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NOTICE OF REGULAR MEETING
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that on Wednesday, February 19, 1986, commencing at 9:30 a.m., the Advisory Planning Commission of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency will conduct its regular meeting at the TRPA office, 195 U.S. Highway 50, Round Hill, Zephyr Cove, Nevada. The agenda for said meeting is attached to and made a part of this notice.

Date: February 7, 1986

By:
W.A. Morgan
Executive Director
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
MEETING AGENDA

I  CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

II  APPROVAL OF AGENDA

III  DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

IV  PLANNING MATTERS
   A. Discussion on Schedule for Resolving Regional Plan Issues
   B. Discussion and Recommendation on Plan for 1986
   C. Discussion and Recommendation on Goals and Policies Plan Revisions
   D. Discussion and Recommendation on Draft Proposed Height Standards
   E. Status Report on Transportation Planning
      1. Washington's Birthday Weekend Monitoring
      2. RTP Update
      3. Unmet Transit Needs
      4. Other
   F. Other

V  REPORTS
   A. Staff
   B. Legal Counsel
   C. Public Interest Comments
   D. APC Members

VI  RESOLUTIONS

VII  CORRESPONDENCE

VIII  PENDING MATTERS

IX  ADJOURNMENT
February 11, 1986

To: The Advisory Planning Commission

From: The Staff

Subject: Schedule for Resolving Regional Plan Issues

In brief, the schedule for resolving Regional Plan issues will reflect the following:

The Consensus Building Workshop (CBW) group wishes to tackle the issues of land coverage, phasing, density, and SEZ policies. The CBW also wants to see the proposals on shorezone, monitoring, plan area statements, design review guidelines, public services and facilities plan and enforcement. In addition, the CBW has loose ends to tie up, mainly with respect to IPES (individual parcel evaluation system) and commercial development.

Those issues that will result in fundamental policy revisions will need to be resolved by mid-March. Others can be worked out over the following months with a goal of having issues resolved and language changes in Goals and Policies and ordinances by early summer. The first round of changes on Goals and Policies are on this month's agenda. A second round will be on the March agenda. Draft ordinances to reflect those changes will be developed following the Governing Board's approval for drafting purposes of those proposed Goals and Policies changes. Other ordinances for matters not related to issues under review will be developed, or completed if already underway, simultaneously with those relating to plan changes. The APC will be very much involved in the work to be done, especially in ordinance development.

On the 19th, staff will provide a proposed schedule for these many tasks for discussion and modification as appropriate.

Because our goal is to make the plan changes and additions so as to allow a dismissal of the California Attorney General/League to Save Lake Tahoe v. TRPA suit by early summer, we will be doing everything possible to expedite the work. Some matters, particularly policy changes will go first to the Governing Board with little or no review by APC. However, we'll seek APC members' comments before asking the Board to take final action. We appreciate your understanding.

One objective of this February APC meeting will be to set dates for committee meetings for the next few months, so bring your calendars, please.
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AGENDA ITEM IV A.
MEMORANDUM

February 11, 1986

To: Advisory Planning Commission

From: William A. Morgan, Executive Director

Subject: Recommendation on Plan for 1986

Attached is the recommended Plan for 1986. The Plan for 1986 is essentially the first year of the proposed amended regional plan. Also attached is a listing of other residential, commercial, public service, etc. projects and activities which are now exempt from the preliminary injunction and which when combined with the Plan for 1986, will make up the total package for the 1986 building season.

AGENDA ITEM IV B.
TRPA'S PLAN FOR 1986
DRAFT FOUR
February 11, 1986

I. RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

A. Allocations

1. TRPA shall determine allocation limits and which classes of projects are eligible for allocations.

2. Distribution within those allocation limits shall be determined by the counties and city.

3. The allocation limits are set forth on the attached chart.

B. The following classes of projects and parcels are eligible for allocations to build within the limits set in A. above:

1. Placer County permits which are due to expire on August 1, 1986, which have expired CTRPA/TRPA permits, have not yet commenced construction, and are on parcels in land capability districts 4 - 7.

2. Local county building permits which were issued prior to December 19, 1980, have been continuously renewed, have not started construction, and are on parcels in land capability districts 4 - 7.

3. Single family dwelling projects in land capability districts 4 - 7 which were approved by TRPA prior to August 26, 1983 and which did not receive a permit prior to May 1, 1984.

