

TAHOE BASIN AREA PLAN WORKSHOP HELD 3.23.23 NORTH TAHOE EVENT CENTER

Stating population has decreased is not correct. More community members. STR's and second home owners are now full time.

Match Tahoe style. Not modern mountain.

Start planning shore improvements related to mobility and pedestrians from new pier.

Before jumping into building reduce STR...they sit empty or are vacation rentals.

Too high density. Worried about fires and ways to get out.

Great illustrations. Wish they had included square feet and numbers of residential and bedrooms.

500 feet feels like a superblock and erases community. Make it shorter.

Address multi family buildings in SF residential way and appropriate under lots etc.

Allow for less parking and limit other design requirements to make it easier to build affordable market rate housing.

56' is too high keep profile low especially on lake side

Need far more emphasis on EIR versus developments.

Income equitable housing must be a priority.

Great exhibits.

Transit doesn't work here. Need many more buses

Why must homes be 3000sqf? Ours is 1500 and it is very comfortable.

The 500' building length in TC looks like it takes up half the town!

Exhibits are great and very helpful to see visual impact of the proposed height.

Visual impression of 61' building only has 4 floors! Is this real?

Make sure planning commission hears this feedback.

Town center photos misleading on what 56-61' looks like.

?? Parking??

How will housing in the town centers be managed so it doesn't become STR or sit vacant?

Plan with lakeview from 28 in mind.

Underground garages from "high-rises"

Provide infrastructures to sustain new development. IE: new firehouse, internet, water systems, bus turnouts, electric charging stations.

Traffic congestion, esp. along KB with increase vehicles that accompany densification.

More height if doing local housing.

Water shuttle from 8 or more fixed piers around the lake. Bring back the 1890's! Use \$ from TART Connect to make this happen. (Others noted "yes" in agreement in the margin of this item)

Go back to previous zoning of different heights on the lakeside of the street (2 story) vs the other side of the street (max 56')

Bring back façade improvement program to gentrify current buildings up to the \$150K loan forgiven after 10 years- encourage new small business!!

TC different than KB- Less Height in KB same for building length.

With increase of building height to 61'-maybe deed restricted units could be included to provide affordable housing units (i.e.. 1 in 6 units?) -done in Italy (Others noted "yes" in agreement in the margin of this item)

Updated building but no additional height over approved plat and no building length increases. Mix of housing types/ no SFD on main drag. Achievable should be veer in favor of low and mod income. Bring back façade improvement program- forgivable loans-community open space. (Others agreed)

56' plus 185 max building length

Go back to 3 stories on the mountain side and 2 stories on the lake side as approved in 2012.

GK szys County shot themselves in the foot by allowing over 3000 VRBO/Airbnb permits. Ruined housing for workers.

Placer Co. redevelopment properties need to be redistributed into smaller parcels and sold to individual business owners/small developers. Each will build to 3 story codes that already exist. Each will have its own owner builder, individual character. Each will support a local owner and business.

We don't want mega-developers who own the whole town. We don't want over 100-150 foot frontages. We don't want height over trees, none over 48' Wed don't want to make one developer rich at the expense of the local character and environment. Businesses can't survive high rent.

More HT for housing- consistent with lodging amendment potential.

Building height should be 3 stories on the lake side and 4 stories on the mountain side. Do no turn N. Shore into S. Shore. Pre-domus, domus, post domus, KB has born the lions share for affordable housing. It is time to say enough is enough. Stop STR in residential neighborhoods. Business district for business not housing.

Placer County must not remove protections from Ridgeline development. NO development on our ridges.

No single family on SR 28.

MF needs to have parking

New Project- With building height increases WHO FUNDS NEW fire equipment? Developer pays for ladder truck.

Why isn't the county installing sidewalks? More developer costs?

Be an example and install sidewalk at AAA BLDG TC/KB County Building

See Bos approved KB vision plan

Move STRs to town centers

Local housing

Mixed use

Walkable, bike racks, lanes

Complete street improvements.

Less parking, less vehicles, Micro-transit centers/stops charging infrastructure

Traffic Flow Improvements

Break up KB center property(Racoon-Fox) and sell individually reimagine the state park parking into a gathering center

KB-less residential units/more commercial and mixed use(retail kayak rental, restaurants, etc.)

Est. stringent mixed use definition (30% commercial to 50% rest residential

new library with adjacent playground state park welcome center for information

Updated signage particularly at lodging properties.

Safer for bikes. Can't use side walks, have to ride along parked cars that don't look when they pull out.

Reimage the state park parking into a gathering center.

Require community amenities- meeting places etc.

