

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY  
REGIONAL PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

Online Meeting  
Via GoToWebinar

June 24, 2020

**Meeting Minutes**

I. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Chair Mr. Yeates called the meeting to order at 8:32 a.m.

Members Present: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Bruce, Ms. Gustafson, Mr. Bass for Ms. Laine, Mr. Lawrence, Mr. Yeates

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Yeates deemed the agenda approved as posted.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Aldean made a motion to approve the April 22, 2020 minutes.

Mr. Bass abstained.

Motion carried.

IV. Item No. 3: Discussion and possible recommendation for the Proposed Bijou/Al Tahoe Community Plan Amendment to expand the applicability of an existing special height standard to Lake Tahoe Unified School District property

TRPA team member Mr. Conger provided the presentation.

Mr. Conger said this proposal is a request from the Boys and Girls Club of Lake Tahoe to amend the Bijou/Al Tahoe Community Plan. This amendment would apply an existing special height standard to school district property. The proposed amendment effects District 4 of the Bijou/Al Tahoe Community Plan in South Lake Tahoe. This area comprises mostly of public facilities that include a recreation center, Sherriff's substation, ice arena, campground, Forest Service offices, Lake Tahoe Community College, and the South Tahoe Middle School.

There are two standards in District 4 that will be the focus of the discussion. The first is a design standard that applies throughout District 4 and requires that roof pitches be between 7:12 and 12:12. The second standard is the special height standard and is the subject of the amendment. That special height standard allows for height related standards such as roof pitches to be determined on a case by case basis. Under the current community plan that special height standard applies only to the community college property.

The Boys and Girls Club of Lake Tahoe has filed this application seeking an amendment to the community plan. The Boys and Girls Club presently operates a facility at the old Al Tahoe Elementary School campus adjacent to the South Tahoe Middle School. Activities are accessory to the school

## REGIONAL PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

June 24, 2020

and includes such items as after school and summer programs for school age children. The Boys and Girls Club is planning to construct a new building at the eastern end of Lyons Avenue where it meets Rufus Allen Boulevard adjacent to the building they are currently using. They're seeking an amendment to the Bijou/Al Tahoe Community Plan to provide additional design flexibility for that building. The objective would be to allow a lower pitched roof consistent with other buildings on the school district and Lake Tahoe Community College campuses.

The community plan amendment proposal would modify the existing special height standard by changing its applicability. Instead of applying only to community college property, the revised standard would apply to both the community college and the school district properties. This would allow more flexibility for development on the school district property as height related standards such as the roof pitch could be determined on a case by case basis. As part of this modification, staff is also recommending updating the Code of Ordinances chapter references within this section to reflect the code renumbering that took place in 2011.

The Boys and Girls Club provided a written rationale for this proposed amendment and is included in Attachment F of the staff report. The two main points raised were that by having design flexibility allowed under this amendment, it would result in a lower profile building with less interior volume. That could result in scenic and energy efficiency benefits.

An Initial Environmental Checklist and a checklist for threshold standards and compliance measures are included in the staff report. Staff prepared an errata for the threshold standards and compliance measures, Attachment E. It corrected the errors in the document but didn't change the ultimate conclusions of that document. The IEC concludes that the proposal will not result in significant impacts or negative effects to thresholds. For example, scenic impacts are not anticipated because the buildings benefiting from this modification will still need to meet the City's design standards and guidelines. Additionally, TRPA would need to make scenic related findings for any building seeking additional height beyond the standard code allowance. The initial environmental checklist recognizes that strict adherence to roof pitch standards would result in taller buildings with more interior volume. By allowing flexibility, the building would be less visible and more energy efficient than what would otherwise have been allowed.

The Advisory Planning Commission unanimously recommend approval to the Governing Board as proposed. Based on the analysis presented, staff recommends that the Regional Plan Implementation Committee also recommend adoption of the findings in Attachment B recognizing the modifications to Attachment E, and the ordinance in Attachment A.

There were errors in the errata regarding the spelling of the word amendment. The locations are on page 76, following line 19, page 92, lines 13 and 15, page 94, line 51, and page 95 on the comment lines on pages 62-72.

