

**TRPA  
APC  
PACKETS**

**FEBRUARY  
1980**

Phil

NOTICE OF MEETING OF THE  
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE  
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on February 13, 1980 at  
10:00 a.m. at the hearing room of the Tahoe  
Regional Planning Agency, located at 2155 South Avenue, South  
Lake Tahoe, California, the Advisory Planning Commission of  
said agency will conduct its regular meeting. The agenda for  
said meeting is attached to and made a part of this notice.

Dated: February 1, 1980

By: Philip A. Overeynder  
Philip A. Overeynder, Manager  
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

SCS - next mo's. AGENDA

- SCS PROGRAMS -  
PRESENTATION

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY  
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

TRPA Office, 2155 South Avenue  
South Lake Tahoe, California

February 13, 1980  
10:00 a.m.

PRELIMINARY AGENDA

- I CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM
- II APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- III DISPOSITION OF MINUTES
- IV CLEARINGHOUSE
  - U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Draft Environmental Impact Statement, Proposed Wastewater Treatment Facilities, South Shore, Lake Tahoe Basin *PAO*
- V PLANNING MATTERS
  - A. Land Use Ordinance Amendments - High Density Apartment Land Use District and Standards for Timesharing, Interval Ownership Condominiums *GW*
  - B. Subdivision Ordinance Amendments Relating to Condominium Conversions *GWB*
  - C. Work Program - General Plan Update and Threshold Carrying Capacities *PAO*
  - D. State of California, State Water Resources Control Board, Draft Water Quality Plan: Lake Tahoe Basin *PAO*
- VI REPORTS
  - A. Public Interest Comments
  - B. APC Members
- VII RESOLUTIONS
- VIII CORRESPONDENCE
- IX PENDING MATTERS
- X ADJOURNMENT

- Resp. - Individuals - pending?  
DCSID?  
STPUD?  
Comments

~~NO ACTION - HIGHLIGHT~~

~~- DOES NOT FOLLOW NEPA  
- STRENGTHEN~~

ASK FOR REVISION SPECIFIC ANSWER FOR LACK OF NO ACTION ACT.

DRAFT LETTER - FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES

Paul DeFalco, Jr., Regional Administrator  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX  
215 Fremont Street  
San Francisco, CA 94105

Subject: Comments on Draft Environmental Impact Statement, Proposed  
Wastewater Treatment Facilities, South Shore, Lake Tahoe Basin

Dear Mr. DeFalco:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the proposed wastewater treatment facilities on the South Shore of the Lake Tahoe Basin. The DEIS has been reviewed by the Advisory Planning Commission and Governing Body of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, as well as local jurisdictions having authority within the service areas of the South Tahoe Public Utility District (STPUD) and the Douglas County Sewer Improvement District (DCSID).

Our review of the DEIS was based upon our A-95 Clearinghouse function, as well as requests from both affected sanitation districts to support their efforts to alleviate existing deficiencies in treatment abilities in order to meet revised waste discharge requirements. With regard to the A-95 function, the Agency was looking primarily to the consistency of the proposed expansion of the STPUD plant and upgrading of DCSID's facilities with the Agency's adopted plans as well as the validity of the assessment of impacts which may result from these actions. The second area of Agency concern is with regard to the desirability and effectiveness of incorporating mitigation measures into the Agency's operations and plans. Both STPUD and DCSID have requested the Agency's assistance in pursuing the implementation of appropriate mitigation measures.

Consistency With Agency Plans

The Agency's controlling document with respect to wastewater treatment facility improvements is the Lake Tahoe Basin Water Quality Management Plan as adopted by the Governing Body on January 25, 1978, and certified by the Governor of Nevada. The plan was rejected by the California Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) and a revised plan has been remanded to TRPA by the SWRCB for adoption. The Agency has not yet had an opportunity to review the 208 Plan as recommended by the SWRCB and the EPA has not yet taken a position with regard to approval of either Water Quality Management Plan.

The proposed expansion of the STPUD facility to 10.0 million gallons per day (MGD) is consistent with the waste management program outlined in the Agency's Water Quality Management Plan. The required plant capacity under buildout of the Agency's General Plan would range from 9.3 MGD to 12.4 MGD depending on the extent of implementation of water conservation measures.

19

(DRAFT)

The upgrading of the DCSID plant calls for restoring the plant to its original design capacity of 3.0 MGD. This is consistent with the capacity which the Agency already recognized in the Waste Management Plan section of the 208 Plan. The required treatment capacity upon buildout of the Agency's General Plan would require a treatment capacity from 2.9 MGD to 3.9 MGD depending on the extent of implementation of water conservation measures.

