

Miranda Bacon

From: Katie Bath <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, December 18, 2023 7:24 PM
To: Public Comments
Subject: Variance Request 131 Glenwood

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

Good evening,

My name is Katie Adams and my husband and I reside at 142 Glenwood Ave. in Grass Valley. I am unable to attend the meeting as my husband is working nights. And I work early for Nevada County animal control. Though we are unable to make it I did want to bring a question forward, to both the city and the Hospitality House.

Due to the adding of beds/units causes increased traffic of not only residents, guests, employees, county social workers which is significant traffic. But the contractors, city employees and emergency personnel tending to residents at the home as well brings concern to the condition of the road. There is also city infrastructure beneath the road that may be damaged by the continued traffic.

My question is would the city be willing to turn Glenwood Ave into a city street? To aid in the maintenance and stability of the road and aid the residents and operations of Hospitality House with fulfilling their duties to their residents.

Our home has been in my husbands family for over 50 years and this has always been a residential road. The rest home when previously owned always had 10 residents or less and there was nowhere near the traffic the road has now.

If the city is not willing to turn the road into a city street and aid with paving and maintenance. I want to make a point that if the Hospitality House were to be granted this variance, that they agree in writing to pave and maintain the road due to the main source of the traffic coming from their establishment.

I hope you please take into account the thoughts and concerns of us in the neighborhood whose property values have already been affected by a homeless shelter moving in without warning. We would really appreciate the necessary action being taken to correct the previous and continuous wear damaging the road.

Please respond to confirm that you have received my email.

Thank you and Happy Holidays,

Daniel and Katie Adams
142 Glenwood Ave.

Miranda Bacon

From: Nicholas Koch Correia <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, December 19, 2023 1:11 PM
To: Public Comments
Subject: Opposition to Proposed Subsidized Housing Facility Expansion (APN 035-270-035)

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Members of the Grass Valley Planning Commission,

This letter is a supplement to my previous letter in opposition to the above referenced proposed 27 residential units development. In addition to the points of opposition in my letter of 12/12/23, I am hereby raising the following additional opposition concerns:

1. Environmental Status: Your December 19, 2023 Staff Report for Application #23PLN-28 for "Development Review and Variance Request for the Sierra Guest Home Expansion, for a total of 27 Rooms, Including Two Full Apartment Units for Supportive Housing Use Consistent With State Requirements":
 - a. States: at page 1 "Data Summary: Environmental Status: Categorical Exemption".
 - b. States at page 4 "Environmental Determination - The Variance request qualifies for a Categorical Exemption pursuant to Section 15305 Class 5 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Guidelines. A Class 5 Categorical Exemption consists of minor alterations to land use limitations where the site has an average slope not exceeding 20% and there is no change in land use density (emphasis added)...."
 - c. The County of Nevada Parcel Report (as of 11/27/23 included with the Planning Commission report) lists the parcel 035-270-035's Acreage as 0.20.
 - i. Therefore, the site's current density is: 75 dwelling units per acre (15 current dwelling units ÷ 0.20 acres = 75 dwelling units per acre).
 - ii. The site's proposed density is: 135 dwelling units per acre (27 proposed dwelling units ÷ 0.20 acres = 135 dwelling units per acre).
 - d. This development is proposing a change in land use density from 15 to 27 dwelling units per 0.20 acre. Thus the proposed Variance Request #23PLN-28 does not qualify for a Categorical Exemption pursuant to CEQA and its Guidelines because there is a substantial proposed change in dwelling units per acre land use density.
2. Parking Congestion: Current parking for this development seems to consist of across-the-street approximately seven unpainted spaces posted with "no parking - Sierra only" signs. There does not seem to be any additional on-site parking on the proposed project's site plan. The proposed development's minimal parking seems inadequate given the proposed increased density not only of residents but also of visiting doctors, health personnel, family and friends, custodians, plus facility management. This lack of adequate parking will result in on-street parking congestion which seems an unfair burden to impose on the other residents of our neighborhood/street.
3. Design Concerns: Also, I suggest further consideration of the following tenant issues:
 - a. Lack of adequate number of toilets for proposed elderly in need of supportive housing: The site plan shows 25 non-apartment residential units for seniors with ten available toilets. This seems inadequate given the target population, many of

whom may or will suffer from incontinence. More toilets would seem a humane requirement.

b. The dwelling units are very small: They range from 92 to 138 square feet, with approximately 100 square feet being the typical dwelling unit size. When a bed and closet are installed, there will be very little living space within individual units.

c. Lack of adequate open space for tenant use/enjoyment: The proposed 20 foot rear extension of the building would seem to eliminate the site's current rear open space and will deprive the residents of their yard space to sit outside.

4. Relocation Payments Due to Displaced Tenants: The subject report at page 2, paragraph 6 "Project description", references "...abatement of lead and asbestos within the existing structure." Certainly residents will need to be relocated and housed elsewhere during the lead and asbestos remediation work. However, the subject report does not address whether and how tenant relocation will be addressed nor how the lead and asbestos will be environmentally disposed of.

5. Possible Payment of State and/or Federal Prevailing Wages: The subject report does not address whether the proposed work will utilize public funds either from the State of California and/or the federal government and if so, whether the project will pay the required State Prevailing Wages or the federal Davis Bacon Prevailing Wages.

6. Lack of Meeting Notice to Neighborhood Residents: Finally, let me note my disappointment that the Grass Valley Planning Commission did not provide me with actual notice of this meeting's proposed action nor did they provide me with notice of the, (as stated in page 4's Findings #2), Grass Valley Development Review Committee November 14, 2023 meeting to review the project's application. I learned of this meeting via a discussion with a concerned neighbor. In fairness, neighbors within 300 feet of important land use proposed sites should be given actual notice of public meetings via mail or email.

Sincerely,
Nicholas Correia

P.S. Please redact my phone number and address from my December 12, 2023 letter that has been posted on your website. Thank you.