

Washoe County Tahoe Area Plan Summary of Public Comments

Public Comment – Major Themes

1. **The area plan and its relationship with Short-Term Rentals (STRs).**

Nature of the Concern

Short-term rentals are the most frequently raised issue in public input regarding the proposed area plan. Many participants in the public outreach process identified that STRs are the single biggest land use issue facing Incline Village, but they are not mentioned at all in the area plan. The primary concerns with STRs relate to public health and safety and to preservation of neighborhood character. Commenters have stated that the county's recently adopted short-term rental ordinance is insufficient, and that TRPA's intervention is necessary. They ask that the area plan be modified to address STR impacts and to include STR-related policies and standards.

County Response*

The area plan does not alter any standards relating to STRs. The same procedure and requirements that apply currently would continue to apply if the area plan were put into effect. The county recently adopted an ordinance to regulate short-term rentals countywide. Substantial public outreach occurred in the development of this ordinance, including two well-attended workshops in Incline Village. The ordinance is expected to address many public health and safety concerns, such as occupancy, trash, and fire safety. The ordinance will also address parking, which appears to be a large component of the neighborhood character concerns.

The county believes that implementation of the proposed ordinance will resolve many of the issues raised by Incline Village residents. As with any new policy, there needs to be an opportunity to put the standards into effect and observe the results. Should modifications still be needed, these can be made as part of a future ordinance amendment. The county intends to review the ordinance and consider the need for changes in November 2021. Given the substantial public input and current status of the proposed STR ordinance, the county would like an opportunity to see this process through to its completion.

TRPA Staff Response

TRPA does not directly regulate STRs. This has historically been regarded as a local government issue, like business licensing and transient occupancy taxes. In 2019, TRPA did adopt STR neighborhood compatibility criteria into its Performance Review System. This system determines how many residential allocations may be distributed to each local jurisdiction. Jurisdictions that do not adopt standards that promote neighborhood compatibility for STRs would not be eligible to receive their full distribution. For reference, Washoe County has more than 100 unused allocations in its pool, which suggests that the loss of potential future allocations may not be as meaningful to them as it is for other jurisdictions.

Representative Written Comments

- Heirshberg, Diane ([10/20/2019](#))

* These responses represent TRPA interpretation of the county's position based on discussions with county staff.

- Tycer, Ronda ([10/23/2019](#))
- Heirshberg, Diane ([1/29/2020](#))
- Ford, Wayne ([1/30/2020](#))
- Black, Carole ([2/4/2020](#))
- Tycer, Ronda ([2/5/2020](#))
- Todoroff, Pete ([2/21/2020](#))
- Martini, Margaret ([3/3/2020](#))
- Heirshberg, Diane ([3/9/2020](#))
- Black, Carole ([3/10/2020](#))
- Heirshberg, Diane ([3/10/2020](#))
- Tycer, Ronda ([3/10/2020](#))
- Becker, Diane ([2/9/2021](#))

2. The future of the Old Incline Elementary School site.

Nature of the Concern

The Old Incline Elementary School is located at the southwest corner of State Route 28 and Southwood Boulevard. The site is located in the Incline Village Commercial zoning district and is within a Regional Plan-designated Town Center. For the past several years, the site has been used as a park-and-ride for the East Shore Express transit service.

The Transit Master Plan calls for the establishment of two mobility hubs in Incline Village. One of the two hubs is identified as potentially being located at the site of the Old Incline Elementary School. The Tahoe Transportation District (TTD) recently authorized its Executive Director to enter into a purchase agreement with the Washoe County School District to acquire the site. TTD emphasizes that their purchase does not mean a mobility hub will be located on this site. After conducting public outreach in February and March 2021, TTD committed to completing an alternative sites analysis before pursuing development of a mobility hub in Incline Village.