Most importantly, the upgrading and expansion of the two facilities would permit both facilities to meet the revised waste discharge requirements of the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board and the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection. The Agency's Subdivision Ordinance requires each unit within a subdivision to have a connection to a sanitary sewage facility that has the capacity for collection, treatment and export of sewage from the Basin as required by governmental entities with jurisdiction over such matters.

### Growth Scenarios

The DEIS assumes that there is a direct relationship between federal funding of wastewater treatment plant improvements and growth which would take place as a result of those improvements. The DEIS analyzes five growth scenarios, each of which can be correlated with the degree of expansion of wastewater facilities. Although building activity may be limited as a result of limiting sewage treatment capacity, population growth may not be similarly affected because of increased utilization of existing structures and other related phenomena such as overcrowded housing.

In analyzing the DEIS, TRPA took the approach that the impact analysis was really an assessment of the Agency's General Plan and other controlling documents affecting land use. If an impact was identified, it was viewed from the resource base standpoint. In other words, the resource base of the region establishes threshold limitations which may be violated even if controlling land use documents are adhered to within the Basin. The adverse impact areas assist in identifying measures which should be taken to mitigate impacts.

### No Action Alternative

The impacts of the no action alternative do not appear to have been adequately analyzed in the DEIS. The extent that the adverse impacts described in the DEIS would occur without federal involvement in upgrading and expanding wastewater treatment facilities is not adequately disclosed in the document as required under the National Environmental Policy Act. Any direct adverse impacts from a failure to provide for improved wastewater treatment facilities were not included in the analysis of alternatives. *This is a serious*

*deficiency in the document and should be remedied prior to finalizing the EIS. Many of ~~the~~ <sup>TRPA's</sup> Agency's comments with regard to ~~spe~~ this deficiency reflect the lack of adequate consideration with regard to the no action alternative.*

(DRAFT).

Impacts and Mitigation Measures

WATER QUALITY

Impact Assessment - The Agency generally concurs with the adverse impacts on water quality as identified in the DEIS. These impacts have been described in the Agency's Water Quality Management Plan. However, the assessment appears to assume a one-to-one correlation between impacts occurring as a result of development of structures on existing lots in high hazard lands or stream environment zones (SEZ's) and the resulting impacts on water quality. Given our current knowledge that the majority of erosion problems within the Basin are the result of eroding disturbed areas along roadsides and poor roadside drainage, the impacts on water quality projected from ultimate buildout may overstate the effects of buildout of single family residences in these areas. Similarly, the effectiveness of imposing development restrictions on high hazard lands and SEZ's without addressing existing erosion and drainage problems resulting from road construction may overstate the case for further regulating development in these areas. In the opinion of TRPA, an effective program for water quality management must address both existing problem areas and controls for any new development.

Mitigation Measures - With regard to mitigation measures for water quality impacts, the TRPA will commit to implementing the following measures with responsible entities as noted:

<u>Water Quality Mitigation Measures</u>	<u>Responsible Entities</u>	<u>Notes</u>
Protect stream environment zones	TRPA-all Basin lands; CTRPA-California lands; U. S. Forest Service-federal lands	The existing TRPA Grading Ordinance requires BMP's for single family construction within SEZ's. (See Handbook of BMP's.) This measure only effective in combination with measures listed below.
Employ BMP's to control erosion	U. S. Forest Service-federal lands; local governments- primary responsibility for private lands; TRPA, CTRPA, Lahontan, NDEP-oversight responsibility	Enforcement of existing ordinances would suffice <i>MOU ✓</i>
Institute evaluative point system and limit on number of sewer connections to control timing and location of growth	Local governments, TRPA, CTRPA-develop criteria for evaluative point system  Local governments-implement system in cooperation with special districts	May have limited application in Douglas County <i>MOU ✓</i>

19 February 2

(DRAFT)

