to a den, and in doing so, it reduced her home to a 2-bedroom then by adding the ADU, it would increase
432 it back to a 3-bedroom house which could rely on the current septic system. However, she was advised she
433 needed to put in a new septic tank, so her reason to be at the hearing is to hear how this will proceed, as she
434 had to stop her project due to not being able to install a new septic tank.

435
436 Chair Duncan closed public hearing.

437
438 **Motion by Commissioner Milman** to Recommend that the Board of Supervisors find the project
439 statutorily exempt pursuant to Sections 15274 and 15282(h), and categorically exempt pursuant to Section
440 15061(b)(3) the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.

441
442 **Second by Commissioner McAteer. Motion Carried on a 3/0 vote. (2 absent)**

443
444 **Motion by Commissioner Milman** to Recommend that the Board of Supervisors adopt the Ordinance
445 amending Chapter II of the Nevada County Land Use and Development Code and Chapter IV of the Nevada
446 County Land Use and Development Code (*Attachment 1*).

447
448 **Second by Commissioner McAteer. Motion Carried on a 3/0 vote. (2 absent)**

449
450 **Motion by Commissioner Milman** to Recommend that the Board of Supervisors adopt the Resolution
451 amending Chapter 1 of the Land Use Element of the General Plan (*Attachment 2*).

452
453 **Second by Commissioner McAteer. Motion Carried on a 3/0 vote. (2 absent)**

454
455 Chair Duncan asked for any informational items and project updates.

456
457 Planner Barrington advised there are no scheduled Planning Commission meetings at this time.

458
459 Chair Duncan stated past practices were to have meetings in Truckee and asked if any items would be
460 coming forward for that.

461
462 Planner Barrington stated there are a few Use Permits but they are both incomplete at this time. He stated
463 both of those items will be scheduled to be heard in Truckee.

464
465 Chair Duncan asked if the rafting companies are due for a review.

466
467 Planner Barrington advised that he does not believe that rafting companies have started this year due to the
468 rivers being too high.

469
470 Chair Duncan asked if Darkhorse is expired or still alive regarding the Club House.

471
472 Planner Barrington believes they may be expired at this time, but they did submit a building permit for the
473 facility they installed over the driving range.

474
475 Chair Duncan stated Quick Quack is in operation and asked when the Idaho Maryland Mine is going to the
476 Board of Supervisors on October 2 and 3rd.

477
478 Commissioner McAteer stated he was under the impression the Idaho Maryland Mine hearing was going
479 to the Board in August and asked why it was extended to October.

480
481 Planner Barrington advised he is not aware of the reasoning behind those dates being chosen.

482
483 **Motion to adjourn meeting by Commissioner McAteer at 2:50 p.m**

484

485 **Second** by Commissioner Milman

486

487 Chair Duncan adjourned the meeting at 2:50 p.m.

488

489 There being no further business to come before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 2:50p.m. to
490 the next meeting, at a date to be determined, in the Board of Supervisors Chambers, 950 Maidu Avenue,
491 Nevada City.

492

493

494 _____
Passed and accepted this day of , 2023.

495

496

497 _____
Brian Foss, Ex-Officio Secretary

498

499

DRAFT