

Nicole Hagmaier

From: Crystal Jacobsen
Sent: Monday, September 24, 2012 9:23 AM
To: Nicole Hagmaier
Subject: FW: TV business

For the record...

From: Leah Kaufman [mailto:leah.lkplanning@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Friday, September 21, 2012 10:15 PM
To: Crystal Jacobsen
Subject: TV business

----- Original Message -----

From: Tahoefrenz@aol.com
To: leah.lkplanning@sbcglobal.net
Sent: Tuesday, September 18, 2012 8:34 PM
Subject: Re: T- some TV business!!

Tahoe Vista is a mix of one, two and three stories. Keep this same mix. This is part of the charm of the area.

1. Maintain view corridors that exist today on the Lake. (no blockage with trees and fences)
2. Current parking areas should remain view corridors. Additional height on the lakefront should be perpendicular to the Lake not blocking views from the roadway or those across the street.
3. No more height on the Lake than currently exists-
4. Buildings on sand dunes should be limited to the same height as Tonopalo - 32 feet.
5. Additional height on the Highway side - three stories should be considered with setbacks from the road. i.e firelite is setback as is the three story Cedar Glen building.
6. Replacement buildings should have articulation and not be so boxy. Better architecture.
7. Domus/ Tonopalo is the worst example of buildings with excessive height and mass and nothing like that should ever be allowed in Tahoe Vista.
8. Building Coverage reduction for increased height on Highway or Lakefront should be considered. (If massing is reduced then heights could increase)
9. Have a fixed height limit that matches the heights currently existing. NO FOUR STORY BUILDINGS ANYWHERE.

Fran Robinson- The Dunes 6200 Highway 28 (neighbor to Mourelatos Lakeshore Resort)

Nicole Hagmaier

From: Crystal Jacobsen
Sent: Tuesday, September 25, 2012 2:51 PM
To: 'Ellie'
Cc: John Hester TRPA; John Hitchcock TRPA; John Marshall; Michael Johnson; Paul Thompson; 'Darcie Goodman-Collins League to Save LT; Shannon League to Save LT; Clem Shute TRPA GB; Jennifer Merchant
Subject: RE: Transect Zoning

Hi Ellie,

The topic of the County's proposed zoning reclassification and proposed future use of a "Transect" zoning system which was reported to our Planning Commission on August 30 has already been reported to our Board. It was included in an overall work program report which was provided to our Board in July 2011, where our Board directed staff to initiate the work program as outlined by staff. The Board's July 2011 direction included proceeding with addressing land use within the Tahoe Basin portion of Placer County, and included exploring the reclassification of our zoning system in Tahoe, and the use of a Transect zoning model. Here is a link to that Board report:

http://www.placer.ca.gov/upload/bos/cob/documents/sumarchv/2011Archive/110726AA/bosd_110726_01_p1_p18.pdf

In addition, it should be noted that proposed use of a 'Transect' zoning model was discussed at the first community workshop and a preliminary transect diagram was provided as an example in a number of our presentations at the last five workshops. Here is a link to our first community workshop presentation:

<http://www.placer.ca.gov/Departments/CommunityDevelopment/Planning/TahoePlanning/TahoeBasinCPUUpdate/~media/cdr/Planning/CommPlans/TahoeBasinCPUUpdate/Workshops/Workshop1.ashx>

For the purposes of the work the County is doing with its local planning efforts, the 'Transect' zoning system is simply a modified way for our local jurisdiction to classify our zoning districts. While our local planning needs to be consistent with the RPU, we will be developing our own zoning system with the help of TRPA's community design consultants, Dyett & Bahtia (D&B).

With respect to the density standards being set by the RPU and how that relates to local plans, it is our understanding from working with TRPA, that while the RPU may allow additional density within certain areas, Area Plans (local plans) can further restrict this. Furthermore, it is our understanding from our work with TRPA, that Area Plans can keep density limits as they are today, or raise or lower them; and that Area Plans can't allow more than the limits set in the RPU.

Finally, it is important to note that it is the County's intention to develop zone districts and development standards and guidelines that represent what the Plan Area Teams have envisioned and the work that is being or has been done by our teams at the workshops – as long as what they have envisioned doesn't exceed the RPU allowances. To date, based upon the review of what the teams have been envisioning, TRPA's community design consultants, D&B have not encountered any area where the teams have wanted to exceed RPU development standard perimeters. They have noted that in most cases, the standards are more restrictive than the maximum RPU allowances. The only area where our staff has recognized a potential conflict, is with regard to the allowance for up to five stories in the Tahoe City area.

I hope this helps to provide clarification on your issue regarding our local planning efforts, and the use of a Transect zoning model.

Best,
Crystal

Crystal Jacobsen | Supervising Planner, Advanced Planning | Planning Division
Placer County Community Development Resource Agency
3091 County Center Drive Ste. 140, Auburn, CA 95603
530.745.3000 (main) 530.745.3085 (direct) 530.745.3080 (fax) cjacobse@placer.ca.gov

From: Ellie [mailto:tahoellie@yahoo.com]
Sent: Saturday, September 22, 2012 10:49 PM
To: Crystal Jacobsen
Cc: John Hester TRPA; John Hitchcock TRPA; John Marshall; Michael Johnson; Paul Thompson; 'Darcie Goodman-Collins League to Save LT; Shannon League to Save LT; Clem Shute TRPA GB
Subject: Transect Zoning

Hello Crystal,

I was reviewing the Placer County webpage and found this document (<http://www.placer.ca.gov/Departments/CommunityDevelopment/Planning/~//media/cdr/Planning/PC/2012/Aug30/TahoeBasinCommPlanUpdate.ashx>) presented to the Planning Commission dated August 30, 2012 discussing the use of transect zoning for the community plan team effort. Will this presentation be repeated for the Board of Supervisors at the upcoming October 23 BOS meeting to be held in Lake Tahoe?

When will County staff be discussing transect zoning and it's ramifications with the plan teams? We are being mislead by planning out of context without all the information that County has been using to develop the new Plan Areas.

This zoning tool has not been discussed during our plan team meetings. The defintions of each are explained in the Regional Plan Update EIS Appendix D and EIS Section 02. Example: minimum 8 units per acre for residential within a designated PTOD area where today we have 4 units per acre.

The PTOD overlay in Tahoe Vista and Carnelian Bay for Neighborhood General and Center would add more density than the Neighborhood General designation in Kings Beach without the overlay as shown in Exh 2-16 through 2-24

The PTOD overlay criteria expands the zoning described in Alt 3. and has not be adequately represented to the plan teams. The additional allowances will expand the development envelope and may not necessarily be what the teams have envisioned.

The language below is taken from the EIS- there are several more pages that I have not included.

Under Alternative 4, land use designations would be reclassified into a transect-based zoning system, that is, a model wherein a transect defines a series of districts that transition from wilderness and open space to the denser urban core. Transect districts would allow for a mix of land uses and housing types and result in an appropriate distribution of uses across the landscape. Each transect district would include specific measures that would regulate the physical form of the built environment to produce desired relationships between buildings and outdoor public areas, including streets. Alternative 4 proposes establishment of the five transect districts described below, some of which would be further defined by more specific districts (see Appendix D for an illustration of the transect districts, land uses, and summary of specific requirements as to form, function, and performance):

ψ T1: Wilderness District, Backcountry District, Conservation and Parkland District

ψ T2: Recreation District

ψ T3: Residential District

ψ T4: Neighborhood General District, Neighborhood Center District

ψ T5: Town Center District, Tourist Center District, and Special Districts

Characteristics such as massing, design, and permissible uses would be designated for each district. Districts would be further divided into Character Areas, which would have unique land use and design standards.