Residents of Incline Village have raised several concerns with the potential for a mobility hub to be located on the site. Amongst the concerns raised are the following:

- Location – Commenters feel that the location is inappropriate due to existing haphazard street parking and traffic/congestion along Southwood Boulevard. There are other locations they feel that should be considered. Rather than placing a mobility hub in the center of Incline Village, for example, TTD could focus on establishing mobility hubs to intercept traffic coming from outside the basin (e.g., at Mount Rose or Spooner Summit).
- Need – Commenters feel that the need for the mobility hub is being generated by tourists seeking to access the East Shore Trail and Sand Harbor and not by the residents or workforce of Incline Village. They feel that Incline Village should not have to house the parking for these uses and deal with their impacts. Some feel that since Sand Harbor is generating the parking demand, they should expand on-site parking.
- Desired Use – Commenters have expressed that the community does not want a parking lot and bus hub in the center of town. Instead, they note that the community would like to see the

development of workforce housing or some type of commercial or mixed-use development that would create a walkable town center.

County Response*

The area plan recognizes the potential for a mobility hub to be located at the Old Incline Elementary School. The plan, however, does not require that a mobility hub be at this location. Under the proposed zoning (Incline Village Commercial), the old elementary school could still be used for workforce housing or mixed-use development. The county is committed to collaborating with TTD on conducting further outreach to determine the future of the Old Incline Elementary School and to develop a plan for transit in Incline Village. Among the commitments that the county has made to future work are the following:

- *Action LU-4: Update Land Use Concept Plans*
Work with the community and TRPA to update the concept plans in this area plan for the mixed-use and tourist regulatory zones. (Note: the Incline Village Commercial district includes the Old Elementary School site in its concept plan).
- *Action T-4: Short-Range Transit Plan*
Develop a short-range transit plan focused on the Incline Village and Crystal Bay areas.
- *Action T-5: Parking Management Plan*
Work with TRPA and the Truckee North Tahoe Transportation Management Association to develop and implement a comprehensive approach to parking management in the planning area.
- *Action IM-6: Best Practices for Recreational Uses*
Work with stakeholders to identify strategies to ensure that recreational uses are permitted and operated according to best practices for minimizing traffic, reducing pollution and nuisances, and improving safety and general community compatibility.

TRPA Staff Response

Mobility hubs are envisioned to be a major component of future transit improvements in the Tahoe Basin. In October 2019, the Regional Plan Implementation Committee held an informational session on the Washoe County Tahoe Area Plan. At that time, they asked that the plan be revised to incorporate the mobility hub concept and ensure that mobility hubs were not precluded. Several revisions to the plan were made in response and were publicized in the January 2020 draft of the plan. As indicated above, the area plan does not require that a mobility hub be located at the Old Incline Elementary School.

Many of the community's concerns around transit, parking, and conceptual land uses in the Incline Village Commercial Town Center would be addressed through future county actions as part of implementation of the area plan. The county has expressed a commitment to take future actions to implement the area plan once it is adopted.

Under both current and proposed standards, establishing a mobility hub at the Old Incline Elementary School will require that TTD obtain a Special Use Permit from TRPA. As part of a Special Use Permit, project-specific impacts would be considered and appropriate mitigation would be developed.

* These responses represent TRPA interpretation of the county's position based on discussions with county staff.

Additionally, a noticed public hearing would be required. The Special Use Permit could only be approved if TTD can demonstrate that the mobility hub would not adversely affect compliance with threshold standards.

Representative Written Comments

- Tycer, Ronda ([2/17/2020](#))
- Tycer, Ronda ([2/18/2020](#))
- Becker, Diane ([2/9/2021](#))
- Ford, Wayne ([2/12/2021](#))

3. Front setbacks on steeply sloping and corner lots.

Nature of the Concern

Present Washoe County Development Code standards require a minimum 15-foot front setback for steeply sloping lots (> 20 percent slope on the front half of the lot). Corner lots are required to provide front setbacks of 10, 15, 20, or 30 feet depending on the zoning. The proposed development standards would allow front setbacks to be reduced to 0 feet, subject to certain criteria. Several commenters have identified the following concerns with this proposal:

- This approach would eliminate the current practice of holding noticed public hearings at the Board of Adjustments to approve a setback variance. Public hearings are important, because they provide the community an opportunity to weigh in on variance requests through the citizens' advisory board and at the public hearing. A variance that may be appropriate for one property may not be appropriate for another.
- The proposal may not comply with NRS 287.315, which appears to require a noticed public hearing before a public board or hearings officer to make a "special exception."
- The proposal would no longer require a landowner to demonstrate that a hardship exists to receive approval. In many cases, the only hardship is that the landowner wants to build a home that is too large for the lot. This is not adequate justification to reduce the front setback.
- Allowing 0-foot front setbacks can create parking problems, particularly where roadways are narrow. Often, the proposal is to place a garage at the front property line, leaving no place for guest parking. Reliance on street parking is problematic, especially in winter.
- Allowing 0-foot front setbacks can create a "tunnel effect," degrading a neighborhood's scenic quality.

