



Planning Commission Memorandum

Date: November 13, 2025
To: Nevada County Planning Commission
From: Brian Foss, Director of Planning 
Subject: Alternative Housing/RV Dwelling Ordinance – PLN25-0084; ORD25-1
Attachment: Comments Received since Staff Report Release

Additional Public Comments:

Attached are additional comments that have been received since the publication of the staff report.

Corrected Recommended Actions:

- I. Environmental Action: Recommend that the Board of Supervisors find the project categorically exempt pursuant to Sections 15303, and 15305 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines as the project does not increase density and permits recreational vehicles as dwellings within those zoning districts that would otherwise allow traditional built housing of the same type.
- II. Project Action: Recommend that the Board of Supervisors adopt the Ordinance adding Nevada County Code Title 12: Zoning Regulations, Chapter 3: Specific Land Uses, Section 12.03.151: Recreational Vehicle Dwelling, to establish health and safety standards, permitting and certification requirements, and site development standards to allow Recreational Vehicles as dwelling units within those zoning districts that would otherwise allow traditional built housing of the same type; amending the definition of Recreational Vehicle in Section 12.06.010; and amending Tables 12.02.220.B and 12.02.030 to allow recreational vehicles as dwellings in the Rural and Residential Agriculture zoning districts.

Jodeana Patterson

From: gprich@lto.com
Sent: Monday, November 3, 2025 7:24 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Comment

[You don't often get email from gprich@lto.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

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

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

Comments for proposed Nevada County Alternative/RV Housing Ordinance before the Planning Commission.

I was disappointed but not surprised at the 3 acre parcel size limit, 1 acre allows many more parcels to be eligible.

The process is very heavy on permitting, perhaps some streamlining might be added later. If an RV and site passes the 2 year inspection with no issues, perhaps the next inspection could be 5 years, not 2 years until the next inspection.

RE; B. Definitions 1. b There are 5th wheel trailers that are built to 430 square foot, as approved by the RVIA, This limit should be looked at and possibly modified. 400 SF applies to travel trailers.

I support the Ordinance, with adaptive modifications later, if it does not produce a substantial increase in functional housing.

Thank You
Gordon Richards
11070 Brockway Rd #60
Truckee, Ca 96161

Jodeana Patterson

From: james beale <teampeps@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 4, 2025 7:21 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Regarding the RV living

[You don't often get email from teampeps@gmail.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

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

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

My name is James and I have several issues on top of the septic and water issues are these RV gonna have to pay for Fire insurance for living in RVs ? if not, I'd rather tear down my house and save 10 grand a year. The other issue that I have is what about the abandoned RVs left on properties because of the people can't handle the RV living specially, living in our climate Sent from my iPhone

Jodeana Patterson

From: Jo Ann Rebane <jarebane@msn.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 5, 2025 12:50 PM
To: Planning; Lisa Swarthout; Sue Hoek; Alt RV Ordinance; Robb Tucker; Heidi Hall; Hardy Bullock
Cc: Jo Ann Rebane
Subject: Public comment on Alternative/RV ordinance
Attachments: Revised Updated Public comment on RV for ADU 2025.pdf

Some people who received this message don't often get email from jarebane@msn.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

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

Attached, please find revised and updated comments in opposition to the Alternative/RV ordinance coming before the county planning commission on Thursday, November 13, 2025.

I have personal experience living in an RV and some familiarity with what it would cost to fully comply with the proposed ordinance even in its unacceptably vague terms. Unless the county has discovered new, unlimited funding sources available to the planning department, environmental health department, and compliance offices, the proposed ordinance reads like a disaster waiting to happen.

It worries me that commissioners and supervisors from our cities may not take the potential negative and inadequate aspects of the proposed ordinance on the more rural yet residential areas of the county seriously.

Hopefully, all commissioners and supervisors will see the wisdom of scuttling the proposed ordinance to allow current efforts to increase the county's housing supply time to be utilized.

Respectfully,
Jo Ann Rebane

Cement Hill Rd,
Nevada City, CA
530-263-4623 mobile

Updated and Revised Comments: Alternative/RV Dwelling Ordinance

Jo Ann Rebane – 5 November 2025 - Cement Hill Rd., Nevada City, 95959

1. It is premature to entertain permitting people to live permanently in an RV. Recent attempts by the county to increase the affordable/low-cost/low-income housing supply have NOT generated evidence of acceptance. According to Brian Foss, County Planning Director, in two years, only 2 ADUs have been permitted, no pre-approved ADU plans have been used. Only 4 “tiny homes on wheels” have been permitted. And only six Title 25 dwellings have made use of the lessened building codes. Clearly, Nevada County property owners have no appetite for utilizing tools like this proposed ordinance.
2. The county and local helping agencies have many programs available to the poor. There are existing and programs on the horizon to manage/assist our neighbors who have addiction and mental health problems. The county already offers alternative housing options. We must give ourselves time to realize the benefits of utilization. A split-use psychiatric care facility is coming here. The county has grant funding available to repair and replace manufactured/mobile homes. New housing developments have a new financing tool for infrastructure buildouts. Look for developments like Cashin’s Field or the project underway in Penn Valley.
3. This RV dwelling draft seems reasonable until one studies it closely. The cost of compliance could easily exceed \$25,000 which will not incentivize anyone to undertake all required steps to comply with these rules. If the measure is passed as is, without penalties and enforcement provisions spelled out, it will encourage and continue scoff law RVs and continuation of the known health and safety/fire safety issues and dangers well known to all who live and work in Nevada County.
4. It appears that the county is being pushed into allowing permanent residency in travel trailers/RVs by a tiny set of vocal people without adequate input from the vast majority of property owners who will bear the brunt of this ill-conceived idea. The silent majority doesn’t even know that the planning commission and supervisors have this ordinance under consideration.

5. Everyone who has seen an RV wreck knows that the walls and roof are paper thin and that the construction barely holds together. Trailers and RVs are NOT meant to be permanent residences.
6. Living in an RV for months with fully permitted and operational utilities is not easy. I know this from personal experience, having lived in a 5th-wheel trailer with my family on the site of the construction of our home in the Santa Monica Mountains. The utility connections, especially the “dumping” of sewage is very tricky and requires smart use of grey water, additives, and timing. Rain and wind presented enormous problems with the propane pilot system for heat and water heating. Wind and rain drove us off the mountain more than once to seek safe conditions in town. Heavy rain, snow, and cold here in Nevada County will cause unsafe and difficult times for people living in an RV full-time. Uninsulated water lines will freeze and burst.
7. How will having an RV as an ADU affect property owner’s property tax assessment? How has the Assessor been involved with drafting the ordinance? Will property values plummet?
8. What enforcement is contemplated? Which agency will respond to what kind of complaints? How many additional staff will be needed?
9. Who will pay for enforcement activities – property owner, county agency, taxpayers? Will there be required performance bonds?
10. I OPPOSE passing this RV dwelling regulation. Below I have commented in RED on each provision which will be expensive for the property owner to implement and/or where the language of the numbered section is unclear or needs to be significantly changed or expanded.