<u>Water Quality Mitigation Measures</u>	<u>Responsible Entities</u>	<u>Notes</u>
Implement water quality monitoring program	All entities as listed in DEIS	Not mitigation but will assist in evaluating effectiveness of other efforts <i>MOU ✓</i>
Purchase lots in environmentally sensitive areas  (OK)	Local governments, TRPA, CTRPA - develop <del>priorities and criteria for acquisition</del> and prioritization of environmentally sensitive areas +1 +1 +1 +1 Local governments, States, Federal Government - acquisition entities	Mechanisms and financing methods should include Santini Bill and other options <i>MOU ✓</i>
Compensate landowners who experience loss because of development restrictions	Responsible entities need to be identified	Ought to be a criteria and not identified as mitigation <i>MOU ✓</i>
Implement system to transfer development rights	Local governments, TRPA, CTRPA	Merits further study and consideration <i>MOU ✓</i> <i>inc zoning laws 10/15</i>
Implement corrective measures for existing high erosion hazard and SEZ development	Local governments, TRPA, CTRPA, Lahontan, NDEP	Merits further consideration as "offset" policy to facilitate new development

SEISMIC SAFETY

The implementation of land use controls to guard against seismic hazards is not feasible given the level of detail of existing information. The existing Uniform Building Code for Seismic Hazard Zone 3 provides adequate mitigation.

*MOU not addressed*

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Impact Assessment - The TRPA generally concurs with the impact analysis regarding development impacts and biological resources.

Mitigation Measures - The TRPA will commit to implementation of the following mitigation measures as noted:

<u>Biological Resource Mitigation Measures</u>	<u>Responsible Entities</u>	<u>Notes</u>
Control recreational use of wildlife habitat	Local governments, TRPA, California and Nevada Fish & Game Departments, U.S. Forest Service	
Protect against sewage spills	U.S. EPA, Sanitation Districts	Fund necessary improvements <i>MOU ✓</i>

(DRAFT)

<u>Biological Resource Mitigation Measures</u>	<u>Responsible Entities</u>	<u>Notes</u>
Protect active osprey nests	All entities as noted in DEIS	
Require biological inventories for rare and endangered species	All entities as noted in DEIS	Already required in California } <i>MOU not addressed</i>
Require adequate construction and management practices to protect habitat	All entities as noted in DEIS	
Protect SEZ's	(See Water Quality)	<i>MOU ✓</i>

**NOISE**

Impact Assessment - The Agency generally concurs with the impact assessment with regard to increases in ambient noise levels which would occur as a result of further development. The relationship of transportation control strategies to noise abatement mitigation measures is not adequately addressed. Although noise levels at peak periods may not be reduced, strategies to reduce traffic volumes may decrease the direction of peak noise levels.

Mitigation Measures - The Agency will commit to implementation of mitigation measures for noise as follows:

<u>Noise Mitigation Measures</u>	<u>Responsible Entities</u>	<u>Notes</u>
Implement noise control ordinance	Local governments, TRPA, CTRPA	Already implemented. Enforceability difficult. <i>MOU ✓</i>
Revise zoning ordinance to prevent incompatible land uses	Local governments, TRPA, CTRPA	<i>MOU ✓</i>
Establish special permit procedures to implement noise reduction measures	Developers, local governments, TRPA, CTRPA	<i>?</i>
Construct noise barriers along major highways	Caltrans, Nevada Department of Transportation	Not feasible except in very limited applications. <i>MOU - WPO!</i>
Implement transportation measures	(See Transportation)	<i>MOU - ANRUS</i>



(DRAFT)

## AIR QUALITY

Impact Assessment - The Agency generally concurs with the projected impacts as described in the DEIS.

Mitigation Measures - The Agency has already committed to implementation of those measures contained in the Nonattainment Plan as recommended for adoption by the Nevada Environmental Commission. *Mon* ✓

## VISUAL RESOURCES

<u>Visual Resources Mitigation Measures</u>	<u>Responsible Entities</u>	<u>Notes</u>
Implement measures protecting water and air quality	(See Water Quality and Air Quality)	<i>Mon</i> ✓
Adopt urban design plan with implementing ordinances for design review	Local governments, TRPA, CTRPA, U.S. Forest Service	<i>Mon</i> ✓
Establish National Scenic Area (N.S.A.)	U.S. Forest Service, U.S. Congress	Further study of N.S.A. proposals required before Agency can take a position

## HOUSING

Impact Assessment - The housing analysis fails to evaluate the impact of the no action alternative on housing supply and availability within the Basin and the linkage of increased traffic, energy consumption and air quality problems which would result from "spillover" outside of the Tahoe Basin.

The impact analysis also failed to identify current deficiencies in sewer permit allocation systems which encourage the construction of single family residences in areas classified as High Density Residential. The loss of the integrity of higher density neighborhoods has resulted in a lower supply of resident housing at greater distances from work and activity centers. Due to current development restrictions in California and economic conditions in both states, construction of new apartment or rental type units has been virtually cut off. The viability of public transportation mechanisms and air quality control strategies is also lessened because of lower densities actually occurring within areas suitable for higher density construction.