In addition to transect-based zoning, 12 PTOD districts would be established. PTOD zoning is a sustainable community planning strategy that concentrates development in denser, relatively urban settings to create walkable areas. Redevelopment projects within PTODs would be required to contain a minimum residential density of 8 dwelling units/acre and would be allowed up to four stories in height in central areas.

Exhibits 2-16 through 2-24 illustrate the land use plan proposed for Alternative 4.

Regional Plan Update Draft EIS 2-47

Redevelopment projects within PTOD areas or Community Plans would be allowed up to 70 percent coverage on high-capability lands for both undeveloped and developed parcels. Height limits would be revised to reflect existing height within the area. Soft coverage within sensitive lands (LCDs 1–3) could be restored and transferred into PTOD areas or Community Plans for use in commercial or tourist projects. Regulations that prohibit subdivision would be removed for mixed-use projects in PTOD area.

Regional Plan Update Draft EIS 2-48

Please advise when the plan teams and public at large will be notified that Placer County is pursuing transect as a planning tool if approved in the RPU.

Regards, Ellie

Nicole Hagmaier

From: Crystal Jacobsen
Sent: Wednesday, September 26, 2012 8:15 AM
To: Nicole Hagmaier
Subject: FW: Tahoe City TOD

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Hi Nicole – can you add this person to both our main distribution list for Tahoe CP and the workshop list?

Thanks !

From: Bryan Grunwald Associates [mailto:bg@bryangrunwald.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 25, 2012 4:25 PM
To: Crystal Jacobsen
Subject: Tahoe City TOD

Dear Crystal,

Please provide me with the TRPA, Forest Service and stakeholders (especially Granlibakben and Tahoe Marina Lodge) for the West Shore Community Plan in connection with the concept below. Thanking you in advance for the contacts. Also if you could include me on the mailing list I would appreciate it. Also the website to the documents presented.

As Peter may have told you, the purpose of my inquiry is to see if I could be of assistance in promoting the completion of the Lake Tahoe Trail in Tahoe City from Fanny Bridge to the park south of the old fire station. It is my understanding that the owners of the Tahoe Marina Lodge is opposed to this trail because of impact on privacy.

My idea is to offer them either or both a density/height increase and the use of the old fire station and its parking lot as a land. They could either relocate the access road or bridge over it with rooms. At best Tahoe Marina Lodge is a dated property.

The taxing agencies would benefit from hotel room tax for a larger hotel on Tahoe Marina Shore property. However, the market for resort hotel construction is very soft now. But the Lakefront and Tahoe City location may obviate this problem. Moreover, if a gondola was constructed from the Transportation Center to mid mountain location between Squaw Valley, Alpine, Homewood ski resorts, this would make the property even more desirable.

I have considerable experience in trail planning and private/public partnership execution as part of a planning process. I worked on the boardwalk for Santa Monica that lead to the Shutters Hotel being built (this also bridges over an alley). Most recently I worked on trail/hotel plans for the city of Mammoth Lakes.

If you would be interested in pursuing this conversation, I would partner with Jerry Keyser of Keyser Marston Associates for economic services and other specialties. Also Peter D iDomenico a civil engineer. Jerry Jerry has a home near Tahoe City.

Bryan E. Grunwald, AIA, AICP
Bryan Grunwald Associates
Planning.Architecture.Urban Design
6440 Hillegass Avenue
Oakland, CA 94618
W 510.420.1812
F 510.420.1819
E bg@bryangrunwald.com
W bryangrunwald.com

Nicole Hagmaier

From: Crystal Jacobsen
Sent: Wednesday, September 26, 2012 2:37 PM
To: 'Bryan Grunwald Associates'
Cc: Allen Breuch; Nicole Hagmaier
Subject: RE: Tahoe City TOD
Attachments: PlanAreaTeamsMatrix.pdf

Hi Bryan,

Here are our contacts for TRPA and the Forest Service:

John Hitchcock, TRPA
jhitchcock@trpa.org
775.589.5220

Mike Lefreve, US Forest Service
mlefevre@fs.fed.us
775.831.0914

I have also attached a list of all the community members on our Plan Area Teams (our community plan working groups). I am unsure if any of the members are affiliated with Granlibakken or the Tahoe Marina Lodge. Allen Breuch in our Tahoe City office is the Planner on our Community Plan Update team that works directly with the Tahoe City Plan Area Team working group, and so he may be more familiar with the property ownership of certain members of his team. I have cc'd him on this email.

As for your general concept/inquiry about the potential redevelopment of portions of Tahoe City, including business relocation and density/height increases and the gondola concept, our team will be reviewing your ideas and will let you know if we would like to meet with you to further discuss it.

I have added your contact information to our distribution list for the Community Plan Update. For more information regarding the Community Plan Update, you can visit our webpage at:

<http://www.placer.ca.gov/Departments/CommunityDevelopment/Planning/TahoePlanning/TahoeBasinCPUUpdate.aspx>

Thanks for your interest in our process.

Best,
Crystal

Crystal Jacobsen | Supervising Planner, Advanced Planning | Planning Division
Placer County Community Development Resource Agency
3091 County Center Drive Ste. 140, Auburn, CA 95603
530.745.3000 (main) 530.745.3085 (direct) 530.745.3080 (fax) cjacobse@placer.ca.gov

From: Bryan Grunwald Associates [mailto:bg@bryangrunwald.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 25, 2012 4:25 PM
To: Crystal Jacobsen
Subject: Tahoe City TOD

Dear Crystal,

Please provide me with the TRPA, Forest Service and stakeholders (especially Granlibakben and Tahoe Marina Lodge) for the West Shore Community Plan in connection with the concept below. Thanking you in advance for the contacts. Also if you could include me on the mailing list I would appreciate it. Also the website to the documents presented.

As Peter may have told you, the purpose of my inquiry is to see if I could be of assistance in promoting the completion of the Lake Tahoe Trail in Tahoe City from Fanny Bridge to the park south of the old fire station. It is my understanding that the owners of the Tahoe Marina Lodge is opposed to this trail because of impact on privacy.

My idea is to offer them either or both a density/height increase and the use of the old fire station and its parking lot as a land. They could either relocate the access road or bridge over it with rooms. At best Tahoe Marina Lodge is a dated property.

The taxing agencies would benefit from hotel room tax for a larger hotel on Tahoe Marina Shore property. However, the market for resort hotel construction is very soft now. But the Lakefront and Tahoe City location may obviate this problem. Moreover, if a gondola was constructed from the Transportation Center to mid mountain location between Squaw Valley, Alpine, Homewood ski resorts, this would make the property even more desirable.

I have considerable experience in trail planning and private/public partnership execution as part of a planning process. I worked on the boardwalk for Santa Monica that lead to the Shutters Hotel being built (this also bridges over an alley). Most recently I worked on trail/hotel plans for the city of Mammoth Lakes.

