

July 31, 2015

Crystal Jacobsen
Maywah Krouch

Re: Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan and Implementing Regulations Public Review Draft comments.

Hi Crystal, Maywan,

I apologize but this summer has been incredibly busy. I have not been able to go through the Tahoe Basin Area Plan – Public Review Draft or the Implementing Regulations in great detail. The comment period from June 2015 to August 1st 2015, is simply not enough time to review these documents and analyze how they compare to the work our teams spent two years in deliberation on.

Additionally, it would have been helpful to our plan teams to have a workshop or two that showed us specifically how the proposed Basin Plan incorporated our comments (or didn't) from our two years of efforts and minutia of detail.

In other words, our teams spent a lot of time looking at height, density, zoning etc. and at times there wasn't consensus which resulted in split votes on important items. Our teams represented a good cross section of the business and other community and thus their input should be highly valued.

I would like to see a list of the items that our teams voted on that may have been contentious or merited extra discussion as applied to the Area Plan documents especially relating to height, density and zoning. Our team comments should be included somewhere in the documents.

Additionally, in the old community plans there wasn't the five year check of how the goals and policies were met even though this was a requirement. What prevents this from happening again? The entitlements were given out but all of the required goals did not get met. How does the Basin Area plan prevent this from happening and does it tier off of what was required to be done in the old Community plans? I would like to see a chart of what was previously required, what got implemented on the ground, and what is left to achieve that did not get constructed or implemented.

In general, the biggest issues affecting any community are height and density. I think our plan team was unified that no more than two stories on the lake side and no more than three stories on the mountain side for Tahoe Vista and Carnelian Bay and preservation of parking lot views was discussed in detail.

(We did not vote on any overrides to the existing TRPA code in terms of height or density for areas outside Town Centers. Does the Basin Area Plan propose overrides for Village Centers?

General Comments:

Secondary Housing: I am not opposed to garage apts within 1/4 mile of transit or the highway provided there are regulations on number of cars and size of unit. I think the unit size should be 640 sf or the same sf that TRPA allows for detached structures over garages. The impacts to the neighbors in residential subdivisions should be analyzed in terms of traffic, noise, parking, etc. Would these units be deed restricted for rents and for number of cars? Suggestion: One car for every 640 sf of unit size would help to alleviate congestion in neighborhoods. How many secondary units are projected?

CFA conversion: The CFA conversion to TAU's should be more than 454 sf for one TAU as the TAU's proposed are larger than this and could have more impacts than CFA of this same size. I suggest a 1:1 ratio of CFA traded for TAU. The impacts of noise, traffic, parking, etc. should be analyzed. I agree with a cap of 400 converted TAU's and only in Town Centers.

Parking: Shared parking is beneficial especially if one use is open in the day and closed at night. Too little parking however is not good either and the \$30,000 per parking space could be cost prohibitive to the smaller projects wanting to redevelop.

Project Area:

I also am very concerned about non-contiguous project areas This should be based on a case by case basis as the impacts could be substantial in one location and not realized in another. Impacts could be severe if density is accumulated in one location.

Open Space: How will additional areas slated for open space be identified ? How will they be achieved? Are entitlements linked to the requirement for additional open space?

Opportunity sites? Is this similar to the old CEP program? These sites should have their own environmental analysis in conjunction with cumulative impact analysis of other full project build out in Town Centers and in comparison to the villages at Squaw and Northstar, Homewood projects, and proposed 760 units for Martis Valley West and 500 space campground at a minimum.

I have spoken with Samir on the Tahoe City lodging project which is a ugly blighted project as is and in desperate need of redevelopment. In my discussion with Samir I expressed a concern that 120 units on 1.2 acres is pretty dense and four stories pretty high especially as this project is not set back from the Highway and will change the look or community character for the center of Tahoe City. This is more than a reported "boutique hotel" and is in reality 40 standard hotel rooms and 80 condos. Is there a economic analysis that shows people will purchase these condos adjacent to a main Highway? Will the project be phased? If the 80 units were smaller would it be possible to preserve a full story of height? In other words, a cap to three stories? The character of four stories with very little setback to the highway should be analyzed in detail.

Will there be requirements and enforcement in place to require people not to have cars if they occupy these units? What are the impacts of the additional height and density to adjacent property owners and those that currently look over the two story Hendrickson building having relied on current planning laws in place to preserve their views? Does this "opportunity project" get more incentives than other projects of a similar nature that haven't been classified as an "opportunity project"?