4. Parcels in land capability districts 4 - 7 which received a 1983 allocation from Placer County, El Dorado County, and the City of South Lake Tahoe, and are within the urban boundaries.

5. Other parcels located in land capability districts 4 - 7, and are within the urban boundaries.

C. Allocations for purposes of transfer are subject to the limits set in A. above. The following classes of parcels and projects are eligible for an allocation to transfer but are not eligible to build:

1. Single family dwelling Nevada case-by-case approvals which were approved by TRPA prior to August 26, 1983 but which did not receive a permit prior to May 1, 1984.

2. Parcels located in land capability districts 1 - 3 and parcels in land capability districts 4 - 7 outside urban boundaries, which received a 1983 California allocation.
3. Placer County permits which are due to expire on August 1, 1986, which have expired CTRPA/TRPA permits, have not yet commenced construction, and are on parcels in land capability districts 1 - 3.

4. Local county building permits which were issued prior to December 19, 1980, have been continuously renewed, have not started construction, and are on parcels in land capability districts 1 - 3.


D. Rules for residential construction shall be as follows:

1. Bailey land coverage coefficients shall be applied on a parcel basis.

2. To be eligible to build, parcels with a Placer County permit (B.1.), the pre-December 19, 1980 local permits (B.2.), and parcels with 1983 California allocations (B.4.) must be found to be served by at least three of the following:

   (a) paved roads; (b) sewer; (c) electricity; or (d) water.

3. Except for Placer County permits (B.1.), the pre-December 19, 1980 local permits (B.2.), prior TRPA approvals (B.3.) and parcels with 1983 California allocations (B.4.), parcels without approvals must be served by:

   (a) paved roads; (b) sewer; (c) electricity; and (d) water.

4. All approvals (reissued or new) shall begin construction within the three year approval period and shall complete construction within two years once construction is commenced, unless an extension is granted pursuant to TRPA's Rules and Regulations.

5. All construction shall be subject to installation of BMP's whether or not required by the original approval.

6. Except for prior TRPA approvals in land capability districts 4 - 7 (B.3.), all residential construction shall be subject to review under the amended regional plan standards for woodstoves, heaters, etc. Prior TRPA approvals shall be permitted to proceed as originally approved.
7. The residential height limit shall be ________ except for pre-December 19, 1980 local permits (B.2.) and prior TRPA approvals (B.3.).

8. Parcels which are eligible to build and require further TRPA review, shall submit a complete application within one year of receipt of their allocation. Failure to do so will result in the forfeiture of the allocation.

E. Rules for transfer of residential allocations shall be as follows:

1. Transfer of allocations shall only be allowed from land capabilities 1 - 3 to land capabilities 4 - 7 and shall also result either in the permanent dedication of the transforee parcel to open space, or donation of the transforee parcel and retirement of coverage.

2. Inter-county transfers of allocations shall not be permitted.

3. Failure to irrevocably commit to transfer of an allocation within one year of receipt of an allocation shall result in forfeiture of the allocation.

4. Unused or forfeited allocations shall be returned to the counties and may be carried over into the next year's allocation.

5. Multi-residential projects on parcels in land capability districts 1 - 3 with a pre-December 19, 1980 local permit (C.4.) shall be allowed one TDR for each residential unit (i.e. triplex receives three TDR's).

6. Case-by-case applications in Upper Tyrolia (C.5.) shall be allowed one TDR. In any event, the number of TDR's for the Nevada case-by-case approvals and the Upper Tyrolian applications shall not exceed 199.

7. The Nevada case-by-case approvals (C.1.) shall be allowed one TDR which shall not be counted in the allocations for the Plan for 1986. However, any transferred allocations shall be accounted for in subsequent years.

II. COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT

A. The following projects have been identified as pre-August 26, 1983 approvals which did not receive permits prior to May 1, 1984:

1. Blankenship Office Bldg. TRPA File No. 82156. (10,698 sq. ft.)

2. Moran. TRPA File No. 82108. (2102 sq. ft.)
3. Strong Office Bldg. TRPA File No. 81-1152. (3,892 sq. ft.)

B. The above projects may receive a permit upon satisfaction of the conditions of the approvals. Implementation of this agreement will cease the tolling of the approvals.

C. Expansion of other commercial structures shall be permitted only where it is found to be the only feasible way to meet health or safety codes.

