

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY  
REGIONAL PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

Via GoToWebinar

July 29, 2021

**Meeting Minutes**

I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Chair Mr. Yeates called the meeting to order at 8:36 a.m.

Members present: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Bruce, Mr. Friedrich, Ms. Gustafson, Mr. Lawrence, Mr. Yeates

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Yeates deemed the agenda approved as posted.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Aldean provided Ms. Ambler with minor clerical edits and moved approval of the June 23, 2021 minutes as amended.

Motion carried.

IV. Item 3: Discussion and possible recommendation for approval of Phase 1 Housing Code Amendments to the TRPA Code of Ordinances related to: **a)** Bonus Unit Boundary, including amendments to Chapter 52; **b)** Non-conforming density, including amendments to Chapter 31; **c)** Accessory Dwelling Units, including amendments to Chapters 21, 31, 39, 50, 51, 52 and 90, Meyers, Tahoe Valley and Tourist Core Area Plans, and Rules of Procedure Section 12; **d)** Development Rights Strategic Initiative Code Clean-Up: Potential Residential Units of Use and Bonus Unit Pools, including amendments to Chapters 51 and 52

TRPA staff Ms. Bettinger provided the presentation.

Ms. Bettinger said staff is back here today with Phase one of the Housing Code Amendments which they presented last month with the request for a motion to recommend approval to the governing Board of the amendments and the findings. These housing related amendments emerged out of consultation with the Tahoe living housing and Community revitalization working group which is a committee of the APC.

The amendments are focused on addressing the serious housing shortages that we're facing in the basin today. Staff went over these in quite a bit of detail in the presentation last month. Today's presentation will be at a high level with what the concrete elements of the proposal are. They will emphasize what's different this time and answers to questions that came up in prior hearings.

## REGIONAL PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

July 29, 2021

This proposal is to encourage and allow more workforce housing types and is fully within the growth caps and the development pattern identified in the Regional Plan and 2020 Regional Transportation Plan. The impacts of that growth have been analyzed.

This proposal moves forward policy changes that further implement the goals of the Regional Plan such as encouraging more walkable neighborhoods and centers, providing sufficient housing to meet local and regional housing goals and providing housing that is sized appropriately for local workers and residents.

At the last presentation, they discussed the missing middle workshop that they held a few months back and how this amendment package supports those concepts, which was often that they see the overlay of multiple regulations end up leading to larger homes that aren't very affordable to local residents. An example of that is that they wanted to look at how the size of homes in Tahoe has changed over time. They obtained some GIS data from the County Assessors to come up with examples that you see on this slide four. What they're seeing play out in Tahoe is that people really maximize the total building envelope that they have available. Especially in areas where single family is the only residential option that's allowed, they're seeing it result in much larger homes than they've historically seen in the basin. That's not to say that there is not a need for larger homes. But the needs assessments that they've done over time and throughout the Basin have shown that the majority of homes needed are really in the studio to two bedroom size range. The median size home has increased pretty significantly over the past 50 years or so.

As part of addressing that overall issue, they are trying to increase the amount and diversity of housing options and the other Regional Plan goals. This has resulted in the development of the Phase one Housing Code amendments.

The first element of the proposal is to expand the bonus unit boundary to encompass previous planning efforts. First, is the Regional Transportation Plan. Second, is the town centers from the 2012 Regional Plan, and third is the existing multi-family zones which much of the affordable housing is already located in and these overlap with the community priorities that were analyzed in the in the Regional Transportation Plan.

(Slide 5) These maps are showing the different boundaries that we are expanding the bonus units to. First is the half mile from transit buffer which is our existing bonus unit boundary. Second is the half mile from town center buffer, and third is the multi-family zones. This map in green is showing that total area.

(Slide 6) This slide is illustrating the environmental analysis and the new areas of the proposed bonus unit boundary are shown in orange. They align quite well with the low trip length traffic analysis zones which are areas with trip lengths that are less than or equal to the average.

Encouraging more development in areas that are at or below the average trip length contribute to bringing the overall average down. Trip lengths are closely correlated with VMT.

The next code change would allow non-conforming tourist density to be converted and used for multi residential redevelopment on-site, as long as multi residential development is an allowed use in that location.

## REGIONAL PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

July 29, 2021

Under the current code, a hotel owner with the tourist density over what is currently allowed can redevelop and keep all of those units on site if they redevelop and keep the tourist use. But if they want to redevelop to residential then they have to comply with residential densities, which are generally much lower than tourists, and much lower than some of the non-conforming tourists.

The proposed change would allow these tourist units to be redeveloped on-site as residential density. A question came up offline, does this create more residential development? It does not. Under existing code, they allow conversion of development rights from one type to another. Tourist units can convert to multi residential at a ratio of 1:1.5, and under the existing code, all 17 of these units could be converted to 25 multi-family residential units. That does not change. What changes is how many units can be used on site. Under the existing code, in the example shown, the owner would only have been able to develop six of these units on site, then they would have to bank and transfer off 19 of the residential units. But under the proposed code, they could build 17 of these units on-site as multi residential then bank and transfer off the remaining units. It's important to note here that if a hotel owner decides to redevelop to residential and they want to deed restrict these new units to affordable, moderate, or achievable, they can receive bonus units at no cost from the TRPA pool. If they want to sell off the original development rights that they now have, this can help the project pencil financially.

Because the conversion of tourist units to multi residential was already analyzed during the development rights strategic initiative, and environmentally neutral conversion rates were developed. The Environmental impacts of allowing the same number of multi residential units on a site as there are existing tourist units has already been analyzed. However, they did want to check and see where these units would go, specifically if these units would go into areas where they want to encourage and incentivize development.

Using their GIS data, they wanted to see whether there is an existing tourist development outside of the proposed bonus unit boundary that would be eligible to take advantage of this specific code change. They found that there wasn't any. In summary, all tourist developments that exist today that would be eligible for this code change, are within the bonus unit boundary. Attachment B shows the proposed code changes and track changes. After the change that expands a non-conforming tourist density can be used as residential density. We also added another section to clarify that non-conforming residential density can also be redeveloped and keep the non-conforming residential units.

This has already been the practice and the code interpretation that they wanted to codify as part of this amendment package.

The next code change is to allow accessory dwelling units on all residential parcels regardless of size, accessory dwelling units are commonly referred to as secondary units or mother-in-law units, as well as a couple of other names that you may be familiar with.