Parks and beaches: Parks and Beaches in Kings Beach are mainly State owned and would not be candidates for Mixed Use in all probability. Is this a real gain?

Design Guidelines: Our Plan teams did not go over the Design Guidelines in great detail and each area should be very specific. I would like to have a workshop on just the Design Guidelines as they relate to current code vs proposed code for each area.

I do not want to see any buildings along Highway 28 in non -Town Centers closer than 20 feet from the edge of travel way especially if higher than two stories. I have enclosed comments from several years ago that looked at a draft of Design Guidelines and do not know if any of these comments were incorporated.

I would like the opportunity to comment further and in more detail and hope that the County will take additional input. Thanks.

Leah Kaufman
Principal Planner

1/2/2013

To: Placer County and TRPA

Re: Comments on DYETT & BHATIA North Tahoe West Plan Area Design

From: Ellie Waller and Leah Kaufman

Page	Reference	Comment
Cover Page	photo	Replace Tonopalo photo- with photo of Cedar Glen/Rustic Lounge. (Cedar Glen just won a TRPA Best in Basin award for best commercial project for 2013). Tonopalo is not the communities most well received project.
Cover Page	Text	Remove the wording "Town District Standards". Replace with ?? as discussed at November Plan Team meeting.
Page 1	Introduction	What is multi-modal transportation?
Page1	Introduction	Add bullet in second paragraph for "Preservation and Creation of view sheds."
Page1	Description of North Tahoe West	Tahoe Vista Plan team should have shared input with Kings Beach (East Plan team) for the area west of Agatam?
Page1	Vision Statement	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• What is the Tahoe West Vision Statement that was written specifically for our area? Add.• We need to be clear regarding what makes Tahoe Vista and Carnelian Bay unique as a Community.• Design Standards to reflect preservation/ enhancement of the unique qualities of the area. i.e. views to the lake, Community Character, "Old Tahoe" style of architecture, limits on massing and height, and preservation of trees.
Page 1	Second bullet in last paragraph	Where and what is the "Tourist Village lakeside of Highway 28"? What uses are intended for this area?
Page 1	Third bullet in last paragraph	Add additional wording for "maintaining existing Community Character" and considerations of "neighboring properties."
Page 2	Purpose: " A "	The community plans must also "protect the existing residential environment" as Tahoe Vista/Carnelian Bay have mixed-uses of Residential, Tourist, Commercial, Public Service and Recreation .
Page 2	Purpose: "D "	Wording should be added that describes maintenance, improvement and enhancement of lake and mountain views and preservation of existing natural resources. i.e. trees of significance. (This is what makes Tahoe Vista/CB unique).
Page 2	"Mixed Use Districts"	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Change title of "Mixed Use Town Center" designation.• What is a vertical mixed use project?

Page	Reference	Comment
Page 2	Mixed Use Gateway	Physical form should also include features that would inform the pedestrian or traveler that they are in a “gateway.”
Page 3	Map	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carnelian Bay should have more or equal review (i.e. MUP vs (A) than Tahoe Vista yet the Mixed Use Table allows more uses with (A) designation in Carnelian Bay as a VC Zoning). • Carnelian Bay is much smaller and more compact area wise and is geared towards public recreation and some minor retail- services. • Carnelian Bay also has sensitive land capability designated areas that provide open space that should be preserved.
Page 3	Map	Remove heading “Mixed Use Town Center”. Town Centers as designated by TRPA are not an “allowed use” in Tahoe Vista or Carnelian Bay. (Confusing).
Page 5	Boat Launching	Boat Launching should require a MUP in VC due to potential environmental impacts and neighbor notice.
Page 5	Campgrounds/Camping Incidental	Campgrounds/Camping incidental should require a MUP in VC district due to environmental impacts and neighbor notice. Fire pits, traffic, noise etc. VC may not be a great designation for this use as the parcels are small.
Page 5	Community Centers	Community centers over 5000 sf should require MUP.
Page 6	Houses of Worship/Libraries and Museums	MUP should be required for Houses of Worship/Libraries and Museums in all zoning districts if over 5000 sf. (traffic, massing, noise, aesthetics etc)
Page 6	Golf Courses	New golf courses or expansions of existing golf courses should require a CUP in all districts.
Page 6	Sport Facilities	Sport facilities should require a MUP due to height and mass if facilities are over 5000 sf.
Page 6	Theatres and Meeting Halls	Theatres and Meeting Hall should require a MUP due to size and height. Should also be allowed in Service areas.
Page 6	Caretaker and Employee Housing	Employee housing projects over 20 units should have MUP requirements. Employee housing projects over 20 units should require a CUP. (No one area should have more than 50 employee or senior units).
Page 6	Multiple Family Dwellings	Multiple Family Dwellings over 20 units in all zoning locations should be require a MUP due to neighbor notice, and environmental impacts.
Page 6	Residential Uses- Apartments	Apartment type uses are missing in category of use. Apartments over 20 units should require MUP.

