
PLUMAS COUNTY
ZONING ADMINISTRATOR
Minutes of the Meeting of November 16, 2016

The Plumas County Zoning Administrator convened in a meeting on November 16, 2016, at 10:01 a.m. in the Permit Center Conference Room, Quincy. Zoning Administrator, Randy Wilson, presiding. Senior Planner, Rebecca Herrin, is in attendance.

I. AGENDA

The agenda is approved as submitted.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT OPPORTUNITY

No public comment presented.

III. TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP / PLANNED DEVELOPMENT PERMIT & NEGATIVE DECLARATION NO. 654: AGUILERA, et. al (DAVE NORTON, agent); APNs 003-260-002 & 003-320-003; T.21N/R.9E/S.4 & 5 MDM

As continued from the November 18, 2015, Zoning Administrator meeting, the proposal to divide approximately 87 acres into five parcels of 1.95, 2.16, 2.20, 3.71, and 76.05 acres for single-family residential use, located at 2166 Little Grass Valley Road, LaPorte, is presented. Randy Wilson, Zoning Administrator, states a letter was received from Jim Webster of Webster Engineering stating they are withdrawing the application for the tentative subdivision map and planned development permit. The new owner of the property, Soper Wheeler, has been notified of the decision and concurs. With the public hearing still open, Wilson asks if anyone wishes to speak on the project. There being no comments, the hearing is closed at 10:02. Wilson states he will recognize the letter requesting the application be withdrawn and no other action will be held on this project. Any future activity would require reapplication.

IV. TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP / NEGATIVE DECLARATION NO. 670: PLANK, WILLIAM & ELIZABETH; APN 140-060-044; T.23N/R.14E/S.26 MDM

The proposal to divide 30.15 acres into two parcels of 3.5 and 26.65 acres for commercial/industrial and limited residential use, located at 81202 Highway 70, Beckwourth, is presented. Rebecca Herrin, Senior Planner, states this property has been the subject of numerous proposals for development. It's currently developed for industrial use and one residence. A tentative map to subdivide the property was initially submitted in 2004 and approved, but the final map was never recorded and the tentative map expired. A subsequent lot line adjustment resulted in two parcels, of which this project is one of the parcels. A tentative map for a division of 15 parcels was submitted in 2009 but never completed. The staff report covers the evaluation of zoning compliance, general plan compliance, airport land use, the Sierra Valley Groundwater Management District, and road access. Negative Declaration #670 has found that there will be no impact on the environment and staff is recommending the Negative Declaration be adopted.

Randy Wilson, Zoning Administrator, asks the applicant or their representative if they understand and agree with the conditions of approval. Applicant's representative, Chris David, replies that they are in agreement. Wilson opens the public hearing at 10:07. There being no comments, the hearing is closed at 10:07.

DECISION

Wilson states he will take the actions recommended by staff, and 1) adopt Negative Declaration #670 pursuant to Section 15074 of the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines, making findings A through C, and 2) approve the Tentative Parcel Map subject to the conditions of approval outlined in Exhibit 5 of the Staff Report, making Findings A through F as follows:

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION FINDINGS

- A. That there is no substantial evidence in the record supporting a fair argument that the proposed project, as mitigated and conditioned, might have any significant adverse impact on the environment; and
- B. That the proposed Negative Declaration reflects the independent judgment of the Plumas County Zoning Administrator, and that the mitigation measures will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels; and
- C. That the location and custodian of the documents which constitute the record of these proceedings is the Plumas County Planning Department, 555 Main Street, Quincy, California.

CONDITIONS

- 1. The Final Map shall be prepared in conformance with the Tentative Map prepared by NST Engineering on June 29, 2016, except as modified by these conditions.
- 2. The Final Map shall be recorded prior to November 16, 2018, or an Extension of Time shall be filed.
- 3. The area of Special Flood Hazard as shown on the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) 06063C1350E dated March 2, 2005, and the Letter of Map Amendment Case No. 02-09-560A dated March 20, 2002, shall be delineated on the additional information map recorded with the final map and designated as a building and grading exclusion area.
- 4. All sewer lines and overhead power lines shall be included in easements as shown on the final map. All sewer-related easements shall be dedicated by the developer to the Beckwourth County Service Area concurrently with recordation of the final map and a Will Serve letter shall be issued by the Beckwourth County Service Area prior to the recordation of the final map.