The proposal would lift the one acre size limit and allow up to two accessory dwelling units per residential parcels to allow one attached and detached ADU. Then because ADUs would be an allowed use on all residential parcels, just like any accessory uses, it wouldn't require special noticing to neighbors like they currently do right now. This is all part of the effort to reduce the disparity between how easy it is to build larger single family homes, and how hard it is to build smaller more typical workforce housing types.

## REGIONAL PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

July 29, 2021

That is the summary of the proposed changes to TRPA's regulations. Local regulations still would apply to ADUs in the Basin. In Douglas County and Washoe County ADUs are not allowed on parcels of less than one acre. That rule will not change unless they amend their area plans.

On the California side, each jurisdiction has passed or is in the process of passing their own ADU regulations that reflect the California law. Based on this, in California counties, ADUs would be allowed on all residential parcels. There are no rentals of less than 30 days, and there are size limitations.

As noted in the packet, they're bringing forward the area plan amendments needed for those California jurisdictions to be able to implement their own ADU codes with this packet.

For the environmental analysis, because ADUs would be allowed on all residential parcels, they decided to model this using their transportation model, because it's not that easily assessed at a qualitative level.

Based on how they've developed this code proposal, they do expect that most new ADUs will be built inside the bonus unit boundary because that's where the incentives are provided. However, if people do want to develop with a full development right, they can build outside the bonus unit boundary.

ADUs that utilize bonus units will get a deed restriction along with the bonus unit. ADUs that use a full development right are not required to be deed restricted. Allowing this is consistent with encouraging as many of our remaining development rights and allocations to be used for smaller units that are more affordable to local workforce and have a stronger likelihood of providing naturally affordable housing than if that development right was used for a larger house. Because ADUs could be allowed anywhere in the Basin, they wanted to analyze an ADU scenario that took into account the furthest extent of where we might see this development. The modeling team analyzed a scenario where they assumed that a significant number of remaining development rights would become ADUs and that all of these would be built in areas that are zoned single family only. Since they've also have updated information on projects in the pipeline, that will be using bonus units they were also able to model those as well, such as the Sugar Pine Village and Ski Run Pioneer Housing Project.

Even though this scenario shifted more people into the longer trip length areas that had been in the Regional Transportation Plan forecast, that was offset by an increase in lower income households as they're seeing implementation of the bonus unit incentive program. Lower income households have a lower trip rate.

Overall, these changes represent a pretty small shift in general that are basically absorbed by all the other measures that have been put in place in the Regional Transportation Plan and the Regional Plan.

Staff ran the most conservative scenario, looking at the worst-case scenario and that's what those results are showing that there would not be a significant affect.

They wanted to identify some of the questions and comments that came up at the informational hearings on these amendments in June, including ones from the Regional Plan Implementation Committee, the Local Government and Housing committee, and the Advisory Planning Commission. The committee and commission members asked for clarification on whether the

## REGIONAL PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

July 29, 2021

amendments would affect the transfer of coverage from sensitive lands and in general and wanted to be sure that the environmental analysis would adjust parking, traffic, and VMT.

They tried to point out the outcomes of this analysis through the presentation but wanted to highlight that the amendments do not make any changes to the coverage regulations, and all the incentive programs for transferring coverage remain in place and would not be affected by the amendments.

As noted at the beginning of the presentation the overall growth and growth pattern is consistent with what was analyzed in the 2012 Regional Plan and the analysis here for parking, traffic, and VMT ties off of that analysis. They also received a few questions from the Local Government Housing Committee, and RPIC members about ensuring that the bonus units are used as intended, and don't become extended stay hotels due to the lack of clarity and the definitions or the compliance language.

Based on these comments staff made a couple of changes to the proposed code. They modified the definition of affordable to specify that it is intended for permanent residents and seasonal workers and to clarify that the compliance language was to clarify some of the language in the bonus incentive program.

Phase two housing amendments will be started in February where they'll looking at site constraints, an additional incentives for ADUs.

Presentation can be found at:

[Agenda-Item-No.-3-Phase-1-Housing-Code-Amendments.pdf](#)

### Committee Questions and Comments

Ms. Aldean referred to page 94 of the packet under Section 21.3, Accessory Uses. Under sub paragraph B, C and D, please add an "s" after unit. That was done in A, but not done in the subsequent paragraphs. In 21.3.2, where it states that an accessory dwelling unit shall be considered a residential unit subject to the residential allocation limitations and transfer provisions. She assumes that the reference to transfer provisions includes coverage limitations. She knows that it's been suggested by some that we take a look at those coverage restrictions in addition to looking at the idea of perhaps not requiring an additional development unit if the ADU is within an existing structure. She wants to ensure that people understand that our coverage limitations are still intact.

Mr. Marshall said that is correct. These amendments do not change the basic coverage rules. That will be a topic for future conversations. None of these changes allow any additional coverage to be brought in that you wouldn't otherwise be able to do.

Ms. Aldean asked when we reference the transfer provisions, is that language included in those transfer provisions?

Mr. Marshall said the transfer provisions are really related to the transfer of the units, rather than coverage which would have its own independent sections regarding coverage.

Ms. Aldean said for purposes of full disclosure, would it be prudent to include something in the accessory use provision that states that coverage limitations remain intact?

## REGIONAL PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

July 29, 2021

Mr. Marshall said they would generally avoid that kind of duplication because otherwise they'd have to do that in many areas. There are distinct coverage rules in wherever you're trying to transfer or move coverage around, you have to go to those rules as opposed to transfer of the use provisions. These kinds of transfers or for the ADUs or for any of these that we should say, none of these provide additional coverage opportunities at this time. That shouldn't be a code issue but more of an educational issue.

Mr. Friedrich said a suggestion was made of allowing junior ADUs or ADUS in already constructed space such as a garage, or a bedroom to be built without a development right and without a bonus unit. He asked what would be the implications of that and what analysis is required if they were to make such a move. Assuming that would be some amount of analysis required, might that be considered in the next round?

Mr. Marshall said fundamentally if you're going to do an ADU you need to have a development right of some kind. Either it's a bonus unit or development right in either an existing unit of use or an allocation if you're going to put it in an ADU. They are not excusing any part of that requirement. That issue, however, is on the agenda for the next series of amendments to look at whether or not there should be, particularly maybe for an in-house use that there should be requirement for some sort of existing development or bonus unit. By maintaining that requirement it provides an incentive for affordable housing and affordable housing within our bonus unit areas, because it reduces the cost substantially by getting a bonus unit. This is so someone wouldn't have to go out and acquire or get an existing unit of use or an allocation. That allows them to make those assumptions that Ms. Bettinger was talking about where these units are going to go primarily because of the incentive, the significant incentive to use bonus units. If you're going to use a bonus unit, you need to deed restrict. It has those advantages. However, there may be some instances in which it may be better as a policy matter to also incentivize junior ADUs by not requiring an existing unit. That analysis is going to have to be with the next set of considerations.

