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Q & A

**Ronda Tycer**

TYCER INPUT FOR MEETING 8-22-22

First, I’d like to point out thatthe developers, TRPA and Washoe County have all known since the developer’s initial application last year that the 947 condominium project would require a code change to the Washoe Tahoe Area Plan.

I repeat some dates and facts:

• In September of 2021 the Project Plans were submitted to Washoe County.

• In or shortly after December 2021 Washoe County approved the traffic study and the geo-technical assessment.

• In January 2022 the Incline Community was informed of the project via a*Tahoe Tribune Article* letting us know there would be a neighborhood meeting but never mentioning a date. TRPA let us know that they were only obligated to notify parcel owners within 750 feet of the project most of whom were commercial parcel owners. The so called public meeting was reportedly a one-way presentation online with no opportunity for community input.

• In June 2022 TRPA put the project approval of 947 on their "consent calendar" based on their claim it was not “controversial.” They approved the project without any public discussion.

• Now in August 2022, the developer, TRPA and Washoe County have announced that the 947 Project requires a Washoe Tahoe Area Plan code change. Although they have tried to minimize the potential impact, we citizens know this change could serve as a dangerous precedent. There is no enforcement and therefore no guarantee that the 26 owners who have already put in their deposit on one of the $2 million plus condos will not vote to allow short-term rentals. The likelihood that any of these condos will serve local employees or be considered affordable rentals is zero.

The code change should be denied. The 947 Tahoe Boulevard project should be reconsidered and the developer should be required to provide a percentage of condos that are truly affordable, moderate, and achievable for Incline Village employees.

Ronda Tycer

Incline Village Resident

Tahoe Area Plan Amendment

**Judy Miller**

The reason it was carved out was because it’s on the main highway – it would make ideal apartments - -but rather than doing away with the restriction – why not require a higher density of units – have a design that would provide

Rather than luxury units – on Big Water – ***more than 25% are now STRs*** -I hope we can find a way to address employee housing.

Speaker - My emails are included in the chat – send these thoughts – so I can respond – and touch base.

**Pamela Tsigdinos**

Participating - not in favor – lived in area – residents know the public safety constraints – adding more housing with people and vehicles will exacerbate – a congested area

Country club and Tahoe Blvd – ¼ mil from development

Already congestion intersections far more treacherous

This condo development which currently doesn’t allow STRs – with a majority of owners in favor will eliminate restrictions on STRs.

Speaker

Based on long discussions with potential buyers – there is a strong desire to not have STRs – They don’t want to deal with it the building – I don’t anticipate that will change –

Road safety and walkability and –We’ve gone through the studies – TTD – traffic light to help safe crossing – we’re committed to work with authorities

If you read the Area Plan – promoting density is to ensure walkable communities – makes this location attractive -

**Linda Offerdahl**

As much as we’d like to see affordable housing – those efforts need to start with the County – identify parcels – and develop incentivs.

We need more housing of all types. We have new families – affluent families – shortage of housing.

There is a lack of commercial redevelopment in IV – There is a lack of leadership for discussions – Without any community conversations, where does our community need stuff?

This development stimulates the local community and contributes to walkability. It is a good boon –The barriers to building are insurmountable – The lack of space – The local resistance to any change.

This developer lives in our community and is following all regulations –

The cost of development precludes development of affordable properties – I speak on behalf of promoting growth. The project deserves consideration.

Scott ?

I represent property owners adjacent to the development - 260’ property line – real estate agent and 926 Incline Way – own 5 office builders- comments opposed to this parcel – that would deprive this owner of any reasonable use of the property – he has the right to develop – **he’s allowed to put 25-50 multifamily units on the property FALSE – IT IS CURRENTLY ILLEGAL]** – without any amendments – opposition to

Think it’s a good project - we need housing

This owner isn’t required to serve the community.

**Kathie Julian**

Questions – community meeting? Tahoe Area Plan – under 110…. It talks about what’s being encouraged – in special zones –

Repeatedly mentions *affordable housing units* –

Again stated on p 33- allowable uses – *multifamily units*

Puzzled how with all your resources that this wasn’t identified early on as an unallowable use of the property –

I found it in an afternoon –

So how did you miss this non-allowable use in your planning?

Concern that the County is looking to setting precedent – to undermine affordable housing

I attended the Tahoe Summit – affordable housing was a key message driven home by our leaders

Speaker

The reality is that affordable will never occur.

Remind you – please mute until called on

**Carole Black**

I second Kathie Julian – if there’s a *zoning requirement* – I don’t see how that’s incentive on developers – use of the property –

My thought - we need more affordable housing –

[Chat Box Comments:

WALK anywhere? They’re going to drive their Teslas to Raley’s to recharge and shop!]

[**No developer has the right to develop any property that isn’t within the current zoning regulation**. No, we do not need more multi-million dollar CONDOS. We need actual WORKFORCE housing, which is exactly what this property is zoned for: multiple family housing. Stop adding more and more mansions to our town. We need housing for the people who WORK here and can afford to raise children in our community. DO NOT approve this change in the zoning!!!]

Speaker

Needs of the community –

We are fully engaged in evaluating affordable opportunities – previous uses – gas station and restaurant - car traffic – whether this is 50 apartments or 40 condos – same traffic

[In what world is $2 million affordable????]