If you would be interested in pursuing this conversation, I would partner with Jerry Keyser of Keyser Marston Associates for economic services and other specialties. Also Peter D iDomenico a civil engineer. Jerry Jerry has a home near Tahoe City.

Bryan E. Grunwald, AIA, AICP
Bryan Grunwald Associates
Planning.Architecture.Urban Design
6440 Hillegass Avenue
Oakland, CA 94618
W 510.420.1812
F 510.420.1819
E bg@bryangrunwald.com
W bryangrunwald.com

Nicole Hagmaier

From: Crystal Jacobsen
Sent: Monday, October 01, 2012 1:43 PM
To: 'Steven Merrill'
Cc: Jennifer Montgomery; Nicole Hagmaier
Subject: RE: Greater Tahoe CityArea Plan

Hi Steven,

Thanks for your email. We do understand that second homeowners have a large interest and stake in the North Tahoe Basin, and should be involved in our Tahoe Basin Community Plan Update process. That said, at this juncture, we do have one second homeowner on our community working teams and as we move forward in this process, we may include others.

With respect to receiving notifications, we have had many second homeowners request to be added to our outreach/distribution list for the Community Plan Update project and therefore, those that are on our list are getting meeting email notifications. In addition, we have been utilizing utility bill mail-outs as another way to reach all homeowners and have been including flyer inserts into utility bill mail outs as a way to notify people about upcoming meetings on the Community Plan Update.

If you have an additional resource or way for us to further outreach to second homeowners, we appreciate any insight, suggestions or help that you can offer. We welcome your participation as a second homeowner, and appreciate your interest in our planning process.

We will add your name/email to our distribution list and I would be more than happy to talk to you further about our process, should you have any questions. Please feel free to call me and also visit our website for more information on the Community Plan Update:

<http://www.placer.ca.gov/Departments/CommunityDevelopment/Planning/TahoePlanning/TahoeBasinCPUUpdate.aspx>

Best,
Crystal Jacobsen

Crystal Jacobsen | Supervising Planner, Advanced Planning | Planning Division Placer County
Community Development Resource Agency
3091 County Center Drive Ste. 140, Auburn, CA 95603 530.745.3000 (main) | 530.745.3085 (direct) |
530.745.3080 (fax) | cjacobse@placer.ca.gov

-----Original Message-----

From: Steven Merrill [mailto:steven@BENCHMARK.com]
Sent: Saturday, September 29, 2012 12:29 PM

To: Crystal Jacobsen
Cc: Jennifer Montgomery
Subject: Greater Tahoe CityArea Plan

No second homeowners i know of ,including my self, have received notifications or outlines about this plan or notifications about meetings Why not? Also, Will there be meetings on these plans outside the basin for convenience of second home owners. We do represent a very significant part of these communities.

Steven Merrill
1940, 1980 and 2000 north Lake blvd.

(415) 407-2347 shouldn't you call our

Sent from my iPad

Nicole Hagmaier

From: Crystal Jacobsen
Sent: Thursday, October 25, 2012 12:49 PM
To: 'Mary Cushing'
Cc: Nicole Hagmaier
Subject: RE: Tahoe Basin Plan Update

Hi Mary,

Thanks for your email. We appreciate your input and have added it to our record.

Best,
Crystal

Crystal Jacobsen | Supervising Planner, Advanced Planning | Planning Division
Placer County Community Development Resource Agency
3091 County Center Drive Ste. 140, Auburn, CA 95603
530.745.3000 (main) 530.745.3085 (direct) 530.745.3080 (fax) cjacobse@placer.ca.gov

From: Mary Cushing [mailto:mhakala@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 22, 2012 10:36 AM
To: Crystal Jacobsen
Subject: Tahoe Basin Plan Update

Crystal -

Here's the way I see it. We residents of the area come to these meetings and express our wishes and concerns. But, the businesses who will profit financially from the plans being done the way they want, will pursue their wishes to the end. They are being paid to continue to make things happen their way, and we residents are not. So the corporations usually, eventually, get what they want. Building any structures higher than two stories will not be welcomed by the residents. That's the bottom line. WE DO NOT WANT TO LOOK LIKE SOUTH SHORE. We have a small community here, and we like it this way. Yes we need to do something, but tall buildings we do not want.

Mary Cushing

Nicole Hagmaier

From: Crystal Jacobsen
Sent: Friday, November 02, 2012 8:38 AM
To: 'Roger Patching'
Cc: Nicole Hagmaier
Subject: RE: Hi Crystal

Hi Roger –

I was out of the office for most of last week and have been trying to catch up this week, so my apologies for the delay in getting back to you.

I appreciate your comments regarding “nonresident property owners”. As I noted at our last Town Hall Meeting, it was our Board’s direction to create the teams with a primary focus on full-time residents, yet also allow for nonresident property owners where we can. Per our discussion and your suggestion, I have asked our team to modify the table to include a nonresident property owner category – I haven’t seen the modified table yet, however when I have it, I will send you a copy and also have it reposted to our website.

With respect to your suggestion about enlarging the teams, we will not be doing so. The teams were intended to be have between 7-9 members, with 9 being the maximum. The intent is to create team sizes that are manageable in terms of maintaining productive working sessions. As I noted at the last Town Hall Meeting, as vacancies arise we will give further consideration to filling those vacancies with nonresident property owners.

Thanks again for your email and your interest in this process. I’ll be in touch when I have a modified team list.

Best,
Crystal
Ps – Gerry says hi...

Crystal Jacobsen | Supervising Planner, Advanced Planning | Planning Division
Placer County Community Development Resource Agency
3091 County Center Drive Ste. 140, Auburn, CA 95603
530.745.3000 (main) 530.745.3085 (direct) 530.745.3080 (fax) cjacobse@placer.ca.gov

From: Roger Patching [mailto:roger@friendsoflaketahoe.org]
Sent: Thursday, November 01, 2012 1:39 PM
To: Crystal Jacobsen
Subject: Hi Crystal

How are things going? I know you have a lot on your plate, and my issue is not as urgent as others, but I thought I’d check in for a status report. No worries, just checking.

Best to you and Gerry,

Roger

Nicole Hagmaier

From: Crystal Jacobsen
Sent: Friday, November 16, 2012 10:53 AM
To: 'danamare@aol.com'
Cc: Nicole Hagmaier; Jennifer Merchant
Subject: FW: Placer County Tahoe Community Plan Update Stakeholder Committee Selection

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Hi Dana,

My name is Crystal Jacobsen and I am managing Placer County's Tahoe Basin Community Plan Update. This email message is for Elizabeth Hale whom requested a copy of this correspondence at our Tahoe City team meeting last night. She asked if I could send this to your email address. She also noted that we could include this email address on our email notification list if it is not already listed.

The correspondence below is an email from the Sierra Nevada Alliance to Placer County, noting their recommended community members for the County's Plan Area Teams.

Thank you for passing this along to Elizabeth.