III. PUBLIC SERVICE, RECREATION and OTHER FACILITIES

A. Applications for, and approval of, public service, recreation and other facilities or development, shall be provided for through specific exemptions from the preliminary injunction.

IV. CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

A. The following capital improvements are expected to be either funded or constructed in the 1986 building season:

1. Water Quality and Erosion Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Expected Status</th>
<th>Responsible Agency</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. of Airport to Wye</td>
<td>Constructed</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>$620,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Dr.</td>
<td>Constructed 86/87</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bliss #3</td>
<td>Constructed</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>798,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubicon Palisades</td>
<td>Constructed</td>
<td>El Dorado</td>
<td>869,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubicon - Other</td>
<td>Designed</td>
<td>El Dorado</td>
<td>1,821,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Truckee I</td>
<td>Designed</td>
<td>El Dorado</td>
<td>57,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Truckee II</td>
<td>Designed</td>
<td>El Dorado</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Area No. 5</td>
<td>Designed</td>
<td>El Dorado</td>
<td>3,933,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bijou/Wildwood I</td>
<td>Constructed</td>
<td>City SLT</td>
<td>3,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bijou/Wildwood II</td>
<td>Designed</td>
<td>City SLT</td>
<td>4,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regan Beach I</td>
<td>Constructed</td>
<td>City SLT</td>
<td>650,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saddle Road</td>
<td>Designed</td>
<td>City SLT</td>
<td>175,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Sierra Tract</td>
<td>Designed</td>
<td>City SLT</td>
<td>180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;D&quot; Street</td>
<td>Constructed</td>
<td>City SLT</td>
<td>970,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Erosion</td>
<td>Designed</td>
<td>City SLT</td>
<td>600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Yard</td>
<td></td>
<td>Douglas Co.</td>
<td>182,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zephyr Heights</td>
<td>Constructed</td>
<td>Douglas Co.</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Fairview</td>
<td>Constructed</td>
<td>Washoe Co.</td>
<td>600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crystal Bay - Incline</td>
<td>Designed</td>
<td>Washoe Co.</td>
<td>591,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyland</td>
<td>Constructed</td>
<td>Placer Co.</td>
<td>177,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dollar Point</td>
<td>Constructed</td>
<td>Placer Co.</td>
<td>730,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKinney Estates</td>
<td>Constructed</td>
<td>Placer Co.</td>
<td>570,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpine Peaks</td>
<td>Designed</td>
<td>Placer Co.</td>
<td>360,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnelian Woods</td>
<td>Constructed</td>
<td>Placer Co.</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talmont Estates</td>
<td>Constructed</td>
<td>Placer Co.</td>
<td>289,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estates Drive II</td>
<td>Constructed</td>
<td>Placer Co.</td>
<td>587,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trout Street</td>
<td>Designed</td>
<td>Placer Co.</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Oct. 1986 Status</td>
<td>Responsible Agency</td>
<td>Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnelian Drive</td>
<td>Designed</td>
<td>Placer Co.</td>
<td>475,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various Water Tanks</td>
<td>Designed/Constructed</td>
<td>STFUD</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various Water Tanks</td>
<td>Designed/Constructed</td>
<td>NTFUD</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spooner Maint. Yard</td>
<td>Constructed</td>
<td>NDOT</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Transportation & Air Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Oct. 1986 Status</th>
<th>Responsible Agency</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pioneer Trail to Park Avenue, Signal and Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>Constructed</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach Bus</td>
<td>Service Extension</td>
<td>City SLT</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TART Maintenance Facility</td>
<td>Designed</td>
<td>TART</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. 50 Demonstration Bus Project</td>
<td>Planning Study</td>
<td>TRPA, TTD, TTF</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Street</td>
<td>Constructed</td>
<td>City SLT</td>
<td>350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahoe City WYE</td>
<td>Designed</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail Sub-station</td>
<td>Constructed</td>
<td>Postal Service</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. SEZ Restoration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Oct. 1986 Status</th>
<th>Responsible Agency</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perini Property</td>
<td>Designed</td>
<td>TCPUD</td>
<td>$ 75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow Creek</td>
<td>Constructed</td>
<td>Placer Co.</td>
<td>570,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griff Creek #2</td>
<td>Constructed</td>
<td>Placer Co.</td>
<td>350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keller Road</td>
<td>Constructed</td>
<td>USFS</td>
<td>70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Country</td>
<td>Constructed</td>
<td>Cal State Parks</td>
<td>219,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. Monitoring Program

