COMMUNITY INPUT ON VILLAS AT HARBORSIDE PROJECT

Nearly 100 comments and complaints have been submitted to the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency concerning the Villas at Harborside project in Homewood over the last year. These comments were made in writing, in person, by telephone, and via email and online complaint forms on the TRPA website. Staff has worked closely with the Homewood community to answer many questions from concerned neighbors and to engage them as the project has gone through review. All of the comments received, as well as question and answer emails between staff and the public, have been included here in a special report to the Governing Board as an addendum to the staff summary. Staff made a commitment to the concerned citizens who provided their input that their comments would be shared with the Board.

Comments opposing the project focus on the following issues and make specific claims:
- Timeshare use with fractional ownership is improper for the area.
- There is inadequate parking in the area.
- The applicant has not complied with prior permit conditions and appears to circumvent land use regulations.
- The proposed project is too dense for environmental quality and community character.
- Scenic quality will be degraded and views of the lake will be blocked.
- Problems exist with the applicant’s buoy field that should be addressed before other projects can be approved.
- Dying trees in the project area show that vegetation has not been adequately protected from development.
- Issues with parking and boat traffic in the larger project area create impacts too great to allow more development.

Comments in support of the project focus on the following and make specific claims:
- There is a need in the area to attract more visitors to help the economy and small businesses.
- The proposed project would have a smaller visual/scenic impact than three large, single family dwellings.
- Private property rights dictate that any project that complies with all applicable regulations should be allowed and does not require support from the community.

TRPA staff from the Legal, Environmental Review Services, and Communications & Customer Service departments responded to many requests for information from concerned citizens and held several informal meetings to engage the community and keep them informed as the review process moved along. Many questions from concerned citizens enhanced the review process by helping TRPA identify critical issues germane to project review. Public input also assisted TRPA staff in resolving outstanding compliance issues in the project area.
COMMENTS IN SUPPORT
November 2, 2006

Mr. Allen Biaggi, Chairman  
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency  
PO Box 5310  
Stateline, NV 89449

RE: Villas at Harborside

Dear Chairman Biaggi and Members of the Board,

I own Blacktop Paving, a locally owned business at North Lake Tahoe, with offices in Homewood. I am writing to express our full support for the Villas at Harborside project.

The Homewood area has been in a state of decline for several years. Many structures were built during the late 1950's and early 1960's. These structures have deteriorated and now cause a blighted condition. Mr. Topol wishes to demolish one of these deteriorated structures, the Homewood Marina Lodge, and replace it with modern tourist accommodation units. This is a privately funded redevelopment project that is being carried out in complete accord with all Placer County and TRPA rules and regulations. The project will enhance the appearance of Homewood while providing a much needed boost to the local economy.

Mr. Topol's past projects are of high quality, completely consistent with community character and environmentally sound. Good examples are the West Shore Café and the construction of nearly 1,000 ft. of highway frontage improvements that include underground utilities and BMP's to control and treat state highway drainage to Lake Tahoe. The proposed project consists of small buildings carefully placed within the existing forest that improves lake views over the previous condition and protects scenic qualities of the area.

I strongly urge Governing Board to show that TRPA favors reasonable redevelopment and environmentally sound improvement to the West Shore of Lake Tahoe by approving the Villas at Harborside project.

Sincerely,

Raymond de Vre'  
Blacktop Paving
November 3, 2006

Mr. Allen Biaggi, Chairman
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Board of Directors
P.O. Box 5310
Stateline, NV  89449

RE: Villas at Harborside

Dear Mr. Biaggi and Members of the Board:

I am a 24 year west shore resident of Homewood, California. Our family home is located in Homewood, at 4880 Westlake Blvd. I am a member and former Director of the Homewood Homeowners Association.

I am writing today to voice my support for Mr. Nate Topol’s project, Villas at Harborside, Homewood. As is clearly evident from the completion of “phase one” of this project, Mr. Topol presents well designed first class projects. The newly completed West Shore Café is beautifully appointed and I believe it will become the finest restaurant at Lake Tahoe.

The completion of Mr. Topol’s Villas at Harborside project will enhance the value of our lakefront community. It is a low-density development which is much more attractive than a possible multi-story, non-Lake Tahoe type architecture.

I encourage the Governing Board to show support for this redevelopment project.

Sincerely,

Ray Stone Jr.

Ray Stone Jr.
The Villas at Harborside
Homewood, California

Executive Summary of Support Letters

The attached communications from business owners and residents of the area including and surrounding Homewood, California, the site of The Villas at Harborside, were collected in response to an appeal which alleged that the project would be detrimental to business in the area, affect access and sightlines to Lake Tahoe, and not fit with the existing flavor of the community.

The overall theme of these letters state that contrary to the allegations made in the appeal, and other comments from a relatively small (but vocal) group of opposing parties, the project would be better for business.

Better for the Local Economy
These statements affirm that having nine smaller homes (approximately 1700 sq.ft. each), positioned three on each of the three parcels would be far better for the local economy than one large “McMansion” per lot. The reason for this is that the nine homes, each divided into 25% interval ownership, would be occupied more often than the usual occupancy of the “average” large lakefront vacation home.

Better Lake Views-Less Visual Impact
They also state that nine smaller structures would allow for more views of the Lake from the highway as they have a staggered placement on the property, and will have much less of a visual impact from both Highway 89, and from Lake Tahoe. The placement of the smaller homes also impacts fewer trees.

Property Rights
Some residents stated their firm belief that a property owner should be able to use their property as they see fit, as long as it complies with local regulations and fits in with the local Community Plan. It was also expressed that most of the opposition comes from second homeowners, and that their “not in my backyard” attitude is not shared by full-time residents.

Some Supporters Intimidated
Also, there were several business owners who were supportive of the project, but did not want to express their support in writing. They stated that they were fearful of the impact their support might have on their businesses as a result of “retaliation” by the opposing parties.
Letters to Placer County Board of Supervisors in Support of the Villas at Harborside Project

Black Bear Tavern -- Craig Cooper
Bruce Massie -- Creative Kitchens & Baths, Inc.
Chaney House B&B -- Gary & Lori Chaney
Granlibakken Conference Center & Lodge -- Ron Parson
Hatton Construction, Inc. -- Chris Hatton
High Sierra Water Ski School -- Lee Schmidt
Homewood Import Repair -- Jerry & Blanca Vasina
Hugh & Muriel Harris -- Homewood Neighbors
John Walker & Jodie Fioro -- Homewood Neighbors
North Lake Tahoe Resort Association -- Steve Teshara
Obexer's Country Market -- Syd & Mike Earley
Tahoe Lake Cottages -- Mike Laffety
Tahoma Lodge -- Kay Williams
Tahoma Meadows B&B -- Dick & Ulli White
West Shore Sports -- Rob Weston
Wild West Communications Group -- Edward Miller
Placer County Board of Supervisors  
December 6th Meeting at Granlibakken, Tahoe City  

Re: Villas at Harborside  

Honorable Supervisors,  

We are writing in support of the project known as Villas at Harborside on West Lake Blvd. (highway 89) in Homewood. We believe this project is set for review by your board at the December 6th meeting, and urge you to vote in favor of allowing Mr. Nate Topol to make the proposed changes to his property.  

As full time, year-round residents, we own and operate the Tahoma Meadows Bed & Breakfast just down the road from the proposed project, and believe that a property owner has the right (within the confines of the law) to develop his/her property as they wish.  

Mr. Nate Topol has presented a plan for development that is the best solution for this property. His plan for building clusters of smaller homes instead of three large (previously approved) “McMansions”, will compliment the “old town” ambiance of “downtown” Homewood.  

In addition, the “time-share” aspect will increase visitorship to the Homewood area, thus helping to invigorate an otherwise slowing economy.  

Mr. Topol has demonstrated the planned quality of this proposed project with the construction of both the West Shore Café and the three homes on the adjacent property.  

This project will do nothing but improve our community and we urge you to vote in favor of allowing it to continue.  

Most Sincerely,  

Dick & Ulli White  
Tahoma Meadows Bed & Breakfast
Placer County Board of Supervisors

December 2, 2005

Dear Board of Supervisors,

We own Obexar's Country Market in Homewood. We are writing in support of the project known as Villas at Harborside. I want to encourage you to vote in favor of this project and allow Mr. Nate Topol to continue the development of his property.

The Villas at Harborside will help our economy and generate business activity for the West Shore. Any one can see the advantages of building a cluster of cottages over three large lakeside mansions. The part-ownership nature of this project will generate more frequent visits to these vacation homes than three wealthy families who will visit their Tahoe "cabin" mansion 2 or three times a year.

The West Shore, along with the North Shore of Lake Tahoe has experienced a slow down in its economy. Homewood/Tahoe has lost two businesses over the last few years, the hardware store and a very popular restaurant. Both of these businesses generated frequent visits by residents, second homeowners and visitors.

As you are all aware, North Tahoe overall is experiencing a tremendous visitor loss as more and more homes fall prey to the second and third hardly-ever-used "trophy" home syndrome. Mr. Topol's project will help to counter that trend.

The Villas at Harborside will help to improve our community and I urge you to vote in favor of allowing it to continue.

Thank you for your consideration of this vital issue.

Sydell Mike Earley
Obexar's Country Market
December 1, 2005

Placer County Board of Supervisors

Re: Villas at Harborside (Dec. 6th Board Meeting)

Dear Supervisors,

My wife and I have lived and worked on the West Shore of Lake Tahoe since 1986. We have raised our children here and love where we live. I am the owner of Homewood Import Repair, an automotive repair business, and I am very concerned about the future of North Lake Tahoe and the West Shore.

We have seen many changes occur over the years since we moved here from Czechoslovakia and opened our business.

I truly feel that in this country, a person should be able to use his land as he sees fit, as long as it conforms with the laws and regulations of the local community.

The Villas at Harborside will generate business activity for the West Shore. We need more business in our area, and more consistent business, not just seasonal. Nine part-ownership homes will do much more to accomplish that than the currently approved plan for three large houses.

We like the small town feeling of the West Shore and the access to the lake. Those of us who live here year 'round want to keep that feeling, but also realize we need business to survive.

I hope you will vote to allow Mr. Topol to build the project he wants on his land. I know it will be a benefit to our community.

Respectfully,

Jerry & Blanca Vasina
Homewood Import Repair
Placer County Board of Supervisors  
Auburn, California  

December 1, 2005  

Dear Placer County Supervisors,  

I am TRULY a West Shore resident. My home here is my FIRST home. I do not live in Sacramento or the Bay Area.  

My wife Mary and I have lived here for years and raised our three children here. I was the Postmaster at Homewood and now own Hatton Construction, Inc. My wife Mary is the manager of the PDQ Market in Tahoma.  

I know that some people are opposed to the proposed construction project in Homewood called the Villas at Harborside. Some of these people are newcomers to the area, and although they are entitled to their opinions I am offended by these people who don't really live here, but because they can afford to hire a high-priced lawyer from "the big city", think they can push around REAL local people.  

I am writing to you to show my support for The Villas, which I feel will generate much needed business activity for the West Shore. We lost our hardware store recently and now have to drive 16 miles round trip to Tahoe City to the closest alternative. That generates more traffic and uses expensive gasoline. We also lost a restaurant that was a favorite of both locals and visitors.  

We need more stable business on a year-round basis, and I think having nine smaller homes with a constant flow of owners will have a positive effect on the economy here on the West Shore.  

Thank You,  

Chris Hatton  
Hatton Construction, Inc.
December 1, 2005

Placer County Board of Supervisors

Regarding: Villas at Harborside project, Homewood, CA

Dear Placer County Board of Supervisors,

I am a West Shore (Lake Tahoe) businessman and own West Shore Sports (a sports equipment rental business) on West Lake Boulevard in downtown Homewood. Like all of my local business colleagues, I am very concerned about the future of North Lake Tahoe and the West Shore.

Nate Topol’s project, The Villas at Harborside will generate business activity for the West Shore, and the North Shore as well. The infusion of revenue brought to our community by the interval owners of the proposed nine homes will be a positive factor in the local economy.

As I am sure you know, the West and North Shores have experienced somewhat of an economic downslide in the past few years. Homewood and Tahoma alone have recently seen the closure of two major businesses (Homewood Hardware, Stony Ridge Café) both of which were valued assets to our community and kept people from having to drive miles to Tahoe City for essential goods and services.

Mr. Topol and his planners have taken great care to assure that lake views will still be available to the public, as will access to the shore. They have been respectful of the environment and the old-growth trees on the property. The other projects done by them on the adjoining property have demonstrated the high quality of their design and construction, as well as style that is consistent with the area.

I strongly urge you not to put too much value on the comments and complaints from the group of second homeowners who oppose this project. They may be vocal, and have high-powered attorneys, but their “not in my back yard” attitude is not shared by most of the year-round residents who live and work here.

Thank You for your consideration and for the opportunity to give input on this matter.

Rob Weston
West Shore Sports
December 2, 2005

Mr. Robert Weygandt, Chairman
Placer County Board of Supervisors
175 Fulweiler Drive
Auburn CA 95603

RE: Villas at Harborside

Dear Chairman Weygandt and Members of the Board,

As a lake Tahoe West Shore resident, homeowner, business owner and concerned citizen, I offer my complete support for the Villas at Harborside project. Change is not always popular, and I understand that there is opposition to Mr. Topol's Harborside plan. I do not know the specifics of the objections, however, I urge you to continue to support this already approved project for three reasons: The West Shore is in desperate need of redevelopment; we need new business to stimulate economic growth; and this new development will incorporate new environmental standards that help protect lake Tahoe, our national treasure.

The Villas at Harborside is a great example of the type of investment required on Tahoe's West Shore to stimulate economic development and lay the groundwork for redevelopment. For a number of years, slow economic conditions on the West Shore have forced business to close or move out of the area. In the past three years alone, I know of a dozen West Shore businesses that have disappeared. In many cases, the business had provided lodging or services to the transient community that is the key to Tahoe's economic engine. While much of the limited development has eliminated jobs and negatively affected the business climate, Mr. Topol's West Shore Café is one of the few new or redeveloped businesses that will continue to serve the visitor with a first class facility that offers a great venue for area visitors, but more importantly will provide a measurable boost to the economy by offering jobs, contracting for local services, and generating additional TOT income.

Mr. Topol's ongoing superb redevelopment of the ageing West Shore Café is a tangible measure for the quality he will infuse into the Villas at Harborside project. Planning development and redevelopment at Lake Tahoe is very expensive, time consuming and frustrating. Despite this, Mr. Topol has redeveloped the Café and now is redeveloping his Harborside site. Mr. Topol deserves our support in new effort to improve the economy and visitor's experience.

Past environmental policies have allowed rampant development in sensitive area without regard to the impact on the environment in general and the Lake in particular. Reinvestment and redevelopment of properties like Mr. Topol's proposed Harborside location ensures that the latest environmental standard will be in place when the project is completed. In the long run, MR. Topol's compliance with the latest standards on this site will help preserve Lake Tahoe with is the key element driving our travel based economy. Mr. Topol has incorporated all of the governing standards into his development plans and deserves our support in completing his project.

I again urge you and the entire Placer County Board of Supervisors to deny the appeal and approve construction of this beneficial project. This project brings needed visitor spending, will contribute measurably to the property tax and transient occupancy tax collected by Placer County, and helps preserve Lake Tahoe.

Sincerely,

Ron Parson
Owner/President/CEO
December 2, 2005

Placer County Board of Supervisors
Auburn, California

Dear Placer County Supervisors,

I own Bruce Massie's Creative Kitchens & Baths located in Tahoma, on Tahoe's West Shore, and also serve as an (elected) Director of the Meeks Bay Fire Protection District. I am writing to express my support of the project known as The Villas at Harborside. I want to encourage you to take positive action in favor of The Villas as proposed by Nate Topol.

With the seasonal nature of our economy, we certainly see ups and downs with the varying influx and departure of visitors and second (or third!) homeowners. We have also noticed a somewhat downward economic trend in our community and feel that some of it can be attributed to folks who only visit their vacation homes once or twice a year.

Although the approved plan calls for three very large homes, many of us here on the West Shore feel that there are obvious advantages to building a "cluster" of nine cottages over three large lakeside mansions. With multiple owners, it stands to reason that more people will be using the homes, and more people means more money into our local economy.

Please help to reverse this downward trend that has already claimed our hardware store and a much loved restaurant by approving Mr. Topol's project.

Sincerely,

Bruce Massie
Creative Kitchens & Baths, Inc.
December 2, 2005

Placer County Board of Supervisors
175 Fulweiler Ave.
Auburn, CA 95603

To the Board of Supervisors,

This letter is sent to you as a show of support on behalf of my wife and I of the Villas at Harborside. We have looked at the project and see it as an asset as well as benefit to the economic development of our West Shore community. My wife and I have observed the quality of this project so far and approve.

With the size of some of the homes being built on lakefront property over the past several years we feel this project to be more in line / size from an acetic, scenic, functional value to our community.

As full time residents here in Homewood for over thirty years my wife and I urge your support of this project.

Sincerely,

Gary W. Chaney
Lori Chaney
December 1, 2005

Placer County Board of Supervisors
175 Fulweiler Ave.
Auburn, CA 95603

To the Board of Supervisors,

This letter is sent to you in support of the Villas at Harborside. We have looked at the project and find it to be an asset to and a benefit to the economic development of the West Shore of Lake Tahoe. Our economy here in Tahoe will receive a much needed boost from this project. Being familiar with Mr. Topol and his previous developments here in Homewood, we are confident that the Villas at Harborside will reflect the quality of his previous development.

The fact that the Villas at Harborside will be smaller in size than many of the homes being built on lakefront property of late, the views and scenery will be preserved. We strongly urge you to approve the continuation of this most valuable project to our ongoing development of the West Shore.

Both Ms Fiori and I are permanent residents of Homewood and have lived here for many years. Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Respectfully,

[Signatures]

Mr. John H. Walker
P.O. Box 861
Homewood, CA 96141

Ms Jodie Fiori
P.O. Box 827
Homewood, CA 96141
Hugh and Muriel Harris  
P. O. Box 247  
Homewood CA 96141  
December 4, 2005

Bruce Kranz  
Placer County Board of Supervisors  
Auburn, California

Dear Mr. Kranz:

We met earlier this year through Rick Brown in connection with our project at 5095 West Lake Blvd. in Homewood. You may recall that we also own the residence at 5050 West Lake Blvd.

This letter is written in support of the Topol "Harborside" project in the block that adjoins us. We find the small clustered "cottages" being proposed to be a pleasant change from the massive homes that seem to have become the norm at Tahoe.

We have received copies of letters written in opposition and we find the writers to be incorrect in a number of areas that include:

Parking: There is an existing parking problem in Homewood during the summer months due to boat trailers being parked and stored along the roadway and side streets in Homewood. This problem is clearly not related to any Topol operation, either from the "Harborside" development or from the High and Dry Marina, but stems from a different source in Homewood.

Tourist accommodation units: The opposition does not mention the benefit to Homewood of having existing, old, unsightly and dilapidated motels torn down in order for these T.A.U.'s to be transferred to the "Harborside" development.

Those who have written are also misinformed in other areas, such as the number of offsite parking spaces to be provided, individual unit square footage and beach access.

As close neighbors, we ask that you vote in favor of the "Harborside" development.