Section 12.03.151 Recreational Vehicle Dwelling

- A. Purpose - Reasonable regulations – use of RV to provide needed housing for county residents
- B. Definitions –
 1. (d) Should prohibit Truck-mounted RVs. These are slide-in-campers which usually do not include a full bathroom.
- C. Standards: permits, site inspections, 2 yr -
 1. Administrative Development Permit - Permit valid 2 yrs, fee, site inspection, unoccupied w/in 10 days of permit expiration AND should

be removed w/in 10 days. Fees or bond should cover cost of removal if property owner fails to remove or tax lien placed on property if county removes.

2. Inspection – OK - \$ Who schedules and pays for the multiple inspections? Need more inspectors?
3. Certifications – OK - \$ Are the labels and ANSI stickers still stuck to the RVs? What if the labels have loosened or worn off? Who verifies the RVs status/compliance?
4. Current DMV registration – OK - \$ Who will check that the sticker is current? What consequence if registration out of date?
5. Deed Restriction – recorded - \$ What does it cost to prepare and record a deed restriction? 30 consecutive days is NOT long enough to be considered long-term use. Who would go to all the trouble and cost of actually complying with this ordinance and endure the nuisance factor of hosting revolving tenants?
6. Zoning – RV can be an ADU in RA and R1 zones & all Rural zones on minimum 3 acres (allowing on any R1 acreage is inconsistent with preserving the rural character of county and should NOT be permitted.)
7. Location – no comment
8. Site Development Standards – no comment
9. Accessory Structures – detached & permitted thru final - \$ How enforced? What consequences for unpermitted add-ons?
10. Foundation: keep wheels on and inflated:
 - a) Paved / gravel surface – strict thickness / compactness / slope - \$\$ This requirement could easily cost around \$5,000 or more.
 - b) Use chocks & jacks, no leveling blocks – Preventing the use of leveling blocks assumes that the paved/gravel surface is absolutely level like one would find in a top-notch RV park.
11. Screening – cover undercarriage, wheels, solid & fixed – OK - \$
12. Habitability –
 - a) Live & sleep w heat & light – Yes.

- b) Require 24 hour on-site access to hot and cold potable water, a kitchen, toilet, bathing facilities, and lavatory sink...
Unclear – is the RV required to be equipped with and provide or does the property owner’s residence or out-building provide good water, kitchen, toilet, bath and lavatory sink?
- c) Street address – does the RV have a separate street address from the primary residence?
- d) Detectors – OK – Who checks for the required detectors, tests them, and certifies continuous good working order? Self reporting? Consequences?
- e) Fire extinguisher – OK – Who checks? Who is responsible if there’s a fire – property owner or tenant?
- f) Solid Waste – \$\$\$ What does a perc and mantle cost? A leach field could cost more than \$2,200 and the septic tank, its installation, and the clean out connection much more than \$3,500. The septic system must be located at a prescribed distance from any water wells and be sized according to the number of bedrooms/occupants.
- g) Utility Connections & Mechanical Equipment
 - 1. If RV connected to existing permitted water supply and onsite sewage disposal serving existing single-family dwelling – permits and inspections required. \$ Who confirms existing septic capacity adequate?
 - 2. Existing permitted water supply & sewage disposal meeting all regulations including alternative/temporary septic & water – approved, permitted, inspected. \$\$\$ - Alternative or temporary septic disposal methods including, for example, a 55 gallon drum must NOT be permitted. As written, an environmental disaster is allowed and encouraged. Same objections to the idea of a temporary water supply – hose from the house? Take water from a fire hydrant? What consequences if connections are not approved, permitted, inspected?
 - a. Well production and storage tank – OK \$\$

- b. Keep systems in good working order – OK Watch out for grey and black water sewage disposal. Does Environmental Health Dept have extra inspectors ready to do these inspections and at what cost to taxpayers? Respond to complaints?
- 3. Electric utility connections (equipment, panels, meters) require building permit. No extension cords. Off-grid electrical system OK if permitted. Generator not allowed as primary electrical source. - OK \$\$\$ - Installation of 30 or 50 amp service, meters and supply lines could cost between \$800 and \$3,000 or more. Off-grid electrical solar panels and batteries are costly to install correctly. What consequences if connections are not approved, permitted, inspected?
- 4. Building permit required for ground mounted propane tank. OK - \$\$ Site preparation, connections, and tank rental. Who inspects? What consequences if no permit obtained?
- 5. All utility connections (water, sewage drain, fuel supply) must meet regulations and be inspected prior to permitting. – OK - \$\$ - What consequences if connections not approved, permitted, inspected?
- 6. No wood burning heat sources – OK
- h) Modification of RV must be to ANSI standards, inspected & approved. – OK - \$ - What consequences if changes not approved, permitted, inspected? How would anyone know about modifications to the RV? Self reporting?
- i) Wind and Snow loads –
 - 1. Above 3,200 ft. an approved, engineered ramada or snow shelter required (or proof that RV meets load standards) – \$\$ - What consequences if snow shelter not approved, permitted, inspected?

2. Above 3,200 ft. snow removal maintenance agreement required – OK - \$ - Building department must keep a file? Will it check for compliance and issue fines?
13. Driveways must provide minimum fire safety access – OK - \$ - Which agency checks compliance? Any consequences for non-compliance?
14. Fire Protection Plan – RV must comply
- a) Applicant for Administrative Development Permit must submit a Fire Protection Plan, approved by County Fire Marshal prior to approval of Administrative Development Permit. Planning Dept keeps original & fire district gets copy. Fire Protection Plan must be site specific & address issues:
 - \$ - Who qualified to write protection plan? How are representations verified? Any bond required? How is compliance monitored after permit issued and by which agency? Any consequences for non-compliance?
 - b) Issues:
 1. Distance to fire dept & possible response time – OK
 2. Description of access road conditions – OK
 3. Identify RV's emergency water supply – OK
 4. Location of required fire extinguisher – OK, but will the tenant keep it there?
 5. Identify evacuation routes – OK
 6. Describe Fuels Management Plan requiring:
 - a. Defensible space design – Who prepares this – property owner, master gardener, forester...?
 - b. Identify high fuel load areas – What proximity? 20 Ft or 100 yds? High fuel loads exist in the entire county – this requirement needs to be much more specific.
 - c. How defensible space will be ensured – Does property owner describe and promise to do this? Contract with some provider?

- d. Mechanism for maintenance of defensible space –
\$\$ - Does property owner certify/promise to annually hire weed whackers and foresters to comply? Must owner provide signed contracts with weed whackers and tree service companies? Can he promise to do the work himself? Which agency checks compliance?
- e. Evacuation plan/safe routes – no comment

Jodeana Patterson

From: Lance Goddard <lancegoddard@mac.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 5, 2025 1:39 PM
To: Planning
Subject: Alternative/RV Dwelling Ordinance

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

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

Gentlepersons,

I have already sent in my comments concerning this ill-advised plan. My concern is that the opinion of the attendees at the public meeting might be considered more than those who don't attend the meeting.