Page	Reference	Comment
Page 6	Residential uses (Timeshare/Fractional)	Timeshare/Fractional Uses are missing in category of use designations. MUP should be required for all projects due to massing, noise, neighborhood notice etc. No fractional/timeshare in S designation or VC.
Page 6	Secondary Units	Secondary Units should be allowed in (S) if accessory to the primary use. i.e. caretakers quarters.
Page 6	Senior Housing/ Employee Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Senior Housing should not be treated any different than Employee housing and should require CUP in all districts if over 20 units. • Employee housing should be dispersed in all zoning districts and in all communities. Tahoe Vista has the second most affordable housing on the North Shore and other areas should be encouraged to have a fair share. Employee housing should be encouraged to be mixed in with non-restricted housing. • No more than 50 units in any one area should be allowed . Units to be in multiple buildings.
Page 6	Single Room Occupancy Housing	What is this? Could not find in Placer County zoning ordinance.
Page 6	Building Material Stores	Building Material Stores should also require a MUP in VC
Page 6	Grocery and liquor stores or any retail	Grocery and liquor stores should not be allowed in service area.
Page 7	Child care Services	MUP should be required in all zoning areas. (noise, traffic)
Page 7	Construction Contractors	Construction Contractors should be discouraged in VC zoning.
Page 7	Kennels, animal boarding	Minimum setback/buffer to neighbors should be required if allowed in proximity with residential uses- Should be encouraged in (S) zoning due to noise impacts.
Page 7	Medical Services/Hospitals	Should be allowed in (S) designation only.
Page 7	Offices	Offices should be allowed in all zoning designations- Limit sf or number of ground floor offices allowed like they do in Truckee in the Town Core if goal is primarily retail oriented uses.
Page 7	Personal Services	Personal Services should be allowed in all zoning districts.
Page 7	Service Stations/Carwash	CUP should be required in addition to (C). Service stations should be discouraged in Tahoe Vista and Carnelian Bay.
Page 7	Storage, Accessory	Need sf maximums for this use.

Page	Reference	Comment
Page 7	Hotels/Motels	CUP should be required for all motels/hotels/bed and breakfasts (transient dwellings) over 15 units due to neighborhood notice and env impacts.
Page 10	Broadcasting studios	What is intent of limiting ground floor use of broadcasting studios? Why is use banned in Tahoe Vista?
	Miscellaneous	Many use categories that are in the TRPA community plan are missing from the mixed use tables. Design team should review TRPA CP permissible uses.
Page 10	Building Placement Standards (Street frontage setback)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Street frontage should be measured from front property line not edge of pavement as edge of pavement changes depending on what Caltrans does with the roads. • More definition needed for waiver of sidewalk and pedestrian facilities. (need more reasons to waive) • Some sidewalks are located within Caltrans ROW and would not have the space for a 4 foot landscaped parkway in front. • Bike Lanes should also be identified in profile.
Page 10	Building Placement Standards (Interior setbacks)	Don't understand interior side setback. Why the two dimensions of 0 feet and 10 feet? If projections of rooflines etc are allowed into side setbacks by up to 50% then 10 feet may not be adequate especially if purpose is for landscaping and providing buffers between developments or different and possibly incompatible uses.
Page 10	Building Placement Standards (Lake Tahoe Setbacks)	TRPA regulates "backshore buffer" setbacks for Lake Tahoe. In some cases TRPA setbacks could be more stringent than 30 feet. Setbacks should be whatever is the more restrictive between County and TRPA requirements.
Page 10	Building Placement Standards (Minimum frontage at the build-to line)	Don't understand?- Please clarify. Show photo examples.
Page 10	Building Placement Standards (Maximum projection into setback)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Projections into setbacks are also governed by the fire dept and their standards may be more restrictive at times. 50% allowance may be too much considering snow shed and landscaping buffers. • (Need more information and clarification with examples)

