

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

3
4 **MINUTES** of the meeting of September 24, 2020, 1:30 p.m., Board Chambers, Eric Rood
5 Administration Center, 950 Maidu Avenue, Nevada City, California via remote
6

7
8 **MEMBERS PRESENT:** Chair Aguilar and Commissioners Coleman-Hunt, Duncan, Johansen
9 and Greeno.

10
11 **MEMBERS ABSENT:** None.

12
13 **STAFF PRESENT:** Planning Director, Brian Foss; Principal Planner, Tyler Barrington; Deputy
14 County Counsel, Rhetta VanderPloeg; Associate Planner, Janeane Martin; Administrative
15 Assistant, Shannon Paulus.
16

17
18 **PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

- 19
20 1. Penn Valley Church Page 6, Line 254
21 PLN19-0022; GPA19-0001; RZN19-0001; CUP19-0002; EIS19-0003
22

23 **STANDING ORDERS:** Salute to the Flag - Roll Call - Corrections to Agenda.
24

25 **CALL MEETING TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order at 1:30 p.m. Roll call was
26 taken.

27
28 **CHANGES TO AGENDA:** None.
29

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

35 **COMMISSION BUSINESS:** None
36

37 **CONSENT ITEMS:**

- 38 1. First Two-Year Extension of Time (PLN20-0139; EXT20-0006) Northern Sierra Propane
39 (PLN16-0072; DVP16-8; EIS16-0002)
40 2. Second and Final Three-Year Extension of Time (PLN20-0150; EXT20-0007) Christ Final
41 Map (FM07-010; EIS07-053)
42 3. Extension of Time (PLN20-0155; EXT20-0008) Standing Rock Ranch (FM13-001; U13-
43 007; MGT13-010; MGT13-018; MGT13-019; MI13-015)
44 4. Acceptance of 2020-07-23 Planning Commission Hearing Minutes.
45

46 Commissioner Duncan requested that Consent Items 2 and 3 be pulled from the consent calendar.
47 **Motion** to approve the Consent Items 1 and 4 by Commissioner Duncan; **second** by Commissioner
48 Johansen. **Motion carried on a voice vote 5/0.**
49

50 **Item Pulled From Consent Calendar**

51 Second and Final Three-Year Extension of Time (PLN20-0150; EXT20-0007) Christ Final Map
52 (FM07-010; EIS07-053)

53
54 Chair Aguilar asked Principal Planner Tyler Barrington if he was the Planner for the project.

55
56 Planner Barrington answered that he was the Planner who drafted the staff memo. He stated that
57 per Code, the applicant was requesting an extension of three years for their Final Map. He said
58 that the applicant had accomplished some improvements, however they had additional
59 improvements that needed to be made in order to complete the map. He reviewed some history of
60 the project and stated that it was the recommendation of staff that the Commission approve the
61 Extension of Time. He added that the applicant was present and able to comment on the project.

62
63 Chair Aguilar asked for questions of staff.

64
65 Commissioner Duncan stated that typically projects like this would have been completed by now,
66 and that it had been over a decade since its initial approval. She added that the applicant had
67 benefited from additional State legislated time, and that overall reasonable time had been applied
68 to the project. She questioned the applicants given reasons for the request of the extension, which
69 were the COVID-19 Pandemic, which had been going on for the last 6 months, and the applicants
70 age and ability to move forward at this time. She asked staff if any recent work had been completed
71 towards this project. She noted that in the 2010 Staff Report that the applicant had begun the Final
72 Map Check process.

73
74 Planner Barrington deferred to the applicant.

75
76 Chair asked for additional questions of staff.

77
78 Commissioner Duncan asked if any work had been completed subsequent to the Extension of Time
79 that had been granted in 2017. She also asked if the conditions currently in place were adequate to
80 mitigate fire danger.

81
82 Chair Aguilar noted that the applicant had completed a 1,200-foot emergency egress, however he
83 was not certain when that occurred.

84
85 Commissioner Duncan wanted to know when that was completed. She said that the project had
86 been in process for a very long time.

87
88 Chair Aguilar asked Planner Barrington where the project was located in relation to American Hill
89 Road.

90
91 Planner Barrington shared his screen and showed the Commission where the project was located
92 on a map.

93
94 Chair Aguilar mentioned that some homes were going in on Constitution Court, which was near
95 the project site. He asked if the applicant had supplied the water to those sites. He also asked to
96 hear from the Applicant.