Ms. Bettinger said that this issue has come up with the Tahoe Living Working Group members quite a few times and many of the members do feel like we need to make changes to this. Staff will be looking at this in the next phase and how to do this in an environmentally, sound way, so there are not any major changes to the growth caps.

Mr. Friedrich there's been some interest expressed in in South Lake Tahoe for allowing mobile tiny homes, ADUs on wheels, essentially to be permitted under this program. He understands that we're not doing that now, but what would be the process if a local jurisdiction wanted to amend its code to allow mobile tiny homes as an ADU, what would be required?

Mr. Marshall said that would most likely take a TRPA code change. It could also potentially be done in an area plan. But fundamentally, under TRPA definition those are mobile homes. Those would need to be reviewed under their definitional changes. TRPA classifies mobile homes as only being allowed in mobile home parks. TRPA would have to do some massaging of their general rules to take on that issue. That issue is also slated for Phase 2 or 3.

Ms. Bettinger said correct, that has also come up in the working group. Staff will be addressing it, hopefully, in the next few months.

Mr. Lawrence said he had the privilege of being part of the Local Government & Housing Committee and the Tahoe Living Working Group. A big thanks to TRPA staff for all of the experts

## REGIONAL PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

July 29, 2021

they brought in during this process and the phenomenal work of Ms. Fink and Ms. Bettinger in a fairly short period of time.

There's a lot of merits to taking a look at junior ADUs or tiny homes and then seeing whether they need a development right or not, That may get us some momentum towards affordable or achievable housing.

But we do need to be cautious, so much of what we do is based on growth caps. We have a lot of conversations whether it's over tourism or short-term rentals, etc. It's all kind of tied to the major effort they did in 2012 to get the Regional Plan Update and keep growth caps in place. It should be looked at a Phase two but we do need to be mindful of the growth gaps and just the overall capacity of the basin. Lastly, they received a letter from Tahoe Meadows regarding the historic district. He reached out to Ms. Bettinger and although they didn't connect, he was able to get his questions answered. He also had a conversation with Mr. Marshall and is comfortable that the historic district of Tahoe Meadows addresses much of the concern in the comment letter that they received.

Mr. Yeates agreed that the work of Ms. Fink, Ms. Bettinger, and others was remarkable. But he is struggling with what has been clearly stated in the narrative and also Ms. Bettinger's presentation that accessory dwelling units attach themselves to a residential use. Referring to page 95, Section 21.3.2, Subsection B, it says that an accessory dwelling unit shall be considered accessory use, where the primary use is a commercial use, public service, or recreational use.

He doesn't get that because now we're attaching a residential use to a potential caretakers place in a recreational area or adjacent to a ball field for example. The same goes for recreational, public service. This is a residential use, attaching it to a residential use. We want to use it for purposes of encouraging more housing, especially affordable workforce, etc. And that, in fact, it would attach itself within the density bonus area so that would get the density bonuses that might give us more housing.

But at the same time there's the Regional Plan that we're kind of encouraging development in the town centers, places where it's appropriate, where there's transit, etc. To him, recreational uses don't fit that. And the concept of a public service building of some kind, having an attached ADU, maybe it makes sense but that that should be treated more on a case by case basis.

He's not comfortable moving this to the Governing Board. This is different than what the narrative of the staff report and is different than what Ms. Bettinger presented that this is a residential use attaching to a residential use except for this specific language here that they're amending the code to allow to be attached to public service or recreational use. He suggested holding this and discuss it further and then bring that back because he's not at all comfortable.

The other issue that he has is one that's been raised in recent comment letters to the board from the Nevada side. Because California has the requirement in the ADU that it can't be used for short term rentals, there's a 30 day limit on rentals. That would be attached to whatever they do making the amendments to the code here for the California side. That doesn't apply to Nevada because of the fact that they are not California and will have to amend their area plans to be less than an acre, for example. People are concerned that it could mean that what they really don't like is short-term rentals in areas like Incline Village and other areas of the Nevada side. Can we as the basin wide agency carry over that 30 day requirement for ADUs from a basin

July 29, 2021

wide perspective and understand that to get down to the less than one acre, they would have to amend their area plan. But as far as basin wide, the 30 day limit applies.

Mr. Marshall said starting with the accessory use issue and to what types of base uses accessory dwelling units should attach. The primary place where people are going to put these things are an accessory to a residential use. Reviewing Section 21.3.2 that is labeled B, historically, TRPA's Code of Ordinances has allowed a secondary unit (TRPA's language for an ADU) or associated with uses that are permissible which means that they're allowed in that plan area statement or now area plan. TRPA currently allows accessory dwelling units to be placed on non-residential parcels and that has happened in the past but not very often. It's fundamentally areas like a caretakers cabin associated with a cabin on the Forest Service acquisition lands, for example. There are other campgrounds that might want to have a dwelling unit on the campground for the host or whoever is taking care of the campgrounds. They have historically allowed that kind of recreation and commercial.

There are two things happening: One is they're allowing two ADUS; a regular ADU and a junior ADU for residential parcels. That is another change that's been made because previously there could only be one secondary unit on a parcel more than one acre. The parcel size is being reduced and allowing two instead of one. The change they wanted to make here was to clarify that for these other uses that they currently allow you to only get one. It states that one accessory dwelling unit shall be considered an accessory use. That's one purpose for why this edit here and they wanted to make certain that permissible use where that one was identified as these other kinds of uses. They're being more specific; they're not expanding the category of uses for which an ADU could be accessory to. Mr. Yeates' point is that it goes to the underlying policy rationale of should we be doing this for these parcels that could be remote. Are we putting residential units in areas where that's not consistent with the Regional Plan guidance of concentrating those units within the town centers. It hasn't been a problem in the past with the existing secondary unit allowance. They're not anticipating it being a problem in the future. He recommended that if he's hesitant about this particular one, that they stay with the language that substitutes the ADU for the secondary residence because that's what we're now calling this product.