Mitigation Measures - The mitigation measures offered in the DEIS include a provision to encourage development of moderately priced housing in nearby areas outside of the Tahoe Basin. Rather than dealing with housing problems by exporting those needs out of the Tahoe Basin, the Agency will commit to the following mitigation measures:

*spillover on*

(DRAFT)

<u>Housing Mitigation Measures</u>	<u>Responsible Entities</u>	<u>Notes</u>
Create high density apartment (HDA) zone to preserve existing rental stock and program development of rental units	Local governments, TRPA, CTRPA	Proposed zone prohibits construction of single family dwellings in HDA zones <i>MOU - not addressed</i>
Redistribute development through transfer of development rights	Local governments, TRPA, CTRPA	Deserves further study. Could be used in conjunction with HDA designation <i>MOU ✓</i>
Encourage housing rehabilitation loans and grants	Local governments	<i>MOU -</i>
Improve neighborhood facilities to encourage private sector investments	Local governments	
Institute incentives for new development to include moderately-priced housing	Local governments, TRPA, CTRPA	<i>MOU ✓</i>
Institute incentives for major employers to expand housing stock when expanding operation	Local governments, TRPA, CTRPA	Limiting only to casinos does not address impact of other major employers <i>MOU - NOT ADDRESSED</i>
Coordinate regionwide land use policies	Local, regional, state and federal agencies	

TRANSPORTATION

Impact Assessment - The Agency generally concurs with the impact assessment with regard to increased demands on transportation systems.

Mitigation Measures - The mitigation measures offered in the DEIS substantially overlap recommendations of the Highway 50 Corridor Study prepared by JHK & Associates. Resolutions of support for the recommendations of the study have been adopted by all affected local jurisdictions. The Agency could therefore commit to implementation of the recommendations of that study.

- MOU ✓*
- JHK
- Bike trails
- Loop Rd.
- G.P. Update
- Transit
- increase bus
- bus pass
- ski bus
- bus at S.
- para-transit

RECREATION

Impact Assessment - The DEIS correctly identifies increased recreation conflicts arising due to increased use of the Basin.

Mitigation Measures - The Agency will commit to implementation of the following mitigation measures:

<u>Recreation Mitigation Measures</u>	<u>Responsible Entities</u>	<u>Notes</u>
Adopt ordinances to protect SEZ's and high hazard lands	(See Water Quality)	MOU ✓
Establish National Recreation Area (N.R.A.)	U.S. Congress	Agency can take no position until further details are available. The objectives of an N.R.A. vs. an N.S.A. may substantially differ. MOU - NOT ADDRESSED
Adopt Nonattainment Plan measures	(See Air Quality)	MOU ✓
Adopt noise standards	(See Noise)	MOU ✓
Acquire land for public recreational use	U.S. Forest Service, California and Nevada State Parks, local government programs	MOU ✓

*another card*  
PUBLIC FACILITIES/FISCAL CONCERNS

356042 Impact Assessment - The DEIS generally identifies areas of impacts on public facilities with regard to capacity limitations or other needed improvements. However, to be more useful, the document should more thoroughly analyze limitations on key public services such as water supply which are directly related to the proposal. The conclusion that water supplies may limit growth due to compact limitations can probably be supported, but a more immediate problem is the allocation of available supplies amongst competing water suppliers, particularly in Douglas County.

The fiscal impact analysis in the DEIS relates more to impacts of growth than to the impacts of decisions to not allow growth. Again, the impacts of the no action alternative on fiscal matters are not evaluated. Many of the conclusions regarding fiscal impacts of new growth would relate more to a community which is considering substantial new subdivided lands rather than in-filling of existing subdivided lands.

Mitigation Measures - The Agency will commit to working towards implementation of the following mitigation measures:

<u>Public Facilities Mitigation Measures</u>	<u>Responsible Entities</u>	<u>Notes</u>
Consolidate water districts	Local governments, utility districts	Will assist in alleviating "spot" water shortages MOU - NOT ADDRESSED
Implement water conservation measures	Local governments, utility districts	MOU ✓
Retrofit water conservation	Private <u>SC</u>	MOU - NOT ADDRESSED
<i>put next page</i> Mandatory water conservation on new construction	Utility districts, local governments, TRPA, CTRPA <u>SC</u>	

*move in this card to be put in next page (2 lines)*

(DRAFT)

