

Marja Ambler

From: Jacob Stock
Sent: Thursday, December 8, 2022 9:37 AM
To: Marja Ambler
Subject: FW: Objections and Proposed New Amendments for TBAP
Attachments: NTRAC letter.docx

Re. Placer County AP.

From: leah kaufman <leah.lkplanning@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Wednesday, December 7, 2022 10:06 PM
To: Cindy.Gustafson <cindygustafson@placer.ca.gov>; Sophie Fox <sfox@placer.ca.gov>; Kathy Hopkins <KHopkins@placer.ca.gov>; swdra@placer.ca.gov; Emily Setzer <ESetzer@placer.ca.gov>; Crystal Jacobsen <CJacobse@placer.ca.gov>; Shirlee Herrington <sherring@placer.ca.gov>; mwood@placer.ca.gov; Gavin Feiger <gavin@keeptahoebblue.org>
Cc: andersplan@me.com; 'Bridget Powers' <bridget@jxbproperties.com>; 'Alexis Ollar' <alexis@mapf.org>; 'C Munch' <cmunch4@gmail.com>; 'Rinnn' <rinnn@aol.com>; 'Tobi Tyler' <tylertahoe1@gmail.com>; 'Carolyn Willette' <carolyntahoe@sbcglobal.net>; tahoellie@yahoo.com; Kristina Hill <tahoehills@att.net>; 'Doug Flaherty' <tahoebblue365@gmail.com>; jmtornese@aol.com; 'Dana Schneider' <danafschnieder@gmail.com>; Cindy Gustafson <Cindy@GoTahoeNorth.com>; Ann Nichols <preserve@ntpac.org>; Stacy Wydra <swydra@placer.ca.gov>; Jacob Stock <jstock@trpa.gov>; Jennifer Self <jself@trpa.gov>; leah kaufman <leah.lkplanning@sbcglobal.net>; Ron Grassi <rongsallygrassi@mac.com>
Subject: Re: Objections and Proposed New Amendments for TBAP

Hi

Please consider this letter for the planning Commission meeting tomorrow. Sorry for the late submittal but there is a lot of information in the proposed amendments. I did not make it all the way through but hopefully addressed the key issues. I would be glad to meet or discuss.

Leah Kaufman
Land Planner
530-386-2134

On Wednesday, December 7, 2022 at 03:21:34 PM PST, Gavin Feiger <gavin@keeptahoebblue.org> wrote:

Attached is the League's letter, submitted earlier today.

Gavin Feiger

Senior Land Use Policy Analyst, League to Save Lake Tahoe
2608 Lake Tahoe Boulevard, South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150 | 530.541.5388 | keeptahoebblue.org



This email message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message.

From: Ann Nichols <preserve@ntpac.org>
Sent: Wednesday, December 7, 2022 1:54 PM
To: 'Cindy Gustafson' <cindygustafson@placer.ca.gov>; sfox@placer.ca.gov; khopkins@placer.ca.gov; swdra@placer.ca.gov; esetzer@placer.ca.gov; cjacobse@placer.ca.gov; sherring@placer.ca.gov; mwood@placer.ca.gov
Cc: andersplan@me.com; 'Bridget Powers' <Bridget@jxbproperties.com>; Gavin Feiger <gavin@keeptahoeblue.org>; 'Alexis Ollar' <alexis@mapf.org>; 'C Munch' <cmunch4@gmail.com>; 'Rinnn' <rinnn@aol.com>; 'Tobi Tyler' <tylertahoe1@gmail.com>; 'Carolyn Willete' <carolyntahoe@sbcglobal.net>; tahoellie@yahoo.com; 'leah kaufman' <leah.lkplanning@sbcglobal.net>; Kristina Hill <tahoehills@att.net>; 'Doug Flaherty' <tahodblue365@gmail.com>; jmtornese@aol.com; 'Dana Schneider' <danafs Schneider@gmail.com>
Subject: (HIGH RISK ATTACHMENT)Objections and Proposed New Amendments for TBAP

Opposition to Proposed Tahoe Basin Area Plan Amendments; and Support for New Changed Amendments

December 8, 2022, Item 3; 10:30 a.m.

To Placer County Planning Commission,

From: North Tahoe Preservation Alliance. NTPA has been [helping preserve the natural beauty and rural character of North Lake Tahoe since 2008](#) "

We oppose:

1. Not Complying with CEQA- the Staff's citation at page 1 of the November 22, 2022 Staff Report of CEQA Guidelines Section 15061(b)(3) ("Section 15061(b)(3)") as exempting the adoption of the proposed Area Plan Amendments from the California Environmental Quality Act. The clear language of Section 1506(b)(3) demonstrates that the "common sense exemption" does not apply to the proposed Tahoe Basin Area Plan Amendment, and compliance with CEQA should be required of the proposed Tahoe Basin Area Plan Amendment.

North Tahoe Preservation Alliance supports:

- 2. -Scenic-**Protecting the ridgelines-Keep buildings from projecting above the ridgelines. Remove redline change of SR-p 9.
- 3. Scenic-**Economic improvement should not be a trigger to reevaluate scenic requirements. SR P 9&10.Remove text“economic improvement”.