Regards,

Lance Goddard

Jodeana Patterson

From: Steve and Carolyn Battaini <crosjb@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Wednesday, November 5, 2025 2:10 PM
To: Planning
Cc: Jodeana Patterson
Subject: Re: PC 11.13.25 meeting agenda: Alternative/RV Dwelling Ordinance (PLN25-0084, ORD25-1 SR)
Attachments: 2025-11-13 PC Agenda.pdf

You don't often get email from crosjb@sbcglobal.net. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

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

I have written my opposition to the proposed ordinance, which you have in your records, and hopefully read and considered. I have not changed my opinion against the ordinance. My last words to this effect are: "Don't let temporary people do permanent damage." By that I mean if his alternative dwelling can do harm to our wonderful county. To keep the negative aspects in check, please add all appropriate safeguards for fire safety, environmental, and public safety with laws and people to man them. Otherwise you'll have a much bigger problem than what you are trying to resolve.....

Carolyn Battaini
14027 Liquidambar Ln
Grass Valley, Ca. 95945

On Tuesday, November 4, 2025 at 10:07:34 AM PST, Jodeana Patterson <jodeana.patterson@nevadacountyca.gov> wrote:

Good morning,

Please find attached the agenda for the upcoming Planning Commission public meeting on Thursday, November 13, at 1:30 p.m. The location will be 950 Maidu Avenue, Board of Supervisors Chambers.

Respectfully,

Jodeana Patterson

Jodeana Patterson

From: Melissa Clark <gvrider@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 6, 2025 7:11 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Rv as residence.

You don't often get email from gvrider@yahoo.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

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

Hi there,

I am all for this passing. However it should be only if it is set up correctly. Power, septic etc. We have a neighbor who has lived in his for over two years. No septic, power running from a generator. Water pumped from a well via generator power.

Despite MANY neighbors the county has not enforced the current law. He allows everything to run into the creek. This is unacceptable and the county needs to enforce current laws.

His address is 21861 Golden Pines Court. Auburn 95602.

I truly hope the county abides by its laws and enforces them. I would really like a conversation with you regarding this situation.

Thank you,
Melissa Clark
530-575-8060

[Yahoo Mail: Search, Organize, Conquer](#)

Jodeana Patterson

From: cofnevco@gmail.com
Sent: Thursday, November 6, 2025 4:23 PM
To: Planning
Subject: Opposed to the proposed Alternative/RV Dwelling Ordinance

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

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

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

Dear Chairman and Commissioners of the Nevada County Planning Commission,

Thank you for hearing my concerns regarding this proposed ordinance,

I have been a Nevada County resident for most of my life. In that time, I have been a 2-time business owner, property owner, improved property, including replacing an existing septic system, resold same property, and have been a large contributor of my earnings through the years to help the homeless in Nevada County improve their situation. This ordinance does not help the homeless, nor improve anybody's situation longterm. It is an attempt to change the economic status of the County by seeking cheaper rents by allowing substandard dwellings. I am highly concerned that the Planning Department is over zealous in seeking exemptions and speedy passage of this controversial County wide ordinance that could largely affect the safety and health of every citizen here. The proposal should require a proper Environmental Review with such far-reaching exemptions of basic building codes, not exempt it.

Without responding to public concerns provided or during Townhall meetings, the Planning Department remained completely silent, but then sent out the latest notice received, wherein Nevada County Planning seeks to claim this project exempt from any Environmental Review that would be normally be required by a plan that involves 1) any major density increase, or 2) have any effect on Environmental factors such as solid waste disposal. CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act) states that any project that might have a significant environmental impact (like a major increase in density) must undergo a thorough environmental review. A density revision that applies to the entire County is a major density increase. As stated, this project seeks our Board of Supervisors to supersede this fact, and vote in the exemption anyway. I count on the wisdom and experience of our Board of Supervisors to differentiate between a 'minor' and 'major' increase. Perhaps CalEPA should have been consulted for proper application of the exemption rather than just a referring to it.

Short of having performed an Environmental Study and Report for the proposed County-wide increase in density, the notice goes on to seek the BOS find the project exempt (from an Environmental Review), which is provided for projects that have minor alterations in land use with NO change in density. Nor will the exemption apply to any project with a slope of 20% or more. The ordinance has no limit to slope. In addition, Mr. Foss, himself, refers to Nevada County's trees, vegetation, and slopes as a difficulty in fighting fires in Nevada County during his interview with KCRA. How can both of those statements be true? At face value, it would appear that approval is sought for the Board of Supervisors to accept exemptions that are being claimed that clearly do not qualify as "minor". This project seeks NO modifications to existing septic systems for solid waste disposal before connecting this third dwelling unit, even though it could add usage similar to a 3 Bedroom home that was limited as adequate for only that main home's maximum volume, or have 24/7 access to shower, toilet, kitchen... all facilities that produce waste disposal. Is proper waste disposal of any kind no

longer required? While Placer County adopts stiffer building code standards to mitigate fire risk and efficiency, Nevada County lowers theirs.

Readily published documents for California state that a residential septic system size is often based on 150-200 gallons of wastewater per day for a 3-bedroom home. Sewage tanks in RVs can hold from 15 to 40 gallons of **concentrated** black water (sewage). Septic systems are designed to handle a continuous flow of wastewater, not the large sudden volumes dumped from RVs. If there is no upgrade to the septic required, it suggests that everybody's septic system is either much more than sufficient for more bedrooms than Nevada County has permitted us for, or this plan is inadequate in allowing NO modification for increased usage. The people you are proposing to live there really do exist, and use water and utilities just like all of us! Clearly, the 1000+ RV's that have already been established illegally within our county, if they are hooked up to a septic at all, are likely hooked up to a dwelling that has already been built with the number of rooms they were allowed with their existing septic system and leach field, and are currently misusing permitted improvements by increasing the load without increasing the capacity to handle the load. Although smaller in living space, the size of the RV does not change the water usage or septic needs per individual. If the RV can sleep 6 people (and some sleep 8), then it will produce at least as much wastewater and sewage as a 3-bedroom house or more. Adding that onto a septic designed to handle the needs of just the main house is a design for failure, by Nevada County's own usage standards. Additionally, because the RV has a holding tank, chemicals are used that destroy the beneficial bacteria that a septic system relies on to break down waste. Without the proper bacterial action, the waste in the septic tank will not decompose correctly, and may cause solids to build up faster, leading to a clog in the leach field. You have no even acknowledged the human use in your plan. Finally, bulk downloads to an existing septic can actually destroy a leach field.

There is no specification in regards to a water supply, except that it provides no less than 3 gpm. No specifications except for the amount of water supply. No codes to comply with in regards to plumbing?