Best,
Crystal

Crystal Jacobsen | Supervising Planner, Advanced Planning | Planning Division
Placer County Community Development Resource Agency
3091 County Center Drive Ste. 140, Auburn, CA 95603
530.745.3000 (main) 530.745.3085 (direct) 530.745.3080 (fax) cjacobse@placer.ca.gov

From: Gavin Feiger [<mailto:gavin@sierranevadaalliance.org>]
Sent: Tuesday, February 28, 2012 11:43 AM
To: Edmund Sullivan
Cc: joan@sierranevadaalliance.org
Subject: RE: Placer County Tahoe Community Plan Update Stakeholder Committee Selection

Hi Ed,

Below are the four people we recommend for each working group. Without any application information, we had to go by name recognition alone in a few cases. Also, we were surprised no one from the League to Save Lake Tahoe was on the list. We were also surprised that a couple of people we thought would have been involved were not on the list: Rob Weston from Homewood (West Shore) and Ellie Waller from Tahoe Vista (North Tahoe West). Thank you again for involving us. Let me know if you have any questions or if there is anything else we can do to help.

Tahoe City
Judy Friedman
Zach Hymanson
Jeff Sparksworthy
Marguerite Sprague

West Shore
Suzanne
Wilkins, AICP
Jan Brisco
Judith Tornese
Marion Burrowes

North Tahoe West
Patty Orlando
Leah Kaufman
Lewis D. Madden
Robert Lyman

North Tahoe East
Theresa May Duggan
Ann Nichols
Ki Nyborg
Andy Deinken

-Gavin

Gavin Feiger, Program Associate
Sierra Nevada Alliance | Regional Climate Change Program
530.542.4546 x.302
gavin@sierranevadaalliance.org
www.sierranevadaalliance.org
South Lake Tahoe, CA



SIERRA NEVADA ALLIANCE

Protecting and restoring Sierra land, water, wildlife and communities since 1993.
[Tickets on sale for the 7th Annual Wild and Scenic Environmental Film Festival - On Tour!](#)

From: Edmund Sullivan [<mailto:ESulliva@placer.ca.gov>]
Sent: Tuesday, February 21, 2012 1:16 PM
To: Gavin Feiger
Subject: RE: Placer County Tahoe Community Plan Update Stakeholder Committee Selection

Hi Gavin,

No, don't limit yourself to candidates who classify themselves as such, but do choose candidates that your organization believes will best present/advocate for natural resources, water quality, preservation, etc. The information I have is limited. Only choose candidates you're comfortable with. You can run the list by your peers if you wish. Plan on choosing 3-4 candidates for each team area. Thanks for your help.

Ed

From: Gavin Feiger [<mailto:gavin@sierranevadaalliance.org>]
Sent: Tuesday, February 21, 2012 11:26 AM
To: Edmund Sullivan
Subject: RE: Placer County Tahoe Community Plan Update Stakeholder Committee Selection

Hi Edmund,

Thank you again for asking for our input and we are happy to recommend/rank candidates. Would you like us to just focus on candidates that list "environmental" or "conservation" as a category? Also, if we do not know all of the people on the list, do you have applications or any other kind of information that would help guide our recommendations?

I will get this back to you within a week.

Gavin Feiger, Program Associate
Sierra Nevada Alliance | Regional Climate Change Program
530.542.4546 x.302
gavin@sierranevadaalliance.org
www.sierranevadaalliance.org
South Lake Tahoe, CA



SIERRA NEVADA ALLIANCE

Protecting and restoring Sierra land, water, wildlife and communities since 1993.
[Tickets on sale for the 7th Annual Wild and Scenic Environmental Film Festival - On Tour!](#)

From: Edmund Sullivan [<mailto:ESulliva@placer.ca.gov>]
Sent: Friday, February 17, 2012 4:16 PM
To: gavin@sierranevadaalliance.org
Subject: Placer County Tahoe Community Plan Update Stakeholder Committee Selection

Thank you Gavin for assisting us with Placer County Tahoe Community Plan Update Plan Area Team member selection. Attached is a list of candidates for all four plan areas. Please prioritize your selections for each area. We hope to have the selection process finished by March 16th. If you have any questions concerning the selection process do not hesitate to call or email me. Once again thank you.

Edmund P. Sullivan
Senior Planner
Planning Services Division
3091 County Center Drive
Auburn, CA 95603
530.745.3030

Nicole Hagmaier

From: Crystal Jacobsen
Sent: Friday, November 16, 2012 10:56 AM
To: Nicole Hagmaier
Subject: FW: Placer County Tahoe Community Plan Update Tahoe City Plan Area Team member selection

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

For the record

From: Edmund Sullivan
Sent: Wednesday, February 29, 2012 10:42 AM
To: Crystal Jacobsen
Subject: FW: Placer County Tahoe Community Plan Update Tahoe City Plan Area Team member selection

From: Steve Hoch [<mailto:shoch58@gmail.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, February 21, 2012 1:03 PM
To: Edmund Sullivan
Cc: Me
Subject: RE: Placer County Tahoe Community Plan Update Tahoe City Plan Area Team member selection

Hi Ed – For Tahoe City Downtown Assn. representation on the plan update team, I would like to suggest the following:

1. Hal Slear, TCDA Board Member and designated lead for plan efforts.
2. Gary Davis, TCDA Board Member

Other great choices:

3. Judy Friedman, TC PUD Director / Chair
4. Ron Traebuss, TC PUD Director, NLTRA
5. Wally Auerbach, NLTRA Board

All of these folks would be excellent representatives on the team. Hope you agree. Please let me know how the team is shaping up.

Thanks for including me on the team building.

Steve

From: Edmund Sullivan [<mailto:ESulliva@placer.ca.gov>]
Sent: Friday, February 17, 2012 4:24 PM
To: steve@visittahoeocity.com
Subject: Placer County Tahoe Community Plan Update Tahoe City Plan Area Team member selection

Thank you Steve for assisting us with Placer County Tahoe Community Plan Update Tahoe City Plan Area Team member selection. Attached is a list of candidates for all greater Tahoe City. Please prioritize your selections. We hope to have the selection process finished by March 16th. If you have any questions concerning the selection process do not hesitate to call or email me. Once again thank you.

Edmund P. Sullivan
Senior Planner
Planning Services Division
3091 County Center Drive
Auburn, CA 95603
530.745.3030

From: The Paper Trail [<mailto:judy@tahoepapertrail.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, November 27, 2012 10:59 AM
To: 'Crystal Jacobsen'; 'Marguerite Sprague'
Cc: 'Gary Davis'; 'Harold Slear'; 'Jim Williamson'; 'Kathie Fenley'; 'Martin Spitsen'; 'Walter Auerbach'; 'Zach Hymanson'
Subject: RE: TC Area Plan Committee stuff needed: TRPA Regional Plan Update - Code Chapter 13, Area Plans

RE: the report sent out:

- 1) Please put "DRAFT" in big letters on every page....these are working documents, not a final report
- 2) Is the TC team meeting prior to the 7pm meeting? If so, why?

