

To Whom it May Concern

April 7, 2025

Item 5.A.1

Kurt and Jill Theriault have asked for an opinion as to the effect the proposed zoning change from residential to agriculture/farm use may impact the value of their 2 parcels on the East Shore of Lake Almanor.

Lake Almanor was recently named the #1 location for those seeking mountain homes: with Lake Almanor being the major draw. Note that the Lake Almanor basin is NOT noted for being an agricultural/farming area.

The zoning change will allow up to 18 large animals, hogs, cows, pigs, etc. As a realtor, working in the greater Lake Almanor basin, potential Buyers are seeking vacation lake homes, not farms.

I believe Property Values will decline, resulting in fewer TAX dollars. There are other considerations:

- Plumas County will have to allocate personnel, time and Tax Dollars to deal with the complaints and legal challenges that are very likely to come.
It is my understanding that the parcel has an 18% downslope which is quite significant when considering rain/snow run-off. Ground water contamination is a real possibility with long-term farm use. There is no guarantee that “regenerative farm” practices will be used and no way to guarantee that should the property be sold, it would continue to be used. I wonder if the County is prepared to deal with the issue of farm related ground water contamination.
- 150 ft set back is very minimal. The County nor the Applicant can guarantee there will be no smells. Additionally, farm animals will attract predators, not limited to Wolves, Bear, Mountain Lions & Coyotes, creating additional safety concerns.
- Area property owners will now be wondering if their back yards will also be subject to farm/large animal zoning. Setting a precedent where 1 owner is permitted to benefit at the expense of their neighbors cannot be “walked back”.
- Current owners’ property rights stand to be marginalized at the very least.
- Zoning designations matter. Property owners should be able to rely on them.

I do not have any issue with farm/agricultural activities; I grew up on a 100+ acre cattle ranch that included large and small animals of all kinds.

Sincerely,

M. Lee Ballard GRI, ABR, RSSP

Premiere Agent

DRE 01280147

eXp Realty

Lake Almanor, CA 96137

530-258-6888 Cell

Email: LakeALmanorLee@gmail.com

Ferguson, Tracey

From: Curt Theriault <cntheriault@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 7, 2025 1:24 PM
To: Ferguson, Tracey
Cc: Bruce North; Tina North; Bill Wickman; Sue Wickman; lucindamansell@msn.com; Jill Theriault; Sandy Alford
Subject: 7398 Highway 147 Zoning Change - neighboring F zone lots

CAUTION: This email originated from OUTSIDE THE ORGANIZATION. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Tracey - Please include the letter below to the Plumas County Supervisors

Plumas County Supervisors -

I asked Tracey for the addresses of lots to the south of the proposed 7398 Highway 147 zoning change lot that have been used as a precedent for Zone F lots on the East Shore of Lake Almanor. Tracey provided those addresses to me so I asked one of these neighbors about their lots being zoned F. Many if not all of the lots closest to ours and the Staniger lots are in the Lake Almanor Estates development. This development was designed to include equestrian lots - lots that could support having a couple horses. As these lots were purchased and developed all of the buyers and builders knew that they were on and surrounded by these equestrian capable or now F zoned lots. They knew this before purchasing lots and being part of this development.

This situation is very different then having an established neighborhood all zoned S-1 and then having 1 lot being changed to an F zoned lot. We bought our lots with no neighboring lots being zoned F, if that would have been the case we would not have bought our property and house. To have the possibility of having a directly adjacent lot now be changed to an F zoned lot does not seem fair to us or the equally affected next door neighbors that have all been here for many years.

When I went to check out the Lake Almanor Estate lots mentioned above I didn't see any large farm animals nor any evidence that there were large farm animals currently being housed on the lots in this development. I also noticed that 2 of the properties in this development are for sale.

Curt Theriault
Owner and full time resident of 7246 & 7266 State Highway 147

Ferguson, Tracey

From: Tina North <tnorth8665@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 7, 2025 11:02 AM
To: Ferguson, Tracey
Cc: Bruce North; cntheriault@gmail.com; suewickman@sbcglobal.net; Lucindamansel@msn.com
Subject: Staniger rezoning of 7398 Hwy 147

CAUTION: This email originated from OUTSIDE THE ORGANIZATION. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Tracy

Please present and read this letter at the Board of Supervisors meeting on April 8th 2025

Our names are Bruce and Tina North and are full-time residents at 7194 Hwy 147 Lake Almanor, one of approx. 20 residential sized lots adjacent to the proposed Staniger Farm. None of these lots conform to the current S-1 size requirements so this farm is effectively being established uphill from a residential subdivision (Indian Hills Subdivision III).

The Plumas County Planning Dept. is relying heavily on citations from the 2035 General Plan to promote the approval of this zoning change and also citing letters from 9 different State and Local agencies that apparently have no issues with the zoning change.

The 2035 General Plan also states under Agricultural and Forestry Implementation Measures section 9(a,b) concerning watersheds;

(a) Protection of watersheds will be given a high priority through the implementation of required consideration in land use

decisions.

(b) Support watershed protection and restoration efforts by coordinating with the Upper Feather River Integrated Regional Water Management Plan, the Feather River Coordinated Resource Management Group, Almanor Basin Watershed Advisory Committee and other groups.

Were any of those agencies, groups or committees consulted in this proposal? as I see no letters from any of them, or from the owner of Westwood Beach or from the owners of the two Lakefront public campgrounds directly in the watershed of this project.