Sincerely,

Hugh Harris  
Muriel M. Harris

Cc Supervisor Bill Santucci  
Supervisor Robert Weyandt  
Supervisor Jim Holmes  
Supervisor Ted Gaines
December 5, 2005

Honorable Members of the Board of Supervisors
Placer County
175 Fuhleiler Avenue
Auburn, CA 95603

Dear Members of the Board:

The purpose of this letter is not to support a specific project proposal, but to underscore the need for economic development and activity on Lake Tahoe’s West Shore. This includes activity which generates Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT), sales tax and other tourism and business revenues. As the North Lake Tahoe Resort Association, and in our capacity as the North Lake Tahoe Chamber of Commerce, we are concerned about the decline in economic activity along the West Shore over recent years. Stores and restaurants have closed. Fewer goods and services are available. This is a worrisome trend that must be reversed.

Many of our West Shore members have talked with us about the need for new economic investment along the Highway 89 corridor south of Tahoe City. We believe Placer County should help encourage such investment. The West Shore has great historical heritage. It has outstanding State Parks and U.S. Forest Service lands which provide a diverse array of recreational opportunities. The West Shore needs a vibrant business community to help serve these assets and sustain the West Shore as an important part of the economy of North Lake Tahoe and eastern Placer County.

We respectfully urge the Board of Supervisors to consider and support those projects and economic development activities which will help ensure a successful and sustainable West Shore economy and community.

Very sincerely yours,

Steve Teshara
Executive Director
To: Placer County Board of Supervisors
Date: December 5, 2005
From: Lee Schmidt, High Sierra Water Ski School
Reference: Villas at Harborside

Dear Honorable Placer County Supervisors,

I am the owner of the High Sierra Water Ski School, a West Shore (Lake Tahoe) business in Homewood. I am writing to you in support of the project known as The Villas at Harborside, and would like to encourage you to vote in favor of this project allowing Mr. Topol to continue with his development.

The West Shore, along with the North Shore of Lake Tahoe has experienced a reduction in its economy. The Homewood/Tahoma area has lost two businesses over the last few years. Homewood Hardware and the Stony Ridge Cafe. Both of these businesses generated frequent visits by residents, second homeowners and visitors.

The Villas at Harborside will help our economy and generate business activity for the West Shore. Any one can see the advantages of building 9 1800 square foot homes over three large lake-side mansions. The part-ownership nature of this project will generate more frequent visits to these vacation homes than three wealthy families who will visit their Tahoe “cabin” (a.k.a. “mansion”) two or three times a year.

North Tahoe overall is experiencing a tremendous visitor loss as more and more homes become second and third not often occupied homes of the “trophy” variety. Mr. Topol’s project will help to counter that trend.

The Villas at Harborside will help to improve our community and I urge you to vote in favor of allowing it to continue.

Sincerely,

Lee Schmidt
High Sierra Water Ski School
To: Placer County Board of Supervisors  
Date: December 5, 2005  
From: Kay Williams, Tahoma Lodge  
Reference: Villas at Harborside

Honorable Members of the Board,

I am writing in support of the project known as Villas at Harborside on West Lake Boulevard in Homewood. I believe this project is set for review by your board at its December 6th meeting.

I am a full-time resident of Tahoe’s West Shore and own the Tahoma Lodge. For many years I was the Executive Director of the North Tahoe Visitor & Convention Bureau, and I am currently the Resort Manager at Granlibakken Resort. My experience in these positions makes me acutely aware of the economic health and tourism patterns of both the North and West Shores of Lake Tahoe.

Mr. Nate Topol has presented a plan for development that, after much consideration, I feel is the best solution for his Homewood property. His plan for building clusters of smaller homes instead of three large previously approved “McMansions” will compliment the small town ambiance of “central” Homewood. In addition, the shared ownership aspect will increase visitorship to the Homewood area, thus helping to invigorate an otherwise slowing economy.

Mr. Topol has demonstrated the quality of this proposed project with the construction of both the West Shore Café and the three homes on the adjacent property.

This project will do nothing but improve our community and I urge you to vote in favor of allowing it to continue.

Thank you for your consideration of the needs of our community.

Respectfully,

Kay Williams  
Tahoma Lodge
Placer County Board of Supervisors

Reference: The Villas at Harborside

December 6, 2005

Dear Placer County Supervisors,

I am the owner of The Black Bear Tavern, a restaurant on the West Shore of Lake Tahoe. Naturally, I am very concerned about the future of North Lake Tahoe and specifically the West Shore.

I have seen many changes occur over the years that I have lived here, most of them positive. However, recently the West and North Shores have been in an economic slow down. The West Shore has experienced the closing of two major businesses (Homewood Hardware, Stony Ridge Café) both of which helped stimulate the local economy, and provided important assets to residents and visitors.

Mr. Topol’s project, The Villas at Harborside takes into consideration the need to stimulate the economy. Part-ownership cottages will do much more in that end than three more “trophy homes” which have already been approved for that area.

I have heard that some people opposed to the project claim that it will have a “negative impact” on West Shore business. Nothing could be farther from the truth! These homes, and their owners will generate business activity for the West Shore, and consequently the North Shore as well.

The design of the Villas at Harborside is in keeping with the overall ambiance of the West Shore. It takes great pains to preserve many old-growth trees, maintains lake views and lakeshore access, and will help to improve our community.

I encourage you to vote in favor of allowing this project to continue and denying this spurious appeal.

Sincerely,

Craig Cooper, Owner
Black Bear Tavern
Placer County Board of Supervisors  
Auburn, California  

December 5, 2005  

Honorable Members of the Board,  

I am writing in support of the project known as The Villas at Harborside. I believe this project is set for review by your board at tomorrow’s meeting in Tahoe City. I urge you to vote in favor of allowing Mr. Nate Topol to make the changes to his property.  

As owner of the Tahoe Lake Cottages (a lodging provider) I am deeply concerned with the economic condition of our community. If we are to keep up with other resort areas, we must continue to improve what we offer to visitors, as well as what is appealing to residents.  

I believe a property owner has the right to develop his/her property as he wishes, as long as it conforms to the law. Mr. Nate Topol has presented a plan for development that is the best solution for this property. His plan for building clusters of smaller homes instead of three large previously approved “McMansions” will compliment the “old town” ambiance of downtown Homewood.  

In addition, the “time-share” quality will increase visitor-ship to the Homewood area, thus helping to invigorate an otherwise slowing economic area.  

Mr. Topol has demonstrated the planned quality of this proposed project with the construction of both the West Shore Cafes and the three cluster cottages on the adjacent property.  

This project will do nothing but improve our community and I urge you to vote in favor of allowing it to continue.  

Thank You,  

Mike Lafferty  
Tahoe Lake Cottages
December 5, 2005

Board of Supervisors
175 Fulweiler Ave.
Auburn, CA

Honorable Chairman and Members of the Board,

I am writing to you in support of Nate Topol’s project in Homewood known as The Villas at Harborside.

My wife Lolly Kupec and I have been business owners here at Lake Tahoe since 1976, and have been full-time residents since that date. I have been a Director of the Meeks Bay Fire Protection District for 24 years (22 as Chair) and have served on the El Dorado County Civil Service Commission for 18 years (16 as Chair). Lolly also serves on numerous committees and has been active in the Tahoe City Beautification Committee (sidewalks), The Commons Beach Project, and the Tahoe City Design Review Committee. We are members of the North Lake Tahoe Resort Association and the Tahoe City Downtown Association (she is Secretary of the TCDA Board).

I only tell you this to point out our commitment to the community and our concern for its economic stability as well as its environmental health.

I have rarely spoken out in favor of “development”, and I have seen some projects here on the North and West shores grow out of proportion for the areas they occupy. I have chosen to support Mr. Topol’s project for several reasons.

For one, I would much rather see nine smaller (1800 sq. ft.) homes than three large lakefront mansions. I feel that visual impact will be less, access and sight lines to the lake will be greater, and occupant turnover will provide more revenue to local businesses. I am also familiar with the projects Mr. Topol has built on the neighboring parcels and it is clear that they are of high quality, fitting with the West Shore environment. I am also aware that the project will accomplish the transfer of occupancy units from other older properties that are owned by Mr. Topol, and eliminating these somewhat run-down properties will be of great benefit to our community.

Continued----->>>>>
It is not uncommon to see a group of folks outside of Obexer’s Country Market in Homewood or the Tahoma PDQ Market in the morning waiting for the stores to open for coffee, a newspaper, and chats with friends and neighbors. This small-town experience will be gone if the stores and restaurants cannot stay in business. We have already lost our beloved Homewood Hardware, and Stony Ridge Café.

If I need hardware supplies, I have to make a sixteen mile round trip to Tahoe City. I would hate to drive there for a quart of milk or a newspaper and waste gas, time, and contribute to traffic and air pollution.

It seems that every time a new project arises, whether it be the recently defeated Recreation Complex, the sidewalk project (that took us 20 years!) or “affordable” housing, the “NIMBY’s” (Not In My Back Yard) try to stop it in its tracks. Everyone wants “amenities” but no one wants them in their neighborhood, or wants to pay for them.

I love the small town ambience of the West Shore and want to preserve it. That’s why we have made it our home, but I also am a realist. I understand that unless we continue to grow economically, there will be no businesses to serve not only visitors and residents, but the second homeowners as well.

I urge you not to be distracted by a small group of vocal part-time residents who want to keep everything “the way it has always been”. Although I respect the rights and opinions of second homeowners, and realize that they pay the same taxes as we full-timers, I also know that they do not make their livings here, or deal with day-in, day-out life at Tahoe. Mr. Topol has a right to develop his property the way he wishes as long as they conform to the rules and regulations set forth by the regulatory agencies.

I trust that after reviewing all of the facets of this project, you will do the right thing for the West Shore community, Mr. Topol’s rights as a property owner, and for the economic prosperity of us all.

Respectfully,

Edward I. Miller
Wild West Communications Group
Stellar Art Publishing, Inc.
COMMENTS OPPOSED
TRPA GENERAL COMPLAINT FORM

Concerned Citizens Name: Myron B “Mike” Hawkins   Date: September 10, 2006
Mailing Address: ,
E-Mail:   Phone:

PROPOSED PROJECT: Villas at Harborside, Homewood, CA.

Date, Time, Location of Occurrence: Not applicable

Type of Issue:
Description of Complaint: The applicant proposes to circumvent a number of TRPA Codes of Ordinance, as well as the basic intent and charges of TRPA’s bi-state compact as established in the late 1960s (and as revised by the United States Congress in 1980) to preserve and enhance the environment and resources of the Lake Tahoe Basin. The bases cited for not conforming to established legal ordinances are in a 11½-year-old agreement between the applicant and TRPA staff that in essence permits the applicant carte blanche to do whatever he wishes, regardless of present regulations. Clearly, if existing and valid ordinances were being enforced today, this project would be significantly different!

Consequently, I strongly recommend that the TRPA Board of Governors disavow and invalidate the agreement of February 22, 1995 and disapprove the project in its present form and structure. The reasons and justifications for these actions follows:

1. The zoning classification, “single-family residence/commercial”, may have been appropriate in 1995 when there were commercial activities scattered over the entire roughly five-acre tract, but the current proposed site plan clearly segregates the single-family residences from the commercial activities. The applicant’s interpretation (and proposal) of the zoning is that 50 percent coverage is to be permitted on lots that are strictly single-family residential use. In turn this has resulted in a proposed project that for all intents and purposes eliminates any view of the Lake from the sidewalk and highway.

2. The project being proposed currently is not the project that was under consideration in 1995. Exhibit A of the Agreement clearly shows one single-family residence on each of four lots that are either proposed for three residences or as in one case already has them.

3. The allowed land coverage of 77,781 sq. ft. is based on TRPA’s evaluation of “legally existing coverage” which is questionable. According to one reference a number of the structures on the property were “portable”, which raises the question, “Were the portable structures ‘legal’ to the extent that their coverage should be perpetuated for ever?” In any case, the maximum coverage, i.e., 25 percent, permitted on a lot zoned for “single-family residential use” should be the controlling ordinance rather than an environmentally insensitive “Agreement”. (Note that the applicant’s site plan clearly indicates the residential areas are classified as “Class 5-25% Land Capability”.)
4. Although the Agreement defines allowable public access to the beach to be “from the high water line lakeward (sic)”, this means that there is no public access when the lake level is high. (Question: Is a beach still a beach when it is under water?) The concept of public access being limited to areas lakeward of the high water line is ludicrous and not in accordance with the present-day positions.

5. I have found no hard evidence that the Agreement actually remains valid, e.g., that the Board of Governors ever actually ratified the Agreement or that the Agreement was not terminated for any non-performance requirement (Item 11c).

6. In Item 11a it is stated that “TRPA reserves the full discretion vested in it by law to issue any permit subject to any conditions it deems proper …”. In my own personal experience, I know that TRPA has discredited previous agreements for the purpose of improving environmental protection. It appears to be within TRPA’s prerogative to disavow the 1995 Agreement.

As part of the action by the Board, the Mitigated Negative Declaration should not be approved, primarily because the “invalid” justifications provided by the applicant for circumventing the environmental ordinances do not in any manner “mitigate” the proposed environmental degradations.

Clearly, this project in its present form is not compatible with the intent and purposes of TRPA’s compact. I cannot believe that the framers of the TRPA Compact (and perhaps the 1995 Agreement) ever envisioned that nine single-family residences would be constructed on three lots in such a way that a panoramic view of the Lake and distant mountains would be limited solely to a few owners to the exclusion of thousands of visitors and Basin residents.

I strongly encourage the Board of Governors to disapprove this project in its present form.

mbh
TO:  Jeff Cowen                                      September 12, 2006

FROM:  Darrel Gracia & Bob Chapman

Photos to go with General Complaint relating to Public Access
Emailed on 9/11/06

Mr. Cowen; attached you will find photos that relate to the General Complaint regarding
Public Access from Fawn Street.

1. The first set of photos show how the bike trail is blocked because either employees or
   boat owners park their cars (parallel) along Fawn Street next to the Hi & Dry Marina.

2. The next set of photos reflect how the beach is blocked by row boats, canoes that are used
   by patrons and/or the Hi & Dry Marina. The photo of the boat storage racks reflects the
   impossibility of accessing the beach by the Marina. In addition, you can see that to
   access the stairs across the West Shore Café pier, you would have to wade knee deep into
   to Lake Tahoe.

3. The last set of photos show the “public overview” from Fawn Street. Not only is it not
   accessible but it poses a safety hazard because Mr. Topol has removed the planks on the
   south side of the marina. It was an understanding when Mrs. Alrich build the marina that
   this side of the marina and the plank walkway could be used by the public. With the
   planks now removed, it is considered a safety hazard for children and anyone who
   wanted to swim in this area.

We have included the body of the complaint that we sent you to reference the photos.

We do not live on the lake, in fact we live behind the Grubstake Eyesore. In reviewing
the Settlement Agreement we note the following non-compliance issues:

The 1995 Settlement Agreement, Item 3, specifically states that there should be "open
access to the public, and will not be blocked, fenced, nor will the public be otherwise be
prevented from accessing that beachfront portion of the property". The photos taken
from the Marina toward the West Shore cafe clearly show that there is no "open access to
the public" and if they wanted to walk the beach and access the stairs over the piers, they
would have to be knee deep in water.

Item 6 goes on to address an "overlook on Fawn Street adjacent to the Marina...."to
design, develop and build so that bycyclelist and pedestrians may have access to and
otherwise enjoy viewscape from lakefront portion......". While a bike/pedestrian path
was constructed right long a private residence as you can see from the photograph, the
bike path is blocked with cars parked on that path. The photos you will receive show
now only cars parked on the bike/walking path but no "overlook" and a very unsafe side
of the Marina without
IN addition, Item 8 states that future owners are bound to items 3, 4, 5 & 6 however we have been told by reliable sources that the current owners of the existing Villas at Harborside units have told people that the beach is private and to get off. We are requesting that TRPA review the CC&R's for the Villas at Harborside to be assured that Item 8 of the Settlement Agreement includes wording stating that Public Access to the beach on front of those properties is legal and should be abided by.

Mr. Topol should be made to provide visible and safe access for the public from both Fawn Street and Silver Street across his entire "Homewood" properties. This should include signs, a clear route of ingress and egress, no obstacles along the beach such as boats, canoes, (see photos) that would block or otherwise hinder the use of the beach. The access by the marina is very hazardous at present. There are 3-4 very large fork lifts that are constantly in operation and there is no place for a person to safely get to the beach area.

The three story boat storage units also block the route as do the dozens of rows of boats, canoes, etc., that cover the beach.

The Photos Will Arrive addressed to Jeff Cowan via snail mail.
Block Beach Access

- Beach access blocked by boat
  - Strung in front of Marina

2. Stairs awn
   - West Shore Cafe
   - Way deep in water

3. Boat blocking
   - Beach access

Boat Rack

View from rear of excessive boat racks prohibiting
- Beach access
- View of boats hampering the public from walking on beach
"Fawn" Overlook

Planks remain creating hazard area for children.

"View" overlook blocked by boats, cars and drainage ditches.

"Overlook"
Melissa Shaw

From: John Singlaub
Sent: Tuesday, April 25, 2006 11:04 AM
To: Melissa Shaw
Cc: Lyr Barnett
Subject: FW: Email to John Singlaub
Attachments: "AVG certification"

-----Original Message-----
From: Angela Moniot:
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2006 8:02 AM
To: John Singlaub
Subject: FW: Email to John Singlaub

Angela Moniot
Communications Representative
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
775-588-4547, ext. 235

From: Tracy Jaquier [mailto:tracy@jaquier.net]
Sent: Sunday, April 23, 2006 8:51 PM
To: Angela Moniot
Subject: Email to John Singlaub

To Mr. John Singlaub and the TRPA:

As a homeowner in Homewood, Lake Tahoe, I write to you to express my firm opposition to the proposed Villas at Harborside, Homewood.

There are several reasons this development does not fit the surrounding environment of Homewood:

- The project violates the intentions of the zoning and is a total departure from what was previously approved for this property (four single family homes.)
- In keeping with the surrounding neighborhood, high density – fractional ownership is not an appropriate development for Homewood.
- Parking for such a high occupancy development will cause numerous issues in Homewood. "Stacked parking" is not a realistic answer. It will never be used, and will result in a tremendous increase in cars parked along West Lake Blvd.
- Nine homes (with three stories) on three parcels is too much size and bulk for our community.
- This development will severely change the view corridor of this area, which is clearly in violation of the standards set by the TRPA.

Most importantly, if approved, this development will forever change the “character” of Homewood. It will increase tremendously the amount of people, traffic and cars. Mr. Antonucci in his presentation on February 9, 2006 stated these units are in keeping with the Homewood of the past. As a resident of Homewood for 44 years, I couldn’t disagree more.

4/25/2006
September 24, 2006

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
P. O. Box 5310
State Line, Nevada  89449
Attn:  Jeff Cowen

Dear Members of the TRPA,

My husband and I own a home on the West Shore of Lake Tahoe near Homewood and spend several months a year living there. This letter is to express our concerns regarding the proposed construction of the Villas at Harborside in Homewood, as timeshares. We are very concerned with the following issues regarding this development:

1. The heavy density of the three buildings (about 5400 sq. ft. of living space) and adjacent parking would sit on three small 88 foot wide lots. The timeshare feature of the proposed development results in 9 total units x 4 owners per unit = 36 different owners. When the 9 units are occupied, there will be a lot of additional people in the neighborhood, considering the unit owners and their guests.