4. **Height-Change:** 3 Stories should be 36', not 46'.
5. **Height-** 3 years of Community meetings on TBAP ending in 2017 resulted in agreement that height should be limited to 36' on lakeside of SR28 and 48' on mountainside of SR28. Keep it at those heights. North and West shore do not have the infrastructure for more density. Attached is a photo of 48' vs. 70'. (Kings Beach Housing 48' vs. 70' (actual proposed is just under 72'))
6. **Maximum length** of blank wall should be limited to 220'. That is ½ city block, the proposed 500 lineal feet is more than a city block. Kings Beach Safeway is 225' wide (widest structure in Kings Beach) and Domas is 170'.
7. **Parking** There must be a parking plan included in this plan change. Density is increased and parking eliminated in some cases. Single family lots are now basically allowed to be triplexes. TRPA Multi person density is 25 people/acre to a max of 50 with deed restricted use. TBAP is 62. Keep it at 50 people/acre if deed restricted workforce or low income.
8. **Deed Restricted housing** should be targeted to workforce and low income. Deed Restricted housing must require one local worker per unit and prices must not exceed \$500k or a one bedroom rental maximum rate of \$1200/mo or 2 bedroom of \$1500/mo. CPI increases could be included. Affordable and achievable housing is essentially market rate (\$750k-\$1.4m) which doesn't solve the workforce housing problem.
9. **Density is increased** through TRPA Transfer Development Right (TDR) program and conversions of Tourist Accommodation Units (TAU) think motel room to condo, condotel to Commercial Floor Area (CFA) and visa versa. Bonus units are also additive which can be created by removing stream environment coverage. There is no cap on condo or freestanding unit size. A 180 sf south shore motel room (TAU) becomes a 5k sf penthouse in Crystal Bay and then the old motel site is again redeveloped (Colony Inn/Boulder Bay). The Tahoe Inn motel in Kings Beach had 110 motel rooms (Taus) which were applied towards the large luxury west shore Homewood project and now the developer proposes 110 condos (1-4 bedrooms each) on the site. It's double dipping and it is all additive density. The Tahoe Conservancy is selling off their lands and there is a TRPA marketplace for monetizing these entitlements. There is really no cap on Tahoe's capacity.
10. **Multi-family and multi-person uses** must be required to have a minor use permit. Reducing minimum lot size, setbacks, and parking increase the number of lots that can be developed and increases density. Community should still have notice and a say in the process.
11. **TRPA “2 step process”** which allows immediate conversion of multi-family to condominium must be eliminated. Condos sell for more \$ than multi-family. Developers prefer more profit, so multi-family will not be built.
12. **Single Family or free standing Condos** can be part of a mixed use project on the mountain side of SR28, but shouldn't be on street level on both sides of SR 298 or 89.

13. **Staff needs to give examples of how the changed calculation of mixed use density compares to TRPA's.** Also, give examples of sales prices of low income, affordable, moderate and achievable housing pricing given 7% interest and the buyers spending 30% of their income on housing.
14. **Short term rental (STR) inventory allowances should be reduced from either 3900 permits to 1500 permits or alternatively limit # of rental days per year.** Removing 1 STR for each hotel room is inadequate. Do condotels count as a hotel room?
15. **Ground water intercept** should only be allowed if the dewatering is a one time event that doesn't harm the environment.
16. The County must do a **cumulative analysis**

Of the environmental impacts of all the projects approved or in review.

Placer County is fast tracking what they have called, “experimental” development code changes that will affect Lake Tahoe forever. This month TRPA is also beginning the process of changing their code and thresholds. What if significantly reduced parking, extra height (70’), density, and massing changes don’t work?

BAE Urban Economics, the experts that came up with these ideas, did it again back in 2012 for the failed 2012 TRPA Regional Plan. 2022 is not 2012. It’s the same tired more, more, more solutions. We all know the lake isn’t clearer (plastics, invasives, toxic algae), traffic is worse, wildfires more frequent; multi-million dollar condos are the norm, and affordable housing scarce.

The County’s justification in their own words is to “kick start” development; “scale back requirements”, “alleviate constraints” and “maximize density”.

The reality is there are 14 projects approved or under review on or near the North and West Shore.

Watch: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WKzPL-EwEUw>

1. Boulder Bay	2. Cal-Neva
3. Tahoe Inn	4. Ferrari/Laulima
5. 39 Degrees	6. Neptune Investment mixed use
7. Martis Valley West	8. Jason’s Restaurant-
9. Alpine View Estates	10. Boatworks Redevelopment
11. Tahoe City Lodge	12. Homewood
13. Palisades Ski Area	14. Dollar Creek Crossing

6 large projects are attached-Boulder Bay, Cal-Neva, Tahoe Inn, Kings Beach Town Center, Ferrari/Laulima, Martis Valley West. In addition, there are 8 more notated on the chart. 14 new projects aren't enough? SR 28 and 89 are only two lanes. There is no walking back bad ideas once the damage is done. Think Tahoe Keys.

We support the comments on the proposed TBAP amendments expressed by the representatives of Friends of the West Shore, League to Save Lake Tahoe, Ellie Waller, Mountain Area Preservation, Diane Becker, Tahoe Area Sierra Club, and Tahoe Sierra Clean Air.

Sincerely,

Ann Nichols



North Tahoe Preservation Alliance

P.O. Box 4

Crystal Bay, Nv. 89402

preserve@ntpac.org

775-831-0625

www.ntpac.org

"Helping preserve the natural beauty and rural character of North Lake Tahoe"

TikTok Video: https://www.tiktok.com/@northtahoepreservation?_t=8XCELbNFbSt&r=1

Instagram Video: <https://www.instagram.com/northtahoepreservation/>

Leah Kaufman Planning

PO Box 253

Carnelian Bay, CA

96140

December 7, 2022

Dear Members of the Planning Commission and Placer County staff,

My name is Leah Kaufman. I have been a Land Use Planner in the Tahoe Basin for over 43 years. (41 years working in the private sector and two years in the public sector for the TRPA). I was the longest standing member of the North Tahoe Design Team for over 20 years and a member of the stakeholder group that worked from 2012 to 2017 giving input into the adopted 2017 Tahoe Area Plan. I live and work in Tahoe Vista and am currently semi-retired and *not involved with any* of the proposed or approved projects currently being evaluated by Placer County.