The Draft Ordinance lists only extension cords for electrical supply!?! How can you think we're not lowering our standards with this ordinance? Any failure to acknowledge this as a fire danger is irresponsible. This plan looks to house people cheaper in tiny tin boxes with substandard construction, substandard water supplies, hazardous electrical situations, and high energy situations to stay warm in. This is such a short-sighted plan for Nevada County and its people, and it puts us all in danger. I wonder how quickly folks from our surrounding counties will be moving into Nevada County's new home model.

Nevada County has a high cost of living. Any publication will tell you that. But trying to lower our cost of living by pretending that RVs and camper trailers are residences is preposterous. RVs and trailers are not recognized as homes for continual habitation by either the DMV, the RV manufacturers, or Insurance agencies, as they are only recognized as vehicles. Life does not offer us the choice to live wherever we want we rely heavily on the generosity of those around us just to survive. We always have a choice to improve our lifestyle. Many of us who have been in our homes here in Nevada County for many decades can no longer afford it. It's a sad state of affairs, but our situation is not unique to Nevada County. Economics make it necessary for many to uproot and seek out areas that are affordable, as I am. But I am truly frightened that the County Seat has overstepped its purpose by lowering health and safety, and endangering the County at large.

In spite of our attempts to avoid what Study Area Assessments state that **"Alta Sierra has the most significant potential for a catastrophic wildfire event", (along with 4 other areas)** as cited by Supervisor Ed Scofield in October 2024, Alta Sierra is **STILL** trying to identify and improve the insufficient evacuation routes for fire events to serve the existing allowable density. There are still sections of our area that have not qualified for Firewise Certification, requiring cooperation from entire neighborhoods. After 4 years of extreme tree removal by PG&E, we're left at the mercy of Cal Fair Insurance from year to year, **IF** we are even offered the last option of insuring our homes with Cal Fair Fire Insurance (at the 500% increase to our premiums). It continues to make home ownership unaffordable to all of us, not just renters. Has there been any contact with Cal Fair regarding this new ordinance? Will they continue to insure our homes even after density increases and legalizing RVs and camper trailers as homes? Will Cal Fair pay on any claims that involve an

RV/camper used as a home? My mortgage requires insurance, and the lack thereof makes my mortgage subject to foreclosure. Why would Nevada County pass laws that jeopardize the financial safety of its citizens?

I am asking that our Board of Supervisors and our Planning Commissioner instruct our Planning Department to provide an Environmental Review to determine the real effects on Nevada County at large.

There are currently over 1000 illegal RV's now, and I see social media posts daily offering "RV parking" (sometimes several spots on the same parcel). Even attempting to correct these infractions would go a long way in decreasing our fire danger rating, and thus our cost of living in Nevada County, but there is no code enforcement unless citizens file individual complaints against particular properties, so that publicly proclaimed lawbreakers are not even afraid to proclaim their infractions. Advertisements for rental of legal RVs and campers appear on local social media daily.

There is no question of the substandard housing provided in an RV or camper trailer. That is why it is not ever suggested to be used for full-time habitation. Standard RVs are normally built with materials that are easily penetrated by rodents. Beside the health dangers of rodent infestation, the rodents chew on the easily accessible wiring and create dangerous situations for residents and neighbors of electrical shorts and fire danger. RVs are rarely salvageable after serious damages. They have fewer outlets and a smaller load capacity than a home, a common occurrence of loose connections, vibrations causing bad ground connections and propane system leaks, water leaks and mold, they are hard to keep warm, require continual use of space heaters in a small space, and have warnings against any unattended cooking. RVs and trailers are not homes, nor do they improve your property like a home or ADU. They are personal property assets, like cars, that begin to depreciate to zero value as soon as you put them in service.

I additionally have concerns for the tenants in these situations. As stated, these are the most "at risk" and without a surplus of money to cover an emergency. In response to the postings that have now become familiar is from families who are suddenly homeless because their "home" contained mold. Common problems involving any of the systems (plumbing, electrical, solid waste and freedom from molds) arise with RV's, and when they do, they often leave the RV unfixable and unusable. Those that provide these tenants with this kind of housing should understand the risk, and that they may be required to provide other provisions for their tenants until the home is replaced or repaired, in addition to any losses to their property.

The Planning Department heard from realtors that having a view of an RV from a neighbor's established home instantly reduced the value of that home \$10,000, along with its salability. That means that just by making this decision, your plan promises to make every home owner in the County that much poorer, and we're wondering how we can afford the next stage of our life. Is there a plan to offset this loss?

Your proposal has no size restrictions on any accessory structures to these "RVs", so that decks, porches, sheds, gazebos, and ramadas could all easily double and triple the footprint of the RV/camper itself, becoming quite large. None of these structures should be visible from the existing homes of adjoining neighbors. Those homes were built with a certain amount of privacy. Fencing and/or camouflage screens should be required if parking any of these units means they are visible from already existing homes, the owners who have already invested long-term into Nevada County.

The proposed permits could last for a period of two years, but inspections should take place annually, thereby covering the same length of time as that of DMV registrations, and most tenants' leases. If Nevada County is too busy to enforce it, they should not allow it. Additionally, such structures should require a separate liability policy for tenants' actions to protect neighbors.

The Ordinance of 2023 allowing ADU's and JADU's specifically excludes RV's because they are not designed for year-round occupancy, yet now you claim that statement is incorrect in less than a year... An Environmental Report should be just the thing to clear up the truth.

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to an issue that affects everyone's desire and ability to live here.

Jodeana Patterson

From: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: FW: FW: Local internet advertising

From: cofnevco <cofnevco@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 7, 2025 10:38 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance <AltRVOrdinance@nevadacountyca.gov>
Subject: RE: FW: Local internet advertising

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

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

Thanks so much for that information. Very useful.

It's really unfortunate that you can't even see the site information for the hundreds of these RVs and trailers that are placed illegally, even though it's by one individual who advised the fact.

It's really a question of hope whether any of these meet any fire standards or aren't already burdened with mold or other safety issues. As space heaters are used in cramped quarters, I won't be sleeping very soundly when I think of the fire danger to themselves first, and the community at large.

Thank you again,

Charisse Lolli

Sent from my Galaxy

----- Original message -----

From: Alt RV Ordinance <AltRVOrdinance@nevadacountyca.gov>
Date: 11/7/25 10:17 AM (GMT-08:00)
To: cofnevco <cofnevco@gmail.com>
Subject: RE: FW: Local internet advertising

Hi again, Charisse:

Your concerns are valid and have been noted. Our Code Compliance agents are restricted to responding only to complaints submitted to them by members of the community. I've attached the Nevada County Code Compliance summary, which provides rationale for this model, which was recommended by a 2001-2002 Grand Jury report and adopted by the Board of Supervisors. *Please note that the fees noted in that summary are most likely outdated.*

I can also personally attest to the fact that I observe our Compliance team responding to complaints and issuing citations every day, since I share a workspace with them. If you are seeing specific violations to our municipal code occurring, I recommend submitting a complaint on their website or reaching out to them directly, and I promise you, they will respond.