A. The following monitoring programs shall be designed, funded, commenced or continued during the 1986 building season:

1. Water Quality

   a. Pelagic Zone - The Tahoe Research Group (TRG) will continue to monitor trends in Lake Tahoe's clarity and primary productivity through June 30, 1986. [After July 1, 1986, funding of this activity is not assured, due to the SWRCB's indecision as to whether to continue to support the operations of the Lake Tahoe Interagency Monitoring Program.]
b. **Tributary Streams** - The USGS and TRG will continue to monitor pollutant loads and stream flows in five major tributary streams, consistent with past monitoring efforts, through June 30, 1986. [After July 1, 1986, funding of this activity is not assured, due to the SWRCB's indecision as to whether to continue to support the operations of the Lake Tahoe Interagency Monitoring Program.] The USFS will continue to monitor water quality at several other stations in the Tahoe Basin.

c. **Surface Runoff** - The TRPA staff will make assessments of BMP applications in the field and will determine the degree of compliance with TRPA conditions of approval. All erosion control projects will have specific monitoring provisions.

2. **Air Quality**

a. **Carbon Monoxide** - The CARB and NDEP will continue to provide continuous monitoring at their four permanent stations on the South Shore. TRPA staff will analyze the results of this monitoring in the annual Reasonable Further Progress (RFP) report. The TRPA, with assistance from Caltrans, NDOT, and the City of South Lake Tahoe, will also monitor traffic volumes on the U.S. 50 corridor, and include these results in the RFP report.

b. **Regional and Subregional Visibility** - TRPA staff, with assistance from the Desert Research Institute, will develop specifications for a monitoring program addressing regional and subregional visibility (i.e., visual range). The specifications will include technical, financial, and institutional arrangements for the operation of two integrating nephelometers and a multi-wavelength teleradiometer. (See also Nitrogen Deposition, below.)

c. **Nitrogen Deposition** - TRPA staff, using the traffic count data obtained from Caltrans, NDOT, and the City, will compute regional vehicle-miles-of-travel (VMT) for the average peak summer day, using the Agency's in-house transportation model. In addition, the staff will develop specifications covering technical, financial, and institutional arrangements for the operation of high-volume samplers to determine ambient levels of particulate nitrate and nitric acid gas. Also, the TRG will continue to monitor nitrogen deposition on the surface of Lake Tahoe with buoys placed at several locations.

3. **Scenic Quality—Roadway and Shoreline Units**

The TRPA shall prepare, through a contractor, objective standards, criteria, and procedures for carrying out the scenic quality standards of the thresholds and the Regional Plan. This information will include site-specific measures to bring nonconforming roadway and shoreline units into compliance with the scenic thresholds, and to preserve the scenic resources in all units.
# RESIDENTIAL ALLOCATION TABLE FOR A PLAN FOR 1986

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Prior approvals</th>
<th>1983 allocations</th>
<th>New/reissued allocations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Lake Tahoe</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer County</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983 allocations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas County</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washoe County</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 300
EXEMPT PROJECTS AND ACTIVITIES

I. Other permitted residential projects and activities pursuant to previous exemptions from the injunction are:
   
   A. Additions, modifications, and reconstructions to single family dwellings so long as there is no creation of coverage in excess of the Bailey land coverage coefficients.
   
   B. Modifications or repairs in excess of 20% of the replacement value.
   
   C. Reconstruction of single family dwellings destroyed by fire, act of God or other natural calamity.
   
   D. Modification of coverage on a mobile home lot in an approved mobile home park, provided there is no increase in coverage.

II. Other permitted commercial and tourist commercial projects and activities pursuant to previous exemptions from the injunction are:

   A. A change in an existing commercial use of up to 100 new vehicle trips per day.
   
   B. Condominium conversion of certain existing structures housing retail commercial activities.
   
   C. Renewal of snowmobile permits.
   
   D. Conversion of certain existing approved and permitted timeshare projects.
   
   E. Structural modifications to commercial and tourist commercial.
   
   F. Repair and reconstruction of structures destroyed by fire, act of God or other natural calamity.

III. Other permitted public service, recreation, and miscellaneous projects and activities pursuant to previous exemptions from the preliminary injunction are:

   A. Wildlife and fishery enhancement programs.
   
   B. SEZ restoration programs.
   
   C. Timber management.
   
   D. Erosion and drainage control activities.
   
   E. Ordinary operation, maintenance and repair of public facilities and public works projects.
   
   F. Repair and reconstruction of structures destroyed by fire, act of God or other calamity.
   
   G. Various pier repair activities.
MEMORANDUM

February 10, 1986

To: Advisory Planning Commission

From: Agency Staff

Subject: Draft Revisions to Regional Plan Goals and Policies Reflecting Agreements To-date of the Consensus Building Workshop, and Certain Other Draft Revisions

Under separate cover, you will receive draft revisions to the Regional Plan Goals and Policies for your review and comment. These revisions reflect the agreements to-date of the Consensus Building Workshop, as presented to the APC and the Governing Body during the past several months. Please note that several key Regional Plan issues (coverage, phasing, density, treatment of SEZ's) remain to be resolved, and this set of revisions does not affect these areas. Thus, APC members can expect to review more revisions over the next 60 days.

These revisions cover Consensus Workshop agreements on the framework of the Regional Plan; content of Plan Area Statements; the rate of single-family development; the IFES; and regulation of new commercial development. However, the staff have modified the agreement on the rate of single-family development to reflect the latest ideas of the small group working on the Plan for '86. Also, these draft revisions include policies related to redevelopment and monitoring programs which reflect the recommendations of the Redevelopment Study Group and Agency staff, respectively.

In some cases, these revisions do not include every detail of the tentative agreements. Details will appear in more-detailed exhibits, appendices, and ordinances.

The staff will mail the revisions to APC members on Thursday, February 13. After the APC and Consensus Workshop participants review these draft revisions, the Governing Board will review them at their February meeting. APC members should have a complete copy of the Regional Plan Goals and Policies (April 26, 1984) to review these draft revisions in their proper context. If you need a copy of the Goals and Policies, please contact Julie Frame at (702) 588-4547.
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AGENDA ITEM IV C.
MEMORANDUM

February 10, 1986

To: Advisory Planning Commission

From: Agency Staff

Subject: Revised Height Standards

At the regular January Governing Board meeting Agency staff was directed to prepare draft language for a revised height standard. The Governing Board would like to consider a revised height standard to be applied throughout the region during the 1986 building season and eventually to be adopted as part of the revised Regional Plan. Agency staff intends to assemble a technical committee to review and comment on these draft standards. The committee will include local builders and architects. Their comments and suggestions will be discussed at the APC meeting.

A. Problem Assessment: The revised, draft height standards attached to this memorandum have been developed by Agency staff in order to achieve the following objectives:

1. Provide a single set of height standards to be applied consistently throughout the Region. Current Agency ordinances require the Agency to implement the height standards contained in the CTRPA Land Use Ordinance on the California side of the basin and those contained in the TRPA Land Use Ordinance on the Nevada side.

2. Establish height standards that are consistent with the revised Regional Plan and the Environmental Thresholds. The current height standards in both the CTRPA and TRPA Land Use Ordinances were developed and adopted prior to adoption of the Environmental Thresholds.

3. Where it can be shown to be consistent with the revised Regional Plan and Environmental Thresholds, include some degree of flexibility in the height standards. The current height standards in the CTRPA Land Use Ordinance include provisions for additional heights only for solar systems, cross slope and certain structures such as radio towers, ski lift towers and utility poles. The TRPA Land Use Ordinance allows the Governing Board to grant variances to the height standard, under which there is no limit to the maximum height that can be permitted.

4. Establish height standards that are more responsive to specific site and neighborhood characteristics.

AGENDA ITEM IV D.
B. Summary of Proposed Height Standard:

1. The permitted height throughout the Basin is proposed to be 26 feet, which will allow a two story structure with a moderately pitched roof (4:12). A 15% greater height is provided for appurtenances.

2. If certain findings designed to assure protection of existing views, compatibility with neighborhood and consistency with thresholds can be made by the Agency, additional heights may be permitted to achieve the following:

   a. To encourage the use of foundations designed to conform to the natural slope of the ground for residential structures.

   b. To allow for increases in roof pitch, with greater increases allowed for buildings in the Commercial/Public Service and Tourist use districts.

   c. To provide for solar energy systems.

   d. To accommodate certain types of structures, such as communication towers, ski lift towers, i.e., that due to their nature must be given special consideration with respect to height.