I am in favor of revitalization of the community and redevelopment within the existing character of our mountain communities and improving what we already have. Some of the proposed County amendments such as encouraging active ground floor uses, childcare facilities, facilitating mobile and food truck vendors, supporting the retention of and expansion of business and public art, redevelopment of aging properties, and a need to provide affordable workforce housing within the Town Centers are among them.

My comments are based on the power point presentation provided by Placer County Planning staff on October 15, 2022, the NTRAC meeting of November 30, 2022, reading track changes proposed by Placer County Planning staff in the Tahoe Area Plan, and several meetings with stakeholders and public officials. My underlines below, are either requests for clarification or suggestions based on the material reviewed as stated above.

(I apologize for the late submittal of this letter but there are over 800 pages to read and absolutely not enough time to synthesize all the information or even address it all as the devil is in the details as they say).

1). Based on the Oct 15th power point (page 8) seven stakeholders meeting for only two months were involved in crafting the amendments you are being asked to approve. The seven stakeholders consisted of members from the business and design community only.

The Regional Plan for TRPA with adopted thresholds and carrying capacities was approved in 2012. For five years approximately 37 Area Plan team members representing the community at large, business, the residents, and even visitors and second homeowners etc. participated in numerous meetings bimonthly to create a vision they wanted to see for our communities and in 2017 the Tahoe Area Plan was adopted. (Our names are on the first and second pages of the plan). These 37 members do not include the environmental or business associations

also listed. I feel my biggest disappointment is that not one of the 37 or so of us was notified or included in the crafting or input into these new amendments and most of us still live here.

I feel strongly that the original plan team members as well as additional stakeholders who would like to be involved, should be informed of these proposed amendments and have the ability to meet discuss, give input, and have questions answered by County staff before ANYTHING is approved by the County Planning Commission, Board of Supervisors or the TRPA Governing Board. Five years of our time in crafting a vision for our communities should be taken into consideration as public participation has been very limited and the process rushed. The changes proposed are complex, and of a scale that could impact land uses in this Basin forever.

2). *Short-term rentals*-The October power point (page 6) states that the resident population has declined since 2000 but failed to mention the increase in population by the tourists and second homeowners which have increased dramatically especially since the pandemic. The presentation also did not mention the current reduction of available long-term rentals due to short-term rentals as part of VRBO and Airbnb that has directly impacted work force housing.

3,900 short term rental entitlements are allowed in Eastern Placer County which if cut in half or reduced could potentially house thousands of workers. 3,240 properties are currently approved for short-term rentals per the Placer County web site as of December 5, 2022 leaving over 660 more spots yet we experience many problems as a result of what is already approved.

I would urge you to read the New York Post article written by Lisa Fickenescher November 4, 2022 regarding strict Airbnb guidelines proposed to be implemented in January for New York City. Only permanent residents are allowed to rent a portion of their homes short-term with no separate lock off or entrance. Santa Monica and Boston have enacted restrictions due to the impact on existing hotels and long-term renters. Santa Rosa, County of Sonoma and Windsor have enacted recent moratoriums on short-term rentals to develop more stringent regulations for many of the reasons expressed above. (conversation with Windsor County Planner Kim Voge 12/7/2022).

Note: Regulations in Placer County are not strict enough for short-term rental use and 3,900 units is a huge impact in a small community that swells during the summer months. All of the neighborhoods have done their best to accommodate the renters, clean up trash from the beaches as we have been asked to be the stewards of the lake, but what are the true impacts of this use and our annual visitors in terms of the regional plan and capacity? Traffic is in gridlock during the summer months as we have only two lanes, and noise and partying goes on late into the night. Realtors say that people purchase homes with the intent to short term rent to make money to offset their mortgages.

I think it is important that our largest employers i.e. the ski areas should have the most stringent requirements to provide housing for their employees preferably on site. A good example is Northstar with Sawmill Heights of about 120 units.

In addition to a cumulative analysis of the true impacts of short- term rentals, I would advocate a visitor entry fee into the basin to deal with some of these issues.

3). *Density* In 2020, the County adopted the Placer County Accessory Dwelling Unit ordinance which essentially allows three residential type units on every residential parcel with limited or no parking requirements. (ADU's, JADU's, or tiny homes with a single family dwelling and reduced parking requirements and setbacks).

While not necessarily a bad idea to have multiple units on a parcel that could potentially assist with work force housing, there is still the potential for impacts to water quality, traffic, air quality, scenic, neighboring impacts, etc. and is a density increase in my opinion.

Additionally, the code language to change minimum lot sizes, and to reduce setbacks could increase the potential for additional development. The Area Plan amendments propose reductions from 6,000 sf lot minimums to 2,900 lot minimums and also there is language for no minimum lot sizes.

Example: If you currently have a minimum lot size of 6,000 sf required for one single family residence, and you reduce the setbacks and the size of the parcel by half would this not allow for two structures? Reduction of setbacks, and elimination of parking intuitively would allow more building than would otherwise be allowed if setbacks and parking were required.

An accountable tracking for all existing and proposed development in the basin should be provided and would include the potential increase in density for ADU's, JADU's, and tiny homes on a single parcel, the lots the conservancy originally purchased and now wants to put back on the market, the transfer of development rights and TAU's from other jurisdictions, conversion of CFA to residential and or tourist units, etc.