98 Applicant Glen Christ introduced himself to the Commission. He answered that the most recent
99 work completed, which had begun in October of last year, was to complete another 1,200 linear
100 feet of NID waterline under American Hill Road. He said this covered the entire frontage. He
101 added that the contractor experienced some issues while working on the project and completed the
102 work approximately 4 months ago. He stated this added 3 fire hydrants to the area, as well as
103 bringing NID water to the frontages of those houses that were existing. He added that previously
104 they had also run NID water down the fire egress road, which resulted in another hydrant in the
105 area. He said that the only major issue he had remaining was the road improvements on American
106 Hill Road along his frontage. He had intended to complete that project this summer but was unable
107 to due to the COVID-19 Pandemic, stating that he and his wife were both in a high-risk category.
108 He added that personal issues had impeded his ability to get work done on the project from 2013-
109 2018.

110
111 Chair Aguilar asked for any questions of the applicant.

112
113 Commissioner Johansen stated that the extension of 2,600 square feet of NID water was
114 significant, as well as the fire hydrants. He felt that this showed the public benefit of the project.

115
116 Mr. Christ thanked Commissioner Johansen.

117
118 Chair Aguilar asked for other questions or comments. As none were forthcoming, he asked if he
119 needed to open the item for public comment.

120
121 Planner Barrington deferred to Counsel, however he believed that the Chair had the ability to do
122 so.

123
124 Chair Aguilar opened public comment at 1:38 p.m.

125
126 Commissioner Duncan stated that the item had not been noticed as a Public Hearing.

127
128 Deputy County Counsel Rhetta VanderPloeg answered that the item was on the agenda, so public
129 comment was advisable.

130
131 Chair Aguilar closed public comment at 1:39 p.m.

132
133 Chair Aguilar asked staff for further comment.

134
135 Planner Barrington answered he had no further comments.

136
137 Chair Aguilar asked for further comments from the Commission. As none were forthcoming, he
138 asked for a motion.

139
140 **Motion** by Commissioner Johansen, **Second** by Commissioner Coleman-Hunt to approve the
141 Christ Extension of Time. **Motion carried on a roll call vote 4/1** (Commissioner Duncan voted
142 no).

143
144 Chair Aguilar noted a 10-day appeal period.

145
146 **Item Pulled From Consent Calendar**

147 Extension of Time (PLN20-0155; EXT20-0008) Standing Rock Ranch (FM13-001; U13-007;
148 MGT13-010; MGT13-018; MGT13-019; MI13-015)
149
150 Planner Barrington stated that the project was a 49-lot subdivision which included a Use Permit
151 for horse boarding and activities. He said that it was his understanding that the property had been
152 sold to a new owner. He added that the applicant's representative was available to answer any
153 questions the Commission may have.
154
155 Chair Aguilar asked for questions of staff. As no comments were forthcoming, he asked to hear
156 from the project representative.
157
158 Project Representative Martin Wood of SCO Planning and Engineering introduced himself to the
159 Commission. He stated that the extension request had initially been submitted by Watt Properties
160 and that the project had changed ownership within the last month. He stated that the original
161 approval allowed for 49 lots, and that Watt Properties had completed quite a bit of work on the
162 project in order to meet the Conditions of Approval. He stated with projects such as this, the first
163 phase was typically the most difficult. He discussed the recordation of the first phase which
164 included 5 lots. He stated that this step allowed Watt Properties to test the market, which they
165 desired to do before spending millions of dollars on the first phase. They decided to put the
166 property on the market and sold to David Wilcock. Mr. Wood stated that the request for the
167 extension of time was to allow the new owner time to get new bids and get ready to build out as
168 originally intended. He stated that Mr. Wilcock had expressed his commitment to the agricultural
169 aspects of the property as well as his love for the property. He finished by stating that he was happy
170 to answer any questions.
171
172 Chair Aguilar asked for any questions of the applicant.
173
174 Commissioner Johansen asked about soil types on the property.
175
176 Mr. Wood answered that the USDA maps had been updated since the project had originally been
177 approved. He stated it no longer required an Agricultural Management Plan, however the original
178 approval included one. He added that the middle of the property had the best soils, while the rest
179 was predominantly grazing land.
180
181 Commissioner Johansen said that he was aware that Ernie Bierwagen had looked at the area for
182 orchard land, and that the soils were sufficient for that purpose. He also asked how many miners
183 inches of surface water the property received.
184
185 Mr. Wood stated that he vaguely remembered that Watt Properties had purchased 4-6 miners'
186 inches from NID, which was used to keep the pond and lake full. He added the original map had a
187 condition for all 49 lots be able to use raw water for irrigation. He said that one of the original
188 issues that was faced when the project was being approved was the concern over water, and an
189 exhaustive well study had been done. He added that the ability for the project to have NID raw
190 water had been a major bonus for the project.
191
192 Commissioner Johansen stated he could not remember which canal fed the area.
193
194 Mr. Wood answered that he could not remember the name of the canal, however it had a long
195 siphon that went through the property.