<u>Public Facilities Mitigation Measures</u>	<u>Responsible Entities</u>	<u>Notes</u>
In-Basin reuse of waste-water	DCSID, STPUD, Lahontan, NDEP	Mou ✓
Make <del>common</del> <sup>maximum</sup> use of grants to reduce local costs	EPA, States, DCSID, STPUD	Mou ✓
Make improvements to the electrical supply system	-	
Revise building codes for energy conservation	Local governments	Mou ✓

The Tahoe Regional Planning Agency recognizes that this response to the DEIS serves only as an outline of actions which could be taken to mitigate the adverse impacts described. We look forward to a continuing working relationship with the Environmental Protection Agency to ensure that all of your concerns identified have been adequately satisfied. Please keep the Agency informed regarding your decision with regard to funding on this most important matter.

Sincerely,

Jim Henry, Chairman  
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

JH: PAO: jf

cc: City of South Lake Tahoe  
El Dorado County  
Douglas County  
Nevada Division of Environmental Protection  
Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board  
South Tahoe Public Utility District  
Douglas County Sewer Improvement District

# TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

## MEMORANDUM

DATE January 30, 1980

TO: The Advisory Planning Commission

FROM: The Staff

SUBJECT: Proposed High Density Apartment Land Use District (HDA)

Based on comments from the APC and direction from the Governing Board, Agency staff has prepared the attached amendment to the Land Use Ordinance. This amendment creates a new land use district which is designed to reserve certain areas of the Basin for resident housing. The major premise of this district is that high density apartment complexes will provide this needed housing. Based on this assumption, this new district should preserve the existing housing stock now devoted to such use and also reserve undeveloped lands in appropriate areas for such future uses.

If the land use district is established, staff will initiate public hearings on areas within the Basin that would most appropriately be rezoned HDA. Some of these areas have already been mapped during the 1978 General Plan Update process. The criteria for such classification were as follows:

Undeveloped-

- Lands of moderate to high capability
- Close proximity to transportation corridors or high use areas

Developed-

- Development pattern of 8-15 apartment units per acre
- Areas of redevelopment potential
- Close proximity to transportation corridors and high use areas

This amendment was not reviewed at the January 9, 1980 APC meeting as originally requested due to the lack of a quorum. However, staff still is in need of APC comments on the proposed land use district and such revisions that would be necessary to provide the Board direction on adoption of an ordinance.

LAND USE ORDINANCE AMENDMENT

Add a new Section 7.130:

7.130 High Density Apartment

7.131 Specific Purposes:

To provide rental housing for residents consistent with the housing needs and environmental protection of the Region.

7.132 Permitted Uses:

None but the following uses, or those allowed pursuant to an administrative permit issued in accordance with Section 8.33, which are found to be appropriate and similar in nature, shall be permitted.

(1) Residential:

(a) Single family dwelling units up to fifteen (15) dwelling units per acre;

(b) Multiperson dwellings not to exceed facilities for forty (40) persons per acre;

(c) Mobile home parks for permanent residences up to eight (8) mobile homes per acre.

Within this district, the Agency or the permit-issuing authority shall not consider or approve any proposal for a subdivision, condominium conversion, or any other division of land for residential development. Lots and parcels of land that were created in conformance with this ordinance or lawfully existed prior to February 10, 1972, shall be considered permitted and conforming uses within this district.

(2) Tourist Residential: None

(3) Outdoor Recreation:

(a) All those permitted in the Medium Density Residential District.

(4) Resource Management and Agriculture:

(a) Forest management programs.

(5) Public and Quasi-Public:

(a) All those permitted in the Medium Density Residential district;

(b) Cultural facilities.

New  
language.

(6) Commercial:

(a) All those permitted in the Medium Density Residential district;

(b) Professional offices.

7.133 Limitations On Land Coverage:

No person shall create land coverages in excess of the limits set forth in Section 6.20, as calculated in accordance with Section 8.22, except as otherwise permitted in accordance with Sections 8.25, 8.28, and 9.24, unless the ordinance effecting such such reclassification specifically provides otherwise. Such provision shall not exceed land coverage limits in excess of fifty (50) percent of the land area as calculated in accordance with Section 8.22.

Add to Section 3.00 Definitions:

New language.

Condominium Conversion - Any change in the form of ownership of real property wherein persons obtain ownership interest of individual units thereof, including but not limited to condominiums, community apartments, stock cooperatives, and any other form of such interest regulated by this ordinance.

New language.