County Response*

A variance is an exception to development code standards which is necessitated due to special circumstances on a specific property. Often, the special circumstance is a hardship related to parcel shape or topography. In these cases, a variance would be needed in order to allow a property owner to enjoy the same rights as other similarly situated properties. Because of the geography of Incline Village, virtually all remaining vacant lots are constrained by such things as steep slopes. In practice, the county regards all lots with slopes of more than 20 percent as falling within the "hardship" criteria warranting variance approval.

* These responses represent TRPA interpretation of the county's position based on discussions with county staff.

Obtaining a variance can be a substantial undertaking for a landowner. In addition to application fees that exceed \$1,500, setting a hearing before the Board of Adjustments can affect the construction schedule. In some cases, variances are appealed to the Board of County Commissioners, which results in further costs and delays.

Washoe County's current ordinance standards provides setback reductions for accessory structures on steeply sloping and corner lots. The proposed ordinance would expand this provision to also cover primary structures. The proposal helps to streamline permitting by allowing landowners of corner and steeply sloping lots in Incline Village to proceed directly to the building permit stage without requiring a variance.

The county does not anticipate significant issues to result from this modified process for the following reasons:

- An engineer will review all proposals to ensure there are no issues with sight distance or effect on plans for future road widening.
- A minimum of 15 feet will still be required from the edge of pavement to the structure, which could be used for guest parking.
- As they do with all building permits for new structures, the North Lake Tahoe Fire Protection District will review the plans for fire safety compliance.

In response to concerns raised by local residents, the county has modified the proposed ordinance to require neighboring property owner noticing when the proposal for reduced setbacks involves a primary structure. This will ensure that property owners affected by such setback reductions would have an opportunity to register their objections and potentially cause a public hearing to occur on appeal. Washoe County presently uses this same administrative review procedure for accessory dwelling units.

The proposed code provision establishes 0-foot setbacks automatically when certain objective criteria are met. As such, this procedure is ministerial. It would not constitute the granting of "special exceptions," which are granted discretionarily on a case-by-case basis. As such, the county does not anticipate a conflict with NRS 278.315.

TRPA Staff Response

Local governments have historically determined the appropriate front, rear, and side building setbacks. Additionally, the procedure for approving waivers of these setbacks has also been solely in the purview of local governments. TRPA standards are largely silent on the issue of setbacks. The Code of Ordinances contains only the following setback provisions:

- Subsection 36.5.4, *Setback Standards*, requires a minimum 20-foot setback for development abutting a roadway in TRPA's scenic resource inventory (e.g. State Route 28 and Mount Rose Highway), unless the setback is waived following a specified procedure.
- Subsection 53.9.3, *SEZ Setbacks*, establishes minimum setbacks of between 15 and 50 feet for stream environment zones based on the characteristics of the waterbody and the condition of the slope.

The proposed reduced setback provision for sloping and corner lots would not affect either of these TRPA standards.

Representative Written Comments

- Ford, Wayne ([2/5/2020](#))
- Ford, Wayne ([2/12/2020](#))
- Ford, Wayne ([2/13/2020](#))
- Ford, Wayne ([2/18/2020](#))
- Ford, Wayne ([2/23/2020](#))
- Ford, Wayne (2/26/2020) [[1](#)] [[2](#)]
- Conrad, Wayne ([3/3/2020](#))
- Ford, Wayne ([3/6/2020](#))
- Ford, Wayne ([3/7/2020](#))
- Heirshberg, Diane ([3/9/2020](#))
- Ford, Wayne (3/10/2020) [[1](#)] [[2](#)]

4. **Public outreach on the area plan.**

Nature of the Concern

Several community members feel that the public outreach process with the area plan was insufficient. They feel that additional community meetings should be held in Incline Village before the plan is adopted.