5. A note shall be placed on the additional information map recorded concurrently with the final map and on all building and site development plans that states:

“Should development activities reveal the presence of cultural resources (i.e., artifact concentrations, including arrowheads and other stone tools or chipping debris, cans, glass, etc.; structural remains; human skeletal remains), work within 50 feet of the find shall cease immediately until a qualified professional archaeologist can be consulted to evaluate the remains and implement appropriate mitigation procedures. Should human skeletal remains be encountered, State law requires immediate notification of the County Coroner. Should the County Coroner determine that such remains are in an archaeological context, the Native American Heritage Commission in Sacramento shall be notified immediately, pursuant to State law, to arrange for Native American participation in determining disposition of such remains.”

6. No road improvements shall be required for this map as per Plumas County Code. Any further development or division may trigger road improvements.
7. The Additional Information Map shall be reviewed and approved by Environmental Health prior to recordation.

FINDINGS

- A) This project will be consistent with the C-2 (Periphery Commercial) and the I-2 (Light Industrial), zoning because each parcel will meet the minimum standards for size, width and use. In addition, each parcel is developed. Therefore, land division does not result in any conflict with zoning and density standards.
- B) It is found that this project is consistent with the general plan and zoning because the general plan calls for Commercial and Industrial uses on the site and the zoning designations are C-2 (Periphery Commercial) and I-2 (Light Industrial), which are compatible with existing uses.
- C) The roadway serving Parcel 1 (Clover Street) was dedicated for public use on the face of Bulson’s Addition to Beckwourth (Book A of Maps at Page 1) on October 20, 1905.
- D) The Clover Street roadway is approximately 22 feet wide and meets the requirements of Plumas County Code Section 9-3.606 Easements to serve interior parcels.
- E) Clover Street does not meet any of the defined roadways in the development standards section of the Plumas County Code; specifically, Plumas County Code Section 9-4.405 Class 3 Roads. Clover Street is neither a County Road nor a private road. It is a public way not included in the maintained mileage system and, as such, does not require improvement under the Plumas County Code.
- F) Plumas County Code Section 9-4.607 Improvements to existing roads does not apply to Clover Street because:
 - a) It is located offsite so no right-of-way can be dedicated by the Developer;
 - b) It is not listed on the maintained mileage, so it is not officially defined as a County road that will be improved or maintained in the future;
 - c) None of the other properties that are served by Clover Street have been required to pay into the County Road Fund.

V. **SPECIAL USE PERMIT: McBRIDE, ELLEN; APN 104-181-007; T.28N/R.8E/S.20 MDM**

The request for a special use permit to allow construction of an addition to a lawful, non-conforming structure located at 2922 Big Springs Road, Hamilton Branch, Lake Almanor, is presented. Rebecca Herrin states that the structure is an A-frame cabin probably built prior to the time we had building permits in Plumas County. The A-frame is what we call lawful, non-conforming in that it doesn't meet the current setbacks. When that happens and you want to add onto or enlarge the structure, a special use permit is required. The Environmental Health Department evaluated the existing leachfield and has limited the total number of bedrooms + loft to three. Additionally, the plot plan shows one corner of the existing deck encroaching onto the adjacent property. Condition #4 requires that the portion of the deck that extends over the property line be removed.

Randy Wilson, Zoning Administrator, asks the applicant if she understands and is in agreement with the conditions of approval. Ellen McBride replies that she is in agreement. The public hearing is opened at 10:12. There being no comments, the hearing is closed at 10:12.

DECISION

Wilson states he will take the actions recommended by staff, and 1) find that the project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act under CEQA Guidelines Section 15061(b)(3) as the preliminary review did not reveal any potentially significant impacts, making findings A & B, and 2) approve the Special Use Permit subject to the conditions of approval outlined in Exhibit 4 of the Staff Report, making findings A through D as follows:

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION FINDINGS

- A. That it can be seen with certainty, based upon review of the initial environmental assessment, that there is no possibility that the project may have a significant effect on the environment; and
- B. That the location and custodian of the documents which constitute the record of these proceedings is the Plumas County Planning Department, 555 Main Street, Quincy, California.