Presentation can be found at:

[RPIC-Agenda-Item-No.-3-BijouAlTahoeCommunityPlan.pdf](#)

### Commission Comments & Questions

Ms. Aldean referred to page 49 of the staff packet on the proposed amendment for the community plan. It states that height issues for these sites shall be addressed by TRPA on an individual project basis and may be in excess of Chapter 37. She asked if we should include height and pitch, because

## REGIONAL PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

June 24, 2020

the pitch of these buildings is actually less than what is required. It's not in excess of what is required in Chapter 37. She suggested that it read "Height and pitch issues for these sites shall be addressed by TRPA on an individual project basis and may be different than the standards set forth in Chapter 37."

Mr. Conger asked for Mr. Marshall's input also. They had talked about adding additional modifications to that language in the past and there was some concern that it might be imposing additional restrictions on the community college property.

Mr. Marshall said the way that it's drafted now gets at the crux of the issue which is the height. The proposed amendment allows the pitch variation. He doesn't feel there's a need to include pitch in there. Also, they've not run through all the scenarios as to whether or not if they add pitch and what the outcomes would be. They don't need it and suggested to leave the language the way it is. If they need to go back to it when the City's doing their area plan, staff can look at that issue again if there's any lingering concerns about pitch.

Ms. Aldean asked if it was correct that staff is saying that the reduction in the pitch is implicit in the language.

Mr. Marshall said the language basically removes the pitch requirement. Height is then determined based on other provisions of the Code in Chapter 37 but because they're public buildings there may be allowances for increased height if the findings are made. In this case, there is a slight increase in height. By making the amendment, they are removing pitch as a limiting factor.

Mr. Conger said yes, that's correct. As they've applied this measure over the years, they administered that to allow a case by case consideration of any height related issues. They consider roof pitch to be one of those height related issues.

Mr. Lawrence asked if there's a concern if we move forward with the amendment to the area plan if the properties were disposed of by the school district to a commercial or residential developer. Would these height standards then apply because the area plan was amended, or would these new height standards not apply because we're talking about in the context of properties owned by the school district?

Mr. Conger said as it's written it applies to school district owned properties. If the school district were to dispose of those properties to a private developer and it was owned by a different entity, then the standard would not apply.

### Public Comments & Questions

Steve Teshara on behalf of the Tahoe Chamber said he urged the committee to recommend approval to the Governing Board given the changes that Mr. Conger noted for the record.

### Committee Comments & Questions

Ms. Aldean made a motion to recommend approval of the Required Findings, as described in Attachment B, including a finding of no significant effect, for adoption of the Community Plan amendment as described in the staff report and based upon the revised Attachment E and the spelling correction mentioned in the presentation.

REGIONAL PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

June 24, 2020

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Bruce, Ms. Gustafson, Mr. Lawrence, Mr. Bass for Ms. Laine, Mr. Yeates  
**Motion carried.**

Ms. Aldean made a motion to recommend adoption of Ordinance 2020-\_\_\_, amending Ordinance 2019-03, as previously amended, to amend the Community Plan as shown in Attachment A.

Ayes: Ms. Aldean, Mr. Bruce, Ms. Gustafson, Mr. Lawrence, Mr. Bass for Ms. Laine, Mr. Yeates  
**Motion carried.**

V. COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS

Mr. Yeates said this committee has the Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan, the Washoe County Tahoe Area Plan in July and in August, the City of South Lake Tahoe's Tourist Core Area Plan Beach Retreat Amendment. In addition, there will be the air quality mitigation, the project specific changes on how vehicle miles traveled are handled, and the vehicle miles traveled threshold. He suggested that we should consider having the RPIC meetings at a different day than the Governing Board meeting.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Aldean moved adjournment.

Chair Mr. Yeates adjourned the meeting at 8:56 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,



Marja Ambler  
Clerk to the Board

*The above meeting was taped in its entirety. Anyone wishing to listen to the tapes of the above mentioned meeting may call for an appointment at (775) 588-4547. In addition, written documents submitted at the meeting are available for review*