Maybe it's that we don't go forward with the rest of the language and bring that issue back in phase two, as to whether or not we want to continue this language here. It's not changing the language so that you still only have one, that's still in there. It's one ADU shall be considered accessory. He believes what Mr. Yeates concern is the specification of the types of uses that a ADU could be accessory to. The proposed Code of Ordinances list them out and whereas, before it said it just had to be permissible. That allows any kind of uses that are permissible or consistent with the base zoning. It's not expanding anything, it's making more express, what the intent is. The underlying issue Mr. Yeates is bringing up is whether or not that was good policy in the first place. They didn't really discuss that through the process and if they want to discuss that item, staff will bring it back for further discussion within the Phase Two process.

Mr. Yeates said that would be his preference to further discuss this because everywhere else in this code, it's just striking the word secondary unit, and coming up with accessory dwelling unit. We're treating it different. We're now dealing with California's policy of encouraging this kind of stuff. Maybe, we didn't have this problem under secondary units, but now, we're pushing accessory dwelling units. They should be pushed where we get density issues and where we're focusing on the services that are available and are consistent with the Regional Plan direction.

## REGIONAL PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

July 29, 2021

If it's agreed in that unique situation where there's a Forest Service dwelling unit and they want to put an ADU attached to that for an additional staff person, okay. If everyone feels comfortable that those are unique things then maybe there should be some additional language to make clear that those aren't where they really want to emphasize these accessory dwelling units is fine but just rewriting to take care of the secondary residence issue because they're cleaning up the code throughout, just striking that term and replacing it with an accessory dwelling unit. It's been raised that those prior 1987 secondary residence don't come back and say it's something else and therefore, what the old language says that applied to secondary residences now should get the full benefit or the accessory dwelling unit.

Is staff suggesting that we would reduce Subdivision B that would come forward to the Governing Board?

Mr. Marshall said if the committee wanted to do that, he suggested making the change on line one of B substituting accessory dwelling unit for a secondary residence and leave the rest as is. Then staff could work that issue through Phase Two. However, there are good reasons to specify that it's now just commercial, public service, or recreational uses. It reduces the universe of those other permissible uses. It makes express what those are, so there's some benefit there, His recommendation is to stay with the proposed language but direct that the issue be addressed in Phase Two to make certain that's what we want to say.

Mr. Bruce said what he doesn't want to remove something and then have it impliedly believed by people that by substituting those words it carries the former permissible language forward and then we're stuck with what we had before, without the restrictions. Is it correct in that what Mr. Marshall is stating is to leave the restrictions in, it's better to at least expressly state the restriction so that the permissible isn't implied or isn't available for a go forward purpose.

Mr. Marshall said yes, his recommendation would be to stay with the recommendation from the working group, the Advisory Planning Commission, and although they didn't discuss this item expressly, it was discussed generically how that came through the process. Then direct this larger policy question is do we want to have ADUs as an accessory use for these use categories to Phase Two. It's not about the language here, because that's already allowed. What's being questioned is the underlying policy of that existing code section. He suggested going with these changes as they are now, but in Phase Two ask that the question be posed; Do we want ADUs associated with non-residential uses? That's the policy question that's being asked and is it consistent with the Regional Plan?

Mr. Bruce said maybe what Mr. Yeates is saying is until we decide that policy question, it should be restricted to residential, and we will come back with Phase Two and discuss that.

Ms. Aldean said if they eliminate the amended language entirely then these existing units that are attached to these various categories become non-conforming. That's a problem.

Mr. Marshall said that's correct. He doesn't recommend deleting this section. That raises some other noticing issues and it's inconsistent. We shouldn't do that because then that's judging that we have made a policy determination that we really want to restrict it to residential uses when that really hasn't been the topic of any discussion that we've had to date. There's two options: We can do nothing and that unfortunately will leave the secondary resident language in there that we don't want because we're switching to ADUs. We could swap out ADUs for secondary residence. Make that minimal change to this code section or adopt the code section as proposed

## REGIONAL PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

July 29, 2021

with those changes but direct the underlying issue to be addressed in Phase Two. He recommended the last one as that gets the good code changes in but the underlying issue about this code section, not the changes to the code section, but the reasons why it's in the Code of Ordinances in the first place and allow that to be addressed in Phase Two.

Mr. Lawrence said working for the Agency in the past he has the perspective that this hasn't been an issue in the past but also recognizes the times change so it's important that we get this right regarding accessory uses, or ADUs for these other uses that aren't residential. He looked at this through the lens largely at recreation and maybe public service, thinking about the agencies within the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, primarily State Parks, and the Division of Forestry. Recognizing that two of the biggest issues that we're facing here in Lake Tahoe Basin is over tourism, sustainable recreation, and catastrophic wildfire. While we do need to continue to focus growth in and urban areas, we need to recognize that there is going to be a need in order to address those issues. Having folks on site in some of these recreation areas and public facility areas in order to be ambassadors and getting the message out on how to be a good steward, particularly on high recreation days. With forestry and the Forest Service we know that if we can be on the ground and be able to spot wildfires or get an initial attack that makes all the difference in the world and is sometimes more difference than even doing the pre-suppression fuels work.

He is supportive of holding back on going all the way to these accessory units for these other uses. He doesn't want to lose sight of that. There are reasons for doing this particularly in those areas of over tourism and catastrophic wildfire. We have to be cautious because they don't want to also create a situation where we make a code change and all of a sudden, we have a preponderance of non-conforming uses. .

Mr. Yeates said looking at the staff report narrative and the changes to the code didn't square with everything they're talking about, attaching it to a residential use only. Further discussion would be good. The second issue is trying to address concerns raised about short-term rentals, that wouldn't apply to Nevada Side, because it's not California.

Mr. Marshall said there's also churches, cemeteries, and other uses that there may be appropriate for a ADU to be associated with that kind of public service use. As they explore this, he thinks we'll see a range of not unreasonable instances where the primary use is not residential, that we would want, or wouldn't mind having an ADU associated with it.

When the vacation rental issue was addressed in the overall approach was taken as, this should be decided within reasonable bounds by local jurisdictions as to how they want to deal with vacation rentals. What is being proposed today is to allow ADUs on less than one acre. That change will not be effective on the Nevada side because both the Washoe County and the Douglas County Area Plans have the one acre requirement in them, so this would not be changing that Regional Plan. That would control over the more specific code language that would say there's no longer a parcel size limitation. The question is that when and if that one acre rule is lifted on the Nevada side, in each jurisdiction, what should accompany that lifting of that rule? Each jurisdiction or the Governing Board at that time, could propose something to address this issue of vacation rentals because of the concerns that there's a state law in California, but not in Nevada. That's going to be an issue that needs to be addressed. It's not triggered by what we're doing here, it would be triggered by the lifting of that one acre rule in each of the area plans. That would be the appropriate time to consider whether or not there should be some sort of regulatory give and take with lifting of the one acre size limitation on the

July 29, 2021

Nevada side through those area plans. Rather than take on that large generic issue of should ADUs be vacation rentals.