2. This people density would result in more cars, boats & boat trailers and generally cause much more traffic congestion in the area. Even now, there are many boat trailers parked on Hwy 89 during the summer.

3. Loss of the general ambiance of the neighborhood and a very negative impact to the pleasant environment and village quality of Homewood. There will also be the loss of the scenic water view from the road.

4. Approval of this development would likely encourage many other lakefront property owners to try to convert their properties to timeshare ownership. This would negatively impact all of Lake Tahoe forever.

We understand that Mr. Nate Topol, the property owner and developer, is trying to do the right thing for himself and the Homewood community. However, if the parcels could be reduced to single family dwellings, this would have a lot less impact on the environment and reduce the density and resulting congestion in Homewood.

Please make sure the public receives well-advertised advance notice of the hearing regarding this development. Thank you for considering these comments in your review.

Judith Torinese and Jerry Winters
224 Arguello Blvd.
San Francisco, Ca.  94118
(415) 668-7125

6770 Springs Court
McKinney, Lake Tahoe
(530) 525-6207
Jeff Cowen

From: Dan Higgins [4homewood@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2006 3:15 PM
To: customerservice@ntfire.net
Cc: Jeff Cowan
Subject: Stacked Parking, Villas at Harborside

Re: The Villas At Harborside, Homewood

The developer of this residential project has incorporated the feature of "stacked parking" (essentially tandem parking, that is one car behind another) into his parking lot design. Placer County Design Standards state that "all maneuvering shall be accomplished on-site. Backing out onto a street is not allowed." The current parking lot design has no turn-around areas and little or no room for on-site maneuvering for residents or emergency vehicles such as fire trucks.

The project goes before the Governing Board of TRPA for approval on September 27, 2006. Is the lack of adequate turn-around areas and feature of stacked parking, an issue that may concern the North Tahoe Fire Protection District?

Thanks,

Dan
From Myron “Mike” Hawkins  
Received 9/6/2006

Comments on the Villas at Harborside, Homewood, September 2, 2006

According to my sources, the status of the proposed project, “Villas at Harborside” in Homewood is as follows:

- TRPA and Placer County have approved Mitigated Negative Environmental Declarations for the project, meaning no EIR/EIS is required.
- Placer County Board of Supervisors has postponed project approval until TRPA Board makes a decision.
- TRPA Board of Governors will consider approval of the project on September 27. (Undoubtedly, the TRPA Advisory Council will meet earlier on the subject.)
- The TRPA Staff Report (and recommendations) will not be available to the public before September 20.

There are many environmental, social and economic problems (with long term implications) with this project. (The local Homeowners Association has voted 56 to five against the project as presently proposed.) Some of the problems appear to have been “mitigated” to the satisfaction of TRPA and County staffs. However, the major and overwhelming problem with the project is that under current and valid TRPA regulations, codes and ordinances this proposal would not be under consideration in its present design and magnitude.

Why is this possible? The applicant and TRPA signed some 10½ years ago an agreement that gave the applicant essentially carte blanche approval to do what ever he wanted with the approximately 4.8-acre property. At that time, the primary uses were a marina/boat storage operation, a flying service, a motel, a small restaurant facility and a small outdoor entertainment pavilion. The ill-conceived agreement zoned the entire area a “single-family residential/commercial subdivision”, which, in essence, permitted 50 percent coverage on the entire area (or, as being interpreted, on any lot or part of the total.)

The present overall development plans call for roughly one-half of the southern portion of the total “sub-division” to be commercial facilities, most, if not all, of which are already operational. The northern half of the overall site appears to be zoned single-family residential with one single-family residence on one lot and three time share units on another parcel.

The currently proposed project is for the development of three lots (totaling about 1.4 acres) in the residential sector of the “sub-division”. The plan is to construct three time-share single-family residences on each of the lots with a total coverage of more than 36 percent. In order to assure broad views of the Lake from each of the units, the dwellings
are arranged to eliminate the once-panoramic vista of the Lake from the roadway/sidewy. Although two tunnel-like “15-foot wide Scenic View Corridors” are proposed, one is only nine feet wide and the other is obstructed by trees.

What can be done? First of all, both TRPA and Placer County must redefine their definitions of stewardship as it applies to the future of the Lake Tahoe Basin and its inhabitants. In my opinion, current ordinances, codes and regulations, the public interest, the need to provide a legacy for our descendants and the effort to eliminate the “erosing” of our “national treasure” should, without question, take precedence over out-of-date agreements and precedences, as well as the avariciousness and self-gratification of a few. The future of the structure, organization and responsibilities of TRPA may well depend upon the statesmanship it displays in managing this project.

Mike Hawkins

Word count: 515
September 5, 2006

Jeff Cowen
Community Liaison
TRPA
P. O. Box 5310
Stateline, NV 89449

Dear Mr. Cowen:

I have prepared the enclosed comments concerning the Villas at Harborside. Please distribute to the appropriate staff. I have also sent them by email if that is more expeditious for you.

Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

David Powell
Comments concerning the Villas at Harborside

By David Powell
Member, Board of Directors of the Homewood Homeowners Association
Member, West Shore Citizens Advisory Committee for the General Plan, adopted 1998

Summary

There are widespread concerns with the Villas project. The concerns are about the Parking, Density, and Lake Access. The West Shore General Plan calls for “maintaining the scale and character of the West Shore”. However, this project, if built as proposed, will be significantly denser than any other residential development on the West Shore. Lake Access is minimal, and was implemented according to a 1995 agreement with TRPA that was made when the developer was proposing single-family residences. There never was a modification to the lake access agreement when the developer changed his proposal to time-shares with 3 houses per lot.

It is suggested that TRPA require that the developer reduce the density to two 1800 sq ft homes per lot, thus reducing the density and allowing for more ample parking. Furthermore, it is suggested that the developer be required to provide better lake access. The public lake access that now exists next to the Sunnyside Resort and the Chamberlands Resort are examples of better lake access.

Parking

The parking for the project as currently proposed is very compact. Although there are two spaces per 3BR house, the parking of 6 cars in the space provided will be tight. Although the parking requirements for a timeshare or hotel/motel are one space per “unit”, these 1800 sq ft 3BR houses were not envisioned as a typical hotel/motel “unit” that the regulations were meant to apply to. These timeshare “units” are medium size houses, and the requirements for residential houses should logically apply.

Density

The developer has stated that the proposed 3 houses per lot are well below the allowable density. While it is true that the hotel/motel and timeshare allowable density calls for a maximum of 15 “units” per acre, these regulations envisioned a much different kind of “unit” than an 1800 sq ft 3BR house. Phase 1 of the project has been built with the proposed density and the following photos show the visual impact of this density.
Note that the boundary of the Phase 1 lot is the fence and the proposed development will be in the area that is currently grass. The visual impact of all 4 lots being built with this density would be unique on the West Shore and not in keeping with the General Plan Statement (Homewood Commercial - 159) that calls for “maintaining the scale and character of the West Shore”.

The completed project with 4 lots, each with three 1800 sq ft 3BR houses, would be very dense. It would be significantly denser than the residential developments at Tahoe Tavern or Tahoma.

**Suggestion:** It would be reasonable for the TRPA to require a reduction in density, such as reducing the number of 1800 sq ft houses to two per lot. This would reduce the cramped nature of the buildings to be more in line with the character of the West Shore and allow for more ample parking.

**Lake Access**

According to the agreement of February 22, 1995, which called for developing the property with single-family residences, lake access was to be on county right-of-way and there would be adequate opportunity for walking along the beach between these access points. The photograph below and those on the next page show the quality of the lake access in front of the Project. The stairs providing access over the piers are underwater, except for periods of low lake levels. The drainage culvert prevents any access without climbing the fence into the proposed project area.

There is public access to the lake adjacent to the Sunnyside Resort and the Chamberlands resort that includes large areas for the public to enjoy the lake even at high water periods.

**Suggestion:** It would be reasonable for TRPA to require the developer of the Villas to provide a similar kind of public access to the lake. There is a lot between the West Shore Café and the High and Dry Marina that is planned to be empty. This lot could be made available to the public with little impact on the quality of the residential development. There is some interest in lots such as these by the Tahoe Conservancy; therefore, it may be possible for the developer to sell the lot to them so that the action would have a positive influence on the financial viability of the overall project.
The two photographs above show the poor quality of the lake access. It is impossible to pass along the lakefront when the lake is high. The photograph on the right shows better access... the stairs are accessible and there is some beach area for the public to enjoy the lake. However, it would be much more satisfactory if there was significantly more space adjacent to the lake that was useable under all lake level conditions, such as now exists at the other resorts at the lake.
September 9, 2006

Hugh W. Harris
5050 West Lake Boulevard
Homewood CA 96141

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Governing Board
P.O. Box 5310
Stateline, NV 89449

Honorable Members of the Board,

I am writing in regard to the project known as The Villas at Harborside, in Homewood, CA, on Tahoe’s West Shore.

As you may know, this project has been the subject of much controversy over the last several months. There has been a great deal of information, misinformation, discussion, and rumors about the project, with both support and criticism expressed.

Mr. Nate Topol, owner of the property in question, and his consulting team, recently held some informational presentations at the West Shore Café, and at the most recent meeting of the Homewood Homeowners Association (HHA). These sessions dispelled much of the misinformation that had been spreading around, especially regarding parking (particularly of boat trailers in the summer), density, lake access, and other issues.

There are some 340 parcels in the area considered as Homewood. Of the approximately 100 members of the HHA, less than 60 members voted earlier this summer, with the majority disapproving of the project.

Having attended the presentations, many of my neighbors who were previously opposed have now expressed a more neutral or supportive stance, now that they better understand the nature of the project, the issues, and Mr. Topol’s right to re-develop his property.

I would like to voice my support of the project, and hope you will note that much of the opposition was and may still be based on misinformation and rumor.

Respectfully,

Hugh W. Harris

cc: Bruce Kranz
    Placer County Supervisor
    175 Fulweiler Ave.
    Auburn, CA 95603
To: John Singlaub

September 14, 2006

You will note that I have not signed the attached letter! I believe the issue identified in this letter is a very valid issue that should be resolved by a court decision but I simply am unable to take on another issue at this time.

For your information, I prompted the McKinney-Obexer Court case mentioned in the attached letter. My mother, now deceased, and I did 100% of the research, which involved dozens of trips to Auburn and countless hours doing manual records research.

I shared the County Counsel Reginald Littrell’s Plaintiffs table during the entire trial against three firms of attorneys representing the Defendants. I also was put on the stand to give evidence and be cross-examined. During this process my Tahoe Home was vandalized, my carved Perryman sign was destroyed, Nursery Bushes and plantings were trampled on and broken etc. It was a very stressful process for my family and me.

My wife and I have discussed this issue and concluded we simply are not able to again take responsibility for initiating any court or other action at this late state in our lives. My knowledge, records and research are of course available.

We hope you will read the attached letter and hopefully route it to staff for possible action. I will trust your judgment.

Sincerely,

Ray Perryman
raylois@infostations.com
To each of the TRPA Board Members
CC: John Singlaub

This is a request that you not approve “Topalville West Shore” aka “Villas at Harborside” proposal until there is a court determination on who owns the parcel of land called Lake Avenue. This action is prompted by the Developers Quick Claim aka Brooklyn Bridge Deed to own the land from his surveyed Grant Deeded front parcel boundary line to the low water line of Lake Tahoe (6223’). I believe there is a sound legal basis for saying that this developer has an unclear title to Lake Avenue and does not own the land he claims to own and that other persons or entities do; some of the factors are as follows:

1. This developer does have a solid Grant Deed to a parcel that is 176.23 feet deep and yet he shows on his submitted plot a measurement of 286.090 feet; the 110’ difference a Quick Claim: Deed aka Brooklyn Bridge Deed! Verification can be found in the recorded property deeds. For Example: The 4/29/64 deed selling the Homewood resort Property from Don Huff to Helen T Aldrich states: “That in relation to Parcel 4 described above Sellers shall not be liable for any defects in title to said parcel, and they are hereby expressly released from any and all liability in connection to the grant contained therein.” (Parcel 4 covers that portion of Lake Avenue in front of the old Homewood Resort properties, but not the three southern most lots, which were not owned by Homewood Resort at that time, but are now owned by the developer)

2. On October 28, 1915, Thomas McConnell, the owner and sub divider of the first Homewood subdivision recorded with Placer County a document to clarify that the public never acquired any interest in Lake Avenue. Lake Avenue is between lakefront lots and the low water elevation of Lake Tahoe. In this document he states:

“I hereby further certify that it was my intention at the time of filing the said map (July 28, 1896) that Lake Avenue should be used as a Park for the use and benefit of the then owners and occupants and future occupants of lots in said subdivision.” This, of course, would include the three or four tiers of uphill lots as well as lakefront tier of property owners and occupants.

Before creating this subdivision, Thomas McConnell owned all land to the low water level of Lake. To further clarify his intent to create a Park, he Grant Deeded a singular 105’ wide lot just south of Cherry Street to the then Lakefront lot owner Helen Jackson. This single lot goes from her lakefront property line to the low water level of Lake Tahoe (6223’). The result was a combined two lot measurement 299.4 feet! This action was taken to protect Lake Avenue to be used for his stated intent of a Park for all the Homewood Residence Owners and Occupants.

3. In our research, we have been unable to find any other Homewood property “Grant Deeded” (i.e. with a clear title) by Thomas McConnell from the front tier of Lake front parcel property line to the low water elevation of the lake.
4. In the late 1940's, Placer County notified all Homewood Lakefront property owners to remove their decks and other encroachments from Lake Avenue; those property owners then sued Placer County (Royal Miller et al vs Placer County decision on July 9, 1949) and used the above (paragraph 2) recording of the sub divider's intent for Lake Avenue to claim Placer Count had no legal basis to tell Lakefront owners what to do. Placer County did not appear or represent itself in this court hearing because on June 6, the Placer County Board of Supervisors without any public notice or hearing based on McConnell's recorded intent abandoned any interest that they might have in Lake Avenue! In this suit the Lakefront owners made no claim of ownership of Lake Avenue and the court ruled: Page 7 “They the Property Owners) have no paper title to the strip in question and there is nothing in the pleadings to support title in them.”

This court decision and subsequent actions, of course did not abandon the ownership and use of Lake Avenue by all uphill as well as lakefront owners.

5. There also are copies of letters by original Homewood Property Owners, which verify this broader use of Lake Avenue; for example: On August 4, 1950, Miss Jennie A. McConnell wrote the Board of Supervisors describing her father's intent.

6. Lake Avenue as well as the other streets in McConnell’s Lakeside Subdivision continue into the next Subdivision to the south. That Subdivision is McKinney Tract; it was subdivided and recorded on July 9, 1909 and is about 800 feet south of the property currently being developed. In the 1960s, those Lakefront owners also claimed for a variety of reasons that they owned the property from the front of the Grant Deeded property, which was about 180 feet deep, to the water. Placer County to resolve this issue filed a request for Declaratory Relief i.e. for the Superior Court to determine who the owner in fact was! In a December 12, 1972 decision on <County of Placer Plaintiff vs. Obexer & Sons, Inc et al> the appellant Court upheld the Superior Court Decision that these Lakefront Owners did not own the property from their Grant deeded property to the water and that the shoreline was available for access by the public.

You may wonder why I have sent this as a second letter. This is because I believe that most, but not all of the Homewood Lakefront owners (who do not like Topal's proposed development) would disagree with the contents of this letter; yet I also believe most if not all of the uphill Homewood Property owners would agree with it.

Sincerely,

Ray Perryman

raynois@infostations.com

p.s. Please do not accept any glib comment that these old court cases have been superceded by later Court cases such as Lake County, where the question was on where the low water line was, or Fogerty, or an AG opinion. When it is determined that Lake Avenue is not owned exclusively by the Lakefront owner and is owned by all the Homewood Property Owners, those court cases simply do not apply!
September 12, 2006,

To the Members of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Governing Board:

As a homeowner and member of the Homewood Homeowners’ Assoc., I am writing to protest the proposed units of the Harborside Villas. The density and parking requirements appear to be violated by Mr. Topol’s development. High density is not appropriate and was not the intention of those who wrote the guidelines for the West Shore Community Plan. As proposed the timeshare units would be of greater land coverage (50%) than is allowed the single family homeowner. There will be as many as nine homes on the three small parcels negatively impacting the community of Homewood. The environmental reports prepared by Placer County and TRPA only address the proposed units. They do not consider the existing three units, the West Shore Café, the Homewood Marina and the Homewood Motel. The cumulative effect is much greater and the environmental effects should include the entire development. A complete EIR document should be required.

Please take the time to investigate the land use thoroughly before granting any additional units. Mr. Topol has already impacted the residents of Homewood with the addition of more than a hundred buoys in the Homewood Marina. It is of great distress to those of us who have resided in this community for more than 30 years to have a neighbor who flaunts the regulations with impunity.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. 

Sincerely, 
Grant and Lois Chappell  
P.O. Box 989
Davis, CA 95617
Carole J Gray  
305 Evergreen Drive  
Kentfield, CA 94904  

September 13, 2006  

John Singlaub  
TRPA Executive Director  
P.O. Box 5310  
Stateline, Nevada 89449  

Re: Opposition to the Villas at Harborside, Homewood, California  

Dear Mr. Singlaub:  

I am writing in opposition to the Topol development of The Villas at Harborside in Homewood, which is the topic of discussion at the TRPA Hearing September 27, 2006 for the reasons stated below.  

First, there has always been heavy traffic on Highway 89. I begin to hear the traffic on Highway 89 as early as 5:00 am and the traffic is consistent throughout the summer days and early evenings. This development would undoubtedly add to the existing congestion and noise. I have seen accidents in front of our home on Highway 89 and although the fire department is less than a mile away, I question whether they would be able to respond as quickly as they could five years ago with the increasing flow of traffic.  

Secondly, although Mr. Topol’s architects have presumably drawn a very palpable setting for his development, I find 9 houses on 3 parcels overreaching. I didn’t know Homewood was slated for tenement housing and I strongly doubt that trees would effectively hide these structures as well as the diminishing the noise from these occupants. Tahoe is a gem. Because of careful and thoughtful planning, Tahoe and the West Shore continue its environmental integrity. In fact, this summer my family and I moved back to California from Virginia. One of the two reasons for our relocation is because Virginia is too far from a place where I spent all my summers and where I want my children to spend their summers. By allowing these structures, you’d be diminishing the quality that the West Shore offers.  

Furthermore, I oppose the fact that these structures would be timeshares or quarter shares. Although this is a generalization, pride of ownership does not usually exist when this type of vacation accommodation is offered. I’ve been to timeshares in expensive areas and when I leave, I don’t work as hard as maintaining the property as
I would if I owned it.

Lastly, although much focus is drawn toward highway congestion and safety, I question the congestion and safety on the Lake in front of this development. There is literally a buoy field in front of West Shore Café right now. And as you know, the rules on boating are not as stringent as the ones on the road, so the abuse is much greater. Furthermore, I didn’t see the Coast Guard once during my three weeks up at the Lake this summer, which leads me to expect that they are understaffed to regulate such boating activity.

