MEMORANDUM

DATE: Thursday, September 8, 2022

TO: Trinity County Planning Commissioners and Members of the Public

FROM: Skylar Fisher, Associate Planner

SUBJECT: Agenda Item 2 - Tentative Parcel Map (P-20-40)

Please find the attached comments received as of September 8, 2022.
My name is Michelle Loegering Myers and I am reading these comments on behalf of Good Year of Weaverville:

Fire protection for Weaverville is essential to your decisions. County of Trinity liability is limited when Tentative Parcel Map conditions provide emergency access and exit, as well as protect existing homes, land and public utilities.

Maintain fire and emergency exit and entrance for Jackass Ridge by continuing the TPM condition for construction of an additional road to Hwy 3, alternate to Mulligan St/Manzanita Dr/Reservoir Road.

The service road to the North Weaverville water reservoir and the water tower are essential to stopping fires. Do not allow an encroachment permit for proposed Parcel A to create a bottleneck between Reservoir Road and the service road.

Select a road category appropriate for through access to the Weaverville water tower and reservoir. Category D is not appropriate for through access.

Only approve East Side Jackass Ridge land splits if access to Hwy 3 is from that side of the ridge.

There is not room for a fire turnaround, on the steep, proposed Parcel A of P-20-40. This lack makes dividing this property ill-advised, as creating the fire turnaround elsewhere hinders neighbors’ properties and adjoining neighborhoods.

Rejecting proposed P-20-40 is logical because it is against the Trinity County General Plan. P-20-40 land is zoned rural residential, and the neighborhoods to the west (which are not shown well on the application maps) are zoned residential. Rural Residential East Jackass Ridge does not share the same characteristics and zoning as residential West Jackass Ridge. Visual comparison of these two areas, along with the numerous complaints filed regarding rural residential land use, show rejecting this proposed parcel split as not having similar characteristics and zoning is appropriate. The proposed land split is NOT congruent with the Trinity County General Plan.

Thank you for fully considering all that is in written comments submitted for P-20-40.
LETTER REGARDING PROPOSED LAND SPLIT BY TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP (TPM) P-20-40 (for APN 024-380-034)

West Jackass Ridge is a residential neighborhood (including the Young, Mulligan and Waterworks Subdivisions). Our subdivisions, and particularly the CC&Rs of the Mulligan Subdivision (Reservoir Road), do not allow Additional Dwelling Units (ADUs) nor mobile/modular homes. The East Jackass Ridge rural residential area, including APN 024-380-034, does not share our existing West Jackass Ridge neighborhood characteristics or zoning. Thus, TPM P-20-40 is not congruent with the General Plan (a reason to deny TPM P-20-40).

APN 024-380-034, created by the Riley Parcel Map, is appropriate as is. The Riley Parcel Map had a 60-80' roadway easement from Hwy 3 to the interior of Parcel 2 (aka APN 024-380-034). Use of this recorded easement removes the need to burden Mulligan St, Manzanita Dr and Reservoir Road (i.e., use Parcel 3’s Labrador Lane or another road to Hwy 3 for proposed Parcel A). Not using the Riley Map easement and forcing use of Mulligan St, Manzanita Dr and Reservoir Road is a detriment to quality of life, homeownership, and home values on West Jackass Ridge.

Mulligan St still allows on-street parking, thus traffic is limited to one-way or is even jammed. A condition of proposed P-20-40: improvement and widening of Mulligan St with designation of no on-street (i.e., on right-of-way) parking.

Reservoir Road is a wide public, paved road and the Category D private aggregate/shale road proposed for P-20-40 does not require paving to connect with Reservoir Road’s pavement which ends well before APN 024-380-036. The County of Trinity Reservoir Road pavement will break at the junction of the dirt road, particularly in wet conditions. Further, Category D is not appropriate to maintain the through access required for the service road and land to the north. The huge difference in road requirements between TMP P-20-40 and the Mulligan Subdivision’s Reservoir Road is an additional reason proposed P-20-40 is not compatible with the Reservoir Road neighborhood.
Page 2: Proposed additional split for APN 024-380-034 (TPM P-20-40)

There is not room for a fire turnaround, on proposed Parcel A of Tentative Parcel Map P-20-40, needed for approval of steep Parcel A. Using any part of Reservoir Road, Mulligan Subdivision or adjoining land to meet the land split requirements is not okay.

Fighting fire using the Jackass Ridge service road and the town reservoir was essential in stopping the four major fires starting on Oregon Mtn and burning to, and toward, Jackass Ridge, as well as other nearby fires. Throught access is essential, yet in 2010 easements were added from APN 024-380-033 and APN 024-380-034, through APN 024-380-036 and across the service road, to the boundary of the Mulligan Subdivision where the owner of APN 024-380-036 has a gate. Rejecting P-20-40 is wise, as the driveway encroachment for proposed Parcel A would create a bottleneck where the service road takes a sharp left from the Reservoir Road easement and the gate.

We are seriously concerned about fire and emergency exit and entrance. The condition for construction of an additional road, alternate to Mulligan St/Manzanita Dr/Reservoir Road, continues as a necessity for a Jackass Ridge land split affecting our neighborhood. This additional road has been a condition for land development/split since 2006-07 for TPM P-06-08. Please maintain this condition, or deny the TMP P-20-40.

Thank you for a decision limiting liability on behalf of the County of Trinity that respects, and keeps safe, our established residential neighborhood and its residents.

Concerned Residents/Owners—West Jackass Ridge
Trinity County Planning Commission

I believe the planning commission should be forward thinking on these items as well as consistent to the application of requirements.

I remember when Mr. Scribner wanted to develop a couple of parcels on top of the ridge and the commission applied conditions for fire exits that ultimately stopped the development. I am not against development and would have loved to own one of those homes if they were built. I don’t believe the fire threat has lessened (quite the opposite), so any more traffic to the Reservoir road should have the same burden to develop.

Sincerely,

David Nelson

Weaverville Ca 96093