Thanks.....J

Judy Friedman
The Paper Trail Secretarial & Business Solutions
PO Box 6178
Tahoe City, CA 96145
530-581-5692
fax: 530-581-5695

From: Crystal Jacobsen [<mailto:CJacobse@placer.ca.gov>]
Sent: Tuesday, November 27, 2012 10:20 AM
To: 'Marguerite Sprague'
Cc: Gary Davis; Harold Slear; Jim Williamson; Judy Friedman; Kathie Fenley; Martin Spitsen; Walter Auerbach; Zach Hymanson
Subject: RE: TC Area Plan Committee stuff needed: TRPA Regional Plan Update - Code Chapter 13, Area Plans

Marguerite and all –

The draft district standards are simply a 'starting place' for us to begin to draft the standards. Any figures that you see in the tables are simply the maximum standards allowed by TRPA and we will have the opportunity to refine them.

What we will be addressing tomorrow night is the maps created by D&B and the uses allowed with the zone districts – we will discuss those components in terms of how they align with what your team has envisioned.

After the new year, we will begin to work on the standards – the figures that will fill out the tables, etc.

I hope that helps to clarify things.

crystal

From: msprague.nlths@gmail.com [<mailto:msprague.nlths@gmail.com>] **On Behalf Of** Marguerite Sprague
Sent: Tuesday, November 27, 2012 8:49 AM
To: Crystal Jacobsen
Cc: Gary Davis; Harold Slear; Jim Williamson; Judy Friedman; Kathie Fenley; Martin Spitsen; Me; Walter Auerbach; Zach Hymanson

Subject: TC Area Plan Committee stuff needed: TRPA Regional Plan Update - Code Chapter 13, Area Plans

Hi Crystal:

I hope you had a happy Thanksgiving!

After our November 15 meeting, I took a look at Chapter 13 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances (Area Plans) from the 2012 Regional Plan Update (this was suggested to us at that meeting). It seems that many of the provisions bear directly on our work. Adding to the importance of this, the chapter also says—in different language—that if the plan we're advising on doesn't fit within certain parameters, TRPA will disregard/reject it. Therefore it is important that we understand these parameters. Chapter 13 gives us a great overview of them, but the specifics are found in additional documents, which I understand your department has. With this in mind, I am respectfully requesting you provide us the information listed below. Actually, I think this information would be of interest to all four Plan Area teams, not just ours.

Table 13.5.3-1. Minimum Development Standards for Area Plans

The referenced Code sections appear to be important in understanding the Table. I suggest also providing copies of the specific sections referenced, further defined below by specific subsections:

Section 37.4 (Height)

It seems the information in Table 13.5.3-1 should suffice at this point in our planning process.

Section 31.3 (Density)

31.1 Purpose through Table 31.5.2-1 Categories of Mixed Use.

Section 30.4 (Land Coverage)

30.4.2 Transferred Land Coverage Requirements. 2. Linear Public Facilities and Public Health and Safety Facilities through Table 30.4.4-1 Transfer Ratios.

Section 36.5 (Design Standards)

According to Chapter 36, *Placer County Standards and Guidelines for Signage, Parking and Design* (February 1993) apply to Tahoe City, Carnelian Bay, Tahoe Vista, and Kings Beach. Are these being updated through the current Placer County planning process? What additional Community Design Standards specific to Area Plans should we become familiar with?

Regional Land Use Map and Land Use Map Specific to Tahoe City Area Plan

Team Briefings

It would also be helpful if we could receive summary briefings from the County and/or TRPA staff so we can better understand the following:

- Alternative Parking Strategies
- Alternative Comprehensive Coverage Management
- Area-Wide Best Management Practices (BMPs)
- Alternative Transfer Ratios for Development Rights
- Overview of Findings of Area Plan Conformance with the Regional Plan
- Overview of Additional Review Standards for Area Plans in Town Centers

Thank you in advance for your consideration and information, and thank you very much indeed for all you do for our team, the other teams, and this important process.

Sincerely,

Marguerite

--

Marguerite Sprague

Executive Director
North Lake Tahoe Historical Society
(530) 583-1762
www.northtahoemuseums.org

Crystal Jacobsen

From: msprague.nlths@gmail.com on behalf of Marguerite Sprague
[msprague@northtahoemuseums.org]
Sent: Tuesday, November 27, 2012 8:49 AM
To: Crystal Jacobsen
Cc: Gary Davis; Harold Slear; Jim Williamson; Judy Friedman; Kathie Fenley; Martin Spitsen; Me; Walter Auerbach; Zach Hymanson
Subject: TC Area Plan Committee stuff needed: TRPA Regional Plan Update - Code Chapter 13, Area Plans

Hi Crystal:

I hope you had a happy Thanksgiving!

After our November 15 meeting, I took a look at Chapter 13 of the TRPA Code of Ordinances (Area Plans) from the 2012 Regional Plan Update (this was suggested to us at that meeting). It seems that many of the provisions bear directly on our work. Adding to the importance of this, the chapter also says—in different language—that if the plan we're advising on doesn't fit within certain parameters, TRPA will disregard/reject it. Therefore it is important that we understand these parameters. Chapter 13 gives us a great overview of them, but the specifics are found in additional documents, which I understand your department has. With this in mind, I am respectfully requesting you provide us the information listed below. Actually, I think this information would be of interest to all four Plan Area teams, not just ours.

Table 13.5.3-1. Minimum Development Standards for Area Plans

The referenced Code sections appear to be important in understanding the Table. I suggest also providing copies of the specific sections referenced, further defined below by specific subsections:

Section 37.4 (Height)

It seems the information in Table 13.5.3-1 should suffice at this point in our planning process.

Section 31.3 (Density)

31.1 Purpose through Table 31.5.2-1 Categories of Mixed Use.

Section 30.4 (Land Coverage)

30.4.2 Transferred Land Coverage Requirements. 2. Linear Public Facilities and Public Health and Safety Facilities through Table 30.4.4-1 Transfer Ratios.

Section 36.5 (Design Standards)

According to Chapter 36, *Placer County Standards and Guidelines for Signage, Parking and Design* (February 1993) apply to Tahoe City, Carnelian Bay, Tahoe Vista, and Kings Beach. Are these being updated through the current Placer

County planning process? What additional Community Design Standards specific to Area Plans should we become familiar with?

Regional Land Use Map and Land Use Map Specific to Tahoe City Area Plan

Team Briefings

It would also be helpful if we could receive summary briefings from the County and/or TRPA staff so we can better understand the following:

- Alternative Parking Strategies
- Alternative Comprehensive Coverage Management
- Area-Wide Best Management Practices (BMPs)
- Alternative Transfer Ratios for Development Rights
- Overview of Findings of Area Plan Conformance with the Regional Plan
- Overview of Additional Review Standards for Area Plans in Town Centers

Thank you in advance for your consideration and information, and thank you very much indeed for all you do for our team, the other teams, and this important process.

Sincerely,

Marguerite

--

Marguerite Sprague

Executive Director
North Lake Tahoe Historical Society
(530) 583-1762
www.northtahoemuseums.org

Nicole Hagmaier

From: Crystal Jacobsen
Sent: Monday, November 26, 2012 7:39 AM
To: 'Ellie'; John Hitchcock TRPA
Cc: Steve Buelna; Nicole Hagmaier
Subject: RE: I am struggling with the framework outlined for Tahoe Vista

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Hi Ellie,

Thanks for your comments. I have added them to the record, forwarded them on to our consultant, and we will bring printed copies on Wednesday night for your team to review if desired.