County Response*

The county conducted substantial public outreach since this effort was first begun nearly 14 years ago. The following is a summary of public meetings where the area plan was discussed, and feedback was provided since 2013:

- Public Workshops:
 - February 21, 2013
 - April 24, 2014
 - September 28, 2016
 - December 9, 2019
- Citizens' Advisory Board Meetings:
 - October 2016
 - March 2017
 - July 2017
 - November 2018
 - March 2019
 - September 2019[†]
- Incline Village General Improvement District Board of Directors – June 19, 2019
- Incline Village / Crystal Bay Visitor's Bureau – January 15, 2020

The county followed its standard approach to public outreach with this area plan, as it does for its other long-range plans. The approach complies with the requirements in the Washoe County

* These responses represent TRPA interpretation of the county's position based on discussions with county staff.

[†] There was no quorum at this meeting. Nonetheless, an informal discussion on the area plan was held with those in attendance.

Development Code and the Nevada Revised Statutes. Feedback from the last workshop, held in December 2019, resulted in modifications that the county incorporated into the proposed plan.

TRPA Response

In contrast to community plans, which have a specific outreach process outlined in Chapter 12, *Community Plans*, of the Code of Ordinances, requirements for public outreach are not explicitly established in Chapter 13, *Area Plans*. Instead, Subparagraph 13.6.2.A specifies that “the lead agency shall follow its own review procedures for [master/general] plan amendments.” Nonetheless, that same subparagraph lays out an expectation that the plan “be prepared in coordination with local residents, stakeholders, public agencies with jurisdictional authority within the proposed Area Plan boundaries, and TRPA staff.”

Public outreach for the area plan has followed the county’s standard practices for master plan and regulatory zone amendments. County staff conducted several meetings with the community focused on visioning and soliciting feedback on plan proposals. They also solicited comments from stakeholders and public agencies, which included meetings with both the Incline Village General Improvement District (IVGID) and the Incline Village Crystal Bay Visitors’ Bureau. Since August 2019, TRPA staff has been working closely with county staff to ensure that plan contents comply with Regional Plan goals and policies. Feedback from public agencies, TRPA staff, and the general public has resulted in many positive changes to the area plan.

In response to confusion about the proposal and requests for interactive maps that were raised at the December 2019 workshop, TRPA worked with Washoe County staff to establish a “story map” webpage in January 2020: <http://bit.do/TahoePlan>. This site helps to explain the area plan proposal and provide additional transparency.

Representative Written Comments

- Heirshberg, Diane ([10/20/2019](#))
- Black, Carole ([2/4/2020](#))
- Ford, Wayne ([2/14/2020](#))
- Todoroff, Pete ([2/21/2020](#))
- Ford, Wayne ([2/25/2020](#))
- Heirshberg, Diane ([3/9/2020](#))
- Black, Carole ([3/10/2020](#))
- Becker, Diane ([2/9/2021](#))

5. Impacts from additional height and density in Town Centers.

Nature of the Concern

Several community members are concerned that the area plan allowing additional height (up to 56 feet) and additional residential density (up to 25 units per acre) would create cumulative traffic impacts and impacts on public facilities and services. Some have also raised aesthetic concerns from the additional height.

County Response*

The county has chosen to adopt the Town Center incentives prescribed by the Regional Plan in order to encourage these areas to redevelop. Redevelopment of the Town Centers will be subject to the design standards and guidelines, which were written to ensure high-quality design that fits with the “New Tahoe” aesthetic. The standards consider such things as massing, articulation, and transitional height to ensure that building design will maintain compatibility with the community’s vision. Future development will be subject to an appropriate environmental review and permitting process that will consider site conditions and compatibility on a case-by-case basis.

It’s important to note that the Town Center incentives will not increase overall growth. They will just restructure how that growth occurs, by focusing it within the designated Town Centers. Existing growth management capacity limitations in the Tahoe Basin will continue to apply.