**Sara Schmitz**

Trustee of IVGID – comments purely as a resident – don’t reflect my fellow Board member views.

I am disappointed that – a great deal of time and money has gone into the project and after 1 year, now we hear of zoning restrictions.

Empathy

The Tahoe Area Plan – was 1 year – promote multi-residential development in commercial zones – around the basin – The intentions of the Tahoe Plan are what is needed for the Basin –We don’t need more housing for 2nd home owners.

We need the restrictions and limitations – if this zoning amendment – It sets a precedence for the entire Tahoe Basin – needed in Crystal Bay for Resort At Tahoe – it will set the stage for removing the multi-residential element that was intended in the town centers.

We need to exercise support to deliver on the Tahoe Area Plan – The County needs to provide economic assistance –

This change will have a negative impact – and flies in the face of TRPA’s efforts.

Speaker

\* Goal of the overall plan was to create density = the unfortunate situation – huge success – created due to cost escalation – no increase in density unless you allow another form of multifamily – same impact – 40 condos vs 50 apartments.

• **Erin Connell –**

I agree with Kathie and Sara.

Developers come in – they have something in mind – We bend the rules and they go away and we’re left with a hodgepodge of stuff. We do not have a village core. We have sort of a core. We have no sidewalks. Walking in the core is dangerous. Our other village core is by the Old Elementary School. We don’t have enough parking, not enough sidewalks. Residents don’t ride bikes around the town to get their groceries. It’s a stretch to say that – If your building was to to be in the commercial corridor and comply with the intent – if there was a commercial segment as part of the development…

Residents have not been able to voice concerns. We don’t have a Civic Planner – it should be coordinated – That’s not ever a part of what developers do – We need to up with developments with all the rest of the stuff.

I drive through Truckee there are sidewalks , stores, street lamps – flowers on lamp posts – we have nothing. We continue to live with …

What’s the purpose of having a Tahoe Area Plan?

We’re not in opposition, we want a solution. But we’re not in the problem-solving business. We do the live/work thing. Maybe put some commercial space in front of the condominiums. Maybe additional parking for rent. Something that contributes.

In a community that is starved

We can’t serve those people who buy into the condo. We have no servers, no baggers – no employees. We need to look for a compromise -

Speaker

I know you’ve had bad experience with past developers. But the partners in this development have in excess of a combined 50 years of living in IV. A large commercial center creates traffic flow issues. We’re proposing 40 units of multifamily. Rents would be astronomical. We’re aware of the affordability issue.

**Roxanna Dunn**

Question what’s the process to enforce or promote the Tahoe Area Plan? Was the process followed?

“IVCBA has initiated a Main Street program for redevelopment and revitalization that would provide community guidance to these issues.”

**Helen Neff**

I’m an Incline Resident – and neighbor to the proposed project. The Tahoe Area Plan reflects the wants and needs of the community including transportation. The regulatory orientation is that development should have a strong pedestrian orientation. We need to deliver on the Tahoe Area Plan – accepted

Complete streets improvement – F rated intersection – vehicles only – not pedestrians – improvements need to be provided before any development

Need commitment to the community – NDOT mission is to move vehicles and efficiently as possible – no enforcement on SR28

Speaker

We will be making the area more walkable, safe, but don’t control ability to put in a traffic signal – NDOT authority – we’ve seen the numbers – and will work with our neighbors to get the outcome that is safest…. We can try to make it happen

**Doug Flaherty**

Thanks for having the courtesy for a Q&A session. June 22 TRPA meeting.

[sent in printed comments]

**Pam Straley**

No developer has the right to develop any property that isn’t within the current zoning regulation. No, we do not need more multi-million dollar CONDOS. We need actual WORKFORCE housing, which is exactly what this property is zoned for: multiple family housing. Stop adding more and more mansions to our town. We need housing for the people who WORK here and can afford to raise children in our community. DO NOT approve this change in the zoning!!!

Speaker

In regards to a consent agenda – We have no direct control -= TRPA Board and prof staff review app and do their process – They make a decision as to whether it goes on consent agenda or not – our belief is we provided all the info and it’s in spirit of Tahoe Area Plan –

**Doug Flaherty**

One other question – do you have any data that increase in density leads to reduction in traffic?

Speaker

commercial zones, downtown zones, it allows you to better drive traffic flows –make things more walkable – I don’t believe we are proposing any increase in density – make things more walkable and closer – you end up with

**T Scott Dutcher**

“Has anyone noticed that “condominium" is not an “allowable land use" classification anywhere in the Tahoe Area Plan? It's either “single family", “multiple family" or “multi-person”. This project is certainly attempting to fulfill the need for the high density housing which we need.”

**EMAIL FOR SPEAKER: cbutler@palominocap.com**

Kristina Hill

I’m a local planner and I came into this late – Can you outline the zoning amendment process -- what are the steps and where are you in the process?

Speaker

Rob can you answer?

We will take comments – emails – consider as we prepare environmental documentation – work with TRPAs – complete the staff reports – to different decision makers.

This has to go to Planning at the County – and get approved by 3 entities – Advisory Planning Commission and Governing Board. First County and then TRPA approval.