See you Wednesday.

Crystal

From: Ellie [mailto:tahoellie@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, November 25, 2012 8:11 PM
To: John Hitchcock TRPA; Crystal Jacobsen
Subject: I am struggling with the framework outlined for Tahoe Vista

Hello John and Crystal,
The Regional Plan designations are precise. By stating Tahoe Vista is a Town Center lends confusion to the specifics of planning for the area.
Kings Beach and Tahoe City are appropriately identified as Town Centers.

I request Tahoe Vista be re-classified more appropriately to Village Center- just like Carnelian Bay and new maps provided to the North Tahoe West team at or before our Nov 28 session. I do not want to waste the entire hour talking apples and oranges.

Tahoe Vista/Carnelian Bay will never generate the numbers required to be an effective PTOD as described in your definition of MU-TC or VC. Providing transit stops with covered shelters is all we need. High Quality store frontages- how many stores do we have today, how many will we have in ten years? We need a reality check on what Tahoe Vista/Carnelian Bay are and are not intended to be.

Economic sustainability is NOT based on overloading each little area with services or tourist shopping districts.

Tahoe Vista would be much more suited with a small grocery store near the trailer park, the existing nursery and a few good restaurants that complement the hotel, motels and timeshare facilities and the marinas with a few small stores or boat service/rental facilities. The MU-S designation is not identified on the maps for the marinas in Tahoe Vista/Carnelian Bay. A parking structure proposed for Tahoe Vista/Carnelian is not appropriate. The Gateway identified at Estates Drive is more a tourist accommodation district bordered by residential not a Gateway the definition provided. To have a true Gateway by the MU-G definition properties currently identified as North Tahoe East should be included.

And I still object that the Safeway, Placer County bldg (former AAA) and other properties that are within that locale (with Hwy 267 as the dividing line) are not part of our planning area and currently aligned with the North Tahoe East plan.

Placer County designates those properties as Tahoe Vista.

Please forward my concerns to Dyett and Bhatia representatives and I'd like a response before the meeting. As previously mentioned this will not be productive if we cannot agree upon the designations.

Thank you, Ellie

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Nicole Hagmaier <NHagmaie@placer.ca.gov>

To: Nicole Hagmaier <NHagmaie@placer.ca.gov>; Crystal Jacobsen <CJacobse@placer.ca.gov>

Cc: Paul Thompson <PKThomps@placer.ca.gov>; Steve Buelna <SBuelna@placer.ca.gov>

Sent: Tuesday, November 20, 2012 1:59 PM

Subject: November 28th Community Workshop

Hi all –

This email is to remind you of the Community Workshop that is scheduled for:

Wednesday, November 28, 2012 from 4:00PM-8:00PM at the Granlibakken Conference Center in Tahoe City. Please note the starting time of 4pm rather than our typical starting time of 6PM and that we will be staggering each group's working session:

- **4:00-5:00PM – West Shore Team working session**
- **5:00-6:00PM – North Tahoe West Working Session**
- **6:00-7:00PM – North Tahoe East Working Session**
- **7:00-8:00PM – Greater Tahoe City Working Session**

The format for this workshop will be different than the workshop we have had in the past. Our community design consultants, D&B will be in attendance at this next workshop and will be there to spend focused time with each group to review the work that you have done to date and to review/discuss the Draft District Standards that they have prepared for each team. They will be there to talk through the design concepts and standards that they have drafted for each team and will also be looking for feedback from your teams on the standards.

Please review the attached Draft District Standards for your Plan Area team. Due to the Holidays, we will not be able to print and mail out the Draft District Standards ahead of time, however, hard copies will be provided on the 28th.

Because we are staggering the team's meeting times we assume that everyone should have an opportunity to eat either before or after their meeting time, and so we will not be providing a meal. However, as always, we will have drinks and cookies available. ☺

In addition, based upon the discussion at the Focused Tahoe City Team Meeting on November 15th, the Tahoe City team will be meeting an hour early at **6:00PM** to talk further about the TC downtown stakeholder vision.

Finally, we would like to note that everyone is welcome to come and stay for the entire meeting if you would like to do so, or you can come just for your team's meeting time. **Please email Nicole Hagmaier to confirm your attendance, or that you will be having someone attend in your place.**

We look forward to hearing from you and look forward to seeing you on November 28th.

Thanks,

Tahoe Basin CP Update Planning Team

*Thank you,
Nicole Hagmaier*

*Placer County Planning Services Division
3091 County Center Drive, Suite 140
Auburn, CA 95603
530-745-3117
nhagmaie@placer.ca.gov*

Nicole Hagmaier

From: Crystal Jacobsen
Sent: Wednesday, December 05, 2012 12:08 PM
To: 'Jan Brisco'
Cc: Paul Thompson; Allen Breuch; Edmund Sullivan; Nicole Hagmaier; Steve Buelna; Jennifer Merchant; Michael Johnson; 'Shay Navarro'; Arlo Stockham; Steve Kastan
Subject: RE: Land Use Definitions

Hi Jan,

Thanks for your email. Based upon some of your comments, I would like to respond to a few points that you noted.

With respect to the schedule of the last meeting, County staff tried very hard to allow each team to have equal time with the consultant. That said, the team that was scheduled third in the evening kept asking questions despite staff's efforts to bring that session to a close, and as a result, the final team presentation that was scheduled at 7:00pm did not get underway until about 7:20PM. Because of this unexpected delay, the final team's working session with the consultant went until about 8:30PM, and then staff fielded questions about the overall Community Plan process (largely from the last team, but also from members of the public) for about half an hour, putting an end to the night around 9:00PM. Please know it was the County's intent to maintain the established timeline; however, as a planning consultant, I know you can appreciate that unexpected issues arise, and it becomes necessary to adjust schedules. Please accept my apologies if the scheduling and the allotted time with each team seemed unbalanced; it was not intended to be.

In addition, the County appreciates your concern about each team only having an hour with the consultant. As you are aware, the County is working under limited resources. As a result, staff's budget only allowed for one final workshop with the consultant before the consultant finished with their scope of work on the County's planning documents. Given this limitation, County staff decided to divide the meeting up into four, one-hour working sessions to allow for a presentation and Q/A with each team. Please note that your team will have further opportunity to review/discuss the work that has been prepared by the consultant. Unfortunately, at this juncture, financial resources are not available to have the consultant at future meetings. As noted in many reports given on the Tahoe Basin Community Plan Update, the consultant's effort on the County's work program is funded through a combination of shared resources by TRPA and grant funds awarded the Tahoe Basin Partnership for Sustainable Communities, which Placer County is a part of.

Last, I was confused by your statement that there is a "general feeling" that the process is "off track", and would appreciate any clarification you may be able to provide. As a general feeling implies that you have had discussions with others, it would be beneficial if you could relay to the County who believes the process is off track, and in what way is the process off track?

