

From: [Aaron](#)
To: [Mark Bruce](#); [Cindy.Gustafson](#); [Shelly Aldean](#); [John Friedrich](#); [Vince Hoenigman](#); [Jim Lawrence](#); [bosfive@ecgov.us](#); [Wesley Rice](#); [Bill Yeates](#); [John Marshall](#); [Marja Ambler](#)
Subject: 947 Tahoe Boulevard
Date: Friday, July 8, 2022 4:09:29 PM

Dear TRPA,

You recently voted that the project "Nine 47 Tahoe" is not a controversial project. I disagree with this vote. Whenever it has come up in conversation with residents, they are blown away with this ridiculous project.

I do not understand the purpose of zoning if we are willy nilly ignoring it. You are allowing dense residential to be built on commercial land that was once a gas station (which I was under the impression had contaminated ground soil) labeling it without controversy, and allowing the Tahoe Transportation District to operate with the intent to build a commercial TOURIST bus stations in the most underprivileged and dense residential area. This is backwards. Please reconsider allowing for public comment. Please reconsider the purpose of zoning and how it can harm the Lake Tahoe Basin.

Thanks,
Aaron Vanderpool
806 Oriole Way
Incline Village 89451

From: [Darlene Velicki](#)
To: [Mark Bruce](#); [Cindy.Gustafson](#); [Shelly Aldean](#); [John Friedrich](#); [Vince Hoenigman](#); [Jim Lawrence](#); bosfive@ecgov.us; [Wesley Rice](#); [Bill Yeates](#); [John Marshall](#); [Marja Ambler](#)
Subject: Mixed Use Building Project "Nine 47 Tahoe"
Date: Monday, July 11, 2022 10:34:53 PM

To The TRPA Board:

I am a concerned citizen of Incline Village. The above referenced proposed mixed use project was approved without resident comment. There is significant interest and apprehension concerning it. This action was improper as many of us have well-grounded reasons to oppose the unsafe increased residential density, the increased traffic burden on Rt. 28, and the potential for undue pressure on our recreational facilities:

Given Washoe County encourages Short Term Rentals, the units will eventually be fully booked by tourists. Occupancy levels will not be enforced as neither the will nor the mechanisms are in place to adequately regulate tourist behaviors. It will be impossible for law enforcement to respond consistently as there will not be on-site management.

In the event of an emergency evacuation, 80-100 new persons dumping onto Rt. 28, a two lane highway, will impede the movement progress of current residents as this project's occupants will block the highway.

With the multiplicative effect of pass holder use permits, overcrowding at recreational facilities will certainly become the norm.

Please reduce the permitting of the project to half of the proposal. Please reconsider your policy to place development permits on the consent calendar. The public deserves the right to voice an opinion on all such projects.

Sincerely,
Darlene Velicki

From: [Heather Williams](#)
To: [Mark Bruce](#); [Cindy.Gustafson](#); [Shelly Aldean](#); [John Friedrich](#); [Vince Hoenigman](#); [Jim Lawrence](#); [bosfive@ecgov.us](#); [Wesley Rice](#); [Bill Yeates](#); [John Marshall](#); [Marja Ambler](#)
Subject: 947 Tahoe Blvd condos
Date: Saturday, July 9, 2022 5:07:08 PM

On June 22, 2022, the TRPA Governing Board approved the following Consent Calendar item:
7. PAL CAP FFIF TAHOE 1, LLC ("Nine 47 Tahoe") Mixed-Use Development Approval Page 20740 multi-family units; 925 square feet Office (Commercial), 941 and 947 Tahoe Boulevard, Incline Village, Washoe County, Nevada, APN 132-231-09 and 132-231-10, TRPA File Number ERSP2021-1428.

I am an Incline Village resident who will be adversely affected by this large condominium development. The developer's proposal claims the development will have no significant effect on:

Traffic - The project is located in the center of Incline across from the Raley's shopping center which is one of the busiest areas in Incline Village. The developers own study shows an increase in 880 vehicle miles traveled every day. And if TRPA's job is to truly "protect the lake", the impact of that many more vehicle miles is not insignificant.

Recreation - With 40 units, the project will allow 400 more IVGID passes to be issued to the owners. Half of these pass holders can accompany a maximum of 15 guests to the IVGID beaches every day. Although that is unlikely, there will definitely be significantly increased beach use, as well as increased use of other IVGID recreation facilities - facilities which are at or over capacity now.

Village safety - With 40 units, each of which will have an expected occupancy of 2-3 persons, the population density in and around the project will increase from the current 0 to a minimum of 80-120 people. Density is related to not only traffic but to safety. The project is located on Highway 28 which is a 2-lane road that is one of the 3 possible exits from Incline Village in case of emergencies. Although current evacuation plans are in place to safely exit from Incline Village given sufficient warning, no such plans will hold if the fire begins in or near Incline Village itself. Adding density on Highway 28 increases danger for all other residents. Finally, Incline Village does not need one more traffic light, which will surely be the next step.

TRPA should reconsider this project and limit the number of units allowed.

Sincerely,

Heather Williams
569 Len Way
Incline Village, NV

From: [Helene Larson](#)
To: [Mark Bruce](#); [Cindy Gustafson](#); [Shelly Aldean](#); [John Friedrich](#); [Vince Hoenigman](#); [Jim Lawrence](#); bosfive@ecgov.us; [Wesley Rice](#); [Bill Yeates](#); [John Marshall](#); [Marja Ambler](#)
Subject: NOT non-controversial!
Date: Friday, July 8, 2022 4:04:52 PM

To: TRPA Governing Board:

I am an Incline Village resident who is against TRPA's ruling on the project at 941 and 947 Tahoe Boulevard, Incline Village, Washoe County, Nevada, which sets a worrisome precedent of designating a project "noncontroversial," so TRPA can make a decision without public input. The public - we residents, have vital input and this is an attempt to not allow us to voice it.