All of us residents have seen first hand, the huge amount of runoff during large storms, cutting ditches through our properties, requiring repair and drainage systems to divert the water around our structures. This is currently relatively clean water because of the undisturbed land above us, so I'm really surprised that a constantly disturbed pasture on a steep slope is even being considered since we all know what runs downhill.

Besides all the adverse effects to the neighbors which were completely covered by neighbors letters, a huge issue for me is the constant churning, erosion, contamination and watershedding of farm pastures on an 18% slope, approximately 500 Ft from probably Plumas County's most precious resource - Lake Almanor.

As a final note, from the first Planning Commission Staff Report;

ACTIONS FOR CONSIDERATION

Staff recommends the Planning Commission;

III (B) Adopt the Zoning Ordinance approving the zone change as shown in Exhibit A

Seems very unfair that the County took such a strong position in favor of one party BEFORE two hearings that would expose the near unanimous voices of opposition from the neighbors to this project.

Sincerely

Bruce and Tina North

Tracey: Please include our letter for the April 8, 2025 Board of Supervisors meeting.

Sue and I have a residence at 7178 Highway 147 on the East Shore of Lake Almanor. We purchased our home knowing that we would enjoy the lake and mountains that surround us with neighbors residing for the same purpose. We do not relish the thought that our enjoyment of the area and its tranquility may be disrupted by a zone change to allow farm animals above us. Not only are there elements of disturbance and environmental effect associated with such a change, but our future home value could be drastically impacted.

Our residence is approximately 50 feet from 7398 Highway 147, Lake Almanor (APN 106-010-004-000), impacted by the Zone Change (ZC 9-23/24-01) approved April 8, 2025. The neighbors who have agreed with this letter listed below, are either adjacent or 50 feet from the lot in question. This rezoning, submitted by Jason and Nicole Staniger, adds a 9.0-acre Farm Animal Combining Zone ("F") to the 16.93-acre Suburban ("S-1") parcel for animal husbandry (e.g., horses, cows, pigs up to 100 dB). Planning Director, Tracey Ferguson, response confirmed a CEQA exemption under Guidelines Section 15061(b)(3), citing an initial evaluation with "no potential adverse effects," per the staff report and Resolution.

However, the exemption and rezoning violate the 2035 General Plan's Noise and Land Use Elements, as well as state law. I request the following under the California Public Records Act (Government Code Section 7920.000 et seq.) within 10 days:

1. CEQA Initial Evaluation: The full initial environmental evaluation, including raw noise data, hydrological assessments, biological surveys, and public notice records per CEQA Guidelines Section 15063 (14 Cal. Code Regs. § 15063). The Resolution's Finding 13 (noise at 56 dB from 90-100 dB animals) lacks a noise study—explain how "certainty of no significant effect" was proven without N 3.1.11's required analysis, especially given Berkeley Hillside Preservation v. City of Berkeley (2015) 60 Cal.4th 1086, which demands evidence for exemptions under Section 15061(b)(3).
2. Noise Study: N 3.1.11 mandates a noise study for discretionary projects exceeding General Plan standards (e.g., 55 dB Leq, 75 dB Lmax daytime for residential, Table 3-5; 60 dB CNEL, Figure 22). We are concerned about noise levels given that the Stanigers have opened their natural sound barrier by heavily thinning their property. Please provide the site-specific study or admit its absence, as required by Government Code Section 65457 and Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Board of Supervisors (1990) 52 Cal.3d 553, which voids approvals lacking mandated analyses.
3. Water Quality Data: Finding 10 cites a 150-foot buffer and Title 6, Section 6-10.117, but adjacent "S-1" wells along Highway 147 risk contamination (2022 Sustainability Plan). Please supply hydrological evidence, per Public Resources Code Section 21082 requiring CEQA compliance with local standards.
4. Biological Analysis: Finding 4 references a deer migration corridor (Figure 4.11-2, 2035 EIR) without density data—provide the survey proving no impact, as CEQA Guidelines Section 15064 demands for exemptions.
5. General Plan Consistency: Finding 11 cites PHS-6.8.3, PHS-6.8.5, and AG/FOR-8.4.1, but ignores:
 - LU 1.1.1: "Development... to provide opportunities for... rural, community-oriented living environments." Noise above 55-60 dB disrupts Lake Almanor's character, violating Government Code Section 65302's consistency mandate (Lesher Communications, Inc. v. City of Walnut Creek, 1990, 52 Cal.3d 531).

- LU 1.1.4: Requires findings (fire protection, no zoning conflicts, resource protection) for land-use changes—none are shown, breaching Section 65302.
- N 3.1.3: Bars noise-sensitive uses (my home) near excessive noise unless mitigated (Figure 21)—5-foot setbacks fail N 3.1.10's buffering standard. Provide the full consistency analysis, or it's invalid per Napa Citizens for Honest Government v. Napa County (2001) 91 Cal.App.4th 342.

Having worked with a similar process, the National Environmental Quality Act for over 30 years, we question your actions and use of a CEQA Exemption for this project.

Lastly we strongly object to the Staniger's using a picture of a few goats in a meadow not even associated with their property as a similar use if this zone change goes through.

Bill and Sue Wickman, 7178 Highway 147

We concur with this letter.

Bruce and Tina North, 7194 Highway 147

Curt and Jill Theriault, 7246 & 7266 Highway 147

Lucinda and John Mansell, 7210 Highway

Sandy Alford, 7158 Highway 147