Example of a conversion would be reducing 3,500 sf of commercial floor area to 17.5 multiple family units with no size restriction, 11.67 TAU's, or 11.67 Single Family Residential Units of Use with no size restriction. CFA is currently underutilized and available. Again this is not necessarily a bad thing but what are the exact impacts of these conversions as related to the proposed amendments in terms of density, massing, scenic, water quality, noise and other thresholds?

4). *Height* Page 9 and Page 18 of the October power point states that a re-evaluation of scenic requirements to achieve private reinvestment should be supported if it creates less auto dependency and provides economic opportunities. It is my understanding that scenic requirements are adopted TRPA thresholds and that TRPA does not allow a mix and match of their thresholds? i.e. scenic increases in height for transportation tradeoff or economic reasons. The County also crossed out the word ridgeline in the proposed amended TBAP.

Protection of Ridgeline views are in the TRPA thresholds and so I would like clarification why anyone would propose increased heights exceeding ridgeline views especially if this is a TRPA threshold?

Put the word ridgeline back in the text.

Comment Letter for Tahoe Basin Plan Amendments
Kaufman Planning and Consulting
December 7, 2022

Four stories and 56 feet of height on both the lake and mountainside of Highway 28 is more height than the community and business working groups agreed upon after meeting for two and a half years as part of the 2017 Tahoe Area Plan process. (The County changed the height to increase it from three stories on the lake and 4 stories on the mountainside in 2017 before implementation of the plan to 56 feet for both sides of the highway). As stated previously, approx. 37 community plan team members, and numerous stakeholder groups participated in a vision they wanted to see for our communities and height was a big issue. Many local architects said if more creativity is used then there is absolutely no need for additional heights over 56 feet within the Town Center. Note: The Domus project in Kings Beach is 48 feet and four stories for a visual example.

As a compromise I would support not changing the height that is allowed in the 2017 adopted Area Plan. (NTRAC and League To Save Lake Tahoe suggestion) and get clarification on roof top decks if they are considered appurtenances.

TBAP amendments also eliminate height protections in transition areas which are currently 48 feet and code language amendments cross out this height and defer to Town Center heights. I do not support any changes to this language and don't understand the intent?

Additionally, I do not support any height increases in Village Centers from what was crafted in the 2017 plan.

Note: 48 feet of height is the height of the Domus project at the east end of Kings Beach adjacent to neighboring residential uses. The height of this building towers over its adjacent uses. (Section 2.09 of the TBAP).

There should be an overall vision plan for each of our communities affected by the proposed amendments and the trending projects, including renderings and simulations showing the 56 feet of height with appurtenances. We need specific examples. (I believe there should there be a minimum lot size that is eligible for the large-scale development with open space provided to break up massing of the taller buildings. I support the idea of working from larger to smaller scale in the center of Town Centers towards the transition areas at the ends as proposed by the League.

I would also like to share my conversation with Kim Voge planner with the Town of Windsor on the 20 year old Village Green mixed use project. It is over 50 units of mixed use with residential on top and commercial on the bottom and is three stories tall. This project is highly successful and vibrant. (The pride of the Town) and has parking for each of the residential units. The ground floor commercial consists of restaurants, small scale wine bars, shops etc. Incidentally, also, under current regulations, the tallest height allowed in the Town of Windsor is 57 feet and Town is not located near any scenic resources.

5). For individual buildings, wording was removed for the “wedding cake articulation for side setback and language added for allowing up to 500-foot-long buildings. (300 feet is the length of play in a football field).

I am adamantly opposed to allowing more than the 250 feet as written in the code and eliminating any reference to 500-foot-long buildings with or without articulation in our Town Centers. This impact alone would forever change the character of our communities.

I would also like to understand what the replacement language is for the “wedding cakes?”

6). Multiple Family development no matter where located should have a parking plan and specific site evaluations whether in the Town Centers and especially projects located ½ mile away. (Page 20)

A blanket proposal to simply eliminate parking for multiple family dwelling projects is a bad idea. Parking is always an issue, we live in snow country, and it is unrealistic to expect that everyone will be riding a bus or walking especially in areas where services are limited.

I would propose a site-specific evaluation of parking site by site for new development, as each parcel has its own unique set of circumstances. Emphasis on shared parking and shared access would be encouraged and incentivized. I.e. reduction in requirements for every shared space, reductions for access, and perhaps a bigger reduction than is in the current ordinance for parking adjacent to a bus stop, A master parking plan for the entire town, County assistance programs, paid parking like Truckee, two hour parking restrictions and a reevaluation of public parking etc. The Town of Windsor says the biggest issues they face are conflicts of parking between the business and residences in the Downtown and they have not been able to solve them. For the affordable projects parking reductions include 1 space per studio or one bedroom, 1 ½ spaces for a two bedroom and no covered parking requirements.(conversation with Kim Voge- Planner for the Town of Windsor- December 7, 2022).

7). The plan amendments state that “some new single-family dwellings” should be allowed in Town Centers (page 23) even though there was unanimous agreement by the plan teams that they could not be on a ground floor along the highway and that no new single-family dwellings should be allowed.

The statement of “some” is open ended and needs to be defined. I feel the original intent of the plan teams that no new single-family dwellings on the ground floor along Highway 28 should be upheld. More definition and specifics are needed for the single-family dwelling proposal even with mixed uses. Are these proposed market rate condo developments in Town Centers or is this for individual freestanding houses in Town Centers? I did not see any protection in the ordinances for the existing TAU’s especially on the Lake, which also contribute to a healthy diverse community.

It appears the way the amendments are written that affordable, moderate income or “achievable” housing would be allowed as part of market rate condo developments in the Town Centers. I question why anyone would want to build affordable or moderate housing if the higher achievable housing makes the most money?

