

## TBCP Update – Townhall meeting – July 19, 2012

### Presentation:

Crystal Jacobsen, project manager for the Tahoe Basin Community Plan Update (TBCPU), summarized the progress the project teams and workshop participants have made to date. The area teams have drafted vision statements, and will be reviewing the role of land uses and scale of buildings within the town and neighborhood centers (areas of change, gathering places, gateway considerations, pedestrian-oriented development, and mixed-use areas), which will help to guide sustainable development within the four Plan Areas. As part of the Tahoe Basin Community Plan Update, the County is proposing the development of a Zoning Ordinance and Design Guidelines for each of the Plan Areas. The Zoning Ordinance and Design Guidelines will reflect the overall vision for the areas within the Tahoe Basin.

Crystal gave an overview of the Update process, the purpose, and current status, explained the difference between Community Plans and General Plans, and how the TBCP Update will coincide with the TRPA Regional Plan Update (RPU). The PowerPoint presentation is posted on the County's website at:

<http://www.placer.ca.gov/Departments/CommunityDevelopment/Planning/TahoePlanning/TahoeBasinCPUUpdate/~media/cdr/Planning/CommPlans/TahoeBasinCPUUpdate/Townhall/TownhallMtgJul19.ashx>

### Question and Answer Period:

1. Q - What are the themes that the Plan Area Teams have come up with?  
A - The draft vision statements are in preliminary form. The teams need to envision their areas for the next 20 years regarding land use, design, and scale.
2. Q – How were the teams chosen?  
A – Participants may only represent one participation category, be willing to donate a minimum of 8 to 10 hours bi-monthly, and should have only two absences in a six month period. In addition, participants must have an active business in the Basin or, must be registered to vote in, and have their primary residence in the Basin.
3. Q – It would be helpful to have the County website identify each team member's participation category (who is a resident, second home resident, business owner, etc.).  
A – The County will take this request into consideration.
4. Q – What was the solicitation process for Team member applications?  
A – The County sent the Application Form to area newspapers, radio stations, environmental groups, business owners, and posted it on County websites.
5. Q – More of a statement than a question – wants to see the Lake protected.  
A – Comment noted.
6. Q – What are the proposed zoning regulations, and are they in written form?  
A – The zoning regulations have not been drafted yet for each Plan Area. The teams will be working on creating a separate Zoning Ordinance for each of the four Plan Areas, as well as design guidelines for each area. The County proposes a more visual set of standards (more graphics, a transect system, a “form-based” code), rather than the text-based documents we currently use.
7. Q – The TRPA RPU may not fly due to legal challenges. Doesn't that mean that the County is premature in going forward with the TBCP Update?  
A – The County Board of Supervisors has directed staff to begin the update process. TRPA sets the range of development standards within the Tahoe Basin. The County plans to develop Area Plans that are within that range.
8. Q – Why is the County holding only the second townhall meeting when the Board of Supervisors is going to hear the update at their July 23/24 hearing?  
A – The County Board of Supervisors are updated at each Tahoe meeting on the status of the TBCP Update process. This item is for information only – no action will be taken.