Please let me know if I can answer any further questions.

Respectfully,

Jodeana Patterson

Administrative Assistant II

Clerk to the Planning Commission

Clerk to the Zoning Administrator



[Planning Department](#)

950 Maidu Ave, Suite 170

PO Box 599002, Nevada City, CA 95959-7902

Main 530.265.1222, Direct 530.470.2526

Jodeana.Patterson@nevadacountyca.gov

Hours 8:30-5:00 Monday – Friday (12:00 – 12:30 lunch)

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to which they are addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message.

From: cofnevco <cofnevco@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 7, 2025 9:57 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance <AltRVOrdinance@nevadacountyca.gov>
Subject: RE: FW: Local internet advertising

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

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

It was just another example of the daily listings on 6 or 7 local public Facebook pages offering rental of RV spots, RVs, or others that exist because there is no enforcement whatsoever even though it's always been illegal. It's just meant to show you that the community doesn't care what you vote for they're gonna do whatever they want, knowing that you won't do anything about it.

Thanks for letting me know you never saw this email.

Charisse Lolli

Sent from my Galaxy

----- Original message -----

From: Alt RV Ordinance <AltRVOrdinance@nevadacountyca.gov>

Date: 11/7/25 9:44 AM (GMT-08:00)

To: cofnevco@gmail.com

Subject: FW: Local internet advertising

Good morning, Charisse:

Apologies for the delay in responding to this email; it somehow ended up in our spam folder. I clicked on the link you provided, but was unable to view the content.

The County Code Compliance Department's enforcement model is strictly complaint-based; you may submit a formal complaint via our website: <https://www.nevadacountyca.gov/1306/Code-Compliance-Division>. Then scroll down to this button:



You may also reach out to our Code Compliance team directly at (530) 265-1222, ext. 4. Or you can email them at CodeCompliance@nevadacountyca.gov.

Please let me know if I can be of any further assistance.

Respectfully,

Jodeana Patterson

Administrative Assistant II

Clerk to the Planning Commission

Clerk to the Zoning Administrator



[Planning Department](#)

950 Maidu Ave. Suite 170

PO Box 599002, Nevada City, CA 95959-7902

Main 530.265.1222, Direct 530.470.2526

Jodeana.Patterson@nevadacountyca.gov

Hours 8:30-5:00 Monday – Friday (12:00 – 12:30 lunch)

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to which they are addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message.

From: cofnevco <cofnevco@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, October 11, 2025 8:20 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance <AltRVOrdinance@nevadacountyca.gov>
Subject: Local internet advertising

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

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

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/204Goodmor2957092697218/permalink/4301856330140605/?mibextid=rS40aB7S9Ucbxw6v>

Just an example of our local advertising...

Please pass this on to code enforcement. I'm happy to provide others as they are listed daily.

Thank you,

Sent from my Galaxy

Jodeana Patterson

From: Rona Seabrook <nonarona@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, November 7, 2025 4:21 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance; Heidi Hall; Lisa Swarthout; Hardy Bullock; Sue Hoek; Robb Tucker
Subject: RV/Alternative Housing Ordinance

You don't often get email from nonarona@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

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

Dear Supervisors and Planning Commission,

Included is a letter I recently wrote to our Union Newspaper in Support of The RV/ Alternative Housing Ordinance.

Personally, I have a cozy, comfy, safe home. My property is under 3 acres. Even if it were over 3 acres, I have no interest in adding an alternative home.

I encourage you to support The Ordinance. I believe it is good for our fellow citizens, our county and ourselves.

I do have a question regarding the Alta Sierra area. How many homes are in Alta Sierra 'residential' and 'outlying' Alta Sierra? How many or what percentage of the properties are over 3 acres? Thank you.

Sincerely,
Rona Seabrook

After reading "Guardrails derailed in the RV Ordinance" (10/29/25) and "The Bird Feeder" (10/31/25), I felt sad. Both of these Other Voices op-eds made unprovable assumptions and catastrophic claims while ignoring the human benefits the Alternative/RV Housing Ordinance will provide to our fellow citizens.

For decades, alternative housing has been how many successful businesses and beloved community members first established themselves in Nevada County.

Right now, the alternative housing market is unregulated, offering neither landlords nor tenants legal protection.

The Alternative/RV Housing Ordinance is designed to set minimum health & safety standards for full-time living in RVs & trailers. This is not setting the stage for an imaginary land rush of undesirable people moving here in rundown RVs.

Thousands of people already live in RVs, trailers and converted buses throughout Nevada County. They are who will be most affected by the ordinance. Not newcomers.

Like the ordinances for owner-built, rural housing (Title25) and tiny homes on wheels, the costs and requirements of the Alternative/RV Housing Ordinance are so stringent that few can afford to comply - or even qualify to comply.

Regardless, to be against this ordinance is to be for maintaining the status quo of our steadily worsening homeless/housing crisis.

The ordinance is not designed for chronically homeless street people with substance abuse, mental health and/or antisocial issues. The No Place To Go Project is working on a safe camp for them.

The Alternative/RV Housing Ordinance is designed for housing-ready people: Friends and relatives of property owners, aging & disabled people, youth abandoned by their families, college students, low-wage essential workers, and the self-employed creatives – actors, writers, musicians, artists, poets, sculptors, muralists and other artisans who make Nevada County such a special place for us all.

Please support the Alternative/RV Housing Ordinance at the Planning Commission Thursday, Nov. 13, at 1:30 p.m. in the Rood Center in Nevada City. It's the right thing to do for our fellow human beings.

Rona Seabrook
Grass Valley

Jodeana Patterson

From: Pam Emick <emickster@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, November 8, 2025 1:12 PM
To: Planning
Subject: Proposal to allow neighborhood to be trashed

You don't often get email from emickster@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

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

There are areas that trailer parks are prevalent. That is necessary I can see. Neighborhoods that have fought (almost completely against the county) to protect the value of our property and neighborhood has been thwarted by extremely poor choices the county makes. The degrading decisions forces on these neighborhoods needs to be considered for a law suit stating the Nevada County is lowering the values in private neighborhoods. I can see that it does not affect you personally so does not matter. What you FAIL to realize is you should NOT be representing Yourselves, but rather the county members. Not just the less fortunate and lazy but one would think that retaining the contributing members would be a smart move.

Why not try for once to make Nevada County an attractive location to live.

Please keep your low values out of our neighborhood!!! You have no business destroying the value of our County. If you feel that you don't need to protect the people get the Hell out of politics in our county and bring your poor choices back to the city. We live out here to get away from politicians with the values you propose.

Pam Emick

Jodeana Patterson

From: Jeanne Franklin <jeanneaf@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, November 8, 2025 5:35 PM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Fw: Please reject RV's as Permanent Housing
Attachments: IMG_1188.jpg; Public Comments for Nov 13-2025 Planning Commission Meeting (1).pdf

You don't often get email from jeanneaf@yahoo.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

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

Please see below email and confirm receipt.