The acronyms used such as “tiny houses”, JADU’s, ADU’s, affordable housing, moderate housing, single family dwelling, multiple family dwellings, and deed restricted “achievable housing” can be confusing.

I would like to see a user-friendly manual of the different housing types in relation to County median income levels, required deed restrictions, and potential locations for such, as well as an identified need for each type. Once this is identified, if not already, the code should include language requiring a mix of workforce housing not just the higher end or “achievable housing.” We need specific examples, visual aids and simulations of what these is intended with the single family dwelling development.

8) *Special Use*-The code also proposes changing uses specifically zoned as “special use” and or requiring Design Development Review and making these uses allowable by right (A) which I believe would eliminate the public noticing requirement? 15 multiple family units with elimination of parking requirements, reduced setbacks, and no notice could potentially impact neighboring uses and the environment and is against the TRPA Rules of Procedure Chapter 12.14.1 which requires public notice for employee housing, multiple residential development, Tourist Accommodations, Timeshare, additional height proposals, commercial over a certain sf etc. TRPA also has specifics regarding when Hearings Officer review would be required so the public or affected neighbors can weigh in.

I also did not understand why bars of 17,000 sf would be allowable by right, but high end restaurants over 2,400 sf would require a use permit? (from the TBAP amendments).
Clarification please.

I believe the public should be informed of the more significant projects. Current notice requirements are between 300 to 500 feet for projects requiring a use permit plus hearings officer review at the TRPA. I would add language to the amendments that require noticing to the public, regardless if a use is changed from “special to allowable”. Additionally, changes in use should be consistent with TRPA Code.

9).*New projects* -The County’s power point states that no new projects have been developed in either Town Center, (Kings Beach and Tahoe City) (page 3), and very few workforce housing units built. However, there are 14 projects in the works or that have been approved in these two areas that are not discussed. Perhaps some have not moved forward for *other reasons* besides the planning process if approved? Maybe, they are having difficulty with financing, inflation, the economy, and/or the need to make more profits, timing, demand, etc? Placer County has contributed millions of dollars in financial assistance to several of the larger projects that are proposed in the form of purchased TAU’s, Land and building acquisition, partnerships, and assistance with tax credits, etc.

I would like the County to provide a description of the 14 development projects with details such as # of units, location, type of units, size, workforce component, achievable v.s. low income, moderate income, market rate etc, and where they currently are in the planning stages. The same should be done for the work force housing. We also should understand what

monies have already been spent to assist the developers and what tax credits and other available monies are available.

I agree with the NTRAC recommendation that redevelopment should be preferred over new development but am unsure what this really means as most of the Basin has been developed. Would like a clarification.

10). *Cumulative Impacts*- Changing scenic requirements to allow more height, the potential for additional density by allowing less setbacks, reduced lot sizes, and square footage allowances based on VMT, (page 16), increasing building lengths to 500 feet, (page 17) etc. reducing parking requirements, changing special uses to allowable uses, etc. all have potential impacts to traffic, scenic, air quality, neighborhood impacts, water quality etc. The staff say that a categorical exemption of the code changes would be required for each larger project being evaluated separately. This eliminates the potential to assess the cumulative effects of proposed code language changes.

Cumulative impacts must be addressed not by a categorical exemption based on an amended Area Plan but a full environmental analysis should be performed. TRPA has asked for an Initial Study to be completed by Placer County by a certain date. (conversation with Jacob Stock-TRPA planner- 12/5/2022). This study should be completed and available for public review prior to approval of any of the amendments.

11). The Tahoe Basin Area Plan proposes eliminating the sign chapter to defer to TRPA Code of Ordinances.

Clarification-I would like to know if there are any differences between the two ordinances? Will Design Review still have jurisdiction and review signage for individual projects in Placer County or will applicants have to apply to TRPA?

Summary:

There are a lot of great goals proposed as part of the Placer County amendments as stated in the beginning of this letter and no one denies that revitalization and work force housing are of paramount importance. We must consider the existing mountain character, the vision proposed for the plan adopted in 2017, the impacts to people who live and work here, our two-lane road infrastructure, environmental thresholds, cumulative impacts and carrying capacity before making irrevocable changes to our existing plan. Once regulations, new policies, and amendments are put in place, they have the potential to impact the Lake and our communities for ever.

Please take more time to allow for a robust conversation between all the community members expressing their concerns, answer specific questions raised, explain the code language, and request visuals and examples of what is exactly intended for these amendments before you make any decisions.

(I would be glad to volunteer my time with any working group to further review and evaluate the changes).

Thank you

Leah Kaufman- Land Planner

Marja Ambler

From: Craig Lemons <craiglemons79@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 7, 2022 7:30 AM
To: Marja Ambler
Subject: Fwd: Potential Placer County Developments

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Craig Lemons** <craiglemons79@gmail.com>
Date: Mon, Dec 5, 2022 at 12:13 PM
Subject: Potential Placer County Developments
To: <jhester@trpa.gov>, <cdraecs@placer.ca.gov>
Cc: Craig Lemons <craiglemons79@gmail.com>, Linda <emersondrive8965@gmail.com>, TAMRA LEMONS BROWN <TamraL.Brown@faircom.com> <TamraL.Brown@faircom.com>, Jim Pace <jlpace10@yahoo.com>, <trpa@trpa.gov>, Ann Nichols <preserve@ntpac.org>, John Williamson <john@livingyourmountaindream.com>, sandra <sandra@geocaddsurveys.com>, info@sierrawatch.org <info@sierrawatch.org>, <jcassas@yahoo.com>, <pauldmatthewsir@gmail.com>

Hi Marja.

I may have incorrectly sent this letter to the wrong spot can you get this letter to the correct person?