9. Q – Isn't the TBCP Update just a big plan replica of Northstar? The Ritz Carlton was cited as having problems with occupancy rates during the summer months. Will the Teams be given occupancy rate information to consider during the Update process?
- A – The Teams are at the preliminary planning stage and have not considered the technical information that will be included later in the process during the environmental analysis stage.
10. Q – Are the Teams considering mixed-use residential?
- A – The Teams have discussed the concept of mixed-use residential, but no action has been taken at this point.
11. Q – When will the Vision Statements be available for public review?
- A – The County will consider providing the Vision Statements on the TBCP Update website. Process status will be given before each workshop meeting (which the public is invited to attend), Board hearing, Planning Commission hearing, NTRAC meeting, and townhall meetings.
12. Q - Will outcomes from the Teams be available online?
- A – Draft documents will be available on the County website when they become available.
13. Jennifer Merchant requested that Team members in the audience give the public an idea of the themes developed thus far for each Plan Area.
- A – Kelly (West Shore) noted their theme includes a quaint, serene, quiet, old Tahoe feel for this area.
14. Q – What development is planned around park area sites?
- A – This is addressed in the TRPA RPU. John Hitchcock with TRPA responded and provided information relating to Alternative 3 which addresses additional Tourist Accommodations around park areas.
15. Q – What are the Teams ideas for height limits on the Lakeside as well as mountain side of the highways?
- A – Judy (West Shore) noted that Highway 89 on the Lakeside would be limited to 2-story height, and mountain side would have 2 to 3-story heights. Ann (North Tahoe East) noted a 2 to 3-story limit within a beach community theme, and affordable housing. Judy and Kathie (Greater Tahoe City) noted that Team members are not taking this process lightly. It is a rigorous process, the County is not dictating what the Teams visions are. The Team members are part of the communities they represent and feel they are giving back to their communities by participating in this planning effort. This is not a six month process, but more likely a 3 to 5-year process. Robust discussions take place amongst Team members. The Tahoe City Vision Statement includes a livable, workable, walkable community. Height will be related to design of an area. The audience expressed concerns about the Lighthouse Center and Boatworks as being too tall.
16. Q – What is planned for the Tahoe City area regarding height limits? Are 5-story buildings going to be permitted?
- A – A member of the Tahoe City Team noted the Team was recognizing the existing Cal Gas site along the Truckee River which is a 5-story building built into the hillside. The Team is considering four-story structures along Lake Tahoe.
17. Q – Can the public attend these Team workshops?
- A – The public can attend and observe the workshops, but not participate in the Team discussions. A status update, as well as a question and answer period are provided at each of the workshop sessions. Other opportunities exist for public input on the process: Board of Supervisor hearings, Planning Commission hearings, NTRAC meetings, email or phone call to staff/CEO Representative/Board members.
18. Q – If this is a 3 to 5-year process, what happens to projects currently in the works like the building proposed in Kings Beach at 56' high, the Kings Beach Town Center, or Homewood?
- A – When the TBCP is adopted, new projects submitted after that point will need to comply with those regulations and standards. Projects in the process now will comply with current standards. There is no application submitted for the project in Kings Beach at this point, it's only in the discussion stage.

19. Q – What is the status of the “Brown Project” in Kings Beach?
- A – No application has been submitted to Placer County for this project. An audience member commented that the applicant was pursuing applications with TRPA who has deemed the proposal a “project” under their standards. The developer has put the project site up for sale. Conceptual plans were drawn up five to seven years ago.
20. Q – A Team member commented that the Carnelian Bay and Tahoe Vista areas are represented at the Team workshops (North Tahoe East and North Tahoe West Teams). Team members are reviewing residential lots, commercially zoned lots, beach sides being acknowledged, and businesses maintained.
- A – County has noted these comments.
21. Q – What newspapers were used for polling Team applicants?
- A – The County notified the Sierra Sun, the Tahoe Bonanza and Moonshine Ink newspapers.
22. Q – Will the Teams be provided with economic information in this planning process?
- A – During the environmental analysis stage, professionals will be brought in to provide the Teams with analytical data. The audience expressed a concern about empty storefronts, wanting to ensure that the height of buildings is related to the economic viability of a business, not just a design theme. The audience expressed a desire to see a mix of uses and varying heights to stimulate redevelopment. Height and design should not be parcel specific. Crystal noted that the Teams are looking at broad visioning at this point in the process.
23. Q - Will it be a quicker process to request a rezoning now, or after the Update process is completed?
- A – The rezoning process involves multiple steps for processing an application. It may or may not be a quicker process after the Update is completed depending on what the zoning is for a particular parcel (whether it changes from what it is currently zoned).
24. Q – How do the teams vote – consensus, majority rules?
- A – A simple majority is how a team votes. Team members are required to attend each of the workshop sessions, and are permitted only two absences in a six month period.
25. Q – The Resort Association plan is a complete overhaul of Tahoe City. Who’s doing the rebuilding and what happens to existing homeowners and business owners properties?
- A – The County recognizes The Resort Associations visioning, but theirs is completely different and separate from the County’s process. The Tahoe City Team will meet with the Resort Association to discuss visioning.
26. Q – How will the Tahoe City vision impact existing businesses?
- A – Existing uses will maintain the right to continue their business/land use. If a new project is proposed following adoption of the TBCP, that project will need to meet the TBCP standards.
27. Kelly (Tahoe City PUD, and on West Shore team) commented that the golf course visioning is completely separate from the Tahoe City visioning and wanted to ensure staff and the public are aware of that. The public outreach for the golf course visioning (which has not been submitted to date) will be extensive. There is an existing five-year contract for the golf course in Tahoe City in place currently.
28. Q - Is the County obligated to accept TRPA’s Alternative 3? Concern was expressed about level of expertise on the Teams.
- A – The County comments on TRPA’s RPU, just as TRPA will provide comments on the County’s TBCP Update. TRPA sets the range of development within the Basin, and the local jurisdictions can set their own requirements within that range of development, TRPA code supersedes County code if any conflict arises. The County Plans will conform with TRPA’s Regional Plan.
29. Q - Where did the \$70 million of redevelopment funds go?
- A – Staff referred public to Rae James with the County’s Redevelopment Agency. Redevelopment information and updates are provided at the NTRAC meetings.