Mr. Yeates said that in carrying out this one acre change and just encouraging ADUs they're carrying out California's state policy when we say, you can't have a rental less than 30 days. It's not anything that El Dorado County, Placer County, or the City of South Lake Tahoe did but essentially what the state legislature said. Now, we have people who are worked up over short-term rentals in general. Thinking that in fact if we do this, that Washoe County won't adhere to California's rule and the only position that TRPA could take as the basin wide entity could say that these new ADUs cannot be used for anything less than a 30 day rental. That would be a decision that TRPA could make, and yes, we did adopt a different way that when we dealt with the issue of short-term rentals. And said that they were going to have agencies do whatever they wanted to do consistent with TRPA and would review it when it comes to the residential allocations to ensure that they've met the requirements that TRPA put forth. Not changing that, but it seems that the one size fit all seems as appropriate to simply say basin wide for all ADUs that there should be a 30 day rental requirement.

Mr. Marshall said that is correct that TRPA does have the authority to do that. The more appropriate question is that should it exercise the authority to do that within the context of these ADU amendments?

Ms. Aldean said to a certain extent, they've tinkered with the definition of affordable housing. This was in part to address Ms. Gustafson's concern about the need for affordable housing by seasonal workers and not just permanent residents. By changing the definition to read "Residential housing deed restricted to be used exclusively as a residential dwelling by seasonal workers or permanent residents that are lower income households, and so forth." Technically, a seasonal worker might only be on the job for 29 days and could be considered by some, a short-term rental. As long as the dwelling is accommodating workers in the basin, whether they be permanent or seasonal, that provides a modicum of protection.

Mr. Marshall said yes, but the reason why that protection applies is because you're using a bonus unit. In exchange for the bonus you would have to deed restrict to residential uses. It doesn't get at the broader question of should ADUs in general be utilized for vacation rentals. They anticipate, because of the cost of the development right that there is going to be a number of bonus units used for ADUs, so that those that will use bonus units will be restricted to residential uses, non-vacation rental. But that doesn't mean that someone could construct an ADU in Douglas County when they lift the one acre rule and rent it out as a vacation rental.

Ms. Aldean said the focus of the conversation here concerning accessory dwelling units is to provide affordable housing. The focus is not on dealing with the perpetual concern about vacation rentals, they've allowed the local jurisdictions to take the lead for the most part in addressing these issues. The question is within the context of what we're considering here, is it appropriate? They're trying to create more workforce housing for people living in the basin and understand that not all of that may involve the use of a bonus unit. Is it appropriate to do this now, or to refer it to the working group for further consideration at a future meeting. They need to act on what's before them today, even though it's legitimate concern, and it's been expressed by many. She feels we need to punt to the next phase of these issues.

Mr. Marshall said he would agree with that. Also remember that ADUs to some extent are affordable by design so you're not gaining housing that's lower cost, just because they're using a

July 29, 2021

bonus unit, it has to be deed restricted. You're also gaining housing that might be appropriate because it's smaller and it's not going to demand as much rent. It was expressed during the development of the ADU policy, and that's one of the reason why California's is pushing ADUs because it can potentially provide lower cost housing, not necessarily deed restricted affordable but lower cost housing because of the smaller unit size or the fact that it's attached to another unit. There's good reasons to hope that the basic housing stock will increase for lower cost housing through the removal of the one acre rule that allows the potential for more ADUs to be built. It incentivizes more of the allowable development potential through allocations or otherwise to be used on smaller sized units.

Mr. Friedrich said he's sympathetic to the idea of limiting ADUs to be more than 30 days throughout the Basin but is open to the will of the committee on whether to do that now, or in the next phase. He appreciated the points and the concern.

#### Public Comments & Questions

Carole Black, Incline Village resident said she also sent in a written comment. She appreciated the thoughtful discussion that's just occurred. She's diverging from her written comment to speak to the topic being discussed today which is among her priority concern. This effort clearly has well thought through and appropriate overarching goals. It has been carefully addressed in many arenas; however, she questions with all due respect to all of the comments that have been made, the sense that the one acre restriction, at least in Washoe County was which she's most familiar. In watching the area of plan development, most recently, it was clear to her that a major concern and interaction had to do with aligning with TRPA. There are amendments already being considered appropriately. She has to believe that this one acre restriction, which you are now viewing, as what will contain ADU development, to some degree in this area, will be changed in the fullness of time and probably relatively soon. Once that's done there is no restriction to not developing ADUs without the bonus units and turning them immediately into short term rentals.

She heard the comments about small and will point out that if you spend any time on Airbnb or any of the other websites, lots of short-term rentals occur in small, cute, and mobile units. This is a significant concern and hopes the committee will figure out some way to address it in the very near future. She also think there's a need for a very high level, and comprehensive data driven assessment of the impact of short-term rentals and the area occupancy increases they drive across the region. She hopes that there'll be some detailed assessment of the impact of these changes should they occur. She's advocating for putting in the 30 day restriction across the Lake and appreciated the comments to that effect and doesn't see why it can't be done now.

Judith Miller, Incline Village resident said she appreciated all the work that's been done on these amendments. One thing that she found noticeably absent is lack of data for Washoe County. She understands that the Tahoe Prosperity Centers working with Washoe County to do a housing needs assessment for the Incline Village area. She also shares Ms. Black's concerns about having that 30 day rental requirement. She's seen how short-term rentals have changed this community. We used to have a very large supply of workforce housing here. Almost half of the units in Incline Village are condominiums and smaller units that were the bulk of their workforce housing have evaporated. Many of those have been converted to short-term rentals and a lot of those are located not just in the town center but throughout the community. Because with half of them they're not all in the in the center of town.

## REGIONAL PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

July 29, 2021

Unless we do something with the short-term rentals, and get a better understanding of Washoe County, she thinks there are other avenues we could pursue, that would help to increase the amount of workforce housing without, necessarily creating more occupancy, parking, and traffic. Unfortunately, that's what could be the outcome here. She knows there's limitations on residential allocations, so that would do something to at least limit the amount of ADUs. They have another solution and doesn't think that's been looked into enough. There was something that went before the Placer County Board recommending that short-term rentals have a moratorium, that hasn't happened and not likely to happen in Washoe County. More and more of these smaller units are being converted to short-term rentals and hopes that situation can be addressed.

