
**PLUMAS COUNTY
PLANNING COMMISSION**
Minutes of the Meeting of April 21, 2016

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS:

Dr. Robert Abbott, *Commissioner* (District 1)
Dr. Shauna Rossington, *Vice Chair* (District 2)
Richard Rydell, *Commissioner* (District 3)
Larry Williams, *Chair* (District 4)
John Olofson, *Commissioner* (District 5)

I. CALL TO ORDER

The Plumas County Planning Commission (the *Commission*) convenes in a meeting on April 21, 2016, at 10:01 a.m. in the Planning and Building Services Conference Room, Quincy, CA; Chair, Larry Williams, presiding.

II. SALUTE TO THE FLAG

III. ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present: John Olofson, Larry Williams, Dr. Robert Abbott, Richard Rydell
(attending telephonically)

Commissioners Absent: Dr. Shauna Rossington

Also in attendance (Supervisors, consultants, and staff)

Supervisor Jeff Engel
Randy Wilson, Planning Director
Rebecca Herrin, Senior Planner
Heidi Wightman, Recording Secretary

IV. PUBLIC COMMENT OPPORTUNITY

No public comment is given.

V. PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Randy Wilson, Planning Director, reports that he continues to work on the Integrated Regional Water Management plan (IRWM).

The Plumas County Coordinating Council has a subcommittee appointed by the council to work with the Forest Service on Travel Management Subpart C, which is winter travel management. That subcommittee was able to provide input in the Proposed Action that is put out by the Forest Service.

VI. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING – GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT: MOHAWK VALLEY RANCH (Marcia White, Owner/Applicant); APN 133-130-115; T.21,22N/R.13E/S.5 & 32 MDM; 150 WHITEHAWK DRIVE, WHITEHAWK RANCH, CLIO

Rebecca Herrin, Senior Planner, distributes a letter received from John and Arleen Condrin (owners of property at 91 Hawk Ridge, Clio) urging the Planning Commission to vote no on the proposed rezoning of the property, and an e-mail from Troy Bostian (owner of property at 106 Hawk Ridge, Clio) regarding the impacts of the rezoning on the community. Additionally, Herrin provides a copy of the Environmental Checklist Form, which lists the potential impacts of the zone change along with an explanation of those impacts. Herrin also provides staff's response (dated April 13th) to the letter to the Commission by Timothy Nye dated April 7, 2016, and a copy of a letter (dated April 21st) from Mr. Nye submitted as a supplement to the objection of his April 7th letter, which has not been reviewed by staff. Also provided is an e-mail from Paul Blackburn (a break is called at 10:09 to allow staff to make copies of Mr. Blackburn's letter. Meeting reconvenes at 10:14.)

Herrin reads and discusses staff's response (dated April 13th) to Mr. Nye's comments of April 7th.

The public hearing is opened at 10:45.

Marcia White, President of Mohawk Valley Ranch, Inc., questions if she were to withdraw her request for a General Plan amendment if the existing uses that are granted under the Development Agreement would go away? Ms. White references the letter from the Planning Department received in 2008 stating that if they seeded the commercial area with a commercial business then those commercial uses would stay in place. Herrin replies that County Counsel would need to make that determination. Ms. White adds that she is content with the existing uses on the property and doesn't need the General Plan Amendment. She was under the impression that it was something she was required to do because of the General Plan update in order to get the "zoning" to align. However, if there is a possibility that she could lose the commercial uses on the property she will go ahead with the general plan amendment request. Otherwise she will withdraw her application right now. Randy Wilson, Planning Director, reiterates the need to confer with County Counsel and recommends the public hearing continue and the application not be withdrawn until we receive an answer from County Counsel.

Timothy Nye, property owner at Hawk Ridge, responds to staff's April 13, 2016, response to his initial comments. His major areas of concern are: 1) the subsequent amendments to the original Planned Development permit; 2) the 150' building exclusion corridor along Highway 89; 3) the General Plan update and its impact on the Planned Development Permit for Whitehawk Ranch; 4) the one specific use for the parcel specified in the EIR and Planned Development Permit for Whitehawk Ranch; and 5) the original commercial parcel that has since been moved and developed. Mr. Nye urges the Planning Commission to confer with County Counsel and discuss past actions.

Paul Blackburn, resident of Hawk Ridge, states he concurs and supports Mr. Nye's findings. Additionally, he feels it was nice that Marcia White was offering to withdraw her application, which he feels is a smart thing to do because he doesn't think it is in the best interest of the community or the County. There are a lot of businesses in neighboring communities that are struggling to survive and to think a business could succeed on this parcel and be profitable and

productive to the County is a stretch. This seems to be a very inappropriate zoning request that doesn't suit Whitehawk Ranch.

Marcia White comments that the 150' scenic corridor that is referenced is still in existence and never went away. It is located 75 feet off centerline of Highway 89. All the lots have been setback and the commercial corner intends to honor that. White also points out that the commercial lot was in existence when everyone purchased their property.

Randy Wilson states that this is not an application to amend the Planned Development Permit or the Development Agreement. It is an application that a property owner has the right to file to change the General Plan and Zoning. The Planning Commission's charge, according to County Code, is to make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors on legislative actions. Legislative actions are changes to the General Plan and zoning. Wilson recommends this item be continued so staff can confer with County Counsel and bring back a resolution for the Commission's consideration with their recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. Wilson also notes that staff will confer with County Counsel regarding the applicant's question as to what would be allowed on the parcel should the General Plan amendment and rezone application be withdrawn. Additionally, Wilson notes that the Planning Department has provided notice to property owners according to State law. Notice was published in the newspaper and all property owners within 300 feet of the property boundary were notified.

Motion is made by Abbott, seconded by Olofson, to continue the public hearing to June 16, 2016, with County Counsel present. Motion is passed (4-0)

Staff states that a sign will be posted on the property with the date of the next hearing.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Williams calls for a Motion to adjourn the meeting. Motion is made by Olofson, seconded by Abbott, with a unanimous affirmative vote recorded, to adjourn the meeting of April 21, 2016, at 11:27 a.m. The next regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting is set for May 5, 2016, at 10:00 a.m., in the Permit Center conference room.



Larry Williams, Chair
Plumas County Planning Commission



Heidi Wightman, Recording Secretary