196
197 Commissioner Johansen asked if this project had begun in 1999.
198
199 Mr. Wood answered yes, if considering the original project which included about 114 lots.
200
201 Commissioner Johansen said that treated water was supposed to be piped in.
202
203 Mr. Wood answered that the difficulty with piping water in was that many roads did not have
204 public utility easements under the roadways, it was more of a prescriptive surface right. He added
205 that perfecting those easements would be difficult.
206
207 Commissioner Johansen stated that 4-6 miners' inches was not enough to irrigate that many acres.
208 He asked if they were planning to depend on well water. He recalled that the well tests were good
209 but the neighbors to the project were concerned about wells going dry. He added that many wells
210 in rural areas were going dry.
211
212 Mr. Wood stated that an exhaustive study from NV5 had been done. He discussed the study and
213 stated that the wells that had been tested did not have a subsurface connection. He added that the
214 existing well for the original ranch house put out over 100 gallons per minute. He said that this
215 supplied the ranch house and also provided for the cattle that were on the property.
216
217 Commissioner Johansen asked if cattle were still on the property.
218
219 Mr. Wood answered that was his understanding.
220
221 Commissioner Johansen asked what type of agriculture the new developer was looking at.
222
223 Mr. Wood answered that they had not discussed that in detail, however the new developer did like
224 the cattle on the property. He added that the developer had been very interested in the Agricultural
225 Management Plan which described feasible uses. He added that they had been waiting patiently
226 for the Planning Commission to convene so they could attain the Extension of Time.
227
228 Commissioner Johansen asked Planner Barrington when they needed to take action on the item.
229
230 Planner Barrington answered today. He added for the record that this was the second requested
231 Extension of Time for this project.
232
233 Commissioner Duncan stated that this project had gone through several developers, and that her
234 primary purpose in pulling the item from Consent was to allow for more transparency and to clarify
235 that a new owner had purchased the property. She also mentioned that in the reasoning provided
236 for the extension, it had been stated that the development would benefit diversified housing needs.
237 She was curious to see what the new developer had in mind and hoped that they had enough
238 experience to bring the project forward while maintaining the historic agricultural beauty of the
239 area.
240
241 Chair Aguilar asked for additional comments.
242
243 Chair Aguilar opened public comment at 2:03 p.m.
244

245 No public comment was made. Chair Aguilar closed public comment at 2:03 p.m.

246

247 Chair Aguilar asked for a motion

248

249 **Motion** by Commissioner Duncan, **Second** by Commissioner Coleman-Hunt to approve the
250 Standing Rock Extension of Time. **Motion carried on a roll call vote 5/0**

251

252 Chair Aguilar noted a 10-day appeal period.

253

254 **PUBLIC HEARING:**

255

256 **PLN19-0022; GPA19-0001; RZN19-0001; CUP19-0002; EIS19-0003.** A General Plan
257 Amendment, Zone Change and Comprehensive Master Plan/Use Permit to allow use of the former
258 Pleasant Valley Elementary School campus by the Penn Valley Community Church who proposes
259 to occupy portions of the site and, as the owner, will also serve as property manager for the entire
260 campus, managing tenants in other buildings and the sports fields as an office/professional and
261 recreational complex. A General Plan Amendment and Zone Change proposes two Zoning and
262 General Plan designations: Recreation; and Office-Professional to replace the current Public
263 designations. The Recreation designation will overlay the existing field areas and gymnasium on
264 the site (roughly 11.1-acres), the remainder of the site will carry the Office-Professional
265 designation (roughly 6.4-acres). Both zoning designations will carry a Site Performance
266 Combining District requiring compliance with the proposed Comprehensive Master Plan (CMP).
267 **RECOMMENDED ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION:** Recommend that the Board of
268 Supervisors approve the Negative Declaration (EIS19-0003). **RECOMMENDED PROJECT**
269 **ACTION:** Recommend that the Board of Supervisors approve the Resolution for the proposed
270 General Plan Amendment (GPA19-0001) and adopt the Ordinance amending Zoning District Map
271 (ZDM) #14a to rezone APN: 050-020-032 & 050-020-072 from Public (P) to Office-Professional
272 (6.4-acres) & Recreation (11.1-acres) both with the Site Performance Combining District (OP-
273 SP/REC-SP) and approve Conditional Use Permit (CUP19-0003). **PLANNER:** Janeane Martin,
274 Associate Planner