I look forward in sharing my viewpoints with my other neighbors at the hearing September 27.

Sincerely,

Carole J. Gray
Tel: 703-734-1229
E-mail: cgray123@aol.com
Dear Ms Avance,

Reviewing the Placer County Planning Director Michael Johnson's comments on the Appeal 4/3/06 to the County Board of Supervisors to reverse the County Planning Commission's approval of a conditional use permit of the Villas at Harborside (PEAQ 2005 0136) is as follows:

- He embraced the Placer County Planning Department (PCPD) and it's guidelines to Placer County Planning Commission for the Approval of Villas at Harborside in West Shore, Homewood, CA. As a Planning Director, one should take the lead, not delegate. Obviously, the ball was dropped when NO cumulative or significant impacts were defined in the PCPA Initial Study 9/2005. Thus, a feeble Negative Declaration (Neg. Dec.) was presented as a solution for many environmental discrepancies.

Fortunately, an appeal was made on 10/02/05 against the Planning Director's suggestions and Planning Commissioner's folly. This appeal is still in effect, waiting for TRPA study and Action. I plan to renew it if no EIR (sections 18.32, Placer County Code). As a resident of Homewood, CA for 47 years and Placer County taxpayer, this is the least I can do! Keep Homewood-Homewood.

A withdrawal of the original appeal was asked on 3/14/06 but postponed until the TRPA reviews the flaws and requires an EIR or return to the originally approved project of three cottage homes on three parcels. The appeal withdrawal did not encompass the entire Topol project, only the "Parking impacts".

However, the following issues of the appeal still need to be responded to:

- **The Project is inconsistent with Local Planning Regulations**: even the Initial Study expressly determined that the Project conflicts with the General Plan and Zoning. General Plan Policy 1.1.3 requires the County to protect and enhance scenic corridors through various means including design review and scenic setbacks.

- **The Variance Approval Did Not Comply with State Law**: A Conditional Use Permit and a Variance must be consistent with the General Plan. As shown, granting the variance would make the Project inconsistent with the General Plan because it would, at a minimum directly contradict the Policies regarding scenic corridors and routes.

- Under State Law, a variance may not be granted unless there is a showing that because of special circumstances applicable to the property, "the strict application of the zoning ordinance deprives such property of privileges enjoyed by other property in the vicinity and under identical zoning classification." Government Code 65906
• Instead of imposing to protect the scenic corridor, the Planning Commission approved the Project by reducing the minimum setback requirements, thereby creating greater adverse scenic impacts.

• **The Map Amendment Did Not Comply with State Law.** Amendments to a recorded final map must comply with Government Code section 66472.1 and County Code section 16.26.080, which require certain express findings to be made, none which were made by the Planning Commission.

• It is questionable whether the Project can be approved with three houses on each of the three lots without approval of a **new subdivision map**. Under the Subdivision Map Act, a subdivision map is required for divisions of land for the purpose of sale, lease, or financing. Government Code 66424, 66426. Here, the Project seeks to create up to 36 fractional property ownerships within the nine houses located on the three lots. The Project therefore arguably seeks to divide the existing three lots for the purpose of lease or sale, and would require an approved subdivision map from the County.

There are many issues TRPA needs to know and unless these issues have been satisfied, a recommendation should be made that an EIR must look at these issues or that the originally approved three homes are the total development. Thus, we will continue the appeal until TRPA and County Board of Supervisors understands the dilemma proposed by Topo's Villas at Harborside and require an EIR. Hopefully, resolved at the September 27, 2006 meeting of TRPA Governing Board. Please place this letter in each of the Governing Board's file.

Sincerely,

James W. Gearhart MD

5520 Sacramento Ave., CA 96141

(530) 525-0368 or (510) 656-7703
Myron B “Mike” Hawkins  
1415 Alpine Way, (P. O. Box 858)  
Tahoe City, CA 96145

September 18, 2006

Members of the Board of Governors  
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency  
Stateline, NV

Dear Ladies and Gentlemen,

I recently submitted a TRPA General Complaint Form to the TRPA staff regarding the project, Villas at Harborside in Homewood. In order to stress my concerns about this project and its proposed circumvention of existing TRPA Codes of Ordinance, I am reproducing herein the body of my Complaint, as follows:

**Description of Complaint:** The applicant proposes to circumvent a number of TRPA Codes of Ordinance, as well as the basic intent and charges of TRPA’s bi-state compact as established in the late 1960s (and as revised by the United States Congress in 1980) to preserve and enhance the environment and resources of the Lake Tahoe Basin. The bases cited by the applicant for not conforming to established legal ordinances are in a 11½ - year-old agreement between the applicant and TRPA staff that in essence permits the applicant carte blanche to do whatever he wishes, regardless of present regulations. *Clearly, if existing and valid ordinances were being enforced today, this project would be significantly different!*

**Consequently, I strongly recommend that the TRPA Board of Governors disavow and invalidate the agreement of February 22, 1995 and disapprove the project in its present form and structure.** The reasons and justifications for these actions follows:

1. The zoning classification, “single-family residence/commercial”, may have been appropriate in 1995 when there were commercial activities scattered over the entire roughly five-acre tract, but the current proposed site plan clearly segregates the single-family residences from the commercial activities. The applicant’s interpretation (and proposal) of the zoning is that 50 percent coverage is to be permitted on lots that are strictly single-family residential use. In turn, this has resulted in a proposed project that for all intents and purposes eliminates any view of the Lake from the sidewalk and highway.

2. The project being proposed currently is not the project that was under consideration in 1995. Exhibit A of the Agreement clearly shows one single-family residence on each of the three lots that are currently proposed for three residences.

3. The allowed land coverage of 77,781 sq. ft. is based on TRPA’s evaluation of “legally existing coverage” which is questionable. According to one reference a number of the structures on the property in 1995 were “portable”, which raises the
question, “Were the portable structures ‘legal’ to the extent that their coverage should be perpetuated for ever?” In any case, the maximum coverage, i.e., 25 percent, permitted on a lot zoned for “single-family residential use” should be the controlling ordinance rather than an environmentally insensitive “Agreement”. (Note that the applicant’s site plan clearly indicates that the residential areas are classified as “Class 5-25% Land Capability”.)

4. Although the Agreement defines allowable public access to the beach to be “from the high water line lakeward”, this means that there is no public access when the lake level is high. (Question: Is a beach still a beach when it is under water?) The concept of public access being limited to areas lakeward of the high water line is ludicrous and not in accordance with present-day regulations.

5. I have found no hard evidence that the Agreement actually remains valid, e.g., that the Board of Governors ever actually ratified the Agreement or that the Agreement was not terminated for any non-performance requirement (Item 11c).

6. In Item 11a it is stated that “TRPA reserves the full discretion vested in it by law to issue any permit subject to any conditions it deems proper ...”. In my own personal experience, I know that TRPA has discredited previous agreements for the purpose of improving environmental protection. It appears to be within TRPA’s prerogative to disavow the 1995 Agreement.

In addition, as part of the action by the Board, the Mitigated Negative Declaration should not be approved, primarily because the “invalid” justification provided by the applicant for circumventing the environmental ordinances does not in any manner “mitigate” the proposed environmental degradations.

Clearly, this project in its present form is not compatible with the intent and purposes of TRPA’s compact. I cannot believe that the framers of the TRPA Compact (and perhaps the 1995 Agreement) ever envisioned that nine single-family residences would be constructed on three lots in such a way that a panoramic view of the Lake and distant mountains would be limited solely to a few owners to the exclusion of thousands of visitors and Basin residents.

I strongly encourage the Board of Governors to disapprove this project in its present form.

Sincerely,

Myron B “Mike” Hawkins

Cc: John Singlaub

530/581-2812
e-mail: mbh1@inreach.com
Paula K. Mathis

TRPA Governing Board
Allen Biaggi, Chairman
Director of Nevada Department of Conservation & Natural Resources
901 South Stewart Suite 5001
Carson City, NV 89701

RE: The Villas at Harborside

Chairman Biaggi,

I am a homeowner in Homewood, CA and am concerned about the proposed Villas at Harborside Project that has been put forth by Mr. Topol.

I strongly urge you to revisit this project and give additional consideration to the impact that it will have on the character, safety and environment of Homewood. My feeling is that issues such as parking, traffic, compatibility with the look of the community; impact on the Lake and on views have not been fairly addressed. I believe that with more consideration and design an acceptable project can be developed.

Thank you for your consideration,

Paula K Mathis

CC: Shelly Aldean
Mara Bresnick
Dean Heller
Norma Santiago
Julie Motamedi
Coe Swobe
Jerome Waldie
Jim Galloway
Chuck Ruthe
Bruce Kranz
Steven Merrill
Tim Smith
Mike Weber
Stuart Yount

315 Magnolia Drive, Laguna Beach, CA 92651 949 466-5162
September 19, 2006

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
PO Box 5310
Stateline, Nevada 89449

To Whom It May Concern:

The original proposals for these lots were three individual homes. There is already a one residential design timeshare on this project bringing the finished project I believe to twelve units.

I oppose the proposed project at 5120 West Lake Blvd. based on following issues. Parking-three bedrooms x 9 units proposed is 27 units that could all have automobiles not to mention the units already built. There will be too much traffic and parking issues especially with the newly renovated very popular West Shore Café who is also currently adding 6 hotel units.

Lastly is the issue of an already crowded buoy area on the lake in front on my property 5080 West Lake Blvd to the pier at WestShore Café. Additional buoys will only make a crowded area more crowded! In my opinion TRPA should have not okayed as many buoys as there are. The area is too crowded and a danger to those using the beaches in that area and getting to the already existing buoys.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely yours,

Julie & Donald Wallunas
5080 W. Lake Blvd.
Homewood, Calif.

TRPA FILE #
2005.0823
September 19, 2006

TRPA Governing Board
Shelley Aldean
Carson City Board of Supervisors Member
504 West 5th Street
Carson City, NV 89703

Re: TRPA Governing Board Hearing (Sept. 27, 2006) – Proposed Villas at Harborside Project

We are writing in regards to the above-mentioned proposed project in Homewood, Lake Tahoe.

As you well know, there has been an enormous amount of input regarding the opposition of this project...the parking and general impaction issues primarily.

Not only has Topal’s existing commercial projects impacted Homewood on a ridiculous scale already, but let’s look at the Big Picture with the upcoming developments of the Tahoe Maritime Museum (which is now underway) and upcoming developments of the ski hill, both, which are right across the street – 2 to 300 feet! Just how much impaction can our government agencies consciously rationalize in this small “Normal Rockwell” community? Homewood will soon be one big parking lot with an immense amount of traffic. A real issue which should be addressed by the TRPA and other local government agencies would be working with Cal Trans to get some pedestrian walks assigned to Homewood RIGHT NOW, just to accommodate the already existing commercial entities’ patrons who cross the street. Or will this be addressed once someone is critically injured? Am I wrong in thinking that this issue is one of the government agencies obligations and concerns...to find solutions to the existing impaction and NOT to add to the impaction.

With shared ownership, the impaction and parking issues will increase just by the shear multiples of the multiples. Multiple owners + multiple guests+ multiple cars = impaction!

Let’s get back to basics, this parcel was approved for single family homes, however, shared ownership is more profitable and an easier sell in this market. So when a developer doesn’t get what he wants, an attorney gets involved to see how rules etc. can be manipulated. Each time there is opposition to what Topal wants, his attorney’s step in with their fancy lingo and “technicalities” to misconstrue and buy time. Topal’s “wants” are plain flat wrong for the community and for Lake Tahoe in general. The multiple owner’s impaction would not only be obscene, but where will their guests park?

Regarding the statement of the corridor having a better view or having access to the Lake, this is questionable. One can’t even place their hands on the fence he has already erected
to keep the general public out. It will only get worse. What next, will he be building a brick wall like Fleur-d-Lac? Probably... developers like Topal tackle one issue at a time... NO MATTER HOW LONG IT TAKES FOR THEM TO GET WHAT THEY WANT. I know first hand... I worked for two. When they get an inch, then they take a mile (knowing all to well, they will have to pay money,... but what does that matter... they have deep pockets.) This is evident during the construction of the West Shore Café. I am sure Lake Tahoe's government agencies know Mr. Topal’s M.O. It was pretty obvious to not only Homewood residents but also the building industry in general. Why would Lake Tahoe’s government agencies allow this development to happen? How much money does this man need? He can still make millions off single-family homes, which would not impact our community, half as much as the PROPOSED condominium development. We can’t wait to hear what he has in mind for the property across from Obexer’s Market. Every step he takes, he is chipping at Homewood’s core... little by little.

This past summer the parking on Sacramento Avenue was better; but what will happen after Topal has built everything he wants in Homewood? The back county streets will be impacted once again with the patrons, employees, owners and owner’s guests from Topal’s commercial interests. He will no longer have any vested interest in keeping the residents of Homewood appeased. We don’t see any viable permanent solution for parking or impaction now or after he gets what he wants. This is why so many people in the community are fighting the reality of this condo development. The Homewood community is looking at this situation “down the road” when, and if, this proposed development is a “go”.

Most of Homewood’s families have owned property in Homewood long before Topal came along. We want to preserve everything that Homewood is! Furthermore, we would like to hand down to our children something that we were raised with...the peace, beauty and tranquility of Lake Tahoe. We didn’t have in mind handing down a traffic congested “Parking Lot”. Who would have envisioned this! Certainly not Mark Twain!

I apologize if this letter is rather blunt but these issues should not be manipulated or clouded. If the wrong decisions are made, Lake Tahoe and, especially, Homewood will just be another commercial circus around the basin!!!!

Ms. Lorie Cress’s letter dated August 26, 2006 (which I am sure everyone has a copy) is precise and to the point. Let’s forget about the legal jargon and technicalities and do what is right for Homewood’s community and the Lake Tahoe Basin. We are sure Topal won’t miss a meal if he is only allowed to construct single-family homes versus the condominiums.

Regards,

Kathryn & Scott McLean - (Owner - 5265 Sacramento Avenue - Homewood)
12045 Birch Way
Auburn, CA 95602
Hi Dan,

Thank you for your interest in this project. I am forwarding your comments to Placer County Planning Director Michael Johnson and TRPA Executive Director John Singlaub.

As you know, Placer County and TRPA have yet to make a decision regarding this specific project. Michael and John will carefully consider your concerns before making a presentation to the respective boards.

Thank you again for your e-mail.

Sincerely,
Bruce Kranz,
Supervisor - District Five
County of Placer
TRPA Governing Board Member

Bruce Kranz
Supervisor, District Five
Placer County Board of Supervisors
530-889-4010 Domes
530-889-4009 Domes fax
530-637-1943 Home/Home fax
530-906-1839 Cellular
bkranz@placer.ca.gov

Dan Higgins <4homewood@sbcglobal.net> 3/19/2006 5:22 PM

March 19, 2006

Honorable Bruce Kranz
Placer County Supervisor, District 5
175 Fulweiler Avenue
Auburn, CA 95603

Re: The Villas at Harborside

Dear Supervisor Kranz:

It is not my intention, by this correspondence, to restrict or eliminate local businesses from the Homewood neighborhood or curtail the orderly and appropriate development of local commercial parcels. No one associated with this effort is attempting to prevent any local citizen from the pursuit of, or the patronage of, local businesses. As a Homewood Homeowner, I too, enjoy the convenience offered by local businesses and I
encourage their continuance and growth. This effort is solely about the housing project known as the Villas at Harborside, the impact that the development will have on the subject site, and its effect on the public safety, quality of life, and general welfare, of the surrounding neighborhood.

The housing project, known as the Villas at Harborside, as currently proposed is essentially a multi-residential project consisting of twelve single-family dwellings, on the four lots, located at the site of the old Homewood Resort. With each dwelling approaching 1,900 square feet of living area, the multi-storied 3 bedroom (plus a loft) units will be staggered, three dwellings per parcel, across the old site. Three of the units have already been constructed, leaving nine dwelling, on three lots yet to be approved by the TRPA. The previous planned and approved project called for one large single-family dwelling per lot. The project as proposed today has evolved into twelve "timeshare" dwelling, offering estate or use interests in increments of 25%. In a recent article in the Tahoe City World, the project manager dubbed the Villas "fractional interest ownership" cottages. The elevations of the existing three dwelling do not portray the image of a small, single-storied country houses scattered across an open space as depicted by the word "cottages". To fully appreciate the density of the development as purposed, the obtrusiveness of the structures and their proximity to the shore line, one only need walk the beach in front of the three existing dwellings.

Many of my fellow homeowners have raised issues ranging from a lack of adequate parking (resulting in drivers backing their cars out of the project onto Highway 89, which is not only dangerous but could also result in traffic blockage and reduced response time by emergency vehicle) to the restriction of view corridors resulting from the density of the project. Such public concerns, could have, and should have been addressed at the public hearing held by the Planning Commission on September 22. However, the manner in which the public hearing on the subject property was scheduled by the Planning Commission, first in Auburn, then cancelled and rescheduled for a later date in Tahoe, and then cancelled again, and rescheduled for the date of the cancelled Planning Commission meeting in Auburn, may be more than just confusion. It gives one a sense that the developer sought to circumvent public scrutiny of the project. Statements made by the developer at the Planning Commission hearing on September 22, would lead one to believe that all of the Homewood Homeowners are in favor of the project as purposed. I assure you this is not the case. There are a number of Homeowners who have expressed, not only concern over the impact such a project will have on the Homewood neighborhood, but also disfavor with the scope of the project in relation to the size of the site and its proximity to the west shore of Lake Tahoe. Additionally, the developer sought to give the Planning Commission the impression that he already had TRPA approval, and lacked only Planning Commission approval, which he needed in order to break ground prior to the October 2005 grading deadline. The project has not yet been approved by TRPA and there are some who contend that the Planning Commission gave its approval based on that false impression.

On November 10, 2005, an article appeared in the Tahoe City World which addressed some of the concerns of homeowners who live in the neighborhood. The article states that "Antonucci also noted that there will be at least one parking space for each unit,... required county minimum". Given the size of each unit, and the count of 3+ bedrooms per dwelling, one parking space per unit seems inadequate. On December 6, 2005, Mr. Antonucci presented a summary of the project to the Board of Supervisors. He then stated that each dwelling had one parking space, plus one additional space through the feature of "stacked parking" (which is essentially tandem parking, that is one car behind another), plus five or more other spaces for a total of 23 to 27 parking spaces.

The uncertainty with respect to the number of "off-street" parking spaces and what seems like a complicated parking arrangement prompted me to travel to Auburn and visit the Planning Department. My inquiry pertained to code section, 17.56.310 titled "Timeshare Projects" which defined such projects and outlined their zoning requirements.

The provisions of 17.56.310 apply to any development offering for sale or lease more than eleven estates or use interests in a specific structure or structures for commercial, transient residential or residential purposes, including any and all internal ownership projects regulated as "timeshares" by the state of California as well as other developments which, in the opinion of the planning commission, may be accurately reflected by this description.

A sub section of the code outlined parking requirements for timeshare developments as follows. "Off-street parking" for timeshare projects shall be designed and constructed as
required by Sections 17.54.050 (Parking standards) and 17.54.070 (Design and improvement of parking). The number of spaces required shall be as follows, instead of as required by Section 17.54.060 (Parking space requirements by land use).