TRPA Response

While overall growth will be constrained by TRPA’s growth control system, the incentives will encourage that growth to be focused in designated Town Centers. TRPA strongly supports Washoe County’s desire to implement Town Center redevelopment incentives. Much of the existing development in Town Centers does not comply with modern design and stormwater management requirements. The Regional Plan envisions Town Center redevelopment as a means of achieving water quality and scenic improvements and restructuring land uses in a manner that reduces automobile dependence. When compared with “business as usual” growth scenarios, focusing growth in Town Centers provides numerous benefits, including reduced vehicle miles travelled. Vehicle miles travelled will be reduced as land use patterns are reshaped to promote walking, bicycling, and transit.

Representative Written Comments

- Heirshberg, Diane ([1/29/2020](#))
- Todoroff, Pete ([2/21/2020](#))
- Heirshberg, Diane ([3/9/2020](#))
- Becker, Diane ([2/9/2021](#))

* These responses represent TRPA interpretation of the county’s position based on discussions with county staff.

Public Comment – Individual Topics

SUMMARIZED COMMENT	SUMMARIZED RESPONSE*	COMMENTER
(1) Development Rights. The merging of development rights pools may allow TAUs to be used in residential areas.	Development rights may only be used on permissible uses. A merged development rights pools does not affect which uses are permissible in each area. Because most residential areas do not allow hotels, motels, or timeshares, TAUs would not be used in those areas.	Tycer, Ronda 10/23/2019
(2) Building Height – Town Centers. A strict interpretation of the transitional building height standards could impact potential redevelopment plans for the Cal Neva site.	The transitional height standard applies to development abutting the Town Center boundary. The intent of the standard is to gradually reduce heights where Town Centers meet residential and conservation areas by stepping back the third and fourth floors. Any structures constructed along Cal Neva’s eastern and southern boundaries would need to comply with the transitional height standard. Any buildings beyond these structures (i.e. further from the Town Center boundary) would not be required to meet the transitional height standard.	Exline, Nick 1/28/2020 1/30/2020
(3) Regulatory Zone Names. The regulatory zones are named after the underlying subdivisions, but the boundaries are different. This creates confusion.	The county has added some clarifying language to the area plan and has replaced the term “neighborhood” with the term “regulatory zone” to help avoid confusion. The names of the proposed regulatory zones have been carried through from TRPA’s 1987 plan area statements. The area plan has no effect on the underlying subdivisions or their covenants, conditions, and restrictions (CC&Rs).	Tycer, Ronda 10/23/2019 Ford, Wayne 2/14/2020 Todoroff, Pete 2/21/2020
(4) Environmental Review. An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) should be prepared.	The county prepared an initial environmental checklist (IEC) in accordance with TRPA’s requirements. The IEC concluded that the area plan will not result in significant impacts that were not already analyzed in the EIS for the Regional Plan Update. Because no significant impacts were identified, an EIS for the area plan is not required.	Black, Carole 2/4/2020 3/10/2020

* These responses represent TRPA interpretation of the county’s position based on discussions with county staff.

SUMMARIZED COMMENT	SUMMARIZED RESPONSE*	COMMENTER
(5) Community Character and Vision. The character and vision described in the area plan are not accurate and should be revised.	The character and vision descriptions in Chapter 1 of the area plan were based upon input received at the workshops held between 2013 and 2016. In response to more recent feedback, these have been updated to characterize the community’s struggle with balancing tourism with the needs of residents.	Tyser, Ronda 2/5/2020 Todoroff, Pete 2/21/2020
(6) Driveway Width Standards. Changing the driveway width standards will result in non-conformities and will impact fire safety.	The area plan is not making changes to driveway width standards. The standards currently in effect will remain in effect. As is current practice, the county will continue to refer building permits to the North Lake Tahoe Fire Protection District for review and approval with respect to fire safety requirements.	Ford, Wayne 2/13/2020 [1] [2]
(7) Funding of Capital Improvements. The plan proposes many capital improvements, but funding for these improvements is not guaranteed.	An area plan is not the vehicle for appropriating funds for capital improvements. Capital improvement programming is typically done annually by the primary implementing agencies. Capital improvement programs typically only consider the next five years. Since the area plan is sets a 20-year horizon, it can be used as a reference for future capital improvement programming.	Heirshberg, Diane 1/29/2020 Todoroff, Pete 2/21/2020
(8) Building Height. The plan appears to prefer calculating height limits using segmented height rather than unified height. There are circumstances where unified height is better.	Chapter 37 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances provides two ways of calculating building height – assessing height of the structure as a whole (“unified”), or dividing the building in up to three segments for the purposes of assessing height (“segmented”). This standard would continue to apply to all areas under the area plan, except for Town Centers where additional height is allowed. The standard provides an option and does not favor one way of calculating height over the other.	Ford, Wayne 2/25/2020