275

276 Associate Planner Janeane Martin introduced herself and project representative Andy Cassano of
277 Nevada City Engineering to the Commission. She began her presentation and discussed the
278 location of the project, access to the site, and the components of the project. She reviewed the
279 current zoning of the parcel, surrounding zoning, history of the project site, and the proposed
280 General Plan Amendment and Zone change. She discussed the jobs to housing balance in the area,
281 stating the project was anticipated to have a positive effect by increasing office spaces and
282 employment opportunities. She talked about the proposed zoning of Recreation over the existing
283 field areas, and Office Professional where the existing buildings were located. She stated that both
284 would carry a Site Performance combining district requiring compliance with the proposed
285 Comprehensive Master Plan. She reviewed the Comprehensive Master Plan as well as the
286 permitted and prohibited uses. She discussed specific project details, such as office professional,
287 elementary or junior high school uses, a watchman or caretakers' unit for needed security, and
288 sports league use of the fields and gymnasium. She also talked about church uses, such as Sunday
289 services, weddings, funerals, and other community activities. She reviewed the different buildings
290 currently on the site and their proposed future uses, noise impacts, parking, and landscaping. She
291 discussed environmental review and routing per the California Environmental Quality Act
292 (CEQA), which was available for public review for a period of thirty days, and those agencies
293 which provided comment that resulted in Conditions of Approval. She recommended that the

294 Planning Commission make the recommendations outlined in the staff report for the Board of
295 Supervisors. She added that the California Department of Fish and Wildlife had provided comment
296 which had resulted in an additional Condition of Approval, as outlined in the memorandum
297 provided to the Commission prior to the meeting. She offered to answer any questions.
298

299 Chair Aguilar thanked Planner Martin. He asked for questions of staff.
300

301 Commissioner Greeno asked if the Building Department would monitor the project to ensure that
302 the parking lot lighting and buildings would be brought up to current standards.
303

304 Planner Martin answered that was partially correct. She said that as tenants moved onto the site
305 and applied for permits, those permits would be routed to the Planning Department for review as
306 per standard procedure.
307

308 Commissioner Greeno thanked Planner Martin.
309

310 Chair Aguilar asked for additional questions. As none were forthcoming, he asked if the applicant
311 desired to make a presentation.
312

313 Andy Cassano of Nevada City Engineering introduced himself as the project representative. He
314 thanked Planner Martin and staff for their work on the project. He gave the Commission some
315 background information on the church, stating that the church's original location on Spenceville
316 Road had burned to the ground in 2014. They were unable to rebuild on the site due to prohibitive
317 costs, and took the opportunity to buy the school campus as no other public users had made any
318 offers. He stated that it was a major recycling effort to repurpose the school into a church and
319 community facility. He said that they needed to occupy the site as quickly as possible because of
320 the significant amount of vandalism, and that the COVID-19 Pandemic had made it very difficult
321 to be able to assemble volunteer groups. He said that Lake Wildwood intended on completing
322 fencing on the site which would help with security; as it would deny regular pedestrian entry into
323 the property. He stated that the church was recently denied insurance for the site because it was
324 not occupied. He had advised the applicant that they would not be able to move into the site as the
325 church until the County had provided approval of the permit, however they did have a right to have
326 a presence and defend their property. At an onsite meeting with the Building Department and Fire
327 Official, the Building Department verified that the buildings were complete and ready for
328 occupancy under the standards used to build the school. It was required that a consultant confirm
329 that the fire alarm system was operational, as well as the sprinkler system in the gymnasium. He
330 stated that allowing the church to be on site while work commenced on the sanctuary would be
331 helpful. He stated that several of the buildings on site would not be utilized by the church, and they
332 would be actively searching for compatible tenants for those spaces, such as nonprofit users. He
333 said that they had reviewed the Conditions of Approval, including the one that was added by
334 CDFW, and they agreed with most of them. He drew attention to Department of Public Works
335 Condition C.3, which required an engineered grading and drainage plan. He stated that they were
336 not really planning on doing any grading, other than adding a drop-off lane and ADA parking. He
337 asked if the phrase "if required" could be added to that condition. He also wanted to clarify that
338 throughout the document it was stated that all Conditions needed to be met before final occupancy,
339 he wanted to clarify that "prior to final occupancy" applied to the work in the sanctuary. He stated
340 that Pastor Dave and some members of the church committee were available to answer any
341 questions.
342