Thank-you.

Jeanne Franklin

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Jeanne Franklin <jeanneaf@yahoo.com>
To: heidi.hall@nevadacountyca.gov <heidi.hall@nevadacountyca.gov>; hardy.bullock@nevadacountyca.gov <hardy.bullock@nevadacountyca.gov>; lisa.swarthout@nevadacountyca.gov <lisa.swarthout@nevadacountyca.gov>; sue.hoek@nevadacountyca.gov <sue.hoek@nevadacountyca.gov>; robb.tucker@nevadacountyca.gov <robb.tucker@nevadacountyca.gov>; clerkofboard@nevadacountyca.gov <clerkofboard@nevadacountyca.gov>
Sent: Saturday, November 8, 2025 at 02:35:19 PM PST
Subject: Please reject RV's as Permanent Housing

Dear Planning Commissioners -

As a homeowner in Nevada County, I am asking that you vote against the RV ordinance.

My reasons are simple; we have seen in other CA counties how lowering the permission structure and allowing RVs to be full-time residences destroys the social fabric. Once word gets out around CA that Nevada County allows full-time living in campers, those who are currently living in RVs are not going to pay attention to the 3-acre limitations or the hooking up to electrical and septic requirements in the draft ordinance. The county doesn't have the resources to police the hundreds of people who are living illegally in RVs now, so how will that improve when we get more of this flouting of the laws?

I am a homeowner against THE PROPOSED RV'S AS PERMANENT HOUSING ORDINANCE.

I have countlessly contacted our County Compliance department, filled out "anonymous" complaints as to not have issues with the only family on our road (22747 Swenson Ravine) and the Compliance complaints come back with "unfounded".

"The property owner states nobody is living in the RV's, that they "get together in them at night to drink beers". See attached picture where a person skedaddled into the trailer once our phone started to take pictures during the day.

Unless I can support my complaints of multitude cars and people going up and down our road even the wee hours of the morning (I only know this due to taking our puppy out on potty breaks) can this be warranted as our county cannot survey complaints that they deem "unwarranted".

IF our county thinks RV Housing is "good for the community" think again. WHAT manpower does the county have to ensure Porta Potties are present, being cleaned out and most importantly electrical is installed vs a daisy chain of cords from primary residence to a multitude of RV's? Fire is a HUGE concern as is waste "dumping".

Our neighbor does NOT pay for garbage pick up and I have never seen any sign of trailers on the property having a service to remove waste.

I stand behind the following already addressed to our board of supervisors sent in from another concerned resident.

Please vote No. Thank you for your consideration.

Jeanne Franklin

In January Nevada Co passed the Tiny Houses on Wheels as Permanent Housing Ordinance. The county website clarifies that the ordinance does not permit RVs to be used as permanent housing because RVs are not intended to be used for long-term occupancy and are built to different standards. This distinction ensures that housing options meet the safety and durability standards required for permanent living. So what changed? RVs are still notorious for inadequate wiring; an overloaded circuit (or kitchen fire) can engulf an RV in minutes. RVs do not protect occupants from dangerous smoke; they lack the insulation and seals of a permanent dwelling. During an evacuation, what happens when RVs clog our narrow winding roads? No one will be stopped and cited during an active evacuation. If you support this ordinance, you are not serious about fire safety in Nevada County...or public health. The RV ordinance offers a few "hypothetical" guardrails to protect the environment and our quality of life, but it allows exceptions to almost every guardrail. Hooking up to septic or sewer lines—too burdensome and expensive! Undefined workarounds will be allowed. These will undoubtedly include portable sewage tanks; we'll have to rely on folks struggling financially to pay to have full sewage tanks pumped rather than desperately draining black water after dark. Such draining, which is very likely, will contribute to contaminated soils and contaminated underlying or adjacent water sources such as wells, creeks, and rivers. What about residents whose only water source is a well? Do we have a right to clean drinking water? If portable sewage tanks are appropriate for a residential community, why not allow them for all homes in the county? A dedicated electrical box for the RV has also been deemed too burdensome by supporters. Though a gas generator is not supposed to be the primary power source, the ordinance sets no limit to the number of hours RV tenants can run a gas generator. So when their roll-up solar panel runs out of juice, neighbors (and ditch/canal trail hikers) will listen to loud gas generators for hours on end. No mandatory utility hookups seems like permanent camping to me. If you turn the unincorporated county into a glorified campground then I'd like my property taxes to reflect that. Currently they do not. Many folks already live illegally in RVs, even on smaller parcels, because Code Enforcement is mostly absent—even when neighbors complain. Countless property owners have received the Complaint "Unfounded" email, lacking any details of how that determination was made. What kind of "sewage arrangements" do these illegally-occupied RVs have? Outhouses? Chemical toilets? Where is our Environmental Health Department? Let's face it—without enforcement, any guardrails are irrelevant. If this ordinance passes, a handful may spend the time and money on permits, but the majority will not. Who will bother them? No one. This ordinance will be an open invitation for more RV folks to flock here because we're desperate enough to achieve our affordable housing numbers by simply redefining an RV as a Permanent Dwelling. How innovative--normalizing camping as permanent living! If we already have hundreds of folks living illegally in RVs, imagine how many we'll have when it's legal. In reality you'll be creating as many problems as you solve. Can property owners get liability coverage for an RV rental? Not likely. They could lose everything when a tenant trips on an extension cord. Will RV-lords charge tenants fair rents or might some take advantage of folks with marginal credit? Yet they escape the additional property tax assessments that befall those who build ADUs to real permanent dwelling standards. I don't know what it's like to be housing insecure...but I do know what it's like to work fulltime for over 30 years. I know what it's like to move for more-affordable housing. I know what it's like to carefully review property codes and zoning before making the biggest investment of my life. When the Board of Supervisors rejected Rise Gold's mining permit, one reason cited was current zoning and regulations. Will you continue to respect regulations and zoning? Homeowners beyond the exempt enclaves of incorporated Nevada City, incorporated Grass Valley, the Town of Truckee, and outside the gated communities with enforced HOA's,

are counting on you to respect the regulations and zoning in place when we made the biggest investment of our lifetime.

Jodeana Patterson

From: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: FW: Proposed ousing ordinance Alternative Dwelling Ordinance (PLN25-0084, ORD25-1 SR)

-----Original Message-----

From: Joseph Lisoni <wtrmtr@earthlink.net>
Sent: Tuesday, November 11, 2025 8:19 PM
To: Heidi Hall <Heidi.Hall@nevadacountyca.gov>
Subject: Proposed ousing ordinance Alternative Dwelling Ordinance (PLN25-0084, ORD25-1 SR)

[You don't often get email from wtrmtr@earthlink.net. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

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

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

Heidi Hall Supervisor: We the undersigned residents of Nevada County write to encourage you to VOTE NO on the proposed Housing Ordinance captioned above. The housing issue is serious, but the housing programs newly adopted need time to succeed before introducing the subject RV Housing Ordinance. Please VOTE NO on the proposed Housing Ordinance! Thank you for your service to Nevada County! Joseph Louis Lisoni, Esq. Gail Landtbom Lisoni, Esq.