Based upon the timeline and schedule initially presented to the Board of Supervisors when this work program was approved, it is the County's opinion that the work effort remains on schedule. Additionally, given the limited resources to gather community input, hold community workshops, and town hall meetings, it is staff's belief that the Community Plan process has been quite successful in implementing the work program established by the Board of Supervisors. The documents prepared by the consultant are draft documents that were prepared to reflect the vision of each team for the commercial core areas within each community, as well as to reflect the standards set forth in the TRPA RPU. After being reviewed by Placer County and TRPA staff, the draft documents were released for the team's review and discussion. As noted at the last meeting, the documents are draft, in that they are "living" documents and serve as a template for the County to begin to develop standards and design guidelines for each team. The documents presented will evolve and build as this process moves forward.

While the County recognizes the limited time that each team had with the consultants at the last meeting and apologizes for any frustration that may have caused, the County team remains excited about what has been accomplished to date for the North Tahoe communities, and staff believes that this process remains on track. That

said, the County certainly welcomes any direct feedback you or any other member of the public can offer regarding the work that we have done to date and the draft district standards that have been presented to the teams.

As always, thanks for your continued support in this process, and I look forward to hearing back from you regarding clarification as to how the process is perceived to be off track.

Best,
Crystal

Crystal Jacobsen | Supervising Planner, Advanced Planning | Planning Division
Placer County Community Development Resource Agency
3091 County Center Drive Ste. 140, Auburn, CA 95603
530.745.3000 (main) 530.745.3085 (direct) 530.745.3080 (fax) cjacobse@placer.ca.gov

From: Jan Brisco [mailto:janbrisco@ltol.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 29, 2012 9:07 PM
To: Nicole Hagmaier
Cc: Crystal Jacobsen; Paul Thompson; Allen Breuch; Edmund Sullivan
Subject: Re: Land Use Definitions

Thank you for sending the definitions. I appreciate all the hard work the county is doing to try to prepare for the new plan.

In the interest of keeping this process accountable, I was a bit dismayed that all but one group were limited to an hour session, and the agenda clearly showed the meeting was to end at 8:00 pm. I along with other members of the public were unable to stay another hour while the last group was able to continue dialogue about the issues. Our group wanted to continue our discussions but were cut short without an alternate location to continue.

Further, I found that with the consultant's presentation, we only had time to confirm the map before time ran short.

There is a general feeling that this process is off track, so please take some time to review the effort and deliverables so that we have success at the end of the road.

Again, thank you for your time.

Jan

Sent from my iPhone

On Nov 29, 2012, at 3:16 PM, Nicole Hagmaier <NHagmaie@placer.ca.gov> wrote:

<image001.gif>
Good afternoon,

Attached please find a pdf of the Placer County Zoning Ordinance Land Use Definitions. Should you have any question please feel free to contact either Crystal Jacobsen at 530-745-3085 or myself at the number or email below. Thank you!

Nicole Hagmaier

From: Crystal Jacobsen
Sent: Wednesday, January 09, 2013 7:29 AM
To: 'Jim Williamson'
Cc: Nicole Hagmaier
Subject: RE: Plan Area Teams

Hi Jim,

Thanks for your input. We are not ending workshops, just moving into the next phase of the project. In this next phase we will be holding focused meetings with teams where we can allow for more focused time with each team and then we will resume workshops with the teams thereafter. I plan to report this out to the group tonight.

See you tonight!

crystal

From: Jim Williamson [mailto:jw@boat-lift.com]
Sent: Tuesday, January 08, 2013 5:39 PM
To: Crystal Jacobsen
Cc: Nicole Hagmaier
Subject: Plan Area Teams

Crystal and Nicole

I hope your holidays were well.

Received your most recent emails and attachments of 12-20-12 and 12-7-12, thanks for the updates. Truthfully I am a little perplexed of the change of the Team's schedule from the monthly work shop's. I was mentally prepared for these scheduled workshops, to be conducted for every and many more months.

I will assume you will explain why the workshops were eliminated/reduced, this Wednesday night the 9th ? I am guessing that it was not working out well for the County. It was difficult for our TC team to accomplish what we were asked to, in the time we were allocated. I was always willing and pushing for more time, as you may recall, the TC team was there longer, had very little breaks and had more meetings than others and still didn't get everything done. Working more was fine with me, I personally have a lot of time and effort in with our team, talking to other interested parties and this process itself, that's what we were chosen to do so. I don't feel that we finished what we were asked to accomplish, "**job uncompleted**". When we were asked to review the TC Vision draft it was obvious that we needed **even** more time.

With that said, I still have and will have more **input** on the drafts, and feel that the upcoming town hall meetings will not be the correct venue or have enough time to address my or others team members **input** and I am hoping that as still a **team member**, I can reflect my input

through email's to you, so your staff and consultant can take my opinion and corrections in consideration of the drafts in the works, besides the 9th, once again will not be enough time ?

Thanks and see you Wednesday
Jimmy Williamson



Mail
PO Box 5310
Stateline, NV 89449-5310

Location
128 Market Street
Stateline, NV 89449

Contact
Phone: 775-588-4547
Fax: 775-588-4527
www.trpa.org

MEMORANDUM

Date: January 7, 2013

To: Crystal Jacobsen, Placer County Supervising Planner

From: Arlo Stockham, Regional Planning Manager
Shay Navarro, Senior Planner

Subject: Preliminary Review of Placer County Land Use Maps, Land Use Tables and Scale/Height Standards

As requested, TRPA has completed a preliminary review of Placer County's Draft Land Use Maps, Land Use Tables and Scale/Height Standards (in the November 2012 District Standard Documents and December 20 Height Standard Tables). TRPA staff appreciates the opportunity to actively participate on the plan development process. We look forward to working together to develop Area Plans that are consistent with Regional Plan requirements and responsive to the needs affected property owners and the larger community.

We understand that the draft Area Plan provisions are a work in progress and are likely to be modified through the planning process. As such, comments contained herein are general in nature and focus on topics that are likely to be issues for the TRPA conformance review process. Also as requested, we have not completed a detailed review of the design standards for each plan area, as we understand those are subject to change.

At the appropriate time, we would like to discuss strategies that Placer County may use to address Regional Plan requirements related to environmental topics, alternative transportation facilities and similar matters. We understand those topics will be addressed in other plan sections. Please be aware that other plan provisions could call for changes to the draft land use designations, uses and development standards. It is difficult to provide a detailed review of land uses and development standards without concurrently reviewing conservation and transportation elements for each plan. We encourage you to expedite work on the required environmental and transportation plan elements, since those will influence other plan sections.

Overall, the portions of the Draft Area Plans that are available for review articulate a positive vision for affected areas. The planned land use pattern is sensible and the proposed scale is generally appropriate (with some exceptions).

As a general comment on these plan sections, TRPA believes there should be increased emphasis on environmental improvements in the introduction and purpose statements for each document – and in other applicable plan sections that will be developed. Environmental gain should be achieved through accelerated redevelopment in mixed use areas, sensitive land restoration and providing capacity for development transfers from outlying areas. The design standards appear to support these goals, but the (legally required) need for environmental gain should be more prominently stated throughout the documents, starting in the introductory sections.

Additional discussion will also be needed to clarify if certain TRPA codes are proposed to be superseded by Area Plan provisions. Presumably, the Area Plan Land Use Tables would supersede the TRPA tables. The prevailing standard is less clear in the height and density sections.

More specific comments for each Plan Area are provided below:

Greater Tahoe City Plan Area

Land Use Maps:

It is unclear why so many different districts are needed. This is a decision for Placer County to make, but some consolidation of similar districts may be appropriate to facilitate implementation.