CONDITIONS

- 1. The proposed addition to the lawful nonconforming structure is approved as per plot plan and application submitted September 20, 2016.
- 2. Required building permits shall be obtained within eighteen (18) months of the approval of this special use permit.
- 3. The total number of bedrooms plus the loft shall not exceed three (3).
- 4. The portions of the existing deck that extend over the property lines on the western and eastern sides of the parcel shall be removed. Plans showing the new configuration shall be submitted with the building permit application for the proposed additions.
- 5. The violation of any condition of a special use permit shall be a violation of the provisions of this chapter and shall be punishable as set forth in Article 12 of Chapter 2 of Title 9 of the Plumas County Code.

6. The Special Use Permit is to be signed by the property owners and applicants and returned within forty (40) days of the date of approval or the permit will be voided.

FINDINGS

- A) This project, as conditioned, is environmentally compatible with the surrounding area because the proposed project conforms with applicable state and county codes that are designed to protect public health and safety and to reduce potential impacts.
- B) Prior to the public hearing, it can be presumed that this project is socially compatible with the surrounding area because the conditions are designed to ensure that the project will not create any nuisances or interfere with the surrounding community. The project will be in conformance with all other regulations pertaining to the use.
- C) This project is economically compatible with the surrounding area because the use will not interfere with the economic use of properties in the vicinity in conformance with zoning requirements adopted for the promotion of the public health, safety, and general welfare.
- D) This project is consistent with the General Plan and zoning subject to the conditions imposed by the issuance of a special use permit.

VI. SPECIAL USE PERMIT: PLUMAS CRISIS INTERVENTION & RESOURCE CENTER (Harold & Karen Dale, owners); APN 110-062-026; T.26N/R.9E/S.3 MDM

The request for a special use permit for a public service facility located at 414 Main Street, Greenville, is presented. Rebecca Herrin states that the building was a commercial building previously, and the Plumas Crisis Intervention & Resource Center (PCIRC) had facilities at the Indian Valley Recreation Center, which they desired to relocate into this building. PCIRC partners with local agencies, commissions, non-profit organizations, and county departments to provide direct services and many resources and referrals within the agency's centers. It will be operated Monday through Friday, 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Randy Wilson, Zoning Administrator, asks if the applicant understands and agrees with the conditions of approval. Johanna Downey, Executive Director of PCIRC, states that she is in agreement. The public hearing is opened at 10:16. There being no comments, the hearing is closed at 10:16.

DECISION

Wilson states he will take the actions recommended by staff, and 1) find that the project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act under CEQA Guidelines Section 15061(b)(3) as the preliminary review did not reveal any potentially significant impacts, making findings A & B, and 2) approve the Special Use Permit subject to the conditions of approval outlined in Exhibit 4 of the Staff Report, making findings A through D as follows:

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION FINDINGS

- A. That it can be seen with certainty, based upon review of the initial environmental assessment, that there is no possibility that the project may have a significant effect on the environment; and

- B. That the location and custodian of the documents which constitute the record of these proceedings is the Plumas County Planning Department, 555 Main Street, Quincy, California.

CONDITIONS

1. The proposed Public Service Facility is approved as per the application for Special Use Permit submitted September 28, 2016.
2. Required building permits shall be obtained within eighteen (18) months of the approval of this special use permit.
3. The violation of any condition of a special use permit shall be a violation of the provisions of this chapter and shall be punishable as set forth in Article 12 of Chapter 2 of Title 9 of the Plumas County Code.
4. The Special Use Permit is to be signed by the property owners and applicants and returned within forty (40) days of the date of approval or the permit will be voided.