Thank You
Craig
Hello Mr Hester,

Thank you for your work with TRPA and keeping Tahoe healthy

My name is Craig Lemons and I own a place in Kings Beach. I have recently found out about numerous (14 !!) proposed developments on the North Shore, See proposals listed below

Im sure TRPA is well aware of these proposals and I would like to know what TRPA's position is on them?

I feel as do many of my friends that this amount of development is waaaay too mucha nd is being done to quickly. I dont think public input has been given, nor has the public been informed of the amount and extent of the proposals.

Im hoping that TRPA can help to slow this process down., I am not the only one who feels that Tahoe is busting at the seams with popularity and way more people than it can handle .

The lake we all love is getting loved to death.
Please use TRPAs influence to slow things down

Thank you
Craig Lemons

: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WKzPL-EwEUw>

1. Boulder Bay	2. Cal-Neva
3. Tahoe Inn	4. Ferrari/Laulima
5. 39 Degrees	6. Neptune Investment mixed use
7. Martis Valley West	8. Jason's Restaurant-
9. Alpine View Estates	10. Boatworks Redevelopment
11. Tahoe City Lodge	12. Homewood
13. Palisades Ski Area	

Marja Ambler

From: Debbie Rosell <rosell4@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 7, 2022 2:22 PM
To: Marja Ambler; John Hester; Julie Regan
Cc: rosell4@yahoo.com
Subject: Eastern Placer County Plan modifications - specific to North Lake Tahoe

Dear TRPA Advisory Planning Commission team members, Governing Board members, and Governing Board Staff members:

Please vote to reject the motion to amend the Eastern Placer County Plan modifications at this time. It is simply not ready for prime time.

With this motion, you will see it is designed for huge developers to make more profit, but at the expense of the public and the capacity of the lake basin. It begs the question: is Tahoe here for a few to make huge profits? or for the people of the world to visit in their time and with smaller scale redevelopments?

Remember too that your own Placer County Redevelopment Agency has received viable offers from developers who have smaller scale ideas, fully ready to perform within the current codes. The fact that your own Redevelopment Agency has turned them away is a major part of the problem.

There are too many unanswered questions and unsubstantiated studies and the public comment period has been too short for you to understand the depth of the affect the public will be experiencing with your decision. As you are aware, many people are already weary of governmental decisions, and this one is a definite example of that concern. Give it time, there is no hurry. Give it thought, really take time to see what could happen with untethered development.

Not fair representation or public process by any means. The county planning process is likened to a statement I heard last Thursday: "the county took 2 years to prepare a 7-course meal and they are giving us 5 minutes to eat it!"

Un-equal representation: According to staff, the Placer County planning department and planners have spent the last 2 years working towards modifications to the Eastern Placer County community plans. They have relaxed the restrictions on development with meetings with the developers themselves as well as within their own meetings.

Yet they allow the public 2 minutes to comment. Even past plan team members who donated over a hundred hours to create a community-based plan are allowed only 2 minutes now.

Population of full-time residents: county claims it is down, and perhaps the 2020 census, taken in 2019 showed less full-time occupants than in 2010. But as Realtors during the covid pandemic of 2020, 2021, 2022, and as school district officials can attest to, the local full time population jumped by several thousands of people in the past 3 years. Many work from home, but their kids do not. School enrollment went up so quickly that the district struggled to get enough new teachers for over 600 new students in one year.

We do need motels: Lalima Ferrari claimed that motel needs/visits were down from the past because they wanted to show that they needed to change the vision. In reality, they just closed down for much of the past 5 years. They said they were working on items, that they had some red-tagged rooms etc. Personally I had over 10 friends tell me that they had stayed there every year for their whole lives, and when they tried to make reservations, they were told the motel was not taking any customers. So were the developers trying "to show there is no need for motels????" Were they trying to get code changes that would allow them to build condos and single family homes on the lake? Would they need more height on the lake to make it "pencil out"?

25' foot lots in some neighborhoods: while I do hope to see tiny houses and extra workforce housing solutions, we must remember these subdivisions were legally developed in the 1920's, and private owners held many of these lots. Some are still in private ownership, but when they were considered undevelopable, the owners' rights to build them were condemned by government rulings. These condemnations were given a buyout for pennies on the dollar and the California Tahoe Conservancy or USFS purchased them. Now they will be legally buildable again. Should the previous owners, or their descendants be given the first rights to have them back? Would this taking by the government be now ripe for a lawsuit????

Height allowances gift to the developers: the largest GIFT of public permission to private developers is allowing more height. Height extension not only creates more mass, more sunlight and view blocking, but it allows more density. That is the only reason the developers want it: there is only so much land, but with extra height they can build higher to get more condos, motel/hotel rooms etc, and then throw in more workforce housing spaces as a gift back. Parking and traffic WILL BE AFFECTED!! Even if people use the public transit, there will be more cars.

Height allowances affect shore zone views: the plan team fought hard to keep the heights in check at 36 feet lakeside and 48 feet mountain side. Today's plans will allow 71/72 feet anywhere in the town centers. That is as high or higher than the Jeffrey pine trees in the area, or those left after

the developers cut most of them down and plant deciduous maple trees. Views from the lake will be affected.

Height shadows on neighbors: height also affects the neighboring properties. Many were built under current existing codes and will now be shadowed by ginormous mega buildings. Streets and sidewalks will be shadowed all winter long and exist in a perma-frost through November, December and January. There should be a shadow study showing that the shadow of a new building does not go more than 5 feet over the property line during the winter solstice at noon. This rule would also benefit the property owners on Rainbow, Trout, Brook and Minnow streets who might otherwise face living in a permanently shaded winter home where they used to have peek lake views.