On June 22, 2022, the TRPA Governing Board approved the following Consent Calendar item:

7. PAL CAP FFIF TAHOE 1, LLC ("Nine 47 Tahoe") Mixed-Use Development Approval Page 20740 multi-family units; 925 square feet Office (Commercial), 941 and 947 Tahoe Boulevard, Incline Village, Washoe County, Nevada, APN 132-231-09 and 132-231-10, TRPA File Number ERSP2021-1428.

All Incline Village residents will be adversely affected by this large condominium development. The developer's proposal erroneously claims the development will have no significant effect on:

traffic - The project is located in the center of Incline across from the Raley's shopping center which is one of the busiest areas in Incline Village. The developers own study shows an increase in 880 vehicle miles traveled every day. This is not insignificant

recreation - With 40 units, the project will allow 400 more IVGID passes to be issued to the owners. Half of these pass holders can accompany a maximum of 15 guests to the IVGID beaches every day. Although that is unlikely, there will definitely be significantly increased beach use, as well as increased use of other IVGID recreation facilities.

village safety - With 40 units, each of which will have an expected occupancy of 2-3 persons, the population density in and around the project will increase from the current 0 to a minimum of 80-120 people. Density is related to not only traffic but to safety. The project is located on Highway 28 which is a 2-lane road that is one of the 3 possible exits from Incline Village in case of emergencies. Although current evacuation plans are in place to safely exit from Incline Village given sufficient warning, no such plans will hold if the fire begins in or near Incline Village

itself. Adding density on Highway 28 increases danger for all other residents.

TRPA should reconsider this project and limit the number of units allowed.

Sincerely,

Helene Larson
822 Northwood Blvd, #1
Incline Village, NV 89451
(POB 4487, IV, NV 89450)

From: rondatycer@aol.com
To: [Mark Bruce](#); [Cindy.Gustafson](#); [Shelly Aldean](#); [John Friedrich](#); [Vince Hoenigman](#); [Jim Lawrence](#); bosfive@edcgov.us; [Wesley Rice](#); [Bill Yeates](#); [John Marshall](#); [Marja Ambler](#); khangeland@trpa.gov
Subject: Protesting 947 Tahoe Boulevard Decision
Date: Sunday, July 10, 2022 11:14:22 AM

TO: MEMBERS OF THE TRPA GOVERNING BOARD

I am writing to protest your decision at the meeting on June 22, 2022 pertaining to Consent Calendar Item 7.

7. PAL CAP FFIF TAHOE 1, LLC (“Nine 47 Tahoe”) Mixed-Use Development Approval Page 20740 multi-family units; 925 square feet Office (Commercial), 941 and 947 Tahoe Boulevard, Incline Village, Washoe County, Nevada, APN 132-231-09 and 132-231-10, TRPA File Number ERSP2021-1428.

You approved the Nine 47 Tahoe mixed-use development in Incline Village, which is the largest such project to be constructed in our small village in many years. Although most of us Incline residents welcome redevelopment of properties, without a restriction on use, this project will contribute to the erosion of the voter base and the destruction of Incline Village as a residential community.

The damage to Incline Village by such a development is insidious, caused entirely by current market forces in real estate that are devastating Incline’s voter base. Many—if not most— of these relatively expensive condos—over \$1 million for even the smallest unit (many of which have already been reserved with a down payment) will be bought by investors and become rentals. Few if any of these condos will be available to employees who need to live in Incline where they work.

We blame TRPA for defining short-term rentals in 2004 as a “residential use” when they have clearly become big business and are devastating residential communities around Lake Tahoe. TRPA’s lame attempt to put controls on that bad decision by creating the 100 ‘Best Practices” has done nothing—ZERO—to stop the onslaught. Because Washoe County now allows *an unlimited number of short-term rentals in IVCB*, and because short-term renting is more lucrative than long-term renting, too many of our condominiums and apartments are already converted to STR use.

With the new Nine 47 Tahoe condominium complex, the same market forces will convert these units —within 1 or 2 sales turnovers—into STRs or equally bad fractional ownership/Pacasos. Washoe County has just decided fractional ownership with 8 different owners (each with 44 days of use a year) is still a “single-family residence” use. Hence, Pacasos with constantly rotating residents are allowed in all SFRs in Incline. Full page Pacaso ads are appearing in the Tahoe Tribune.

The Nine 47 Tahoe developers have emphasized that their current CC&Rs do not allow STRs. But once the homeowners take over and generate their own CC&R amendments, that decision can and will be reversed. *There is no way TRPA or any other agency can prevent the inevitable conversion.* Market forces will prevail.

The damage to Incline Village of increasing numbers of STRs and Pacaso owners is profound. None of the occupants in these homes will ever be voting citizens. The IVCB voting base will continue to erode. The owners of Nine 47 Tahoe Boulevard will simply contribute to the influx of people whose primary residences and primary interests are not in Incline.

For the integrity of Incline as a village, Nine 47 Tahoe needs to be reconsidered.

TRPA should require that a percentage of the units be restricted for moderate-income housing of employees, and that the other units never become STRs or fractionally-owned properties.

Respectfully submitted,

Ronda Tycer, **PhD**
Incline Village Resident