Residential and Transient Residential. One and one-half spaces per unit, plus one additional space per bedroom for each unit with more than two bedrooms, plus one space for each permanent employee working on the project after completion and occupancy.

I asked the Staff Planner at the Planning Department if he could interpret the parking requirement and how it would relate to the subject property. He said based on this code section, each dwelling within the subject development, would be required to have 4.5 "off-street" parking spaces per dwelling, for a total of 13 to 14 per parcel. So we are talking 40 "off-street" parking spaces for the 9-units? His answer was yes. This indicates that upon completion, the 12-unit development should have a total of 54 "off-street" parking spaces. As to the element of "stacked parking", there is no provision in 17.54.050 or 17.54.070 which would indicate that "stacked parking" would be appropriate for a development of this use. I then asked him how the project was approved, with only about two-thirds of the required spaces. He indicated that he was unable to answer that question and suggested that I talk to Steve Buelna, Associate Planner, Lake Tahoe Division.

The purpose and intent of developing Planning and Zoning Regulations is to "further the public health, safety, peace, morals, comfort, and general welfare by addressing the simultaneous needs of the county, including, but not limited to: the protection of environmentally sensitive areas; the preservation of natural, cultural, and historical resources; the conservation of visual and aesthetic resources; the maintenance of a given area's existing quality of life**" Pursuant to the mission of Planning and Zoning Regulations, why would the County contemplate approval of a development that does not meet the minimum requirements of its own regulations? From my perspective, the only purpose served by approval of this development is the economic benefit of one person at the expense of the general welfare and quality of life of the entire Homewood neighborhood.

While it is clear, and appropriate, that improvements of some type will be constructed on the subject parcels, it is equally clear and appropriate that any development contemplated for this site must meet at least minimum requirements, and perhaps be held to a higher standard. Why reduce the number of required "off-street" parking spaces? Why allow the impaction, confusion and inconvenience of "stacked parking"? Why allow a variance to reduce the setbacks so that an inappropriate use can be accommodated on the subject parcels? The nature of this site and its proximity to the lake would suggest that any development be held to a higher degree or level of requirements and not something less than "the minimum". It is beyond dispute that Lake Tahoe, and its surrounding shore line is one of our greatest assets, and as such, this west shore site meets the requisite criterion of the Planning and Zoning Regulations mission, to protect environmentally sensitive areas, preserve a natural resource and conserve the visual and aesthetic characteristics of one our most important treasures, Lake Tahoe.

Thank you for your consideration. I appreciate your time and attention devoted to the review of this development which will forever change the quiet and tranquil neighborhood of Homewood and the west shore of Lake Tahoe.

Respectfully,

Dan Higgins
f.y.i. The e-mail list was so long I don't know if you received.

--JR

-----Original Message-----
From: LCreess7199@aol.com [mailto:LCreess7199@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2006 11:35 AM
To: mckenna0707@sbcglobal.net
Cc: dave_bardelli@sbcglobal.net; MMaxineAB@aol.com; abenson@cbnorcal.com; lbertolucci@cinci.rr.com; Rosmar@softcom.net; rbaryl@litol.com; babreuner@earthlink.net; bobros@pacbell.net; BBB8112546@aol.com; bearsn squirrels@sbcglobal.net; kcarling@charter.net; carsdaddy@sbcglobal.net; s.casagrande@comcast.net; colleen.connell@sbcglobal.net; marcied@irrigatortech.com; dasilvaju@sbcglobal.net; jtmcbride@alumni.haas.org; Wedic@cs.com; Cpsych2@aol.com; Grasslandladyvm@aol.com; pmarcarl@comcast.net; hanleybiz@comcast.net; 4homewood@sbcglobal.net; bibleprophesy@yahoo.com; KrsAms@aol.com; CHCroker@aol.com; BruHaHaHaa@aol.com; hassan@norcalrei.com; jakessler@jps.net; vakessler@jps.net; ewkdds@sbcglobal.net; lramar@pobox.com; lala-bigred@earthlink.net; klein1932@earthlink.net; GLevi34022@aol.com; Jlmooser@aol.com; longhouse@sbcglobal.net; billymac3@macco.org; thmac@macco.org; alanlisamatt@sbcglobal.net; dmcb1414@yahoo.com; david.mcginnis@db.com; david.mcginnis@db.com; mcnabola@earthlink.net; dmcnary200@yahoo.com; marymcp@sbcglobal.net; colorcal@jps.net; srmiller44@yahoo.com; Scuba1doo@aol.com; lparrague@captunet.com; raynlois@infostations.com; fpierce@usgs.gov; rockwood@inreach.com; Theresaaavril@aol.com; billsandeman@sbcglobal.net; sarah@obexersboat.com; JimandElda@aol.com; Wood2905@aol.com; joes@wilcowire.com; Scootersimmons@aol.com; catinasmallcabin@sbcglobal.net; wtomash@pobox.com; UUKurt@aol.com; SheriZap@aol.com; dregan@macco.org

Subject: Re: Update

Jack, while I agree with you that parking is a major issue with Mr. Topol's property, the issues are far more complicated then that. Mr. Topol is adding 12 units to Homewood. The units are comprised of twelve 1800+ SF homes. Three of the units are complete. If you drive by the completed units there is not adequate parking to support three-3 bedroom units (possibly 9 cars). At the NTRAC Meeting Mr. Topol's supporters were using the terms "mega-mansions" vs Topol's design of three units on one parcel. I don't see the difference. Three 1800 SF units = 5400 SF. What is the difference between three 1800 SF homes and one 5400 SF home? The allowable coverage is the same, however one single family residence will give a better view corridor, save more trees, have the needed parking area to support the space, and be in keeping with Homewood. Wasn't it Mr. Topol who presented the idea of 4 single family residences to the HHOA annual meeting? What happened to that plan? I do not recall Topol discussing his new plan at any Homeowners Meeting.

Parking aside, the issue of the view corridor; buoys into the middle of the lake; removal of the hotel (that should occur before any more construction); what will happen to the space once the motel is removed; lack of adequate parking for the West Shore cafe patrons, guests and employees; no parking signs in front of Topol's entire property (I have the photos); blocking of Fawn Street for his own personal use; unsightly boat storage on the lake, etc, etc.

I believe that before the HHOA Board makes agreements with Mr. Topol regarding issues that affect all the homeowners, that a committee of members of the association be formed and allowed to provide input into this decision making process. Jack, how do you know what is in our best interests since you have not polled the members on our concerns? I have received many calls and letters from homeowners who believe their concerns are not being addressed. Mr. Topol should be held accountable for all the issues regarding his Homewood projects before he is allowed to go forward with the Villas at Harborside.
In addition, regarding paragraph 4 of your 2/12/2006 email, I do not understand how or why Mr. Topol should get involved in the issue of our property rights to our street end parcels. I'm not sure that his support on this issue would be a valuable asset when addressing the TRPA.

If the homeowners of Homewood do not band together and demand changes through the Board of Supervisors and the TRPA then all the issues I have addressed will go unresolved. If the governing bodies do not hear our voice they have no choice but to approve what Mr. Topol is proposing. Thank you, Lorie Cress
May 7, 2006

Mr. John Singlaub
TRPA
PO Box 5310
Stateline
Nevada 89449

Dear Mr. Singlaub:

As a property owner at 5080 West Lake Blvd., I have watched the Villas at Harborside Rental since its property development. I am opposed to the development for two specific reasons. There is not enough parking in front of the development to sustain the three large buildings which will house multiple renters. Secondly it will create a congestion in the that part of the lake near the shore with the 70 or more proposed buoys added to the ones already there from the normal residences that area of Homewood. Both of these issues create excess noise, pollution, and congestion to the residential neighborhood surrounding the Villas.

Thank you for your interest and I want to make you aware of my feelings regarding the project of Villas at Harborside.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

The Wallunas Family

CC./Melissa Shaw
MEMORANDUM

TO: TRPA GOVERNING BOARD

FROM: TOM MAC LAUGHLIN

DATE: OCTOBER 26, 2005

RE: LORIE & PAUL CRESS LETTER DATED 10/13/05

Dear John:

I am in receipt of the above-mentioned letter. I concur with Lorie Cress, that had homeowners of the Homewood area been notified of Mr. Topol’s commercial developments, I believe there would have been over 100 residents that would have given you public comment against such developments. It is my understanding that the Homewood Homeowner’s Association adopted a plan that each house had to be on at least a half an acre of land. You cannot have three houses on one half acre which is what Mr. Topol has done at his Villas. I believe this restriction was put into place in the mid 1970’s. Jim Sales, who I am carbon copying on this letter, was the president of the association at that time and can give you the specific details as needed.

I completely concur with Lori that the infrastructure is not in place for these developments. The residents of Homewood are paying for these developments by having cars parked in front of their houses and curious pedestrians going to and from these developments looking over their fences and evading their privacy. We are a quiet community that would like to stay that way. These types of developments belong in Tahoe City, Kings Beach, or South Lake Tahoe, not in Homewood. We have been residents there since 1959 and any time these potential developments were proposed, the County or TRPA would notify the residents of Homewood so that we could give our public opinion. Along with Lori, I would like to be notified of any meetings or hearings that the public can attend regarding these developments. My information is as follows:

Tom MacLaughlin
MacLaughlin and Company
1401 Shore Street
West Sacramento, CA 95691

Phone: (916) 371-9021
Fax: (916) 373-0655
Email: thmacc@macco.org
Owner at 350 and 3055 Trout Street, Homewood, CA

In addition, I believe the president of our Homewood Homeowner’s Association would be interested in these issues as well. His information is as follows:

Dr. John F. McKenna
Homewood Homeowners Association
P.O. Box 103
Homewood, CA 96141

With Copy To: 1877 Conifer Drive
Paradise, CA 95969

In closing, I do not think it is fair to the residents of Homewood to suffer from non-notification of commercial development in Homewood. There needs to be a general plan for which we can all live by.

THM/dr
cc: John McKenna
Jim Sales
Anna DeSilva
Billy MacLaughlin
Lorie Cress
819 Casmalia Way  
Sacramento, Ca. 95864  
June 19, 2006

Melissa Shaw, AICP, TRPA Senior Planner  
Subject: Topalville West Shore (AKA Villas at Harbor side)

A Large Group of Homewood Property Owners request:

1) that each of these three parcels in this proposed project retain their existing approval for one single family residence each.

2) That the side measures of this project used for coverage calculations be the 176.67 feet, which is the historic Grant Deed lot measurements of record.

3) That the request for nine large three-bedroom condominium houses be denied.

On May 27, 2006, a group of 17 Homewood Property owners met to discuss their research contacts with numerous Placer County staff, TRPA, The County Recorder, The California State Lands Commission, the Tahoe Conservancy and others. This group represented over 40 Homewood property owners. (FYI, this group also prompted a Homewood Homeowner Association survey of membership and we are informally told the votes “vastly are opposed to this project”).  The purpose of this meeting was to identify those items we are in agreement on and those items needing further fact finding. This letter is a result of that meeting.

The following reasons are provided to support our request to deny this project:

A) This project was previously approved by TRPA as single family residential. The proposed project is essentially a multi-family development. The existing three units are currently offered on the Internet “for rent”. The West Shore General Plan does not include high-density tourist accommodations, time-share or shared ownership zoning. The development should be single family residential which is acceptable zoning for the parcels and consistent with 100% of the existing Lakeshore Homewood homes to the north.

B) The parcel map shows that the side lot measurements are 286.9 and 273.53 feet and includes approximately 50 feet of land under the water of Lake Tahoe. In our research, no other lake front properties have been surveyed to include this 100+- feet of beach and land under Lake Tahoe. Using these measurements considerably increases the allowable “coverage” size even though it includes land that could not possibly be build on (Unless TRPA is going to allow residential construction into Lake Tahoe) and removes any rights of the public to utilize the beach and Lake as a part of the Public Trust Easement for the State of California. The following are references to this Public Trust Easement:

Ray Lacey, the recreation and public access program coordinator for the Tahoe conservancy says The Lake itself is public, and, as a matter of a public trust easement, the public has access to California’s shoreline between high and low water marks. Nevada does not have this public trust easement.
The California Supreme court in the case of State of California versus Superior Court (1981) (Lyon) 29 Cal. 3d 210 and (Fogerty) 29 Cal. 3d 240 held that the area lying between the high and low water marks is subject to a public trust easement for “commerce, navigation, fishing, recreation and preservation.”

C) There is conflicting information on the side lot measures of this property:
   a) The side lot measure of this property in May 1971 was 176.67 feet. (See attachment A)
   b) The Lake Front Neighbor immediately to the north side lot measure is 177.31 feet!
      (See attachment B) By allowing this project to utilize beach and land under Lake Tahoe, Placer County and the TRPA are establishing a precedent for future construction along Lake Tahoe. If homeowners are allowed to use those additional 100 feet in their calculations, the view corridor will be virtually eliminated.

D) As one final reason why the land under Lake Tahoe and shoreline up to the high water mark should not be officially approved, a person only needs to look at what this owner has done 91 feet south of this proposal. This is the site of the old Homewood Resort Main Lodge where numerous historic pictures show people using the beach below the high water level for relaxation and sunbathing. Now the new West Shore Café Building projects out beyond the high water level and on to the land below the surface water of the lake and this shoreline beach is no longer available for such use. At the NTRAC meeting, their representative made a big point about the ease that the public would continue to have to walk this shore line that even had ladders over the pier; however, he failed to mention that such people would have to wade through the waters of Lake Tahoe.

It would also appear that this projects owner has extended his property to the west onto State Highway property by 18 feet. On this 18 feet he has planted a very nice looking lawn and installed a five-foot wide sidewalk with a square edged cement curb. At the NTRAC meeting his representative acknowledged that the no parking signs all along this curb were installed without State Highway approval.

There are of course many more issues of concern on this property such as the very very crowded buoy field that he claims to have permission and grandfather rights to and permission to expand to 125 buoys. (Note, I worked for Homewood Resort & boated this area since 1958 and would personally testify historically there were only about 6 or 7 buoys at most!) This number of rental buoys, of course, allow obscene profits (estimated 1/4 million dollars) from what most people consider public water and significantly further increase the need for unavailable public parking in addition to the parking needs of the new beautiful West Shore Café and High & Dry Marina, which has no public parking. For your further information, the Tahoe Maritime Museum, which is diagonal across the street, from the project Owner’s property is seeking County approval to develop parking spaces along Highway 89 and Fern Street, which is a residential, access street. All of this unplanned parking in this area is creating a very dangerous accident situation.
Also, FYI, years ago, when the Board of Supervisors realigned Fawn and gave permission to use Fawn, they required that picnic tables and benches be maintained for public use at the Lake’s edge; these of course are now nowhere to be seen!

Since I need to report back to this group, I would very much appreciate a response to this letter.

Sincerely,

Ray Perryman

cc: State Lards Commission
   Tahoe Conservancy
   Bruce Kranz
   Placer County Planning/Allen Breuch

To John Sirglaub, TRPA
October 13, 2005

TO: Mr. John Singlaub  
Executive Director of TRPA

FROM: Lorie & Paul Cress  
Homeowners in Homewood.

Arguments against Villa at Harborside, Homewood-- Topol Development

I am contacting you because I am very concerned about how Mr. Topol has tried to push the above referenced development through the government agencies. I am a member of the Homewood Homeowners Association. Mr. Topol stated at the Planning Commission meeting regarding the Villas at Harborside, Homewood that the Homewood Homeowners Association was 100% behind this development. That is a completely inaccurate statement. At that hearing of the Planning Commission Mr. Topol was granted approval to build out the additional three parcels. That means 9 more time-share units next to the three that have recently been completed. None of the neighbors were notified of the Planning Commission Meeting. If the Homewood Homeowner’s Association and/or local homeowners had been aware of the hearing there would have been representation.

It is my understanding that an appeal has been filed by the San Francisco law firm of Allen Matkins Leek Gamble & Mallory LLP regarding the Planning Commissions approval of the Villas at Harborside, Homewood. The basis of the appeal, I believe, has to do with lack of Public Notice of the Planning Commission meeting.

Before Mr. Topol is allowed to continue with any of his commercial ventures Homewood should have a Community Plan in place. Currently there is a West Shore Plan, however it does not address the three potential commercial developments that could change the landscape of Homewood forever. With Mr. Topol’s continued commercial developments along with two other potential commercial developers (Homewood Mountain Resort and Obexors) a Community Plan specific to Homewood should be designed.

Below I have cited specific concerns that have to do with Mr. Topol’s Villas at Harborside, Homewood development. In addition, I have cited other concerns dealing with parking, buoys, and the use of a public street for Mr. Topol’s benefit.

1. Parking for the Villas at Harborside  Mr. Topol was able to get zoning for the Villas as “Time Share” units. Zoning only requires one parking space per
unit. Mr. Topol has 3 carports for the first three completed units. However, these units are large 3 bedrooms homes that could reasonably command parking for 9 cars per parcel and that does not take into consideration additional day guest parking.

2. **Restaurant Parking for West Shore Café & Inn.** The Restaurant has potential parking for its customers to cover 124+- seats. That does not take into consideration the potential seating capacity of over 300 people with summer seating on the deck. Where will these people park? Along the streets of Homewood?

2. **Hi & Dry Marina and Motel Parking.** Boaters who bring their boats to the marina and then park their cars and trailers for the day take two parking spaces. Where do these people park? Along the streets of Homewood.

I do not know the exact number of buoys Mr. Topol has but let's say there are 100 buoys, where do these people who come for the day to use their boats park their cars? Along the streets of Homewood?

I understand that the parcel between the West Shore Cafe and Inn and the Hi & Dry Marina and Motel will be used for weddings and events. Where will the guests park? Along the streets of Homewood? In addition, there is limited parking for the motel.

Parking hazards have not been considered for all the commercial ventures that Mr. Topol has planned. The ingress/egress out of the West Shore Café and Inn appears to be inadequate. The parking lot lacks flow as people coming into the parking lot may have to wait for a parking spot or even back up to let a car out before parking. The unsafe automobile passage could lead to auto accidents, injury and lawsuits.

3. **Fawn Street.....Fawn Street is a county street.** Mr. Topol uses this public street as if he owned it. Currently he has 4 port-a-potties parked on Fawn Street abutting John Saunders house. He also has a two tiered boat storage system parked on Fawn Street abutting John Saunders house. He has posted “no Parking Signs” on Fawn Street. In addition, he puts a locked gate across Fawn Street, a public street, after hours and sometimes during the day.

4. **Buoys.....it is my understanding that Mr. Topol does not have permits for many of the buoys that are part of the Hi & Dry Marina.** Several of the buoys are located a considerable distance into the lake which makes night boating extremely hazardous. I understand that the Chambers Landing Homeowner's Association was fined by TRAP for not removing 13 buoys which the Chambers Landing Association had been told were grandfathered in. Those buoys had been documented and there were photos showing a history yet they were threatened with a fine of $250,000 and settled for a fine of $40,000 in addition to the removal
of the 13 buoys. Why hasn’t the same governing body that fined Chambers Landing enforce the same rules for Mr. Topol. When I look out to the left on my deck all I see is boats. Mr. Topol continues to add illegal buoys and the buoys are too close together (no lake is visible between them). Can’t we enforce the same measures against Mr. Topol and Hi & Dry Marina as was applied against Chambers Landing Homeowners Association?