Note other gifts of public funds: Placer County bought the Rudnick property in Tahoe City for \$4million as a gift to help a developer make his parking count work. Now he just needs height. Do we really need to give developers more??

Traffic and safety: a huge shortfall in the plan is the fact that traffic will be increased by allowing the modifications of the planning codes. It has not been studied or will it be. It will not combine the cumulative effects of all the developments planned to this point, because, so far, the county has not required them or calculated them.

Fire safety and other emergency needs for ingress and egress: you can already see from the Caldor fire last year how it took a mass effort to evacuate SLT and yet they did it because they had time, good planning and a 4-lane highway to facilitate it. More density, more huge developments will make our situation even worse than it already is. This aspect has not been planned well. If a fire hits here on a hot summer afternoon with some wind... well, we might have the time... it depends..., and we might have some planning, but we do not have the highway capacity. In fact, the county has been actively reducing that!! The increased potential for loss of life, known as collateral damage, will be a calculated risk that you, the planners, will be accepting. It is on your shoulders.

Remember With our negligence, HISTORY CAN REPEAT ITSELF

A brief background of untethered development prior to 1976 includes:

**mulit-story towers built for the casinos at CalNeva, Hyatt and South Lake Tahoe Stateline

**Tahoe City Peppertree tower

**Brockway Springs Condo tower (1 of 3 slated to be built)
**Tahoe Keys
**Incline Village upper areas of erosion prone soil
**Condos all over, including on meadows and wetlands
**ski area clear cut forests
**proposed 4 lane highways all around the lake (SLT Hwy 50, Kings Beach, Cornelian Bay, Tahoe City and Hwy 89 from Olympic Valley to Truckee were all built to 4 lanes during the early 1960's)
**proposed bridge over the end of Emerald Bay

Please vote no on the revisions. We can work with some of the ideas on Workforce housing as separate items. We can keep the heights the same as we agreed on the plan teams years ago. We can get developers who will work within those plans.

Thank you, Debra Rosell (Tahoe Vista Homeowner)

STARBARD ENTERPRISES



Real Estate Investment, Construction & Development Gen. Cont. Ca Lic.#389424 NV. Lic.# 023814

Don Starbard

P. O. Box 675

Crystal Bay, NV 89402

Cell: 775 690-0333 voice/fax 775 832-0333

e-mail don@starbard.com web site:

December 10, 2022

www.starbard.com

Placer County & Tahoe Regional Community Leadership & Planners

RE: Revision in development standards.

Please carefully consider the proposed change in development heights and density and the reduction of parking places required by new developers and associated roadway gridlock that this will follow.

I would advocate a more conservative approach one more consistent with the previously approved building standards. I agree that some upward revisions are needed in heights and density, but these should be less than the new proposal. I believe more coverage & density should be included for the individual single family residential properties by way of Alternate Dwelling Unit allowance.

Let us continue to make Lake Tahoe the gem of the HIGH SIERRA.

Sincerely,

Don Starbard



Placer County Planning Commission
3091 County Center Drive
Auburn, CA 95603

December 5, 2022

Dear Members of the Placer County Planning Commission:

The Friends of the West Shore (FOWS) appreciates the opportunity to provide comments on the Proposed Tahoe Basin Area Plan (TBAP) amendments. FOWS mission is to work toward the preservation, protection, and conservation of the West Shore, our watersheds, wildlife, and rural quality of life, for today and future generations. FOWS represents community interests from Emerald Bay to south of Tahoe City.

The following list outlines FOWS concerns with the proposed TBAP amendments.

- FOWS does not support the proposed amendments at this time because they aim to increase the residential and visitor populations on the north and west shore **without first addressing the existing conditions, recent population and visitation increases, and dangerous traffic jams that pose serious public health and safety concerns, especially with wildfire danger increasing every year.** With only a two-lane highway on the North and West Shores of Lake Tahoe, *any* increase in traffic and people will exacerbate a congested exodus in the event of a wildfire evacuation or other emergency need.
- FOWS believes that there needs to be an updated environmental analysis based on **existing** conditions and populations specific to the north and west shore communities that will be affected. Placer County is proposing to do a Categorical Exemption and TRPA will do an environmental checklist, both of which will tier from the EIR/S's done for the 2016 Tahoe Basin Area Plan (TBAP) and 2012 TRPA Regional Plan Update (RPU). Since the TBAP relied heavily on the analysis from the 2012 RPU, which was based primarily on 2010 data, this means that the 'evaluation' of these amendments is relying in large part on analyses that are almost 13 years old. Peak traffic, visitor and residential populations, and wildfire danger are among several parameters that have **significantly** changed since 2010.
- There are many large traffic-generating projects along the West and North shores in various stages of the permitting and/or development pipeline, including but not limited to the Tahoe City Lodge, the Boatworks redevelopment, Palisades Tahoe, Homewood Mountain Resort, and Boulder Bay. The cumulative impact of all these projects added to *existing* traffic conditions should be evaluated prior to adopting these Area Plan amendments, especially considering the impacts of the additional traffic on emergency evacuation and access.
- FOWS recognizes and supports the need for affordable and low income housing, but believes that Placer should find housing solutions that are consistent with the zoning under the current Area Plans approved in 2017. FOWS also want to preserve the rural atmosphere of West Shore communities. The proposal assumes that simply making it easier to permit more units will solve the affordable housing problem. What about the impacts of Short-term Vacation Rentals on affordable housing? What other trends in the economy/society have contributed to the affordable housing shortage? For example, how many workforce rentals have been lost due to remote workers who can now live here full time? Are there other programs or actions that could

further incentivize second homeowners to rent out their units full time and/or the development of inactive or vacant properties? How will the increased cost of building materials/inflation affect such housing?