Subdivision - Any real property, improved or unimproved, or a portion thereof, shown on the latest adopted tax roll of a local government as a unit or as contiguous units, which is divided for the purpose of use, sale, lease or financing, whether immediate or future, into five (5) or more condominiums, or into five (5) or more condominium units through condominium conversion, or into five (5) or more lots, or in which five (5) or more undivided interests are created or are proposed to be created.

Amend Sections 7.10 and 7.13 as follows:

7.10 Regulations indicating the allowable land uses in each district are hereby established as set forth in Sections 7.20 through ~~[7.120]~~ 7.130. In the cases of those uses listed in Section 7.12 the permit-issuing authority shall require an appropriate administrative permit, in accordance with Section 8.33, before such use shall be authorized. The permitted uses shall include accessory uses consistent with such permitted uses. The permitted uses are stated as illustrative of the types of uses consistent with the Tahoe Regional General Plan. The listings are not intended to be exclusive, except the density limitations set forth in Sections 7.30 through 7.90 and ~~[7.120]~~ 7.130.

7.13 Limitations on Height

No building or other structure erected in any land use district shall have a height greater than that specified below except that the permit-issuing authority, by administrative permit pursuant to Section 8.33, may authorize a greater height to the extent that the permit-issuing authority determines that (1) provision has been made for protection from fire hazards and against aviation accidents; (2) consideration has been given to the protection of view and to the character of the neighborhood; (3) proper provision has been made for light and air; and (4) such greater height will better promote the protection of the environment in the area. Only those administrative permits that allow a building or other structure of a height of 45 feet or more shall be subject to Agency review pursuant to Section 4.32. Appurtenances such as chimneys and vents may be erected to a fifteen percent (15%) greater height than specified below. Building height shall be the vertical distance from the grade to the highest point of the coping of a flat roof, or to the deck line of a mansard roof, or to the peak of the highest gable of a pitch or hip roof. Grade is the average of the original ground level at the center of all walls of a building or structure.

Use District	Permitted Height
General Forest	35 feet
Recreation	35 feet
Rural Estates	35 feet
Low Density Residential	35 feet
Medium Density Residential	35 feet
High Density Residential	35 feet
Tourist Commercial	40 feet
General Commercial	40 feet
Public Service	40 feet
Conservation Reserve	As approved in a specific plan.
Medium Tourist Residential	35 feet
<u>High Density Apartment</u>	<u>35 feet</u>

The above table of permitted heights may be modified with respect to residential buildings by permitting height limits of 35 feet plus one foot for each two percent (2%) of cross slope, measured at the building site coverage.



# TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

## MEMORANDUM

DATE: February 5, 1980

TO: The Advisory Planning Commission

FROM: The Staff

SUBJECT: Status Report on Areas Suitable for High Density Apartment Designation

As part of the analysis on proposed High Density Apartment (HDA) land use districts, Agency staff has performed a site review of areas proposed to be designated in this classification. This analysis was done to determine the extent of development in each area and any effects on these areas resulting from the proposed HDA designation.

### Douglas County

In Douglas County, the primary area under consideration for inclusion in the proposed HDA land use district is the High Density Residential area adjacent to Kahle Drive north of Harvey's Inn. This area currently contains a mix of housing types. This mix includes single family dwellings, duplexes, triplexes, 4-plexes and intermediate to high density apartment projects. As a result of extensive development in this area, there are only five or six lots existing that do not have some type of development on them. This area also includes the Oliver Park Trailer Court. This classification would affect development proposals should the trailer court be removed and residential construction proposed.

Due to the mix of housing types, there is a substantial variety of ownership types. Included are owner-occupied, single family residences; renter-occupied single family dwellings; owner-occupied and renter-occupied duplexes; triplexes, 4-plexes; and trailers; and renter-occupied units in intermediate and large apartment complexes.

The other areas under consideration are the HDR areas across the street from and behind Kingsbury Square on Kingsbury Grade. The area behind Kingsbury Square is currently a trailer court. The area across the street from Kingsbury Square is approximately 7 acres in size and is currently undeveloped.

The major impact from the proposed modification would be to restrict the ability to further subdivide existing rental units through condominium conversion. Due to the small number of vacant lots, this change would do little to encourage further apartment construction. Increasing allowable density would probably do little in this area due to the small square footage area of each lot. Visual survey indicates that a number of the projects, especially the large apartment projects, may be over allowable land coverage and possibly over density. This will substantially affect their ability to request conversion and stay within Agency land coverage and density requirements. The Agency is unable to verify whether current Douglas County building codes to allow conversion would be met.