Pamela Tsigdinos said she appreciated the work and the good intentions of trying to create more affordable housing across the Tahoe Basin. Today's comments will deviate slightly from her written comment. This is a significant problem that in very large part was due to a 2004 decision by TRPA to approve short-term rentals as a permitted residential use. This unfortunate action has led to a significant number of housing units being taken off the market from those who would like long term renting options. It is very important to underscore that commercial interests are watching this very closely, and any opportunity to buy up properties and use them as short-term rentals is a reality. For the committee to believe that there are only a handful of bad actors that has not proven to be the case. There's been lots of discussion this morning about what the implications are.

One scenario that has not been discussed is what you are presuming that anyone who owns a residential property is using it that way. There are a number of people who are buying up houses and converting them to 100 percent short-term rentals. This can also be the case; somebody could create an ADU and then rent the house. She underscored that there has not been a thorough analysis or deep dive into the environmental impacts of the existing short-term rentals since 2004. Potentially adding more is going to create all kinds of problems associated with wildfire impacts. Incline Village only has one way in and out of the Basin. Imagine the density issues of everybody trying to leave in the midst of a wildfire. These are life and death issues and does believe that the materials that were submitted to a committee this morning, that say there will not be any kind of environmental impact, no change to water and air quality. Frankly, is a bit disingenuous. In order for you to make a really good decision, the committee needs to go back and do more analysis to understand what the situation is today with short-term rentals and residential use, and what would potentially be the impact of adding more ADUs that could potentially be commercialized. Please think through these issues seriously. Once these code changes are made, they have to live with them, Some of these are life and death issues.

Tara Zuardo, Director, Mountain Housing Council thanked everyone for considering the proposed changes. As a member of the working group, they're excited to see the Regional Plan Implementation Committee make a recommendation of approval on some of these proposed changes. They represent an important first step towards accelerating housing solutions for our region. It's important to note just how much work has been put into these proposed changes by TRPA and the Tahoe Living working group. Also, the research that they've put into the current status of all of the ADUs throughout the region and what is needed for the local workforce housing. The Mountain Housing Council did conduct a study on accessory dwelling units and published a white paper that's available on their website. It provides information on what's out there, how ADUs work, and how they're regulated to be used for local workforce housing. Their

July 29, 2021

recommendations are aligned with the proposed changes to Section 21 which clarifies that up to two ADUs can be built per parcel within a multi-family structure as opposed to per unit.

There's been some concerns that it could be used for vacation rentals and it has been noted that California's already bars this. Nevada does have some restrictions in place. It's important, that there is research that has been put out there that TRPA does expect the significant number of these units would be used for workforce housing and why. They also support the proposed changes to Sections 31 and 52 in terms of changing the maximum densities established for projects as well as eligibility for bonus units, within one half mile of existing transit. It's important that tourist accommodation uses are converted to residential use, because it allows us to open up housing opportunities. In particular, it allows aging motel properties which are currently kind of disincentivized from converting to residential to actually do it and that they don't lose a significant number of units. In doing so it would allow us to kind of approach more of these entities and request and purchase more housing for locals. In addition, modifying the bonus unit boundary in order to provide for more local workforce housing and priority areas for higher density residential development is also important. These changes are a really good first step.

Gavin Feiger, League to Save Lake Tahoe said these are the same comments they provided to the Advisory Planning Commission earlier this month. The League is dedicated to protecting and restoring the environmental health, sustainability, and scenic beauty of the Tahoe Basin. In connection with that mission, they advocate for the implementation of sound environmentally friendly policies contained within the Regional Land Use Planning Documents. They've been the only environmental group actively and continuously participating in the Housing Working Group and the efforts leading up to its formation over the last few years. It's been great working with the Working group and TRPA staff, their feedback and input has been heard. Their concerns have been the same since the start. Coverage, density, and transportation impacts. All of which directly and indirectly impact Lake Tahoe's natural environment.

Addressing housing issues the Lake Tahoe is a top priority, but any effort to improve housing must also ensure that we're protecting the environment. They applauded the process and support the ADU incentive packages presented today. They see the potential for ADUs to help achieve housing and transportation goals, but we need to see the data showing that they are an effective tool here in Tahoe. The effectiveness of ADUs and reaching the housing and transportation goals needs to be assessed before considering more incentives especially those involving coverage and development rights which are coming up more and more.

Coverage requirements and development rights are critical to addressing Lake clarity decline. Development rights are one of the fundamental tools to ensure the pace of development and environmental capacity that's done by capping the total amount of development potential. They believe that there are opportunities within the existing development rights system to address some of the concerns they've been hearing through the working group and here today. For coverage they'd prefer that TRPA look at using its authority to reduce or eliminate parking minimums to reduce the coverage needed and transportation impacts instead of allowing more coverage. They're looking forward to discussing both development rights and coverage opportunities in the future but they're not currently in favor of any big changes to those. They would like the Regional Plan Implementation Committee to recommend approval of the ADU package included in the staff report today with the clarification that further actions, especially those affecting coverage and development rights, are longer term actions that may have significant environmental impacts and need to be carefully considered.

July 29, 2021

They'd also like to see some monitoring and surveying of the ADUs built taking advantage of these new incentives to gage their effectiveness. It's a good start with the modeling that was presented today and trying to actually ground truth that over the next year or so is going to be important to the future.

John Falk, Legislative Advocate, Tahoe Sierra Board of Realtors said he wanted to comment on the proposed package of amendments related to ADUs and how they will be, frankly, made all the better by getting some of the older code provisions that were maybe important at the time they were written but are now outdated and are proving to be a significant impediment, to the creation of additional affordable/workforce housing in the region. They strongly support the approval of the amendments as presented in the staff report. While it's only three sets of issues coming out of the committee and then another one coming from staff, the end result is that this is the first step, short-term step which will bring us closer to actually seeing real housing on the ground as quickly as possible.

He can't speak to the urgency of this, in terms of us getting, not just paper tigers as to, we support housing but real-world on the ground opportunities to build ADUs and then make them available to our workforce in the most expeditious fashion possible. They've been participating in these meetings and Ms. Fink and company have done an outstanding job of both herding cats and bringing us together into a way that they think will ultimately be to everyone's benefit. In keeping with the Regional Plan, the Code of Ordinances, and the environmental objectives, and it seems more than legally defensible. When you look at how the state of California has treated ADUs this will be of great assistance to the California counties in helping them come closer. They still won't be actually in line, but they'll at least be closer to what the State of California is demanding.