Page	Reference	Comment
Page 10	<i>Standards misc</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Master plan (booklet) should be prepared and kept at Placer County to assist developers/builders for styles and colors of pavers, types of acceptable street lights, tree species, and other amenities. • Tahoe Vista/Carnelian Bay should be encouraged to be cohesive in terms of design standards, colors, and materials. (There are several projects that already have pavers, and street lights that could set a standard).
Page 11	Street Frontage Improvements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Street trees should be encouraged to be planted in groups or clusters of three (3) to encourage a more natural rather than a linear look wherever possible. • Clarify areas for the 12 foot lights v.s. low level or bollard lighting? i.e. 12 feet for parking lots and bollard lighting along Highway?
Page 12	Figure 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drawing is confusing. Can design team also provide photograph examples of what is proposed in Figure 2? • Don't understand plan at Mixed-use building. Use photo examples and clarify better.
Page 12	"D"- Build to Line	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need clarification- What is the "identified percent of linear street frontage"?
Page 12	Lake Tahoe Setback Improvements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is this standard for public or private lake frontage parcels?
Page 13	Roof Variation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 28 feet too high before variation is required especially if close to Highway. • (More height for more setback without variation)?
Page 13	Landscaped setback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A 20 foot landscaped setback should be required for all buildings regardless of height.
Page 13	View Corridor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Don't understand this regulation. Need examples and photos. • In many cases 24 feet above ground level will block views of the lake. Example (Le Petite is 11 feet above street level and enough to block lake views). • View Corridors must be preserved in all zoning districts, across parking lots, and where views to Lake Tahoe currently exist. • Offer incentives for other standards if project open new views to Lake Tahoe.

Page	Reference	Comment
Page 14	Required Findings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Define “additional height” Should be defined in terms of feet allowed. “Existing and planned uses” is too vague. Define a standard acceptable for comparison purposes. Scale and massing needs further definition in design standards.
Page 15	Building Form Standards (Maximum building length)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maximum building length should be no more than 75’ for structures where no previous development exists or if over 25% of the trees have to be removed to construct such structure. (This is a character issue as building length will require removal of trees and other natural features on a property). If already disturbed and devoid of vegetation building length can be extended to 125 feet. Some exceptions based on parcel size should also be considered. (prepare a sliding scale based on site disturbance and parcel size).
Page 15	Building Form Standards (blank wall)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 25 feet too long of a run for no windows or other features. Suggest- 15 feet of blank wall maximum.
Page 15	Building Modulation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 75 feet of width too wide for parcels in Tahoe Vista/Carnelian Bay. Sliding scale should be proposed to determine width of buildings based on width of parcels. Incentivize combining of parcels.
Page 15	Building Form Standards (Transparency)Parking Garages	No parking garages should be allowed facing Highway 28 in any of the zoning districts.
Page 16	Parking and Access standards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change diagram to show preservation of Lake Views across parking lots as viewed from Highway 28. Views to Lake should be maintained across parking area.
Page 16	Parking podium	What is a “parking podium”?
Page 17	Surface parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wall development should not be encouraged along Highway 28. Trellis may not be practical in snow country.
Page 17	Shared Access	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parking requirements should be relaxed for private projects located within 100 feet from public parking facilities to encourage shared use.

Page	Reference	Comment
Page 18	Building design and articulation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Give examples of design features to avoid “boxy” architecture. Show photo examples
Page 19	Residential open space	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is this paragraph necessary ? Open space is dictated by zoning ordinance and TRPA Bailey land classifications?
Page 20	Accesibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarify what this means? Show examples.
Page 20	Outdoor Storage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Views to Lake Tahoe should not be blocked with solid walls or fences to allow outdoor storage. In other words outdoor storage should be located on the parcel so as not to interfere with views.
Page 20	Outdoor Storage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the one foot landscape strip consistent with other setbacks identified earlier in the design standards? No structures/walls should be located as close as one foot to the street.
Page 21	Design Guidelines	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highway 89 is located on the west shore. Highway 28 is proper roadway. Tahoe Vista/Carnelian Bay examples should be used for Tahoe Vista/Carnelian Bay plan as much as possible- Sidewalks should be more than 6 feet in the core of Tahoe Vista to encourage outdoor seating, dining, plazas, and the pedestrian experience.
Page 22	Building form and design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Example of building is too massive and out of character for Tahoe Vista/Carnelian Bay. Under Note: 56 feet of height should be removed from example as not allowed in TV or CB. Cedar Glen should also be used as an example of materials, colors, articulation and good example of a redevelopment project
Page 22	Colors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refer to TRPA scenic standards and guidelines for scenic corridors.
Page 23	Building Entrances	Building entrances should also be encouraged to have rock pillars, columns and other stone accents.
Page 23	Shorezone Design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Views across parking areas should be maintained for the pedestrian/traveler along Highway 28. Maintain open view corridors between buildings. No fences or other screening to block views to the Lake
Page 24	Definitions and Rules of Measurement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Definitions should include details from pages 12-19 of the design standards for clarification. TRPA/Placer County Use definitions should be consistent and added for clarification.