3. Special provisions are proposed to allow the Governing Board to consider additional height for larger buildings or structures that may be required for certain types of Commercial/Public Service or Tourist projects. To assure adequate disclosure and assessment of the impacts that may result, additional height may be granted under this section only in conjunction with projects for which an EIS is prepared and the proposed height is specifically addressed. However, the maximum permitted height under this section is 35 feet, with an additional 10 feet of height allowed for increased roof pitch. Specific findings must be made by the Governing Board to assure that no significant visual impacts result, consistency with thresholds and reduced land coverage in exchange for the additional height.
I. Height Standards:

A. Height Limitations: No building or other structure erected in the region shall have a height greater than 26 feet. Building height shall be measured as the vertical distance from the average grade, as defined herein, to the highest point of the coping of the highest flat roof, the deck line of the highest mansard roof or to the ridge of the highest hip, gable, gambrel, shed or other pitched roof, whichever is highest. Average grade is the average of the natural grade at the center of the exterior walls of a building or structure. An exterior wall shall be four (4) feet or greater in length to be included in the calculations for average grade. Natural grade is the elevation of the existing surface of the land prior to commencement of construction of any proposed improvements. Separate height calculations shall be made for each detached building or structure. Chimneys, flues, vents or similar appurtenances may be erected to a fifteen (15) percent greater height than specified below.

B. Additional Height:

1. General Provisions: The Agency may authorize greater heights than specified in I.A. in accordance with the following provisions. Such greater heights may be authorized only upon the Agency making the findings listed under Section B.I.e., based on substantial evidence in the record.

a. Cross Slope Allowance for Residential Structures: The permitted height specified in I.A. may be increased up to a maximum of thirty (30) feet for residential structures by allowing an additional one (1) foot of height for each 3% of cross slope that is maintained across the building site. A cross slope shall be considered maintained across the building site only if the Agency finds that, except with respect to driveway, parking area or garage construction, the project has been designed to minimize grading by utilizing foundations that conform to the natural slope of the project site.

b. Additional Height for Pitch Roof: The ridge of the highest hip, gable, gambrel, shed or other pitched roof may extend up to four (4) feet above the permitted height of 26 feet, provided the point midway between the lowest part of the eves or cornice and said ridge is one (1) foot or less above the permitted height. For buildings or structures located in the Commercial/Public Service or Tourist land use
districts the ridge of the highest hip, gable, gambrel, shed or other pitched roof may extend up to eight (8) feet above the permitted height of 26 feet, provided the point midway between the lowest part of the eves or cornice and said ridge is three (3) feet or less above the permitted height and the building does not contain more than two (2) stories. The increase in roof pitch shall not permit the floor area of the structure to increase beyond that which would have been allowed without the additional height.

c. Solar Energy System: Additional height, not to exceed two (2) feet, may be permitted by the Agency exclusively for the installation of solar energy collection, storage and distribution systems certified by a registered engineer to be in conformance with appropriate federal, state and local standards. The Agency shall grant this additional height only if it is expressly found that the proposed solar energy system could not reasonably be constructed or would not adequately operate in the absence of the additional height and there would not be any adverse environmental impacts.

d. Additional Heights for Certain Structures: Permitted heights for certain types of structures, but excluding buildings, may be increased up to the minimum height required to feasibly implement certain projects. Such projects are limited to communication towers and antennas, utility poles, public safety protection facilities, ski lift towers and other projects the Agency finds to be similar in nature or infeasible without the additional height.

e. Required Findings: Greater heights may be permitted by the Agency in accordance with this section only upon the Agency expressly finding, based on evidence in the record, that:

(1) the greater height will not interfere significantly with existing views and is consistent with the existing character of the neighborhood;

(2) proper provision has been made for light and air;

(3) the greater height is consistent with the Recommendations for Preserving the Scenic Quality as contained in the Lake Tahoe Basin, Scenic Resource Evaluation, 1983;

(4) the greater height will not cause a building to extend above a ridgeline or the existing tree cover; and
(5) the greater height will not adversely impact, singularly or cumulatively, the attainment of the scenic ratings established by the scenic thresholds.