#### Committee Comments & Questions

Mr. Lawrence said there was a lot of discussion at the Governing Board retreat yesterday about how everything is hard and this is one of those things that's difficult. It's time to make some movement regarding affordable, achievable housing, and that's at the forefront of his mind but he doesn't lose sight of some of the challenges that communities are having regarding short-term rentals and other challenges that come along with that. His perspective is trying to get grounded in where we are now and where we're moving to. He looks at ADUs as; one, there is going to be this bucket of ADUs that are going to be using bonus units. There's a tremendous incentive for using bonus units because you don't need a residential allocation and don't need to buy it on the open market, a development right, and those are not easy to find. They get calls at their Nevada land bank a lot for development rights and when they do sell them, they go to auction. So if somebody's doing an ADU with the bonus unit, there's going to be deed restrictions attached to it that gets to the short-term rental issue. When it comes to short-term rentals, they're talking about ADUs that aren't going the bonus unit routes that have received an allocation from the county and have somehow found a development right on the open market and now can go ahead and do an ADU and then potentially without that 30 day limit. Yes, on the Nevada side those could potentially be used for short-term rental. But then there's other factors, right now, you can have an ADU in most cases in residential areas, if you have one acre or more. That's already sort of an existing situation. What we're talking about is lifting the cap that you have to have one acre or more in order to have an ADU. Because many of our parcels in the basin are less than one acre and we want to have smaller units so that they're more affordable and achievable. The topography on the Nevada side have much more steeper slopes compared to California. Nevada has less of the flat Class 5, 6, or 7 land areas. He's largely

## REGIONAL PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

July 29, 2021

thinking of Incline Village and recognizes that he's generalizing to some extent. If we lift that restriction to less than one acre and someone is not using a bonus unit and they've been successful again to get an allocation and find a development right on the market they still would need to fit within the land coverage limitations.

His recollection is most of the parcels and the residential development on the steeper side on the Nevada side are maxed out when it comes to land coverage. A proliferation of ADUs that got development rights and allocations that are on less than one acre but have enough land coverage in order to build a separate unit. To him balancing out the need to make movement towards affordable housing versus covering every single situation that may or may not come up. Also, the risks attached to it, having to get allocations, development right then find the land coverage if it's less than one acre, and in areas that are probably kind of already maxed out the land coverage. He as a committee member, felt comfortable with this recommendation.

Ms. Gustafson thanked both the staff and the incredible work of all the partners and the expertise that went into thinking about these amendments. They're not going to solve the workforce housing situation in one fell swoop. It's going to take incremental changes in many areas and is what's being worked on throughout the basin. She could go either way with the 30 day limitation because California's already under that limitation. She'll defer to her Nevada colleagues on that issue. The coverage is going to be an issue. She doesn't think there will be a mad rush on ADUs because of those coverage restrictions. They'll have work on that issue next.

Mr. Friedrich also thanked the staff, all the members of the public that participated in the dialog over many months. He feels there's been general consensus about this being part of a very much needed solution to this affordable housing crisis. Let's take this first step and then continue to look at improving other aspects of it. Whether it be incentives to actually get people to build these. He's more concerned about in the end, are there too many barriers? Whether it's the development rights, people hesitant to deed restrict, or coverage. He'll also defer to his Nevada colleagues on the 30 day issue since it's covered in California. He's very comfortable and eager to move this first package forward and then review and continue to improve it to provide a solution to a growing crisis of affordable housing.

Mr. Yeates added that there was an errata sheet distributed making some changes on page 91, Section 52.3.4.F, page 93, Section 31.4.5, 0, and page 95, Section 21.3.2.A.

When this 30 day limit started to become an issue, then chair, he asked the Local Government Committee to include housing. Also, for Mr. Lawrence and Ms. Faustinos to be ex officio members of that committee because he wanted to expand beyond just being a local government issue. He didn't feel comfortable that some of these tough issues that local governments were dealing with split us members on this tough issue. They had extensive hearings on how to address short-term rentals. In many ways he wanted more but accepted what we did on short-term rentals because it seemed appropriate, especially on enforcement issues and other things. This is truly something that locals can deal with from an enforcement standpoint. As Ms. Novasel said, what does the data really show and how we deal with these particular issues. However, because California has made it clear that they don't want ADUs turned into short-term rentals and want them to have at least a 30 day minimum. To say this should apply basin wide and take this issue off the table for right now with all those upset people primarily in Washoe County and throughout. To him it isn't doing any harm to what we basically did before. It's just carrying on a policy that makes sense for the development of these ADUs, that we'd want them exactly for the purpose of cheaper and low-income housing. We

## REGIONAL PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

July 29, 2021

don't want some commercial entity taking advantage of the fact that there may be another opportunity for a short-term rental. Just take it off, get rid of the issue. He wants to say basin wide that we just have 30 day rental limitations.

Mr. Bruce asked for the rationale as to why these additional units should be able to be rented for less than 30 days.

Ms. Aldean said we amended the language of affordable housing to state that it could be used for seasonal workers. A seasonal job may not be for more than 30 days. She's concerned about the usurpation of the right of Nevada communities to make that decision for themselves. She's not sure that is appropriate and doesn't want the authority of Nevada to be usurped by California, just as California doesn't want the reverse to occur. She suggested that in the motion this issue of prohibiting the use of ADUs as short-term rentals in the state of Nevada be addressed by the working group. We have a well-established process that we need to follow so that all of these concerns and considerations can be discussed publicly.

Mr. Marshall said concerns about dealing with this issue as a restriction on vacation rentals, the type of use you could use an ADU for. They're not particularly noticed well for that. He suggested that if the committee wanted to preserve that issue, they're better and more defensively doing it as not extending the less than one acre exemption to Nevada. It would limit the effect of what you're doing here, that critical issue is where can you put ADUs to less than one acre just on the California side. You would keep with the existing rule on the Nevada side until either additional work or other changes that you would want to make to have that be lifted. Rather than to impose a condition on all ADUs in the basin that they not be rented for less than 30 days. If that's the way the committee would like to go, he would do it in the terms of the set of amendments that are before you now as the safer route.

Mr. Bruce said he's not looking at it as one states usurping another states' rights or laws. He thought that the purpose of what they're doing here was trying to create affordable housing for the basin. It's hard to imagine that someone's going to be an employee for less than 30 days. He's looking at the purpose and the intent and the thoughtfulness of what it is that they're trying to accomplish here as opposed to whether or not that's a California issue or a Nevada issue. To him, that has nothing to do with it. That's the intention of what we're trying to achieve here by allowing this to happen. We're not trying to do something care to create short term activity. We're trying to encourage employment.