5. **View Corridor Villas at Harborside.** Because the Villas at Harborside, Homewood are built at an angle, the view corridor either from the road or from the lake is going to be blocked. If you look at his schematic of the project it does not accurately depict the elevation and the view corridor between each of these time-share parcels.

6. **View corridor around Homewood Hi & Dry Marina.** If you look at the maze of boats sitting on racks in front of the Marina and the Motel it is a very ugly site for those who boat in the area. There are specific guidelines for the construction or remodeling of single family homes such as dark exterior paint, not a lot of glass on the lake side and plantings on the lake side to hide the structure from the lake. Why can’t the same rules apply to Mr. Topol? Why isn’t he required to clean up the visual pollution in front of the marina before other projects of his are reviewed?

7. I appreciate you taking the time to read this lengthy letter. I hope that you will consider some of these concerns when you make the decision on the approval of the Villas at Harborside, Homewood. I would like to be notified of any meetings or hearings that the public can attend regarding requests made by Mr. Topol.
November 7, 2005

To: Board of Supervisors, Placer County
   175 Fulweiler Avenue
   Auburn, California  95603

From: Colleen and Curtis Connell
       Homeowners in Homewood Calif.

Dear Board of Supervisors

I am writing this letter in support of the letter sent by Lorie Cress (attached) regarding the Villas at Harborside Homewood development project.

We are Homewood homeowners (since 1947) and are disheartened by the double standards that appear to exist around the lake. It is amazing that Mr. Topol could reference 100% support for his project from the Homewood Homeowners association without any documentation of this support.

Many of us live a fair distance from the meeting venues and may be unable to attend on short notice. However, it seems reasonable that information be mailed or e-mailed to the residents for comment. Homewood is a small community and while progress is inevitable, the development of the area should be shared with the property owners. Mr. Topol appears to be able to continue to develop without regard to any environmental impact. For example, private residents are being asked to remove buoys they’ve had for over 50 years (citing disruption of fish habitats) while he adds hundreds of buoys.

The question we have from all this is: Do the residents of Homewood have a right to information regarding the future development of their community and the right to ask questions and voice concerns?

Sincerely,
Colleen and Curtis Connell

Cc: TRPA
    PO Box 5310   Stateline, Nevada  89449
Nov. 28, 2005  
4028 Kingridge Dr.  
San Mateo, CA 94403

To: John Singlaub  
Executive Director of TRPA

From: Paul & June Hendrickson  
Property owners in Homewood for 41 years

Re: Disregard of Community in Development of Villas at Topol’s Harborside,

It has come to our attention that the original intent of Topol to build a few houses on his lakefront property in Homewood has now become a development of many units of time-share condominiums. One unit has been completed and it is obvious that a continuation of similar units will completely block any view of the Lake in this area from the trail and road. In addition this project will further complicate already limited parking space. We also have concerns about the demand for water for the many additional units and the subsequent “landscaping” of the area. Have we no right to object to the ever increasing claim of Mr. Topol to change the environment of Homewood? It seems that whatever demands he makes for approval from the County, etc. are realized without consideration for the Community.

We are members of the Homewood Homeowners Assn. and we attended the last meeting. The president mentioned that he had walked around the property with Topol, but there was never any discussion of the issue. We are quite certain that had a vote been taken of approval or diapproval of the project that the association would have voted in the negative.

PLEASE consider the future of Homewood. We are longtime property owners and we treasure its quiet beauty, which we have always felt an obligation to preserve.

Thank you for your consideration of our opinions.

Sincerely,

Paul & June Hendrickson
October 31, 2005

John Singlaub, Executive Director
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
P.O. Box 5310
Stateline, Nevada 89449

Re: Topol Development
Homewood-Harborside Villas

Dear Mr. Singlaub,

Muriel and Hugh Harris are owners of the lakefront residence at 5050 Westlake Blvd. (between Trout and Silver STs.) Muriel Harris under the name Los Esteros is also the owner of the small professional office building at 5095 Westlake (cor. of Silver St.) as well as the adjoining residential parcel which is unimproved.

Originally Mr. Topol received approval to divide his property into single family residential lots. I believe that the number was five, not including the Westshore Cafe parcel. Subsequently one single family home was constructed at the corner of Trout St. We had not been made aware of any change which allowed the three recently constructed shared ownership "Villas." Further, no notice was received of any hearing in connection with his request to add additional shared ownership units.

Our concern is over the parking problem which has begun to surface, even before the newly constructed Westshore Cafe has opened. We believe the parking or more properly the lack of it in Homewood needs to be addressed before any further permits are granted.

For example, last summer the lakeside of Westlake Blvd. between Silver St. on the north and Fawn St. on the south was posted "No Trailer Parking". The opposite side of the street has been posted "No Parking" as long as the Ski Resort has existed. During the summer months both sides of the highway between Fawn and South Streets are used for boat trailer parking by boatowners using the Obexer launching ramp at the foot of South St. Several large trailers, not attached to a vehicle are simply stored on the road shoulder. Calls to the CHP usually result in a citation being issued after 72 hours but to our knowledge no trailer has ever been towed. The cost of the fine is cheap rent for trailer storage during the boating season.

The posting of the lakeside of the Topol frontage has resulted in trailer parking to the south of Obexers and as far north as our property at 5050 Westlake and beyond. The problem is certain to worsen once the Westshore Cafe reopens.
Incidently, the CHP has advised us that the recently placed "No Trailer Parking" signs are privately placed and not enforceable by the CHP. The boating public does, however, seem to obey these signs. We do not blame the property owner for having the signs installed as none of us want our frontage cluttered with trailers taking away our guest parking.

Boat trailers from the High and Dry Marina operation are not stored along the roadway. These trailers are transported to the ski area parking lots. The problem originates entirely from the OBexer launching ramp.

One needs only to drive past Sunnyside Resort on a busy summer weekend to have an idea of the impact on Homewood once the Westshore Cafe reopens.

Parking in Homewood is available in the two ski area parking lots during the summer months. These two areas should be utilized, at a price of course, for boat owners vehicles and trailers and for excess Cafe and other business parking.

On weekends and holidays during the ski season we are overrun with cars. Homewood Ski Area has inadequate parking for its customers.

We appreciate your time to consider our concerns. We may be reached by telephone or fax if necessary. The numbers are (415) 435-4743 or (415) 435-6262 fax.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Hugh W. Harris
5050 Westlake Blvd.
P.O. Box 247
Homewood, Ca. 96141
To: Placer County Board of Supervisors

From: David Powell, Homewood Homeowners Assoc. Board member

Subject: Zoning variance for the “Villas at Harborside” in Homewood

I believe the zoning variance should not be granted for the following reasons:

1. The project violates the intentions of the zoning
   The Citizens Advisory Committee (of which I was a member) recommended commercial zoning for that area when the general plan was created several years ago. The general plan states that acceptable uses would be bed and breakfasts, single family, or light commercial. High-density tourist accommodation, time-share, or shared ownership is not included in the description of allowable uses for the zoning. The consensus of the citizens committee was that this sort of use would not be appropriate for Homewood and, therefore, was excluded from the allowable uses. Three 2000 sq ft buildings on those small lots is high density and is a significant departure from single-family housing. The lack of adequate parking is an issue associated with the high density, but the basic problem is that there is just too much coverage! The views of the lake will be almost completely blocked and the general appearance is one of a city, not the type of community that the citizens of Homewood want. Furthermore, there will not be sufficient room for snow removal and the inadequate parking will likely be reduced further in the winter.

2. Homewood homeowners do not support this project.
   It was stated in the Planning Commission meeting that there is widespread support for the project… This not the case! I have not encountered anybody in Homewood who supports the project. It was also stated that the evidence for support was inherent in the lack of opposition at the Planning Commission meeting; however, the correct explanation is that there was insufficient notice given. The owner of the lots for which variances are being sought also owns neighboring property for which the notices were sent. I am not aware of any homeowner in the general area that was notified of the meeting. My home is about 700 ft from the project and I was not given notice.

3. The project needs better public access.
   The previous owner of the land in question provided excellent public access to the lake. It contained large grassy areas, had no perimeter fencing, was open to the public, and had a hot dog stand at the waters edge. The community used the land as if it were a park. The current owner claims to have provided public access as part of his overall development of the block of lots. However, his “public access” currently consists of a very small paved area with a picnic table among overgrown shrubs within the Silver St. right-of-way, land that does not belong to the owner. He has essentially blocked all public access on his block of 6 lots. I believe that, in return for development of this block of lots, substantially improved public access should be required.
Ms. Shaw,

I recently and rather belatedly received your letter of August 25 relating the "Incomplete Applications, Harborside at Homewood..." I have been following Placer County's review and its Mitigated Negative Declaration (See the attached: "Comments on Mitigated Negative Declaration, Villas at Harborside").

I was enheartened that TRPA would be holding hearings. I am concerned that the project will become another "Tonopalo" with strong backlash on TRPA and others, particularly since there is no evidence that TRPA has learned from its "mistakes" on Tonopalo. (John Singlaub has said that although everything about Tonopalo is legal, some ordinances [that provide "loopholes] need to be improved.)

I have attempted to study the Villas project somewhat carefully, particularly in reference to coverage, and I am convinced that the applicant has used every loophole available, to say nothing about what appears to be some "smoke and mirrors", to be able to claim 25 percent coverage. I will be happy to discuss this at any time.

Please add my address (mbh1@inreach.com) to the distribution list for this project.

Thank you,

Mike Hawkins
September 30, 2005

VIA FEDEX

Placer County Board of Supervisors
c/o Michael J. Johnson, Planning Director
County of Placer
11414 B Avenue
Auburn, CA 95603

Re: Appeal of Planning Commission Approval
September 22, 2005 Planning Commission Agenda Item #2
(Villas at Harborside)

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors:

Pursuant to Placer County Code sections 17.58.130 and 17.60.110, this appeal is submitted on behalf of local property owner Jane Echlin, one of the owners on whose behalf written comments to the Planning Commission were submitted prior to the above-referenced hearing. At that September 22 hearing, the Planning Commission approved certain entitlements for the Villas at Harborside residential project, including a conditional use permit, variance, and modification of a final subdivision map, and adoption of a mitigated negative declaration ("Project"). In approving the Project, the Planning Commission abused its discretion for the reasons set forth below, thus mandating reversal by this Board.

I. Notice of the Planning Commission Hearing Was Legally Inadequate.

According to the September 15 Planning Commission Staff Report, public notice was provided only by mail to property owners of record within 300 feet of the project and to certain public interest groups. A public hearing on applications for conditional use permits and variances requires notice to also be provided via newspaper publication at least ten days before the hearing, or posted in at least three public places at least ten days before the hearing. Gov't Code §§ 65091(a)(4), 65905(b). There is no evidence in the record that notice was properly provided, thus the Planning Commission abused its discretion in approving the Project without providing proper notice.

In addition, State law requires that notice be given for a hearing on a modification of a final map by, at a minimum, publishing said notice in a newspaper at least ten days before the hearing.
Gov't Code §§ 65090, 65091, 66472.1, 66451.3(a). Again, there is no evidence that the requisite notice was provided. Because the Planning Commission's approval of the proposed map amendment failed to comply with the substantive and procedural requirements imposed by State and local law, it constitutes an abuse of discretion.

II. The Project is Inconsistent With Local Planning Regulations.

The County's General Plan is the "constitution" for all further development within the County. *Citizens of Goleta Valley v. Board of Supervisors*, 52 Cal.3d 553 (1990). Regulations that are inconsistent with the General Plan are void ab initio. *Lesher Communications, Inc. v. City of Walnut Creek*, 52 Cal. 3d 531 (1990). As such, the Project must be consistent with the General Plan and the subsidiary West Shore Community Plan. In addition, zoning must be consistent with the General Plan, and any land uses authorized by the zoning ordinance must be compatible with the objectives, polices, land uses, and programs specified in the General Plan. Gov't Code § 65860(a).

The mitigated negative declaration/initial study expressly determined that the Project conflicts with the General Plan and Zoning. In particular, Staff determined that the Project "does not comply with a number of the design requirements for parking areas described in the design guidelines for the area as well as the Zoning Ordinance."

These concerns were also expressly set forth in the September 21, 2005 letter from Michael McLaughlin to the Planning Commission on behalf of nearby property owners and businesses, which stated the Project will create adverse impacts regarding parking, tree removal, and public access. To date, there has been no satisfactory explanation or analysis of these issues, particularly how the Project will satisfy the applicable parking requirements. In its brief discussion regarding design concerns, the Staff Report merely provides that certain parking spaces "are not necessary to provide the required number of parking spaces," without identifying what the required number of parking spaces are for the Project and how they will be provided. (Staff Report, p. 4.)

The Project is also inconsistent with the General Plan's scenic corridor requirements. The mitigated negative declaration/initial study recognizes that the Project "will significantly impact the scenic qualities compared to the existing condition." General Plan Policy 1.L.3 requires the County to protect and enhance scenic corridors through various means including design review and scenic setbacks. Although some concerns about the Project will be addressed by the Design Review Committee, the Planning Commission cannot approve the Project if it is inconsistent with this important General Plan Policy. Instead of imposing conditions to protect the scenic corridor, the Planning Commission approved the Project by reducing the minimum setback requirements, thereby creating greater adverse scenic impacts.
III. The Variance Approval Did Not Comply With State Law.

The mandatory requirements for issuance of a variance are set forth in Government Code section 65906, which prevail over any inconsistent local requirements. See Topanga Ass'n for a Scenic Community v. County of Los Angeles, 11 Cal.3d 506, 518 (1974). Under State law, a variance may not be granted unless there is a showing that because of special circumstances applicable to the property, "the strict application of the zoning ordinance deprives such property of privileges enjoyed by other property in the vicinity and under identical zoning classification." Gov't Code § 65906. In other words, unique physical characteristics of the property create a unique hardship on the applicant if the applicable zoning was applied. Instead of making this finding, the Staff Report determined that special circumstances "make the strict application of Chapter 17.60.100(D) (Action on a variance)" result in a hardship. This is a misapplication of the standard. The Planning Commission was required to show how the application of the "Commercial/Tourist" zoning requirements would create a unique undue hardship on the Project proponent. No such finding was made.

Like a use permit, a variance must be consistent with the General Plan. Neighborhood Action Group v. County of Calaveras, 156 Cal.App.3d 1176, 1187 (1984). As set forth above, granting the variance would make the Project inconsistent with the General Plan because it would, at a minimum, directly contradict the Policies regarding scenic corridors and routes.

IV. The Map Amendment Did Not Comply With State Law.

Amendments to a recorded final map must comply with Government Code section 66472.1 and County Code section 16.16.080, which require certain express findings to be made, none of which were made by the Planning Commission. In addition to providing the required notice, as set forth above, the failure of the Planning Commission to make the required findings constitutes an abuse of discretion.

In addition, although this issue was not addressed by the Planning Commission or Staff, it is questionable whether the Project can be approved with three houses on each of the three lots without approval of a new subdivision map. Under the Subdivision Map Act, a subdivision map is required for divisions of land for the purpose of sale, lease, or financing. Gov't Code §§ 66424, 66426. Here, the Project seeks to create up to 36 fractional property ownerships within the nine houses located on the three lots. The Project therefore arguably seeks to divide the existing three lots for the purpose of lease or sale, and would require an approved subdivision map from the County. This issue needs further investigation before any development approvals can be granted.
We therefore respectfully request this Board to conduct a public hearing and reverse the Planning Commission's decision approving the Project pursuant to Placer County Code section 17.60.110(D)(4).

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

David H. Blackwell

Enclosure ($445 filing fee)
April 24, 2006

John Singlaub
Melissa Sław
TRPA
P.O. Box 5310
Stateline, NV
89449

Dear Mr. Singlaub and Ms. Shaw

I am writing in regards to the proposed Villas at Harborside in Homewood, Lake Tahoe. I adamantly oppose this project.

If you have been following Mr. Topol’s “development” in Homewood, you would notice that he does not have Homewood’s best interest in mind. Has anyone noticed the number of boats in front of his marina? Do the existing condos Mr. Topol built look like what the TRPA requested? The units he proposes to build are not in keeping with the past either. Did his hotel/café get red-tagged numerous times because Mr. Topol tried to get away with things the TRPA did not approve and are not legal? There is a pattern here, and I just hope the TRPA is aware that there is a problem here.

Beside the above, there are several other reasons this development should not be approved:

- The project violates the intentions of the zoning and is a total departure from what was previously approved for this property (four single family homes.)
- In keeping with the surrounding neighborhood, high density – fractional ownership is not an appropriate development for Homewood.
- Parking for such a high occupancy development will cause numerous issues in Homewood. “Stacked parking” is not a realistic answer. It will never be used, and will result in a tremendous increase in cars parked along West Lake Blvd.
- Nine homes (with three stories) on three parcels are too much size and bulk for our community.
- This development will severely change the view corridor of this area, which is clearly in violation of the standards set by the TRPA.

Please do not allow him to further damage Homewood. We do not want it to become Kings Beach or South Shore. No one will benefit from these new condos other than Topol. Mr. Topol is not interested in the integrity of Homewood. He is only interested in making money. We want Homewood to remain quiet, peaceful, clean and safe. Help make this possible. Please help keep the lake beautiful and Homewood, home.

Sincerely,

Brenda Cooley (homeowner in Homewood)
MEMORANDUM

TO: JOHN SINGLAUB
TRPA
P.O. BOX 5310
STATELINE, NV 89449

FROM: THOMAS H. MACLAUGHLIN

DATE: MAY 1, 2006

RE: TOPOLS VILLAS OF HARBORSIDE HOMewood

I am writing this memorandum to voice my disapproval of the development at the Villas of Harborside, Homewood, California. I am a member of the Homewood Homeowner's Association and have been a resident of Homewood since 1959. The purpose for my family locating their second home in Homewood was for the peace and quiet that it brings.

Since approximately 1970, the Homewood Homeowner's Association has been against commercial and multi-family developments. This has been their position since their inception and this is the main reason why I joined the Association. I recently read an article with Topol stating that the Homewood Homeowner's Association is behind his development. I do not believe this is the case. As a matter of fact, I would imagine that 95% of the homeowners in the area are against this type of development. Currently, there is no infrastructure in place to handle the existing commercial businesses such as Homewood Marina and West Shore Café. Cars are parked up and down the streets and are now starting to park on San Souice and as far North as Trout Street. This is ridiculous. In most commercial zoning, parking must be provided for the business that they apply to. The Marina, which has little or no parking, is a complete abuse of this planning strategy. It appears that the West Shore Café has parking for 30 cars. There will be an overflow situation on most nights and the overflow will occur onto the streets of Homewood. This is not fair to us as residents. Now, The Villas at Harborside wants to add nine time-shared units with one parking space each. Please keep in mind that occupancy will be double or triple the maximum when you have a family in for a weekend, and all their friends that typically show up for a vacation on the lake.

Any time that we have been put on notice for commercial or residential developments in Homewood, we show up to the hearings in numbers and voice our opinions against such development. I am against this development and I would strongly recommend that you deny any future commercial development such as time-shares in Homewood. These type of developments belong in Kings Beach or South Lake Tahoe.