SUMMARIZED COMMENT	SUMMARIZED RESPONSE*	COMMENTER
<p>(9) Missing Plan Components. The plan appears to be missing certain components, namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A map showing the area plan boundaries. • A map showing regional transit routes and stops. 	<p>These maps have been added to the latest version of the area plan.</p>	<p>League to Save Lake Tahoe 1/7/2020</p>
<p>(10) Coverage Reduction and Stormwater Management. The plan’s approach to coverage reduction and stormwater management in the Town Centers is unclear.</p>	<p>Additional language has been provided in Chapter 2 under the “Town Centers” heading to clarify the approach. The plan requires sites with excess coverage to reduce coverage as part of a project. Additionally, TRPA’s transfer program provides a mechanism to reduce coverage in stream environment zones. With respect to stormwater management, the county has chosen not to pursue an integrated stormwater management program for the Town Centers. Instead, each parcel will be responsible for meeting its stormwater control obligations on-site, as is current practice.</p>	<p>League to Save Lake Tahoe 1/7/2020</p>
<p>(11) Threshold Gain. It is unclear how the plan will result in threshold gain in the Town Centers.</p>	<p>Additional language has been provided in Chapter 2 under the “Town Centers” heading to clarify how threshold gain will occur. Redevelopment of Town Centers is anticipated to result in direct water quality improvements, as redeveloped sites install Best Management Practices (BMPs). Additionally, redevelopment of Town Centers should result in scenic threshold improvements as non-conforming signs and structures with non-conforming design will be replaced with structures that adhere to design standards and guidelines.</p>	<p>League to Save Lake Tahoe 1/7/2020</p>
<p>(12) Residential Character. The plan’s approach to ensuring the preservation of neighborhood character is unclear.</p>	<p>The plan’s approach to preserving residential character is to carry through existing permissible use and density standards. In accordance with Policy LU8-6, any future amendments to the area plan that affect residential areas should only be done with the interest of preserving the character of those areas.</p>	<p>League to Save Lake Tahoe 1/7/2020</p>

SUMMARIZED COMMENT	SUMMARIZED RESPONSE*	COMMENTER
<p>(13) Requests for Additional Components. The county is encouraged to add the following to the plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A map showing the geographic boundaries of the 27 zones. • Expansion of the greenhouse gas reduction standard to apply to all new development. • Requiring improvements in support of multi-modal transportation as part of a development project. • Requiring bicycle parking. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maps for the individual regulatory zones are included in the Development Code. • The county does not wish to expand the greenhouse gas reduction standard to apply to all new development. This can result in significant development costs, and the proposal has not been discussed with the public. • In the latest revision of the plan, a new standard (Site Design Standard D) has been added to the Design Guidelines and Standards to require multi-modal improvements. • In the latest revision of the plan, a new guideline (Parking Guideline 5) has been added in reference to bicycle parking. Current Washoe County parking standards also require one bicycle parking space for every 20 required vehicle parking spaces. 	<p>League to Save Lake Tahoe 1/7/2020</p>
<p>(14) Alignment with Transportation Plans. Some projects were listed in the area plan but are not listed in the Active Transportation Plan (ATP) or Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).</p>	<p>The area plan has endeavored to line up with the ATP and RTP. However, these plans do not operate on the same timeline. The RTP focus on improvements that will occur over the next five years. In contrast the area plan envisions improvements on a 20-year planning horizon. The projects that are listed in the area plan may be considered for inclusion in a future ATP or RTP. The latest revision of the area plan should include all relevant projects currently listed in the ATP and RTP. Both the ATP and RTP will be updated over the coming year, and TRPA plans to align these plans with projects listed in the area plan.</p>	<p>League to Save Lake Tahoe 1/7/2020</p>