Mr. Yeates agreed with Mr. Bruce on this matter. He views things that we're trying to accomplish here from a basin wide perspective. He doesn't want to get us into a bi state issue. Whatever they're doing here on ADUs is basin wide. California's already bound by this, it made sense and it's an easy one for us as the Governing Board.

Ms. Aldean asked if the only reference to ordinance changes for maximum density is on page 97, Section 31.3.2, Table of Maximum densities. It states one unit per parcel, excluding ADUs. Is it correct pursuant to Mr. Marshall's suggestion it would be except in the state of Nevada.

Mr. Marshall said the focus is not so much on the density. Section 21.3.2.A also has two units. Ms. Aldean's correct on page 97, Table 21.4.A is where they're deleting the one acre requirement. Section 31.4.7, is carry over from page 93.

Ms. Aldean asked if it could state "wherever applicable" instead of calling out specific revisions.

REGIONAL PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

July 29, 2021

Mr. Marshall said yes, that's where he would make those changes on page 97, Table. He would also include direction to staff to if there's other areas.

Ms. Aldean made a motion to recommend approval of the Required Findings as contained in Attachment A including a finding of no significant effect for the adoption of amendments to the TRPA Code of Ordinances related to 1) bonus unit boundary, including amendments to Chapter 52; 2) non-conforming density including amendments to Chapter 31; 3) accessory dwelling units, including amendments to Chapters 21, 31, 39, 50, 51, 52, and 90 Meyers, Tahoe Valley, and Tourist Core Area Plans, and Rules of Procedure, Section 12, and 4) Development Rights, Strategic, Initiative, Code Cleanup, potential residential units of use and bonus unit pools, including amendments to Chapters, 51 and 52, as shown in Attachment B.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Gustafson, Mr. Bruce (Subject to his comments earlier. He wants the Nevada folks to consider from a local jurisdiction perspective that it is important that the purpose of what we're doing here is for affordable housing and employment), Mr. Friedrich, Mr. Lawrence, Mr. Yeates

**Motion carried.**

Ms. Aldean made a motion to recommend approval and adoption of Ordinance 2021-\_\_\_, as contained in Attachment C amending Ordinance 87-9 as amended, for the adoption of amendments to the TRPA Code of Ordinances, Chapters 21, 31, 39, 50, 51, 52, and 90 subject to the changes contained in the Errata sheet dated 7/29/21 and subject to the understanding that the wording of the ordinance, Paragraph 21.3.2.B will be referred back to the working group to be addressed in Phase Two of the Housing Code amendment process. In addition, the issue of prohibiting the use of ADUs as short-term rentals will also be considered. Part of this motion will also contain an amendment to Paragraph 31.3.2, the Table of Maximum Densities which will allow for one unit per parcel excluding ADUs except in the state of Nevada. In addition, if there are other references to the Amendment concerning the excluding of ADUs from the one unit per parcel limit elsewhere on the Code that staff is directed to make those changes as well.

Mr. Lawrence asked for one clarification on the motion. Would the motion take off the table in Nevada, removing the one acre limit and return it to the working group.

Ms. Aldean said yes, that's her understanding and it would be referred back to the working group for further consideration.

Mr. Lawrence said he'll vote no on that motion. One, he thinks we're kind of chasing ghosts a little bit. He's also uncomfortable that we don't have on the Regional Plan Implementation Committee representation from Washoe County and Douglas County. Because of that, he would prefer to have it move forward to the full board so that they can participate and have this discussion with the full board.

Mr. Marshall wanted to get some language that construes that. He feels that the language in the motion made is accepting the one unit per acre. For purposes of RPIC, make that recommendation, and then he'll come back with language when we address this at the Governing Board. He wanted to be certain that the language does what Ms. Aldean stated. To clarify, it is to limit the allowance for up to two ADUs on parcels of less than one acre to California.

Ms. Aldean said that's fine.

REGIONAL PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

July 29, 2021

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Ms. Gustafson, Mr. Bruce, Mr. Friedrich, Mr. Yeates

Nays: Mr. Lawrence for the reasons he stated earlier. They don't have representation from Washoe and Douglas Counties and isn't comfortable making that change as an RPIC recommendation. He reserves the right to change his vote when it gets to the Governing Board.

**Motion carried.**

Ms. Aldean made a motion to recommend Adoption of Resolution 2021-\_\_ to amend the Rules and Procedures that are set forth in Attachment D.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Bruce, Mr. Friedrich, Mr. Lawrence, Mr. Yeates

Absent: Ms. Gustafson

**Motion carried.**

Mr. Yeates thanked his colleagues for the attention and patience to go through this very good and important changes to our housing policies.

V. COMMITTEE MEMBER REPORTS

None.

VI. PUBLIC INTEREST COMMENTS

Kathy Julian said in reviewing the list for the Tahoe Living and Housing Community Revitalization Working Group she doesn't see a lot of input from Incline Village residents. There's a representative from the chair of the Incline Village General Improvement District Board of Trustees, Tim Callicrate and Washoe County management staff, Eric Young. She doesn't see the grass roots feedback from people who live here in Incline Village and have strong feelings about the need for affordable housing for workers. Also, that this doesn't backfire on us turn into short-term rentals because the state of Nevada or Washoe County is reluctant to put restrictions on rentals. She thanked Mr. Bruce for his comments and his efforts. She agreed that we need to have from TRPA a strong statement that this code change should not encourage the use of new ADUs as short-term rentals. She has little faith in Washoe County that they will take a strong stand on this because frankly it's in their financial interest to have short-term rentals and the tourism revenue. She urged more representation from residents of Incline Village on any working committee that is addressing code changes.

Pamela Tsigdinos, Incline Village resident said they are the people who day-to-day have to suffer the consequences of bad actors.

Mr. Yeates said this public comment period for items that were not before the committee. The issue of short-term rentals and the changes to the ADUs was a part of matters before the committee today. We must adhere to the fundamental purposes for this public interest comment that would be on items that were not agenzized for this hearing.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Aldean moved to adjourn.

REGIONAL PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

July 29, 2021

Chair Mr. Yeates adjourned the meeting at 10:39 am.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Marja Ambler". The signature is written in black ink and is centered on the page.

Marja Ambler  
Clerk to the Board