2. Special Provisions: The Agency may authorize greater heights for buildings or structures located within the Commercial/Public Service or Tourist land use districts in accordance with the following provisions. Additional height may be authorized under this section only upon the Governing Board making the findings listed under Section B.2.c. based on substantial evidence contained in an Environmental Impact Statement prepared in accordance with Agency requirements.

a. Increased Permitted Height: The permitted height specified in I.A. may be increased to 35 feet.

b. Additional Height for Roof Pitch: The ridge of the highest hip, gable, gambrel, shed or other pitched roof may extend up to ten (10) feet above the permitted height of thirty five (35) feet provided the point midway between the lowest part of the eves or cornice and said ridge is thirty eight (38) feet or less in height.

c. Required Findings: Greater heights may be permitted by the Agency in accordance with this section only upon the Governing Board expressly finding, based on substantial evidence contained in an Environmental Impact Statement prepared in accordance with Agency requirements, that;

(1) the findings listed under Section B.1.e. can be made with respect to the subject project;

(2) the portion of the building or structure permitted by the greater height is adequately screened from view, as seen from; public thorough fares; the shorelines of lakes in the Tahoe Basin; neighboring buildings; or other areas from which the building or structure is frequently viewed. In determining adequate screening, consideration shall be given to the degree to which the horizontal distance from which the building or structure is viewed, the extent of screening and proposed exterior colors and building materials cause the building or structure to blend or merge with the background.

(3) the total land coverage for the project is 2% less than otherwise permitted under the land capability system for each foot of height greater than permitted under Section B.1.b.

(4) Other factors to be addressed in the EIS shall include height/bulk relationships and proximity to other buildings.
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MEMORANDUM

February 10, 1986

To: Advisory Planning Commission
From: Agency Staff
Subject: RTP Update and Washington's Birthday Weekend Monitoring

RTP Update

As the designated Regional Transportation Planning Agency for the California portion of the Tahoe Basin, the TRPA is required to submit a Regional Transportation Plan Update by November, 1986. At this point, the staff is in the process of critiquing the present Transportation Element and identifying and gathering additional base data for the development of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Staff expects to have a detailed outline of the RTP by the March APC meeting.

Staff will give a more comprehensive oral report at the APC meeting.

Washington's Birthday Weekend Monitoring

The Washington's Birthday weekend is one of the most congested weekends in the Lake Tahoe Basin. In the past, CTRPA conducted both turning movement and speed surveys during this weekend to develop a base of information for evaluating projects and determining the effectiveness of transportation measures.

During the weekend of February 15, 16 and 17 the TRPA staff will be conducting a monitoring program which will collect data on traffic volumes, average vehicle speeds, intersection turning movements and vehicle fleet mix. This effort requires approximately 30 person days from the TRPA staff and a great deal of cooperation from the City, Counties, NDOT and Caltrans. The data collected during this weekend will assist the staff in preparation of air quality plan RFP reports, identification of needed operational improvements, model calibration, and evaluation of projects.

The staff will have a report on the progress of the monitoring program at the APC meeting.

If you have any questions regarding the RTP Update or the Washington's Birthday Monitoring Program, please contact Jim Brennan at (702) 588-3296.
MEMORANDUM

February 11, 1986

To: Advisory Planning Commission

From: Agency Staff

Subject: Unmet Transit Needs

The California Transportation Development Act (TDA) requires that before any Local Transportation Funds (LTF) from the TDA can be used to fund other than public transportation projects, a public hearing must be held and a finding that there are no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet must be made.

Prompted by requests from El Dorado County to spend a portion of these LTF funds on road and street repairs, the TRPA held a public hearing for the purpose of determining whether or not there were any unmet transit needs which were reasonable to meet in the unincorporated portion of El Dorado County within the Tahoe Basin. This hearing was held January 9, 1986. Following the hearing, the hearing panel (comprised of a representative of the APC, two representatives of the TRPA Governing Board and the TRPA Assistant Executive Director) took action to recommend that the Governing Board reconsider its definitions of "Unmet Transit Needs" and "Reasonable to Meet". In addition, the hearing panel recommended that the Governing Board also consider the LTF Trust Fund being held by El Dorado County in its findings that are made in regard to unmet transit needs.

The Governing Board, at its January meeting, directed staff to request additional information from Caltrans concerning these definitions. Both the TDA Rules and Regulations and information from other areas of the State of California were reviewed by staff in preparing a recommendation for revised definitions of unmet transit needs and reasonable to meet. The Hearing Panel and the TRPA staff are to meet and develop a recommendation to the Governing Board on the definitions and on a finding of unmet transit needs. The recommendations will be presented to the APC at its February 19, 1986 meeting.

For further information in regards to this agenda item, please contact Leif Anderson at (702) 588-3296.
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