343 Chair Aguilar asked for questions of the applicant.

344
345 Commissioner Johansen stated that the project had been unanimously accepted by the Penn Valley
346 Community. He said that the Penn Valley Municipal Advisory Council (MAC) loved it, and that
347 he had spoken to the neighbors to the north who were excited about the project. He asked if the
348 applicant or representative found any of the other conditions to be too onerous or expensive, as he
349 felt the public benefit to having the building occupied and vandalism stopped was important.

350
351 Mr. Cassano joked that they would like to remove half of the Conditions, however he did not feel
352 it was appropriate. He added that they appreciated how the Conditions had been crafted to allow
353 some time so they could work towards compliance with all the Conditions. He felt that the
354 Conditions were fair considering County Codes.

355
356 Commissioner Johansen clarified that they were comfortable with the Conditions.

357
358 Mr. Cassano answered that was correct.

359
360 Commissioner Duncan stated that they recognized that vandalism was an issue for unoccupied
361 sites and was even an issue at Western Gateway Park. She appreciated that they were proposing a
362 full-time caretaker. As an interim measure, she asked if they could place a travel trailer onsite for
363 immediate protection. She asked staff if there was anything they could do.

364
365 Chair Aguilar asked if something could be added to allow the applicant to protect the property
366 without breaking the rules.

367
368 Planner Martin answered that staff had recommended and included a watchman/caretaker's unit
369 which could be placed within the Recreation area as allowed by Code. She stated that it was
370 necessary to go through the Board of Supervisors approval process, first however after that it would
371 be an allowable use.

372
373 Commissioner Duncan asked if property owners could have a temporary unit onsite for two weeks
374 without a code violation.

375
376 Planner Martin answered she was not aware of that provision.

377
378 Commissioner Duncan stated that this was an opportunity to be creative and let the community
379 know that they were aware of their needs. She felt it would be a good idea if they could be part of
380 the solution.

381
382 Planner Martin answered that she was strictly a purveyor and reader of the code, and that she was
383 not aware of that provision.

384
385 Commissioner Duncan asked for Planner Barrington to weigh in.

386
387 Counsel VanderPloeg answered that they did have Recreational Vehicle and Temporary
388 Occupancy within code, which was specific to certain zonings and the issuance of a building
389 permit. She said that the Building Department would need to be consulted and that they would be
390 unable to provide an answer at this time.

391

392 Commissioner Duncan stated that she believed that in the past they had also allowed
393 compassionate use.
394

395 Planner Barrington added that the County Code did allow for security housing in recreational
396 vehicles as part of a Use Permit, which was being considered today. He added that the zoning
397 would need to be changed and the Use Permit approved as a part of the process. He added that
398 different options had been discussed with the applicant for security.
399

400 Mr. Cassano stated that it seemed that they were walking a fine line between what was allowed by
401 the Zoning Code and whether or not a property owner could provide reasonable security. He stated
402 that a permit would not be required to hire a security agency to patrol the property at night.
403

404 Commissioner Johansen agreed with Commissioner Duncan that this was a time for them to step
405 up as the vandalism to the property was significant and could potentially destroy the property. He
406 added that the need to have security at the site was important, and that everyone in the County had
407 people living in recreational vehicles. He stated that a property owner could reside in a recreational
408 vehicle for 3 months and for seasonal agricultural housing it was extended to 6 months. He added
409 that the County laws were good but argued that the public benefit outweighed any County laws.
410

411 Chair Aguilar answered that the best thing the Planning Commission could do would be to get the
412 approval process going. He said that the Board of Supervisors could certainly consider it, not only
413 for this project but for future as well.
414

415 Commissioner Coleman-Hunt added that the community and the project were at risk because the
416 owners were unable to get insurance, due to not occupying the site.
417

418 Chair Aguilar clarified that it was the County Supervisors who made the Codes.
419

420 Planner Barrington added that the Code section pertaining to recreational vehicles did allow for
421 seasonal stays for owners of any parcel with no permanent dwelling not to exceed a total of 90
422 days between April 15 and October 15 of a calendar year. He said it was potentially an interim
423 solution, however the permanent solution was the hearing process.
424