Sincerely,

THOMAS H. MACLAUGHLIN

cc: Melissa Shaw
May 7, 2006

Mr. John Singlaub  
TRPA  
PO Box 5310  
Stateline  
Nevada 89449

Dear Mr. Singlaub:

As a property owner at 5080 West Lake Blvd., I have watched the Villas at Harborside Rental since its property development. I am opposed to the development for two specific reasons. There is not enough parking in front of the development to sustain the three large buildings which will house multiple renters. Secondly it will create a congestion in the that part of the lake near the shore with the 70 or more proposed buoys added to the ones already there from the normal residences that area of Homewood. Both of these issues create excess noise, pollution, and congestion to the residential neighborhood surrounding the Villas.

Thank you for your interest and I want to make you aware of my feelings regarding the project of Villas at Harborside.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

The Wallunas Family

CC./Melissa Shaw
June 1, 2006

TO: Melissa Shaw
TRPA

FROM: Lorie Cress
Resident of Homewood

I am enclosing twenty-one forms from residents of Homewood who oppose the Villas at Harborside Project. I've had these sheets for months and thought I had already mailed them to TRPA. Please add them to the Villas at Harborside file.

As I mentioned to you by phone message, a group of residents opposed to the Villas at Harborside project met this past Saturday, May 27th. Seventeen residents were able to attended. There were about twenty more residents who were not able to come to Tahoe for the meeting. We discussed various issues regarding the project and narrowed down the areas that we think were the most important and that we needed to research.

The issues covered were:
Parcel Size—inaaccurate parcel lengths on Ward Young Plan
Incompatibility of Project with Neighborhood
TAU's: who monitors their transfer (Grubstake & Homewood Motel)
Coverage based on Settlement agreement between TRPA & Topol
Parking — lack of adequate parking for all of Topol’s development
Buoy Field – dangerous and illegal
Trees: who monitors the dead or dying trees on the entire property

In addition, we are requesting that we be added to any list of notification of any action on the Villas at Harborside project. You can notify us through my email address above or my mailing address. Someone mentioned that they thought the next TRPA Governing Board hearings would be in June. Will the Villas at Harborside Project be included in those hearings?

If you do not have time to respond in writing, could you please email me at the email address on my letterhead? Thank you for taking the time and I look forward to sitting down with you sometime soon to address some of the issues addressed above.
TO: PLACER COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS & TRPA

I am very concerned about the proposed Villas at Harborside Project. Please keep me informed of any hearings/meetings regarding development issues in Homewood.

Sue Strong
Print Name

Sue Strong
Signature

5/6/06
Date

3600 19th St.
Mailing Address 5UC C4 95818

5380 Sue Ave. Homewood
Tahoe Address

Signorets@aol.com
Email Address

(916) 443-6130
Phone Number

Comments:
Lyric, thank you for being such an important missing!!! I want Homewood to be saved!

Please mail/fax this form to: Lorie Cress
1134 Commons Drive
Sacramento, Ca 95825
Lcress7199@aol.com 916 201-5102; FAX: 916 923-5739
TO: PLACER COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS & TRPA

I am very concerned about the proposed Villas at Harborside Project. Please keep me informed of any hearings/meetings regarding development issues in Homewood.

John A. Stephenson
Print Name

Signature

April 10, 2006
Date

P.O. Box 67787
Tucson, AZ 85728
Mailing Address

4870 Westlake Blvd.
Homewood, CA 96141
Tahoe Address

Email Address

Phone Number

Comments: although we live in Tucson, AZ and use the Tahoe house only during the summer, please keep me informed about NATE Topol and his Villas at Harborside project.

Thanks! John

Please mail/fax this form to: Lorie Cress
1134 Commons Drive
Sacramento, Ca 95825
Lcress7199@aol.com 916 201-5102; FAX: 916 923-5739
TO: PLACER COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS & TRPA

I am very concerned about the proposed Villas at Harborside Project. Please keep me informed of any hearings/meetings regarding development issues in Homewood.

Scott & Kathy Nelson
Print Name

March 21, 2006
Date

15045 Birch Way
Mailing Address

5365 Sacramento
Tahoe Address

Email Address

Phone Number
530 268-9688 (Home)

Comments: I am including a copy of my last letter to the Board of Supervisors in case you did not have the opportunity to review our opposition.

Please mail/fax this form to: Lorie Cress
1134 Commons Drive
Sacramento, Ca 95825
Lcress7199@aol.com 916 201-5102; FAX: 916 923-5739
TO: PLACER COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS & TRPA

I am very concerned about the proposed Villas at Harborside Project. Please keep me informed of any hearings/meetings regarding development issues in Homewood.

Print Name: NED ENGUE

Signature:

Date: 3-28-06

Mailing Address: 30 WALNUT

Tahoe Address: SBN SARACOMENTO

Email Address: NED ENGUE @ EARTHLINK.NET

Phone Number: 415-383-1378

530-525-7961

Comments:


Please mail/fax this form to: Lorie Cress
1134 Commons Drive
Sacramento, Ca 95825
Lcress7199@aol.com 916 201-5102; FAX: 916 923-5739
TO: PLACER COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS & TRPA

I am very concerned about the proposed Villas at Harborside Project. Please keep me informed of any hearings/meetings regarding development issues in Homewood.

ROBERT LA MAR
Print Name

Signature

3.21.06
Date

PO BOX 631/MOON BAY, CA 949419
Mailing Address

5567 LA GROVE, HOMEOOOD
Tahoe Address

RLAMAR@POBOX.COM
Email Address

650-560-9300
Phone Number

Comments:
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Please mail/fax this form to: Lorie Cress
1134 Commons Drive
Sacramento, Ca 95825
Lcress7199@aol.com 916 201-5102; FAX: 916 923-5739
TO: PLACER COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS & TRPA

I am very concerned about the proposed Villas at Harborside Project. Please keep me informed of any hearings/meetings regarding development issues in Homewood.

Steven C. Breuer
Print Name

3-23-06
Date

1100 Fox Chapel Rd.
Pittsburgh, Pa. 15238
Mailing Address

4920 West Lake Blvd.
Taboe Address

Brenner@aol.com
Email Address

412.681.9490 x 202
Phone Number

Comments: This developer never knows when enough is enough. He's creating Kingz Beach in Homewood! Please help!

Please mail/fax this form to: Lorie Cress
1134 Commons Drive
Sacramento, Ca 95825
Lcress7199@aol.com 916 201-5102; FAX: 916 923-5739
TO: PLACER COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS & TRPA

I am very concerned about the proposed Villas at Harborside Project. Please keep me informed of any hearings/meetings regarding development issues in Homewood.

Jessie Saner
Print Name

Signature

3-23-06
Date

PO box 32 Ione, Ca 95640
Mailing Address

5070 West Lake Blvd
Tahoe Address

N/A
Email Address

(209) 274-2194
Phone Number

Comments: Letters have been written to Supervisor Kranz and the Board of Supervisors

Please mail/fax this form to: Lorie Cress
1134 Commons Drive
Sacramento, Ca 95825
Lcress7199@aol.com 916 201-5102; FAX: 916 923-5739
TO: PLAUCR COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS & TRPA

I am very concerned about the proposed Villas at Harborside Project. Please keep me informed of any hearings/meetings regarding development issues in Homewood.

Print Name

Junk-Hon

Signature

Date

3-24-06

Mailing Address

1642 Askew Way
Saloon, CA 95660

Tahoe Address

5054 - Field St
Julien 1-916-985-3163

Email Address

RSW12885.com

Phone Number

1-530-526-7016

Comments: I am so concerned with speed and
the Harborside Project. I will help anytime to
stop this man.

I have a serious stuid for my back and the keep is un
4.3. I will try to change the date so I can be at
this month day. I will send a letter.

Thanks for all your hard work

Junk-Hon

Please mail/fax this form to: Lorie Cress

1134 Commons Drive
Sacramento, Ca 95825

Lcress7199@aol.com 916 201-5102; FAX: 916 923-5739
TO: PLACER COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS & TRPA

I am very concerned about the proposed Villas at Harborside Project. Please keep me informed of any hearings/meetings regarding development issues in Homewood.

RUTH RUPPEN
Print Name

Signature

3/24/06
Date

98 SANDBURG DR
Mailing Address

355 South St. Homewood
Tahoe Address

Email Address

916-451-4299
Phone Number

Comments: I AM PARTICULARLY CONCERNED

MORE ROADSIDE PARKING IN THIS ALREADY
CONGESTED AREA. I AM ALSO AGAINST ANY
BLOCKAGE OF LAKE VIEW IN THIS OLDEST
SUBDIVISION OF THE WEST SHORE.

Please mail/fax this form to: Lorie Cress
1134 Commons Drive
Sacramento, Ca 95825
Lceress7199@aol.com 916 201-5102; FAX: 916 923-5739
TO: PLACER COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS & TRPA

I am very concerned about the proposed Villas at Harborside Project. Please keep me informed of any hearings/meetings regarding development issues in Homewood.

BARBARA C. BREWER         Barbara C. Brewer
Print Name                        Signature

3/22/06
Date

5 HEATHER LANE
ORINDA, CA 94563
Mailing Address

BARBARA@EARTHLINK.NET
Email Address

Tahoe Address

925-254-4024
Phone Number

Comments: THANKS FOR YOUR EFFORTS

Please mail/fax this form to: Lorie Cress
1134 Commons Drive
Sacramento, Ca 95825
Lcress7199@aol.com  916 201-5102; FAX: 916 923-5739
TO:  PLACER COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS & TRPA

I am very concerned about the proposed Villas at Harborside Project. Please keep me informed of any hearings/meetings regarding development issues in Homewood.

Tracy Breuner Jaquier
Print Name

Signature

3-20-06
Date

8 Buckeye Rd
Belvedere CA 94920
Mailing Address

4920 West Lake Blvd, Homewood
Tahoe Address

Tracy@jaquier.net
Email Address

415 435 0805
Phone Number

Comments: I will attend The April 3 Meeting in Tahoe, as well as The March 31 meeting in Sacto

Please mail/fax this form to: Lorie Cress
1134 Commons Drive
Sacramento, Ca 95825
L.cress7199@aol.com 916 201-5102; FAX: 916 923-5739
TO: PLACER COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS & TRPA

I am very concerned about the proposed Villas at Harborside Project. Please keep me informed of any hearings/meetings regarding development issues in Homewood.

Print Name

Signature

Date

Mailing Address

94/99

99/99

Email Address

Phone Number

Comments:

Please mail/fax this form to: Lorie Cress
1134 Commons Drive
Sacramento, Ca 95825
Lcreas7199@aol.com 916 201-5102; FAX: 916 923-5739
TO:  PLACER COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS & TRPA

I am very concerned about the proposed Villas at Harborside Project. Please keep me informed of any hearings/meetings regarding development issues in Homewood.

June Walkrose  
Print Name

[Signature]

02/22/04  
Date

[PO Box 529]  
Mailing Address  
[Sierra, Ca 95728]

[5080 W. Lake Blvd]  
Tahoe Address

[walkrosej@globalnet.net]  
Email Address

[9325793657]  
Phone Number

Comments:  
What can be done about all the delays behind this project

Please mail/fax this form to:  Lorie Cress  
1134 Commons Drive  
Sacramento, Ca 95825  
Lecress7199@aol.com  916 201-5102; FAX: 916 923-5739
TO: PLACER COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS & TRPA

I am very concerned about the proposed Villas at Harborside Project. Please keep me informed of any hearings/meetings regarding development issues in Homewood.

Date: 3-24-06

Print Name: [Signature]

Mailing Address: PO Box 185 Woodland

Tahoe Address: 4960 West Lake Blvd

Email Address: danbestpuck@msn.com

Phone Number: 530-735-6292

Comments: Harris, Dam a very concerned homeowner and will do all I can to help you in stopping Mr. Topol’s Harborside Project.

Please mail/fax this form to: Lorie Cress
1134 Commons Drive
Sacramento, Ca 95825
lcress7199@aol.com 916 201-5102; FAX: 916 923-5739
TO: PLACER COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS & TRPA

I am very concerned about the proposed Villas at Harborside Project. Please keep me informed of any hearings/meetings regarding development issues in Homewood.

Print Name: Martha B. MacLaughlin

Signature: Martha B. MacLaughlin

Date: 3/17/06

Mailing Address:
216 Breckenwood Way
Sacramento, Ca. 95864

Street Address: 355 Trout Trail

Mailing Address:
Homewood, Ca. 96141

Email Address: 

Phone Number: (530) 522-7341

Comments: Good work, Lorie!

I have written the Board of Supervisors at large
and Supervisor Bruce Kragg.

Please mail/fax this form to: Lorie Cress
1134 Commons Drive
Sacramento, Ca 95825
Lcress7199@aol.com 916 201-5102; FAX: 916 923-5739
TO: PLACER COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS & TRPA

I am very concerned about the proposed Villas at Harborside Project. Please keep me informed of any hearings/meetings regarding development issues in Homewood.

James & Susan Gearhart
Print Name

Jared Wilkinhart
Signature

3/17/06
Date

PO Box 3442
Mailing Address
Fremont, CA, 94539

5520 Sacramento Ave, Homewood
Tahoe Address
Since 1983

Quixand Ley
Email Address

510-656-7703
Phone Number

Comments: Have County Board of Supervisors request records why applicant David Antonucci of Topol was removed as Manager of Tahoe City Public Utility District (TCPUD) a year or two go. Leopards never change their SPOTS.

Please mail/fax this form to: Lorie Cress
1134 Commons Drive
Sacramento, Ca 95825
Lcress7199@aol.com 916 201-5102; FAX: 916 923-5739
TO: PLACER COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS & TRPA

I am very concerned about the proposed Villas at Harborside Project. Please keep me informed of any hearings/meetings regarding development issues in Homewood.

Print Name          Signature

MARCH 18, 2006

Date

7258 TERRA GRANADA IA
WALNUT CREEK CA 4850 WEST LAKE BLVD.
Mailing Address    Tahoe Address

Email Address       Phone Number

galanisamatt.esbcglobal.net (925) 930-8243.

Comments:


Please mail/fax this form to: Lorie Cress
1134 Commons Drive
Sacramento, Ca 95825
Lcress7199@aol.com 916 201-5102; FAX: 916 923-5739
TO: PLACER COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS & TRPA

I am very concerned about the proposed Villas at Harborside Project in Homewood. Please keep me informed of any hearings/meetings regarding the development issues.

Virginia M. Kessler  
570 4th Avenue  
Sacramento, CA 95818  
916-446-5570

Dated: March 21, 2006

Tahoe address:  
5015 West Lake Blvd.  
Homewood, CA

Email address:  
vakessler@jps.net
TO: PLACER COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS & TRPA

I am very concerned about the proposed Villas at Harborside Project. Please keep me informed of any hearings/meetings regarding development issues in Homewood.

Dr. Earl W. Koberlen
Print Name

3/24/06
Date

915 Chapman St
San Jose, Calif 95126
Mailing Address

9090 West Lake Blvd
Homewood, CA
Tahoe Address

ewk@swcglobal.net
Email Address

408 241-8193
Phone Number
530 525-4619

Comments:


Please mail/fax this form to:  Lorie Cress
1134 Commons Drive
Sacramento, Ca 95825
Lcress7199@aol.com  916 201-5102; FAX: 916 923-5739
TO: PLACER COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS & TRPA

We are very concerned about the proposed Villas at Harborside Project. Please keep us informed of any hearings/meetings regarding development issues in Homewood.

EMMETT F. RHoads  
DOROTHY S. RHoads

Print Name

March 23, 2003  

Date

1740 Danielson Court  
Carmichael, CA 95608  

Mailing Address

edrhoads@sbcglobal.net

Email Address

385 South Street and  
5250 Sacramento Street  
Homewood, CA

Tahoe Address

385 South Street and  
5250 Sacramento Street  
Homewood, CA

Phone Number

385 South Street and  
5250 Sacramento Street  
Homewood, CA

Comments:
We are opposed to the Villas at Harborside Project because it violates zoning and is a departure from what was approved. There is insufficient parking at present, without additional residences. People launching and using boats from Homewood Marina are now, and have been, parking vehicles and trailers on the unpaved areas, including, without authorization, private property. TRPA should investigate these ordinance violations, plus Harborside lot coverage and view corridor requirements.
Virginia M. Kessler  
570 4th Avenue  
Sacramento, CA 95818  
916-446-5570

Homewood address:  
5015 West Lake Blvd.  
Homewood, Ca  
March 21, 2006

Mrs. Lorie Cress  
1134 Commons Drive  
Sacramento, CA 95825

Re: Topol’s Villas at Harborside, Homewood

Dear Lorie Cress, and group of Residence and Friend of Homewood

I oppose the additional 9 units proposed for the Villas at Harborside.

I’m also a concerned homeowner in Homewood.

I want to thank all of the group that are working hard in this matter, and sending the letters and emails to us. Without this group what would we have going on in this area. If Topol’s plans are approved, what next will he want for Homewood.

I have written my letters, (both times) and hope they will help. I’m not able to be at the meeting on the 3rd, but my son Mike Miller will try and attended, weather permitting.

My email address is vakessler@ips.net and Mike’s email address is colorcal@ips.net.
Mike is concerned with what is happening in Homewood, also.

Thanks again for all the hard work.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Virginia M. Kessler
April 4, 2006

The Honorable Supervisor Jim Kranz
District 5
175 Fulweiler Avenue
Auburn, Ca 95603

Re: Villas at Harborside/Appeal Hearing

Dear Supervisor Kranz,

We are writing to express our concerns about the upcoming Appeal hearing regarding the Villas at Harborside. There was a lot of confusion surrounding the Planning Commission Hearing dates for the project. It was scheduled for September 9th, rescheduled to September 22, cancelled and rescheduled for October 13th, cancelled again and re-scheduled again for September 22. The project was heard and approved on September 22 with no public input. Why? Because there was clearly a defect in the notice of map modification and legal notice was not given. It appears that for some reason the Planning Commission jumped through hoops to accommodate Topol. Again, we ask why? Could it be that Topol tried to circumvent public scrutiny of the project by requesting changes in the hearing date? The bottom line; notice was not given to Homewood residents.

Mr. Topol has manipulated the system to his advantage time and time again. There comes a time when he should be made accountable. He pays fines instead of complying with the County or TRPA and then he cries that he has paid all these fees and should be allowed to go forward. He tells TRPA one story and Placer County something else. Examples of the blatant manipulation of the system include: Added more living units in the West Shore Café then approved by the County; blocking off Fawn Street for his own personal use (Homewood Marina); placing “no parking” signs all along Highway 89 in front of his properties; promises to give up living units in his motel for the added unapproved units in the West Shore Café. If the County approved the transfer of motel units for the unapproved West Shore Café units then shouldn’t the motel be torn down now before the West Shore Café is opened? Mr. Antonucci stated at the NTRAC hearing in February that the motel rooms were going to be used toward the Villas at Harborside. Is a small motel room similar to bedrooms in an 1800 square foot house? How many times can he transfer the motel units?