- FOWS is also concerned that these amendments were prepared without engagement with the broader public, including the Planning Teams who spent years reviewing and compromising on the original Tahoe Basin Area Plan regulations. Now these amendments are being fast-tracked toward approvals while the general public is still just finding out about the changes.
- On the West Shore, the proposal to change multi-unit uses from requiring a Minor Use Permit to being Allowed 'by right' means adjacent/nearby properties would not have to be notified of such developments. This takes the public out of the equation both at the permit-level stage and now at the planning stage (due to the lack of adequate engagement and review done with the public on the amendments).
- The amendments also reduce, or in some cases, eliminate the requirement for parking for new units. FOWS is concerned that this may result in more vehicles parking along public roadways and in residential areas, creating traffic concerns and other impacts. We believe it is unrealistic to assume the new residents or visitors staying in the new units will not have vehicles that need to be parked somewhere, especially without an improved transit system.
- A lot of effort went into the scenic protections in Town Centers in the original adoption of the TBAP. The amendments would allow for taller/wider buildings that may further block views of the mountains and lake. Suggestions that TRPA's scenic requirements will prevent scenic impacts makes little sense; the amendments themselves show the plan would allow for more height and massing than is currently allowed and there is no mitigation that can physically prevent taller and wider buildings from blocking views. In other words, there is no way to mitigate a lost view.

FOWS requests that the amendments be postponed unless and until a comprehensive environmental analysis based on existing conditions (and current TRPA environmental thresholds, e.g. the revised VMT standard) and adequate public engagement is performed. Thank you for considering these comments.

Sincerely,



Judith Tornese,
President

Cc: Jacob Stock, Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

Marja Ambler

From: Jacob Stock
Sent: Thursday, December 8, 2022 9:35 AM
To: Marja Ambler
Subject: FW: TBAP proposed amendments - Comment for Placer County Planning Meeting on 12/8/22

Re. Placer County AP.

From: wintmobile@aol.com <wintmobile@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 6, 2022 12:50 AM
To: adashiel@placer.ca.gov; Shirlee Herrington <sherring@placer.ca.gov>; Cindy.Gustafson <cindygustafson@placer.ca.gov>; Kathy Hopkins <KHopkins@placer.ca.gov>; swydra@placer.ca.gov; Emily Setzer <ESetzer@placer.ca.gov>; Crystal Jacobsen <CrystJacobse@placer.ca.gov>; planning@placer.ca.gov
Cc: John Hester <jhester@trpa.gov>; Julie Regan <jregan@trpa.gov>; John Marshall <jmarshall@trpa.gov>; Karen Fink <kfink@trpa.gov>; Jacob Stock <jstock@trpa.gov>
Subject: TBAP proposed amendments - Comment for Placer County Planning Meeting on 12/8/22

Dear Placer County Officials,

PLEASE DO NOT APPROVE THE AMENDMENTS BEING PROPOSED FOR THE TAHOE BASIN AREA PLAN, for the following reasons:

1. The height is being allowed to increase substantially to 71 feet. This is totally unacceptable and will change Tahoe from quaint towns/villages to urban centers with tall buildings that will ruin lake views for the general public and cast shadows on the streets & other property. Please retain the current height limits as provided in the 2017 Tahoe Basin Area Plan. Tahoe should not be a place where views are only provided for the wealthy and not for the local residents & visitors. How do you mitigate a lost view? Once lost to the public, it is gone forever. I recall when driving into Tahoe City on Hwy 89 (from Hwy 80), we would get our first exciting glimpse of the Lake. Somehow with development, that view disappeared, gone forever for the residents & tourists who arrive in Tahoe City looking for their first view of Lake Tahoe
2. With more height and length allowed, density will increase and will cause more traffic congestion. Our 2 lane roads on the North & West Shores cannot handle more traffic. It's important to consider that Tahoe may have reached its Carrying Capacity.
3. These amendments appear to be a push for more development and a loosening of zoning restrictions under the guise of building more affordable housing, since the amendments also apply to lodging, commercial activities and other business activities. We support affordable housing, but why not institute better control of Short-term Vacation Rentals to make more units available to local residents? Can Placer subsidize some affordable housing under current zoning? Can incentives be provided to develop inactive or vacant properties? Other alternatives should be explored to encourage affordable housing rather than loosening zoning standards by increasing density, height and decreasing setbacks, parking, etc.
4. The cumulative impacts of many projects, already in the pipeline for development, needs to be evaluated, especially for traffic and emergency evacuation.

5. A major concern of residents & visitors is the need for emergency evacuation in the event of a wildfire or other emergency. These amendments will increase the population & vehicles at Tahoe. The Tahoe roads cannot handle more congestion of people & their cars trying to escape a wildfire.

6. It has been many years since the last EIR/S has been done. Since that time, much has changed at Tahoe - remote workers with their vehicles have moved to Tahoe, more tourists and traffic, drought conditions and wildfire evacuation. A new EIR/S should be provided to better evaluate all these issues.

7. The group solicited to provide Input/suggestions for these amendments were developers and business people. There was no representation of the general public and residents of the town centers and villages who will be impacted by these amendments. Then these amendments are quickly presented to the community over the holidays with very little time to evaluate and understand all the ramifications of these amendments.

Therefore, please consider deferring a decision on these amendments. Visual examples should be provided to the public on how these amendments could or will impact their communities. Public opinion should be solicited on how the amendments can be modified to reflect the needs and alleviate the concerns of the local communities.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Jerry Winters
6770 Springs Ct.
Tahoma, California