Jodeana Patterson

From: Ursula Donofrio <ursdonofrio@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 12, 2025 1:14 PM
To: Danny Milman; Steve French; Terence McAteer; John Foley; Jo Garst; Clerk of Board; Alt RV Ordinance; Heidi Hall; Hardy Bullock; Lisa Swarthout; Sue Hoek; Robb Tucker
Subject: PLEASE VOTE NO ON RVs AS PERMANENT HOUSING

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

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

<https://www.sierrathread.com/thread/rv-ordinance-nevada-county-supervisor-planning>

The RV Ordinance Isn't Compassion — It's a Step Backward

Nov 7

Written By [Mac Young](#)

Nevada County is full of people who care deeply about this place. We look out for one another. When a neighbor's fence falls down in a storm, we show up. When someone's barn roof leaks, a pickup truck full of tools appears before sunrise. We solve problems together.

And we are all aware of our current housing struggle. People who grew up here are being priced out. Seniors can't keep up with rising costs. Young working families are being pushed toward Sacramento or Reno. Nobody denies that something needs to change.

But the proposed RV Dwelling Ordinance is not the solution. It does not fix housing. It does not make living here more affordable. It does not give people stability. What it does is normalize survival living and call it housing policy.

We deserve better than that—and so do the people most impacted by this crisis.

Let's talk plainly. RVs are not houses. They were never meant to be. They are made for camping trips, seasonal travel, vacation weekends, and temporary stays. Their insulation is thin. Their electrical systems are light-duty. Their roofs are not built for our winters. Their materials are flammable. Their plumbing systems were never designed for year-round use.

No ordinance changes those physical facts.

And yet the County is proposing to classify RVs as long-term dwellings in rural neighborhoods, provided owners go through a stack of permits, upgrades, inspections, and renewals every two years. On paper, this may look orderly. In real life, it's a program built on assumptions that simply do not reflect reality on the ground.

The RV ordinance will harm people in our community. Already, 17,000 plaintiffs who lived in FEMA trailers after [Hurricane Katrina](#) have alleged damaging health consequences, from respiratory problems to dozens of deaths and cancer cases, in a federal class-action lawsuit naming 64 trailer makers and the federal government. Many of the plaintiffs were drawn from the roughly 350,000 people who unsuccessfully filed claims against the Army Corps of Engineers over the levee breaches that flooded New Orleans. Living in a trailer is detrimental to the health of our neighbors and not a long-term solution to homelessness.

Consider the fire danger. We live in one of the most wildfire-prone regions in the state. Fire districts are already stretched thin. Many rural roads are narrow, steep, and difficult to evacuate under best conditions. RV siding ignites easily. Propane tanks rupture. Embers can take a unit in minutes.

Approving more combustible dwellings in forested zones isn't compassionate. It's risky.

And then there's the winter problem. Anyone who has lived above 3,000 feet knows what snow load means: heavy, wet, crushing weight. RVs cannot handle that load. The County knows this—they included a requirement for engineered snow shelters or "ramadas" to protect RV roofs. That means if someone wants to live in an RV in our climate, they have to build a building to protect the RV.

If you need to build a building to make your "housing unit" safe, that "housing unit" is not safe.

Now let's look at cost—because this ordinance is being marketed as an "affordable housing solution."

To legally live in an RV under this ordinance, a homeowner will have to:

- Upgrade water infrastructure or well systems
- Expand septic capacity or install new wastewater solutions
- Install dedicated electrical systems
- Prepare stabilized building pads
- Pay permit and inspection fees every two years
- And again—at many elevations—construct a snow-rated shelter structure

Anyone who can afford all of that can absolutely afford a small permanent home, cottage, modular home, or an owner-built Title 25 unit.

This ordinance does not lower housing costs. It shifts them into a different form, and in doing so, creates an illusion of affordability while locking vulnerable people into unstable shelter.

This ordinance will directly affect the people already struggling the most—seniors on fixed incomes, low-income families, young adults trying to remain in the community they love. These are the people who will be told, "Here, now you have a home," when what they actually have is a vehicle—one storm, one fire, one mechanical failure away from displacement.

That is not dignity. That is not stability. And it is not a reflection of who we are as a county.

If we truly want to support the people who live here, we should be focusing on:

- Streamlined, lower-cost small home building options
- Pre-approved building plans
- Fee reductions for full-time resident construction
- Title 25 owner-built rural cabins and cottages
- Modular and factory-built home legalization without red tape

These are real, permanent, rooted solutions—ones that build equity, generational stability, and pride of place.

Nevada County should not respond to the housing crisis by lowering the standard of what we call a home. We should respond by making it easier to build real homes.

We can do this. But it starts by being honest about what this ordinance really is—and what it is not.

For the safety, well-being, and dignity of our residents, I urge the Nevada County Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors to vote NO on ORD25-1.

Nevada County is worth protecting. And our people deserve housing that is worthy of calling home.

[Nevada County Board of Supervisors Planning Commission housing homeless](#)
[Mac Young](#)

Mac is a proud graduate of Bear River High School, Class of 1992. He is a member of Sierra Thread.

Jodeana Patterson

From: Bill Zoller <zollerbill@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 13, 2025 7:02 AM
To: Jodeana Patterson
Subject: Re: Notice of Public Hearing (for PC 11/13/25 meeting): Alternative/RV Dwelling Ordinance (PLN25-0084; ORD25-1)

You don't often get email from zollerbill@yahoo.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

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

I strongly oppose this ordinance. Please don't adopt it.

Bill Zoller
116 Starling Circle, Grass Valley CA

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone](#)

On Friday, October 24, 2025, 9:24 AM, Jodeana Patterson <Jodeana.Patterson@nevadacountyca.gov> wrote:

Good morning,

Please see the attached Notice of Public Hearing of the Planning Commission on Thursday, November 13, at 1:30 p.m. for a proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment to add Section 12.03.151 to the Nevada County Code Title 12 Zoning Regulations to establish health and safety standards, permitting and certification requirements, and site development standards allowing for recreational vehicles as an additional residential unit on developed properties subject to the permitting and standards outlined in the draft Ordinance, for your review and comment.

For questions, please contact Planning Director Brian Foss at (530) 265-1256 or Brian.Foss@nevadacountyca.gov. Please submit any comments to AltRVordinance@nevadacountyca.gov.

Respectfully,

Public Comment & Key Points – Nevada County RV Dwelling Ordinance (ORD25-1)

Submitted by: Michael James Taylor

Date: November 13th, 2025

Public Comment

Chair and Commissioners,

The Planning Commission exists as the firewall between staff and policy — the checkpoint that ensures Nevada County’s land-use decisions align with the General Plan, building standards, and common sense. When a proposal drifts from those principles, it’s this Commission’s duty to stop it and send it back for correction. The proposed RV Dwelling Ordinance is one of those moments.