To approve the proposed land use map for the Area Plan, amendments to the Regional Plan Land Use Map from Recreation to Mixed-Use would be needed along the Truckee River Corridor and at Commons Beach. The land use change appears appropriate for existing service businesses along the river corridor; but it is unclear why a mixed use designation would be proposed or needed for the public beach. TRPA Staff recommends retaining Commons Beach as a recreation district without mixed use allowances. There may also be a minor expansion of the Mixed-Use Commercial area at Dollar Point (along Aspen Drive), which does not appear to be an issue from a Regional perspective.

There has also been considerable discussion of redesignating the golf course clubhouse area. The gold course site is notably absent from the mixed use district maps. TRPA encourages planning for the golf course site in the context of the Area Plan update. The property provides unique opportunities for redevelopment, environmental restoration and improving community connectivity.

Finally, the implications of the “Master Plan Overlay” designation are not readily apparent and warrant further discussion.

Land Use Tables:

The proposed land use tables appear to address all uses and supersede TRPA's land use classifications. All of the districts allow some combination of mixed uses and will require a Regional Plan Land Use Designation of either Mixed Use or Tourist.

Detailed land use allowances and restrictions generally fall within the discretion of local governments. In general, we encourage you to consider additional allowances and streamlined processing for residential uses in mixed use areas – especially multi-family. As drafted, a property owner could establish a variety of commercial uses without any discretionary review, but would need to obtain a Minor Use Permit in order to include residential units (if they are allowed at all). The additional procedural requirements will likely discourage mixed use development. Similarly, home occupations are prohibited in many areas but would be both environmentally beneficial and consistent with existing development patterns. These restrictions do not support the Regional Plan's goal of encouraging mixed use centers as much as they could. Additional residential uses in mixed use areas will be needed to implement the Regional Plan and allow for continued issuance of residential allocations without violating the Region's VMT and LOS standards.

For the same reason, reduced allowances for automobile oriented uses within Town Centers should also be considered. For example, auto and mobile home sales may not be appropriate in the MU-TC district, which is the downtown core of Tahoe City. A new auto dealership could undermine walkability and limit capacity for more appropriate town center land uses.

Scale and Height Standards:

Provisions for the MU-TC and MU-REC district appear appropriate, as both districts are within the Tahoe City Town Center. To be consistent with Table 4, language in item F (criteria for additional height) should be clarified/corrected to note that it applies to just the MU-TC and MU-REC districts (not the "Town Centers and Neighborhood Districts" that are currently identified in item F).

We also note that new findings are proposed for certain situations. Please consider utilizing TRPA's findings for additional height in Town Centers (TRPA Code Sec 37.7.16), possibly with supplemental standards. The proposed additional height findings differ from TRPA code and will require additional review and analysis as a "replacement standard". The reason to modify adopted height findings is unclear.

The landscaped setback provision for additional height (item F.2) is important to retain somewhere (with possible modifications) in order to address TRPA requirements in Chapter 13 of the Code for transitional height and/or buffer areas adjoining lower intensity areas.

Height and scale provisions for the MU-RT district should also require findings for additional height in Centers (TRPA Code Sec 37.7.16 or alternative).

Height and scale provisions for the other land use districts (MU-N, MU-C and MU-S) are somewhat confusing and appear exceed the maximum height allowed by the Regional Plan outside Town Centers. The standards reference TRPA Code Chapter 37, but also outline allowances that exceed that allowed by Chapter 37. These districts are outside the Town Center and should be limited to height allowed in TRPA Code Chapter 37. If additional height is desired for any of these properties, please consider including them on one of the Town Center districts and amending the Regional Plan Town Center boundary in accordance with criteria in Chapter 13.

North Tahoe West Plan Area

Land Use Maps:

Similar to Tahoe City, there may not be a need for four separate mixed use districts – but this is a decision for Placer County to make.

Land Use Maps appear consistent with the Regional Plan. There may (or may not) be minor expansions of mixed use areas into properties currently designated Residential. More detailed maps that are being prepared will reveal the details. Any map amendments will need to be identified, but there do not appear to be any issues of Regional concern.

Tahoe Vista is currently designated Tourist in the Regional Plan. The plan should clarify if an amendment to Mixed Use is proposed for some or all of the mixed use districts in the area. From the Regional perspective, either Mixed Use or Tourist would be reasonable designations for the area.

Land Use Tables:

Same comments as for Tahoe City – further allowances for residential uses in mixed use areas and further restriction on auto-oriented businesses appears appropriate.

Allowances to develop a wide variety of commercial, industrial and communication facilities without any discretionary review in the MU-S district may be excessive.

Scale and Height Standards:

The entire Plan Area is outside a designated Town Center. Accordingly, height standards should either reference TRPA Code Chapter 37, or be more restrictive. If additional height is desired for any property, please propose an amendment to the Regional Plan Town Center boundary in accordance with criteria in Chapter 13. As drafted, many height provisions exceed Regional Plan allowances and would not be approvable without an amendment to the Town Center boundary. The 48 foot maximum height proposed for portions of Tahoe Vista would require a significant amendment to the Regional Plan and warrants further discussion. Other height standards may be achievable without inclusion in a center, but would need to be refined modestly to maintain Regional Plan consistency.

Like Tahoe City, the applicability of conflicting TRPA and Area Plan provisions for height should be clarified.

North Tahoe East Plan Area

Land Use Maps:

There are no apparent inconsistencies with Regional Plan Land Use and Town Center designations.

Land Use Tables:

Same comments as for the other plan areas – further incentives for residential uses in mixed use areas and further restriction on auto-oriented businesses appears appropriate. As drafted, a fast food restaurant in the Kings Beach Town Center can be developed without any discretionary review, but a multi-family project cannot.

Scale and Height Standards:

With all districts included in a Town Center, maximum heights appear consistent with the Regional Plan. Like in the Tahoe City Plan, TRPA Chapter 37 height findings should either be required or additional analysis of the proposed replacement findings should be completed. The proposed variations in height standards and adjacency/buffering provisions appear consistent with the Regional Plan.

West Shore Plan Area

Land Use Maps:

Maps appear generally consistent with the Regional Plan. More detailed mapping will identify any minor boundary adjustments, none of which appear to be regionally significant.

Land Use Tables:

Same comments as for the other plan areas – further incentives for residential uses in mixed use areas and further restriction on auto-oriented businesses appears appropriate. As drafted, a fast food restaurant can be developed without any discretionary review, but a multi-family project cannot. Please consider eliminating allowances for auto sales, service stations and related uses since the roadway network on the West Shore has very limited capacity.

Scale and Height Standards:

Please clarify applicability of TRPA Chapter 37, which appears to accommodate the proposed height limits. The table currently references TRPA code, but also specifies different standards. It is unclear what standard prevails. TRPA recommends deferring to TRPA Code Chapter 37 height limits outside Centers.

Conclusion

As noted above, these review points are general in nature and intended to identify significant issues to discuss. We look forward to discussing these matters and refining the draft plan provisions so they meet the community's needs and adhere to TRPA limitations.

Please feel free to contact either of us as needed throughout the planning process.