SUMMARIZED COMMENT	SUMMARIZED RESPONSE*	COMMENTER
<p>(15) Timing of Reno – North Tahoe Transit Service. Establishing service between Reno and North Tahoe is important. Since it's listed for long-term implementation, there should be some consideration for doing a scaled-down project in the short-term.</p>	<p>The plan identifies two relevant projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project T-42, <i>Reno -North Tahoe Transit Service</i> • Project C-14, <i>Inter-Regional Transit Service</i> <p>Project T-42 is based on former community plan policies and its scheduling (6-10 years) aligns with the Long-Range Transit Plan. Washoe County's Regional Transportation Commission (WCRTC) is anticipated to be the lead for this project.</p> <p>Project C-14 is an EIP project and its scheduling is based on the current EIP schedule. TTD is the designated lead agency.</p> <p>The area plan's implementation schedule is based on the current schedules shown in the Long-Range Transit Plan and the EIP.</p> <p>The WCRTC has been working on a pilot version of this service for implementation in the Summer of 2021.</p>	<p>League to Save Lake Tahoe 1/7/2020</p>
<p>(16) Performance Metrics. The county should consider setting performance metrics specific to the area plan.</p>	<p>The county intends to rely on the area plan's performance metrics at this time. In the future, the county may consider developing plan-specific metrics as part of an area plan amendment.</p>	<p>League to Save Lake Tahoe 1/7/2020</p>
<p>(17) Trail setback for wireless facilities. The plan appears to delete an existing provision requiring a 1,000-foot trail setback for new cell towers.</p>	<p>Article 324 in the Washoe County Development Code includes a provision that requires a 1,000-foot trail setback for cellular monopoles, unless certain criteria are met. The provisions in Article 324 will continue to apply without change. The design requirements in Article 220 (the area plan's development code component) apply in addition to Article 324, not in place.</p>	<p>Heirshberg, Diane 3/9/2020 Black, Carole 3/10/2020</p>

SUMMARIZED COMMENT	SUMMARIZED RESPONSE*	COMMENTER
<p>(18) Incline Village Commercial concept plan. The Incline Village Commercial concept plan (Map 2.4) was added to the plan without community knowledge. This is problematic, because it shows public service use at the Old Incline Village Elementary School site, which is inconsistent with zoning and the community's wishes for the site.</p>	<p>The Incline Village Commercial concept plan (Map 2.4) was carried over from the existing Incline Village Commercial Community Plan. The community plan was adopted in 1996 and is currently in effect. This map appeared in drafts of the plan since October 2019. It's important to note that Washoe County's approach has been to carry over the concept plans from the community plans for the time being. These plans, however, are proposed to be updated as part of a public engagement process (see Action LU-4).</p>	<p>Becker, Diane 2/9/2021</p>
<p>(19) Traffic and parking mitigation. The plan includes no mitigation for additional parking and traffic that will be generated by the Town Center incentives (additional height, density, and coverage).</p>	<p>Each subsequent project in the Town Centers will be subject to TRPA permits and must demonstrate compliance with the area plan. Under the proposed Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT) framework, each project will be responsible to quantify and mitigate VMT. Each project will also have to meet the parking requirements established in the Design Standards (Appendix B to the area plan).</p>	<p>Becker, Diane 2/9/2021</p>
<p>(20) Involvement of Incline Village and Crystal Bay residents. Goal IM-2 seeks to establish cooperation among stakeholders. Residents should be included as stakeholders.</p>	<p>The county's intention is to include Incline Village and Crystal Bay residents as part of stakeholder outreach. This is typically done through the Incline Village / Crystal Bay Citizens Advisory Board. This is the county's current process, and it will continue after adoption of the area plan.</p>	<p>Becker, Diane 2/9/2021</p>
<p>(21) Workforce housing. The plan should include an action to review the zoning at the Old Incline Elementary School site to make sure it doesn't preclude workforce housing.</p>	<p>The current and proposed zoning of the Old Incline Village Elementary School site would allow for workforce housing.</p>	<p>Becker, Diane 2/9/2021</p>