Height and density are too much, go back to original- 2 stories on lake 3 stores on mountain side.

Traffic is a big problem- can't drive many days through town.

Where will parking be located for the new housing in the town centers?

Will the commercial spaces be affordable for local businesses or will we be looking at empty storefronts because the cost is prohibitive?

Please keep height limits to 2 story on the lake side so light gets over and we see sky rather than buildings

Hotels not more condos that will be STR's

Space for our non-profits

Height 3 stories mountain side 36'-48' 2 stories lakeside - Agreed to this in 2013- We don't want snow building up on hwy 28. No shadows on the road!!!!

2013 Vision Plan- you're making changes. Go back to what the community wanted!

Under ground parking

Free Planner Assistance

Incentivize don't restrict. (tax credits. Subsidies) Deed restrictions don't entice development.

Mixed use- retain, housing, restraints, music. Vibrancy

Ground water intercept is a bad idea for the lake and lakeshore. It enables buildings underground parking to go higher.

Ensure architecture reflects mountain style! We don't want to be San Jose.

No big investors. Smaller projects several smaller investors

Put comments online

Limit STR. Reduce by 15% over 10 years

Infrastructure upgrade. Min invested in roads, street lights etc. in Town Center. Revitalized bus require +/- \$25.50m.

Congestion - pricing on cars entering basin \$15 a day for non-residents, non local workers like National Parks

Heights restrictions. No revisions. 2-3 stories downtown areas KB

Aid and incentives mixed use, not just lodging.

Consider transition zones for building height plus length. West shore appropriate not this same as KB appropriate not the same as TC appropriate. Lower heights for places like W. Shore. Better fit with surroundings. Also different regs appropriate if proximal to lake or if my block lakeview. Should be lower height if next to lake view or in line with view.

Maintain max height at 56'

500' long structure is a terrible idea

Underground parking is an awful idea. Allows even taller structure

3 years community input. 36' lake side. 48' mountain side

Will this let Homewood build longer and taller? It should not

Love the renderings and vision!

Take this feedback back to the Planning Commission

Don't cave in to the big developers. They aren't the icing on the cake.

Notify community when EIR/EIS released.

Population: STR create new "local" uses. Covid 19 increased population = don't be fooled!! 2021 had increase of over 620 students in TTUSD. Where did they come from? NEW LOCALS!!

Limit STR's to 10% of the housing stock (Placer-In Basin) and density of STR's

People should be housed at ski areas because that is where they work

STR take all the housing

Seasonal employment can limit housing because regulations req. full time. CA/COUNTY/GRANTS?

Too many STR's

Reduce the cost to break ground and build

HS-P-12 Yes. Short term rental max cap shall be decreased by a ratio of 1 str for each new lodging unit per BOS

Increase Compliance Officer staff

Asset Cap as an additional criterium for affordable achievable housing.

Limit the amount of people staying in rental units

Each STR bedroom =1 TAU

Tahoe Inn blight

Multi room home should only house all members of the same family

STR are root of problem go back to residential zoning for res. only

Restrict people. Decrease hotels. Require smaller hotels

Require developers to pay into the electric bus system

Scale development heights based on unit size

TRPA to do transparent account of growth. Stop 2 step MF-condo

Create a façade improvement program to encourage existing building owners/tenants to invest.

Could some or all county fees be waived to encourage reinvestment?

Could through traffic somehow be diverted around town centers? Is there the ability to close off road to town centers to make them pedestrian only?

Are there area for centralized parking garages?

Wants to make sure housing affordability requirements are not waived. Often sees these types of units are promised early in the project, but then change to market rate.

Concerned about where is parking going to be for this type of density.

Various comments concerned about increased traffic, especially in busy tourist seasons.

Various comments that the existing buildings need to be repaired. Improved, freshened up, etc.

Various comments that 56' is too high (even though it is already allowed)

Various comments that the area should stay exactly how it is.

Any project with affordable housing should be allowed the proposed extra height, not just those that include hotels. Existing buildings cannot reach allowed density (especially those that qualify for bonus units) because of current restrictions.

Would like to see more modern architecture within town centers.

Does not agree with increase to 61', feels that extra height is a requirement for a specific project.

Feels that the lakeside should be limited more than the mountainside.

There should be public space incentives or requirements within the design (does not agree with the comments he has heard before that "restaurants will welcome locals". Locals are not going to pay \$90 a plate to eat at a restaurant. These are not public amenities.

Does not like to see regulations be so prescriptive (75' proposed rule, etc.). Feels it should be up to the Planning Dept, DRC, NTRAC to verify that the buildings design and proportions are acceptable and appropriate to the existing context.