

Nevada County Sphere of Influence Policy Review



BOS Workshop January 26, 2017

Presented by

Brian Foss, Planning Director



Quick Review

- October 25, 2016 BOS meeting in Truckee
 - Proposed changes to Policies 1.8.3 and 1.8.4
 - 1.8.3 - County's Plan will not be more intensive than City's/Town's Plan
 - 1.8.4 - If the City/Town does not desire annexation, refer to the City/Town for review and comment
 - Board directed staff to review County's Sphere of Influence policies and return to the January workshop with recommendations
 - Directed to staff to meet with Cities and Town
 - Staff added an additional meeting with LAFCo staff
 - Meetings occurred in November and December

Meetings with Cities & LAFCo

- Staff Level Discussions
 - Truckee – Tony Lashbrook and Denyelle Nishimori
 - Nevada City – Mark Prestwich and Amy Wolfson
 - Grass Valley – Tom Last
 - LAFCo – S.R. Jones
- Asked same questions at each meeting
 - What is working?
 - What is not?
 - What can the County do better?
 - What can the Cities do better?
 - What activity is going on in each sphere?

CDA's Approach

- Sphere policy should not hinder development
- Infrastructure, infrastructure, infrastructure
 - Water
 - Sewer
- Collaborative approach with City partners
- Developing in the spheres with future annexation in mind
- Compatible zoning
- Ideally, County, City, Owner, and Developer agree
- Development conversations start at the city level with County notification

Sphere Area Info

City	City Acreage	Sphere Acreage (excludes City)	Last Update	Sphere/City Boundary
Grass Valley	3,025	6,269	2011	207%
Nevada City	1,224	2,777	2008	227%
Truckee	18,547	168	2010	1%

- Source: LAFCo

Sphere Policies Location

- General Plan
 - Chapter 1: Land Use Element
 - Chapter 8: Housing Element
- Goal 1.8
 - Coordinate with the cities/town in land use planning and development within their spheres of influence
 - 11 supporting policies

Truckee Meeting Summary

- Policy is not broken
- Different than other cities with no city provided utilities
- Annexation opportunities:
 - Teel Properties
 - Tahoe Donner open space/Nordic Center
 - Johnson Canyon/Donner Rim Trail
 - Airport
- City would like first opportunity for annexation, if not, then process through County
- Emphasis on collaboration, performance metrics, elements, and objectives
- Successful projects – Clear Capital, Airport Admin Bldg.

Nevada City Meeting Summary

- Policy not broken
- Requests consistency between three cities
- Slow down from recession
- Some annexation opportunities with planned development
 - Hurst Ranch
 - Gallelli property
 - Providence Mine
 - HEW Building
 - Sugar Loaf
 - Highway 20 corridor north and Hwy 49 corridor south

Nevada City Summary cont'd

- Concerned with viewsheds and watersheds
- Utilities
 - City has sewer capacity
 - Wants connections to cover capital investment
 - NID has water capacity
- January 25th, LAFCo spoke to Council on sphere boundaries

LAFCo Staff Recommendation Nevada City Sphere Update 2016		
	Sphere Acreage (excludes City)	Sphere/City Boundary
Sphere	1,482	121%
Area of Interest	1,348	

Grass Valley Meeting Summary

- Policy not broken
- Some annexation opportunities with planned development
 - La Barr Meadows/Hansen Brothers
- Request not to take all new affordable housing projects
 - Density impacts
 - Draws on city services
- Glenbrook Basin
 - Pinch points in sewer system
 - Require offsite mitigation

LAFCo Meeting Summary

- Policy is effective
- LAFCo has polices and procedures
- Each city unique for sphere requirements
- No annexation on speculation
- Update spheres every five years (as time and resources allows)
- Projected LAFCo sphere review order
 - Nevada City – projected reduction in sphere
 - Truckee
 - Grass Valley

Consistency with LAFCo

- Orderly Growth
- Logical Boundaries
- Efficient Services
- LAFCo General Policies and Standards
 - Sections II. K. 2. Planning Jurisdiction. The appropriate planning jurisdiction is as follows:
 - a) For areas within a city's sphere of influence, the city is the appropriate jurisdiction
 - b) For areas outside a city's sphere of influence, the County is the appropriate planning jurisdiction
- Areas of Interest require LAFCo comment and review
 - Encourage agencies to establish JPAs or other commitments as appropriate

Staff Recommendations

- Sustain Policy 1.8.2
 - The County shall continue to work closely with the municipalities within the County concerning planning and development of land within the municipalities' spheres of influence
 - CDA maintains collaboration with partner cities
- No change to County goals 18.3 and 18.4
 - Collaborative annexation preferable
 - Appropriate planning/land use processes are in place
 - LAFCo oversees annexation regardless of which agency level is supporting annexation
 - Focuses on service to levels to constituents
- Schedule annual meetings with city partners

Questions?