Let’s start with a basic fact: RVs and Tiny Homes on Wheels (THOWs) are both DMV-licensed vehicles, not permanent dwellings. They are built to vehicle codes, not building codes. The County’s effort to turn them into permanent housing by layering exceptions, renewals, and permits is not planning — it’s patchwork policy.

Nevada County already has a clear path to permanent housing through its Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) ordinance. That’s the appropriate tool for adding long-term residential capacity with a concrete foundation. THOWs and RVs, on the other hand, should remain what they are — temporary, movable shelters.

If the County truly wants to provide flexibility and affordability, the solution isn’t to redefine vehicles as houses; it’s to clarify how they can be temporarily and safely accommodated on properly prepared, permitted pads.

That means:

1. Permitted RV/THOW pads that are permanent improvements — with clear standards for grading, setbacks, surface materials, and drainage.
2. Safe utility connections — approved electrical, potable water, and wastewater hookups.
3. Simple, temporary permits allowing DMV-licensed RVs or THOWs to occupy those pads for limited periods, such as two years.
4. Conversion clarity — if someone wants a permanent residence, the path is already there: build or convert through the ADU program and the California Building Standards Code.

This approach keeps housing policy coherent, enforceable, and consistent with public safety and infrastructure planning. It also protects homeowners’ flexibility without creating new enforcement headaches or health hazards.

The current RV ordinance, by contrast, is riddled with contradictions. It normalizes substandard, combustible structures as housing in wildfire-prone areas, requires “snow

shelters” just to make RVs livable, and will burden staff with an unmanageable, permit-renewal treadmill.

Approving it would lower Nevada County’s housing standards and dilute the meaning of “permanent home.” That isn’t compassion — it’s confusion.

I urge this Commission to fulfill its oversight role and reject the ordinance as written. Send it back to the Planning Department with direction to build from a real foundation: a pad-based permitting system that honors safety, consistency, and the County’s own existing housing framework.

Thank you.

Michael James Taylor

Key Points Summary

1. The Planning Commission's Duty

- The Planning Commission is the firewall between County staff and policy drift.
- Its responsibility is to ensure that all proposed ordinances align with the General Plan, building codes, and sound planning principles.
- When a proposal departs from those standards, it must be sent back for correction.

2. The Core Problem

- RVs and Tiny Homes on Wheels (THOWs) are DMV-licensed vehicles, not permanent dwellings.
- Attempting to redefine them as long-term housing creates contradictions with building, health, and fire codes.
- The proposed ordinance introduces unnecessary complexity, inconsistent permitting, and unmanageable enforcement burdens.

3. Safety and Structural Risks

- RVs are not built for permanent occupancy: thin insulation, light-duty electrical and plumbing systems, and flammable materials.
- Fire danger and snow load risks are significant in Nevada County; requiring a "snow shelter" to make an RV safe underscores its unsuitability as housing.
- Approving more combustible dwellings in wildfire zones endangers both residents and first responders.

4. There Is Already a Path to Permanent Housing

- Nevada County already provides a clear, regulated route for long-term housing through its Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) program.
- ADUs are permanent, inspected, insurable, built on foundation structures that add real housing capacity.
- THOWs and RVs should remain temporary, movable shelters, not be reclassified as permanent homes.

5. The Constructive Solution – A Pad-Based Approach

- Return the ordinance to staff and rebuild it around a permitted pad system that provides clarity, flexibility, and safety.
- Key elements:
 - Permanent, permitted pads with clear standards for grading, setbacks, surface materials, and drainage.
 - Utility requirements: safe electrical, potable water, and wastewater hookups.
 - Temporary use permits allowing a DMV-licensed RV or THOW to occupy the pad for a limited term (e.g., two years).
 - Conversion path: permanent dwellings should follow existing ADU and Building Code procedures.

6. The Right Path Forward

- The current draft should be rejected and remanded to Planning staff with direction to:
 - Eliminate conflicting standards between RVs, THOWs, and ADUs.
 - Clarify temporary use permits through a standardized pad model.
 - Align all housing ordinances with existing building, health, and fire safety codes.

Summary:

This ordinance lowers Nevada County's housing standards and creates a false sense of affordability while increasing risk and confusion. The Commission's responsibility is to protect the County from poorly conceived regulation and insist on clear, enforceable policy built on solid ground.

Jodeana Patterson

Administrative Assistant II

Clerk to the Planning Commission

Clerk to the Zoning Administrator



950 Maidu Ave. Suite 170

PO Box 599002, Nevada City, CA 95959-7902

Main 530.265.1222, Direct 530.470.2526

Jodeana.Patterson@nevadacountyca.gov

Hours 8:30-5:00 Monday – Friday (12:00 – 12:30 lunch)

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to which they are addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message.

Jodeana Patterson

From: Debbie Porter <imreel2@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 13, 2025 7:41 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Subject: Today's hearing on homes on wheels

You don't often get email from imreel2@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

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

Good morning. Please do not support the ordinance to allow anything on wheels to be used as permanent housing. At the very least exclude Golden Oaks Association from allowing this. We are private roads not designed for more use. Most properties use wells. Fire is our very real worry. It makes more sense for the county to create a "camping" area that provides water, power, sewage and rules. Please do not force this problem on rural neighborhoods.
Debbie Porter
10701 Sharmiden Way, Grass Valley, CA 95949

Jodeana Patterson

From: John Mills <jcmills01@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 13, 2025 10:09 AM
To: Alt RV Ordinance
Cc: bajabon@gmail.com; stevbelch@yahoo.com; sandy belch
Subject: RV Housing Ordinance

You don't often get email from jcmills01@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

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

From: John Mills <jcmills01@gmail.com>
Subject: RV Housing Ordinance
Date: November 13, 2025 at 10:02:24 AM PST
To: "AltRVOrdinance@nevadacounty.gov" <AltRVOrdinance@NevadaCounty.gov>
Cc: "bajabon@gmail.com" <bajabon@gmail.com>, "stevbelch@yahoo.com" <stevbelch@yahoo.com>, sandy belch <sandy1belch@yahoo.com>

I am opposed to this ordinance. There are no guardrails in place to keep occupants from dumping directly onto property for street where they squat. We have fallen behind in supervision of our already impacted community of residents, and overwhelmed by the homeless individuals who already take advantage of our generosity as a community.

My husband and I have owned rental properties for many years, 3 of them are low income properties. The costs we incur to just clean up after our low income tenants triples the cost of their deposit, at the least. This new policy the county is hoping to adopt will only draw more transients and I know very few people who are willing to do the dirty work of dumping and cleaning up their left behind mess (think of the abandoned non running vehicles left behind too!!!).

Please protect this community. We have been residents of Nevada County since 1985. We bought 2 of our properties in 1974 and 1976.

I am a firm no.

Thanks for reading this and considering the implications.

Caroline Mills

15797 Shannon Way
Nevada City, CA