30. Q – How many Team members are affiliated with the Resort Association?  
A – Wally Auerbach (Tahoe City Team), Ron Parson (West Short Team), Alex Mourelatos (North Tahoe West), and Philip Gilanfarr (North Tahoe East).
31. Q – Do all the groups listed on the presentation slide have input into this Update process?  
A – Groups listed on Slide #17 include TRPA, Tahoe Metropolitan Planning Organization, Tahoe Basin Partnership for Sustainable Communities, and the Tahoe City Resort Association. These groups have their own planning efforts underway – separate processes.
32. Q – Can the public attend the Team workshops and provide input? When can we provide our input on the process?  
A – Members of each team can be contacted individually by the public. Public is encouraged to attend the workshops for observation only. When the TBCP is available in draft form, the public can review the document. As stated previously, there are lots of opportunities at various hearings and meetings for the public to provide input, as well as emailing County staff. All written correspondence will be incorporated into the record for the project.
33. Q – An audience member commented that the community is “jaded” and wants to ensure the community has an opportunity for input in this process. Who do we write to regarding our comments?  
A – County staff, Board members, Team members - names are included on the County websites. All comments are included in the project record.
34. Q – Concern was expressed regarding the “vested interest” of the Tahoe City Team members. It appears some team members do not have a business in the Basin, or vested interest in Tahoe City.  
A – Staff will provide all comments received at this meeting to the Board members.
35. Q – How were the Team members picked?  
A – The County received 66 or 67 applications for Team membership. We solicited input from residents, business owners, environmental groups, community groups within the Basin, business associations, and the Sierra Nevada Alliance helped in the selection process.
36. Jim Williamson, Tahoe City Team member and business owner, noted that current zoning on his parcel allows him only a fuel or ice business. He’d like to see more ability to choose the land use that works on his site. There are differing opinions on what uses are “grandfathered” in. The TRPA RPU envisions recreational use for his site.
37. Q – There is no balance on the Tahoe City Team.  
A – Kathie Fenley (Tahoe City Team) noted that she works for Placer County Sheriff’s Office and received approval to submit an application for team membership. She is a Tahoe City resident. An audience member stated that this is a conflict of interest and that a County employee cannot push for something outside of the realm of the MOU between the County and TRPA.
38. Q – A Meeks Bay resident asked if this Update proposes Lake wide development to satisfy TRPA requirements. Does this just all go to TRPA as a recommendation, and does TRPA decide on what the TBCP will include?  
A – TRPA does set the range of development with respect to scale (example: height limit maximum of 4 stories), but the local jurisdictions can permit/require 2, 3 or 4-story limits in their Community Plans. TRPA does not permit a 5-story height. The County can’t set focused standards based on community desire. If TRPA changes the height standard of 4-story maximum in the future, the County will need to modify their standards to be in compliance.
39. Q – Will there be specificity in the Plans like a 44’ height limit?  
A – There will be specific height limits rather than a range of height limits.

40. Q – Why are second homeowners allowed to be on the Teams when they don't live in the Basin? How many second homeowners are Team members? Various audience members questioned why second homeowners were on the Teams and why they were not given the opportunity.

A – Possibly two or three members are second homeowners. During the Team member application process, various second homeowners approached the Board of Supervisors at their public input portion of a hearing and requested, and received approval to submit applications to be considered for these Teams. Crystal noted what the distribution was for solicitation of team member applications. Board of Supervisor hearings are noticed in the newspapers and agendas are available on the web.