425 Commissioner Duncan thanked Planner Barrington for that clarification.
426

427 Chair Aguilar mentioned it was about a 3-week solution.
428

429 Commissioner Duncan thought it was for 90 days.
430

431 Commissioner Johansen stated it was for 90 days.
432

433 Chair Aguilar clarified that was until October 15.
434

435 Commissioner Johansen stated it was from April 15 to October 15.
436

437 Chair Aguilar asked for any other questions.
438

439 Chair Aguilar opened public comment at 2:48 p.m.
440

441 Pastor David Hagey thanked Planner Martin and Mr. Cassano for representing the project so well.
442
443 Chair Aguilar closed public comment at 2:49 p.m.
444
445 Chair asked for any comments from staff.
446
447 Planner Martin asked if it was the desire of the Commission to make any changes or additions. She
448 believed that everyone was clear on the provision that would give the applicant until October 15
449 to have someone stay in an RV at the property site temporarily.
450
451 Commissioner Johansen mentioned the change to Condition C.3.
452
453 Chair Aguilar also believed that Mr. Cassano had also desired it to be clear that “prior to final
454 occupancy” applied to the sanctuary. He also asked who had sent in additional Conditions.
455
456 Planner Martin answered that the California Department of Fish and Wildlife had sent in a
457 Condition.
458
459 Planner Barrington asked for a short break to allow staff the time to draft the corrections to be read
460 into the record.
461
462 Chair Aguilar called a break at 2:57 p.m. The Commission reconvened at 3:05 p.m.
463
464 Planner Martin shared her screen and reviewed which Conditions had been modified. These
465 included Planning Condition 4.a, 5.f, 5.g , and 7.a, each of which had “sanctuary” added to clarify
466 when these conditions had to be fully completed, and Department of Public Works Condition 3 –
467 which added, “if required” to the grading and drainage plan requirement for clarification.
468
469 **Motion by Commissioner Johansen** to, after reviewing and considering the proposed Mitigated
470 Negative Declaration, recommend that the Board of Supervisors adopt the Resolution (*Attachment*
471 *3*) for the proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration (EIS19-0003) (*Attachment 2*) and Mitigation
472 Monitoring and Reporting Program (*Attachment 1*) pursuant to Section 15074 and 15097 of the
473 California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines making Findings A through D *as modified*:
474 **Second by Commissioner Duncan. Motion carried on a voice vote 5/0.**
475
476 **Motion by Commissioner Johansen** to recommendation that the Board of Supervisors adopt the
477 Resolution for the General Plan Amendment (GPA19-0001) changing the site designation from
478 Public (PUB) to Office-Professional (6.4-acres) & Recreation (11.1-acres) (OP & REC) pursuant
479 to Section L-II 5.9 of the Land Use and Development Code, and making findings A through E:
480 **Second by Commissioner Duncan. Motion carried on a voice vote 5/0.**
481
482 **Motion by Commissioner Johansen** to recommend that the Board of Supervisors adopt the
483 Ordinance amending Zoning District Map (ZDM) #14a to rezone APN: 050-020-032 & 050-020-
484 072 from Public (PUB) to Office-Professional (6.4-acres) & Recreation (11.1-acres) both with the
485 Site Performance Combining District (OP-SP/REC-SP) making findings A through D: **Second by**
486 **Commissioner Duncan. Motion carried on a voice vote 5/0.**
487
488 **Motion by Commissioner Johansen** to recommend that the Board of Supervisors adopt the
489 Resolution to approve the Use Permit application (CUP19-0002) to establish a Comprehensive

490 Master Plan for the project site subject to the Conditions of Approval and Mitigation Measures
491 shown in Attachment 1, or as may be modified at the public hearing, pursuant to Nevada County
492 Land Use and Development Code Section L-II 5.6.G, 5.5.2.C and 5.17, making findings A through
493 ***K as modified: Second by Commissioner Duncan. Motion carried on a voice vote 5/0.***
494

495 Discussion ensued regarding upcoming Commission meetings and ongoing project statuses.
496

497 **Motion by Commissioner Duncan; second by Commissioner Aguilar to adjourn. Motion**
498 **carried on voice vote 5/0.**
499

500 There being no further business to come before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at
501 3:27 p.m. to the next meeting *tentatively* scheduled for October 8, 2020, in the Board of
502 Supervisors Chambers, 950 Maidu Avenue, Nevada City.
503

504
505 Passed and accepted this 12 day of November 2020.
506

507 *Brian Foss (by sp)*
508

Brian Foss, Ex-Officio Secretary