FINDINGS

- A) This project, as conditioned, is environmentally compatible with the surrounding area because the proposed project conforms with applicable state and county codes that are designed to protect public health and safety and to reduce potential impacts.
- B) Prior to the public hearing, it can be presumed that this project is socially compatible with the surrounding area because the conditions are designed to ensure that the project will not create any nuisances or interfere with the surrounding community. The project will be in conformance with all other regulations pertaining to the use.
- C) This project is economically compatible with the surrounding area because the use will not interfere with the economic use of properties in the vicinity in conformance with zoning requirements adopted for the promotion of the public health, safety, and general welfare.
- D) This project is consistent with the General Plan and zoning because a public service facility is a permitted use in all zones, subject to issuance of a special use permit.

VII. SPECIAL USE PERMIT: PLUMAS CRISIS INTERVENTION & RESOURCE CENTER (Dr. David Walls, owner); APN 100-104-001; T.28N/R.7E/S.7 MDM

The request for a special use permit for a public service facility located at 372 Main Street, Chester, is presented. Rebecca Herrin states that this building was an existing medical building in 2003. There was a Special Use Permit issued for a public service facility for Alcohol & Drug counseling services, and that Special Use Permit expired in 2008. When the Plumas County Building Department received a building permit for ADA improvements on the building, it was discovered that it was going to be a new type of facility that requires a Special Use Permit. There have been no issues raised about the facility, there's adequate parking, and it's compliant with development standards.

Randy Wilson, Zoning Administrator, asks the applicant if she understands and agrees with the conditions of approval. Johanna Downey, Executive Director of PCIRC, states she is in agreement. The public hearing is opened at 10:20. There being no comments, the hearing is closed at 10:20.

DECISION

Wilson states he will take the actions recommended by staff, and 1) find that the project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act under CEQA Guidelines Section 15061(b)(3) as the preliminary review did not reveal any potentially significant impacts, making findings A & B, and 2) approve the Special Use Permit subject to the conditions of approval outlined in Exhibit 4 of the Staff Report, making findings A through D as follows:

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION FINDINGS

- A. That it can be seen with certainty, based upon review of the initial environmental assessment, that there is no possibility that the project may have a significant effect on the environment; and
- B. That the location and custodian of the documents which constitute the record of these proceedings is the Plumas County Planning Department, 555 Main Street, Quincy, California.

CONDITIONS

1. The proposed Public Service Facility is approved as per the application for Special Use Permit submitted September 30, 2016.
2. Required building permits shall be obtained within eighteen (18) months of the approval of this special use permit.
3. The violation of any condition of a special use permit shall be a violation of the provisions of this chapter and shall be punishable as set forth in Article 12 of Chapter 2 of Title 9 of the Plumas County Code.
4. The Special Use Permit is to be signed by the property owners and applicants and returned within forty (40) days of the date of approval or the permit will be voided.

FINDINGS

- A) This project, as conditioned, is environmentally compatible with the surrounding area because the proposed project conforms with applicable state and county codes that are designed to protect public health and safety and to reduce potential impacts.
- B) Prior to the public hearing, it can be presumed that this project is socially compatible with the surrounding area because the conditions are designed to ensure that the project will not create any nuisances or interfere with the surrounding community. The project will be in conformance with all other regulations pertaining to the use.

- C) This project is economically compatible with the surrounding area because the use will not interfere with the economic use of properties in the vicinity in conformance with zoning requirements adopted for the promotion of the public health, safety, and general welfare.
- D) This project is consistent with the General Plan and zoning because a public service facility is a permitted use in all zones, subject to issuance of a special use permit.

Zoning Administrator Notation: Any decision made as a result of this meeting may be appealed to the Board of Supervisors within ten (10) days of the decision. If the tenth day lands on the weekend, the end of the appeal period will be the next working day. The appeal will need to be based on relevant information stated or submitted at or prior to this meeting by a commenting public member or representative, or certain County department heads as stated by County Code. There is a filing fee for the appeal and the fee information is available from Planning and Building Services.

ADJOURN

There being no further business, the meeting adjourns at 10:21 a.m. The next regularly scheduled Zoning Administrator meeting is set for December 14, 2016, at 10:00 a.m. at the Planning & Building Services Conference Room located at 555 Main Street in Quincy.



Randy Wilson, Zoning Administrator



Heidi Wightman, Department Fiscal Officer II