Page 24	Rules of Measurement	What are rules of measurement?
------------	----------------------	--------------------------------

Miscellaneous comments:

- Consultant needs to explain to us how they came up with the “Use Regulations” based on zoning. Why would Carnelian Bay which is more compact and environmentally sensitive have more allowable uses (A) than Tahoe Vista? Suggestion: Can consultant come up with a visual map of what our communities should look like and what services should be offered similar to what was done for Tahoe City?
- (Height) There is not consensus on height of 48 feet or four stories within our plan team. The consultant and County needs to read letters from business and property owners along Highway 28 in Tahoe Vista that were submitted under separate cover. (Since TV is not a Town Center the height restrictions in the TRPA code of Ordinances should apply).
- (Planning director override) Changes to the guidelines shall require a public hearing/Design Review approval not just the planning director override. (case in point- Domus override to allow less screening of a tall massive building from the screening that was required by Design Review). Public and committees would have made a different decision.
- Review TRPA Community Plans and Placer County zoning ordinance to make sure that they are consistent in terms of uses, and requirements for minor use permits etc. TRPA review of projects should also be addressed in Design Standards.
- Need more guidelines for preservation of our resources (trees) and protection of our existing views. Incentives should be available for increasing views to the Lake (reduction of fees, additional height etc).
- Where are the incentives to encourage open space as tradeoffs? (see above)
- What about community gardens or pocket parks or open areas as part of the mix for a desirable community?
- Identify issues where there is no consensus or a split vote and come back and revisit.

- Need more directions and explanation from the design group on the standards. Some are very confusing.
- Would prefer single access road with loop rather than horse shoe roads in new developments. (reduced impacts to adjoining neighbors).
- Has the inter county departments reviewed standards for snow storage easements etc?

11/28/2012

To: Placer County

Re: Comments on DYETT & BHATIA North Tahoe West Plan Area

From: Leah Kaufman, Ellie Waller

P 7	Design Guideline		T
P 9	MU-MTC	We did not describe it as a "greater intensity of use"	T
	MU-LTC	We did not describe it as "vertical mixed use"	T
P 11	MU-G	The condo areas of Heratage Cove was not the gateway-hwy 267 was	T
		Where is the industrial area map?	
	MU-LTC	Where is the master plan overlay for the motel area?	
P 14	Recreation center	Should be allowed for MTC	O
	RV Park	No in any of these areas	O
	Theatre	A in tourist	O
	Employee Housing	No in MU-MTC, MU-LTC, TOR and G	O
	Senior Housing	No in MU-MTC, MU-LTC, TOR and G	O
	SFR	No in G or TOR	O
	Single room occupany housing	No in G or TOR or G	O
	Fast Food Chains	No in any of the areas	O
	Second Hand Stores	No in MU-LTC, TOR, G	O
P 15	Adult/Family Daycare	No in MU-LTC, TOR,G	O
	Public Utility	No in TOR,G	O
	Antennae	No in TOR,G,MU-LTC	O
P 16	Density	No to 25/acre for residential -(should be 4/acre. Multi-family should be 15/acre) No to 40/acre for Tourist - (should be 15/acre)	O
P 17	Setbacks	Measured to edge of lot, not edge of pavement as pavement can change	O
		MU-MTC 20' not 10' and should include sidewalk and landscape	O
		MT-LTC 20' from road and 40' from lake (not 30')	O
P 17	Building Frontage	60% of the lot should require other 40% be open space/BMP	O

		70% in TOR is too much-max. 60%	O
		Projection 50% into setback is too much-25%	O
P 18	Residential setback	5 an 10' is too little Require 15" for sidewalk and landscaping	O
P 19	Setback for non residential	No to allowing a waiver by Director on requirement	O
P 20	Height	F- we agreed to no modification of maximum height	T
		G-we agreed to NOT allow 56' only a maximum of 42' in certain circumstances with a portion of the structure such as an architectural detail We did NOT agree to 56' west of Brassie	T
P 21		No to any additional height provisions	T
P 22	Building Form Standards	Maximum building length, no to 200-350' in allowed length Should be no more than 75'	O
P 28	Master Plan Overlay	North Stateline Plan must acknowledge, transition and buffer next to adjacent residential uses	T/O
P 31	Height	No allowance for extra height	T