If the public had known of the September 22nd hearing of the Planning Commission there would have been strong opposition to the project for the following reasons:

Planning for the Protection of our Lake and Land
April 4, 2006
Page 2

- The Villas at Harborside project violates the intentions of zoning in Homewood. High-density fractional ownership units are NOT APPROPRIATE NOR A LEGAL USE for these parcels in Homewood. The entire project should revert to the approved zoning—SFR.

- Parking requirements for this project represents a departure from typical parking requirements for high density projects in Placer County. The minimal parking requirements plus allowing “stacked” parking will result in SIGNIFICANT TRAFFIC AND SAFETY HAZARDS. Why would the parking requirements on “environmentally” sensitive Lake Tahoe be more lenient than other areas of Placer County?

- Twelve homes on four parcels versus four single family residences is a huge departure in COVERAGE and TRPA’s requirement for a view corridor.

Most Homewood residents oppose this project. Many residents will not speak out because they fear Topol will not let them store their boats at his marina. We wish to preserve Homewood’s quaint, low density, rural atmosphere and uphold the spirit and previously approved zoning (SFR). Thank you for your consideration in this very important matter.

Sincerely,

Lorie & Paul Cress

Residents for a quaint, low density, rural Homewood.
March 24, 2006

Honorable Bruce Krantz
Placer County Supervisor
175 Fulweiler Avenue
Auburn, CA 95603

Re: The Villas at Harborside

Dear Supervisor Krantz,

My wife and I have a home at 5090 West Lake Blvd which we purchased in 1998. At that time Nate Topal was building a “chalet” style house next door to us. We were told that there would be two or three other large homes built on the adjacent lots to the south. We had no objections to this plan. But this has now changed to high density timeshare dwellings. We are less than 100 yards from the proposed development. We will be highly impacted. The developer now plans to build a total of twelve 2000 sq. ft., 3 bedroom multistory houses. Three of these houses have already been built and sold. The elevations of these twelve dwellings do not compare with what existed historically when the old Homewood Resort occupied the property. We feel this proposal is too dense for the size of the lots, restricts the view of the lake and changes what has been the historic look and appeal of Homewood. Homewood as we know it will be changed.

We oppose the Villas at Harborside. We were one of the many property owners who were not notified of the public hearing held by the Planning Commission meeting in Auburn September 22, 2005. Since our home is so close to the project, we feel we should have been notified. We feel there are many, many problems related to Mr. Topal’s developments in Homewood. Homewood has a significant parking problem. In the summer time there are many homeowners and tourists cars parked along West Lake Blvd (Hwy 89) along with many boat trailers. In the winter, cars parked along the highway overflow from the Homewood Mountain Resort. The businesses have few on site parking spaces, in some cases none at all. Mr. Topal’s Homewood Marina Lodge has only a few parking spots on the highway in front of the lodge and Mr. Topal’s High and Dry Marina has no on site parking. Mr. Topal’s new West Shore Café has only 34 spaces which is highly inadequate since the café will be serving several hundred customers on its large deck and in the large dinning room. 34 spaces are inadequate for the 8 upstairs apartments and employee staff yet alone the public. This will force more cars onto the highway.

According to the developers, The Villas at Harborside will have one parking space per dwelling. Given the size of each of these homes and the count of 3 + bedrooms per unit, one parking space per unit is inadequate. It has now been stated by Mr. Antonucci that each dwelling will have one parking space plus one additional “stacked parking” space (tandem parking). This seems to be a very complicated parking arrangement. It is naïve to think this will work. When the owner of the car at the front of the stack needs to get out, he must go to the other houses hoping to get all the cars moved. What happens when one of car’s owners is on the lake all day or on the ski slope? And what about snow removal and snow storage?

Historically, Homewood and the West Shore has been low key, small businesses and mostly single family homes. It’s clear that improvements of some type will be constructed on the subject parcels. We feel because of the nature of this site, its proximity to the lake and the high visibility of the project it should meet more than the minimum requirements of the Planning & Zoning Regulations and the TRPA.

We all treasure our time at beautiful Lake Tahoe and wish to protect and preserve this natural wonder. The density of this development as proposed will stress this sensitive environment and corrupt the visual and aesthetic characteristics of our beautiful, quiet and tranquil neighborhood of Homewood. It will change the west shore of Lake Tahoe forever.

We appreciate your time and attention to review this development. Thank you for your consideration.
Please help us save Homewood.

Sincerely yours,

Earl and Barbara Koberlein
Melissa Shaw

From: Julie Rečan
Sent: Tuesday, April 04, 2006 4:17 PM
To: Melissa Shaw
Subject: FW: The Villas at Harborside

fyi
-----Original Message-----
From: Dan Higgins [mailto:4homewood@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Tuesday, March 21, 2006 8:16 PM
To: Julie Regan
Subject: The Villas at Harborside

Ms. Julie W. Regan, APR
Communications Director
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

Re: The Villas at Harborside

Dear Ms. Regan:

It is not my intention, by this correspondence, to restrict or eliminate local businesses from the Homewood neighborhood or curtail the orderly and appropriate development of local commercial parcels. No one associated with this effort is attempting to prevent any local citizen from the pursuit of, or the patronage of, local businesses. As a Homewood Homeowner, I too, enjoy the convenience offered by local businesses and I encourage their continuance and growth. This effort is solely about the housing project known as the Villas at Harborside, the impact that the development will have on the subject site, and its effect on the public safety, quality of life, and general welfare, of the surrounding neighborhood.

The housing project, known as the Villas at Harborside, as currently proposed is essentially a multi-residential project consisting of twelve single-family dwellings, on the four lots, located at the site of the old Homewood Resort. With each dwelling approaching 1,900 square feet of living area, the multi-storied 3 bedroom (plus a loft) units will be staggered, three dwellings per parcel, across the old site. Three of the units have already been constructed, leaving nine dwelling, on three lots yet to be approved by the TRPA. The previous planned and approved project called for one large single-family dwelling per lot. The project as proposed today has evolved into twelve “timeshare” dwelling, offering estate or use interests in increments of 25%. In a recent article in the Tahoe City World, the project manager dubbed the Villas "fractional interest ownership" cottages. The elevations of the existing three dwelling do not portray the image of a small, single-storied country houses scattered across an open space as depicted by the word “cottages”. To fully appreciate the density of the development as purposed, the obtrusiveness of the structures and their proximity to the shore line, one only need walk the beach in front of the three existing dwellings.

Many of my fellow homeowners have raised issues ranging from a lack of adequate parking (resulting in drivers backing their cars out of the project onto Highway 89, which is not only dangerous but could also result in traffic blockage and reduced response time by emergency vehicle) to the restriction of view corridors resulting from the density of the project. Such public concerns, could have, and should have been addressed at the public hearing held by the Planning Commission on September 22.

4/5/2006
However, the manner in which the public hearing on the subject property was scheduled by the Planning Commission, first in Auburn, then cancelled and rescheduled for a later date in Tahoe, and then cancelled again, and rescheduled for the date of the cancelled Planning Commission meeting in Auburn, may be more than just confusion. It gives one a sense that the developer sought to circumvent public scrutiny of the project. Statements made by the developer at the Planning Commission hearing on September 22, would lead one to believe that all of the Homewood Homeowners are in favor of the project as pursued. I assure you this is not the case. There are a number of Homeowners who have expressed, not only concern over the impact such a project will have on the Homewood neighborhood, but also disfavor wth the scope of the project in relation to the size of the site and its proximity to the west shore of Lake Tahoe. Additionally, the developer sought to give the Planning Commission the impression that he already had TRPA approval, and lacked only Planning Commission approval, which he needed in order to break ground prior to the October 2005 grading deadline. The project has not yet been approved by TRPA and there are some who contend that the Planning Commission gave its approval based on that false impression.

On November 10, 2005, an article appeared in the Tahoe City World which addressed some of the concerns of homeowners who live in the neighborhood. The article states that “Antonucci also noted that there will be at least one parking space for each unit – the required county minimum…….” Given the size of each unit, and the count of 3 + bedrooms per dwelling, one parking space per unit seems inadequate. On December 6, 2005, Mr. Antonucci presented a summary of the project to the Board of Supervisors. He then stated that each dwelling had one parking space, plus one additional space through the feature of “stacked parking” (which is essentially tandem parking, that is one car behind another), plus five or more other spaces for a total of 23 to 27 parking spaces.

The uncertainty with respect to the number of “off-street” parking spaces and what seems like a complicated parking arrangement prompted me to travel to Auburn and visit the Planning Department. My inquiry pertained to code section, 17.56.310 titled “Timeshare Projects” which defined such projects and outlined their zoning requirements.

The provisions of 17.56.310 apply to any development offering for sale or lease more than eleven estates or use interests in a specific structure or structures for commercial, transient residential or residential purposes, including any and all internal ownership projects regulated as “timeshares” by the state of California as well as other developments which, in the opinion of the planning commission, may be accurately reflected by this description.

A sub section of the code outlined parking requirements for timeshare developments as follows. “Off-street parking” for timeshare projects shall be estimated and constructed as required by Sections 17.54.050 (Parking standards) and 17.54.070 (Design and improvement of parking). The number of spaces required shall be as follows, instead of as required by Section 17.54.060 (Parking space requirements by land use).

a. Residential and Transient Residential. One and one-half spaces per unit, plus one additional space per bedroom for each unit with more than two bedrooms, plus one space for each permanent employee working on the project after completion and occupancy.

I asked the Staff Planner at the Planning Department if he could interpret the parking requirement and how it would relate to the subject property. He said based on this code section, each dwelling within the subject development, would be required to have 4.5 “off-street” parking spaces per dwelling, for a total of 13 to 14 per parcel. So we are talking 40 “off-street” parking spaces for the 9-units? His answer was yes. This indicates that upon completion, the 12-unit development should have a total of 54 “off-street” parking spaces. As to the element of “stacked parking”, there is no provision in 17.54.050 or 17.54.070 which would indicate that “stacked parking” would be appropriate for a development of this use. I then asked him how the project was approved, with only about two-thirds of the required spaces. He indicated that he was unable to answer that question and suggested that I talk to Steve Buelna, Associate Planner, Lake Tahoe Division.

4/5/2006
The purpose and intent of developing Planning and Zoning Regulations is to “further the public health, safety, peace, morals, comfort, and general welfare by addressing the simultaneous needs of the county, including, but not limited to: the protection of environmentally sensitive areas; the preservation of natural, cultural, and historical resources; the conservation of visual and aesthetic resources; the maintenance of a given area’s existing quality of life….” Pursuant to the mission of Planning and Zoning Regulations, why would the County contemplate approval of a development that does not meet the minimum requirements of its own regulations? From my perspective, the only purpose served by approval of this development is the economic benefit of one person at the expense of the general welfare and quality of life of the entire Homewood neighborhood.

While it is clear, and appropriate, that improvements of some type will be constructed on the subject parcels, it is equally clear and appropriate that any development contemplated for this site must meet at least minimum requirements, and perhaps be held to a higher standard. Why reduce the number of required “off-street” parking spaces? Why allow the impaction, confusion and inconvenience of “stacked parking”? Why allow a variance to reduce the setbacks so that an inappropriate use can be accommodated on the subject parcels? The nature of this site and its proximity to the lake would suggest that any development be held to a higher degree or level of requirements and not something less than “the minimum”. It is beyond dispute that Lake Tahoe, and its surrounding shore line is one of our greatest assets, and as such, this west shore site meets the requisite criterion of the Planning and Zoning Regulations mission, to protect environmentally sensitive areas, preserve a natural resource and conserve the visual and aesthetic characteristics of one of our most important treasures, Lake Tahoe.

Thank you for your consideration. I appreciate your time and attention devoted to the review of this development which will forever change the quiet and tranquil neighborhood of Homewood and the west shore of Lake Tahoe.

Respectfully,

Dan Higgins

4/5/2006
Melissa Shaw

From: John Singlaub
Sent: Tuesday April 25, 2006 3:05 PM
To: Melissa Shaw
Subject: FW: Harborside Villas at Homewood, North Lake Tahoe

For the file.
~John

-----Original Message-----
From: Earl Koberlein [mailto:ewkdds@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2006 4:50 PM
To: John Singlaub; Julie Regan; Allen Breuch; Box@placer.ca.gov
Cc: LCress7199@aol.com
Subject: Harborside Villas at Homewood, North Lake Tahoe

Earl and Barbara Koberlein
5090 West Lake Blvd. Homewood, Ca.

My husband and I have written to you before about our concerns over the plans for the Timeshares, The Villas at Horborside, or "cottages" as described by the developer. We have stated that the parking and snow storage are highly inadequate. the view corridors are blocked because of the size and placement of the units, and there are some questionable exchanges of coverage from other properties inorder to gain the coverage for this project. A web site has now come to our attention that advertises these units for nightly rental not just for owner timeshare usage. This seems like it is becoming an extention of Mr Topal's hotel next door above the West Shore Cafe. It is our great fear that this property and the proposed additional nine units will become a commercial enterprise with high turnover, an extention of the hotel and in worse case scenario part of RCI or some other international vacation rental agency. Homewood has always been a quiet, peaceful little community, we want to keep it that way. This project is not appropriate for Homewood.

Check out the web site: http://www.triphomes.com/Property-17665-Vacation-Rental.html
This is a web site run by Coldwell Banker in Texas.

Dr. Earl Koberlein, DDS
915 Chapman St, San Jose Ca. 95126
Note! New email address:
    ewkdds@sbcglobal.net
Melissa Shaw

From: John Singlaub
Sent: Tuesday, April 25, 2006 11:04 AM
To: Melissa Shaw
Cc: Lyr Barnett
Subject: FW: Email to John Singlaub
Attachments: "AVG certification"

-----Original Message-----
From: Angela Moniot
Sent: Monday, April 24, 2006 8:02 AM
To: John Singlaub
Subject: FW: Email to John Singlaub

Angela Moniot
Communications Representative
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
775-588-4547, ext. 235

From: Tracy Jaquier [mailto:tracy@jaquier.net]
Sent: Sunday, April 23, 2006 8:51 PM
To: Angela Moniot
Subject: Email to John Singlaub

To Mr. John Singlaub and the TRPA:

As a homeowner in Homewood, Lake Tahoe, I write to you to express my firm opposition to the proposed Villas at Harborside, Homewood.

There are several reasons this development does not fit the surrounding environment of Homewood:

- The project violates the intentions of the zoning and is a total departure from what was previously approved for this property (four single family homes.)
- In keeping with the surrounding neighborhood, high density – fractional ownership is not an appropriate development for Homewood.
- Parking for such a high occupancy development will cause numerous issues in Homewood. “Stacked parking” is not a realistic answer. It will never be used, and will result in a tremendous increase in cars parked along West Lake Blvd.
- Nine homes (with three stories) on three parcels is too much size and bulk for our community.
- This development will severely change the view corridor of this area, which is clearly in violation of the standards set by the TRPA.

Most importantly, if approved, this development will forever change the “character” of Homewood. It will increase tremendously the amount of people, traffic and cars. Mr. Antonucci in his presentation on February 9, 2006 stated these units are in keeping with the Homewood of the past. As a resident of Homewood for 44 years, I couldn’t disagree more.

4/25/2006
I ask you to please listen to the residents of Homewood who are desperately asking for another review of this project. Your decision is of tremendous importance to all the residents of Homewood, as this will forever change the quiet and peaceful character of the West Shore of Lake Tahoe.

Sincerely,

Tracy Breuner Jaquier
Melissa Shaw

From: Julie Regan
Sent: Friday, April 21, 2006 9:58 AM
To: Angela Moniot; Melissa Shaw
Cc: Jennifer Hannum
Subject: FW: Villas at Harborside (Topalville West shore)

Melissa -

Do we have a schedule yet as to when this is going to hearings officer? We need to let our mailing list folks know ...

--JR

-----Original Message-----
From: Jennifer Hannum
Sent: Friday, April 21, 2006 9:10 AM
To: ERS
Subject: FW: Villas at Harborside (Topalville West shore)

Anyone know anything about this project? I've never heard of it. Please let me know.

Jennifer Hannum

From: Ray & Lois Perryman [mailto:raylois@infostations.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 20, 2006 7:35 PM
To: Jennifer Hannum
Subject: Villas at Harborside (Topalville West shore)

Please insure that I am on your e-mail list for the proposed significant change in the atmosphere and lot usage in Homewood that is being proposed by Mr. Topal and is schedule to be heard by TRPA. My family has been in Homewood 100 years this year and I have been here 76 years.

I sincerely hope you will hear and consider the periphery issues that this proposal will make to our community. For example the 70 or more buoys locate in front on this property and his HI & Dry Marina; these make causal boaters change their course way out into the deep waters of there Lake. His Lakefront operation has minimal at best parking; the very large excess is now dangerously overflowing onto residential streets is having to create diagonal parking along Westlake Blvd. which in turn causes drivers to dangerously back out onto high speed Westlake Blvd. And the impact of reducing the width of his lots to 80 feet with three large residences when the normal lots in Homewood are 100 feet wide and have only one residence! ETC.

Mr. Topal is sometimes referred to as the slumlord of Homewood because of reasons such as his neglect on his property at South and Westlake Blvd; this commercial property still has dirt for a parking lot which when wet creates mud etc. which flows directly into the Lake and otherwise is dusty. The operator of the Pizza Parlor gave up on trying to have him fix a leaky pipe under the building and created a garden pond to hold the water (making lemonade out of a lemon!) ETC.

Ray Perryman
March 29, 2006
Via Federal Express

Mr. Allen Breuch
Mr. Steve Buehna
Placer County Planning Department
Tahoe City District
565 West Lake Blvd.
Tahoe City, CA 96145

Re: Public Hearing, Villas at Harborside.

Dear Sirs:

It has come to my attention that the Placer County Board of Supervisors will be conducting a public hearing on Monday, April 3, 2006, for an item referred to as Villas at Harborside (Project). I am the principal owner of Homewood Mountain Resort (HMR). The HMR base facilities and parking lot are located immediately west of the Project on the opposite side of Highway 89.

I have been advised by members of the Homewood community that the project proponent considers the expansive parking facilities of HMR available as overflow parking for Villas at Harborside, the West Shore Café, and the Homewood Marina facilities.

It is important that the record of the Project proceedings, and any other proceedings pertaining to West Shore Café or Homewood Marina, clearly indicate that HMR parking facilities are only available for use by HMR employees, clients and guests or HMR approved special events. We do not have off-site parking agreements or arrangements of any kind with Villas at Harborside, West Shore Café, and Homewood Marina, or any other property owners.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. If you have questions please call at any time.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Jeffrey A. Yurosek

cc: Each member Placer County Board of Supervisors
Ms. Melissa Shaw, TRPA
Mr. John Singlaub, TRPA
Ms. Lyn Barnett, TRPA
March 27, 2006

The Honorable Supervisor Jim Kranz
District 5
175 Fulweiler Avenue
Auburn, Ca 95603

Re: Villas at Harborside/Appeal Hearing

Dear Supervisor Kranz,

We are writing to express our concerns about the upcoming Appeal hearing regarding the Villas at Harborside. There was a lot of confusion surrounding the Planning Commission Hearing dates for the project. It was scheduled September 9th, rescheduled to September 22, cancelled and rescheduled for October 13th, cancelled again and re-scheduled again for September 22. The project was heard and approved on September 22 with no public input. Why? Because there was clearly a defect in the notice of map modification and legal notice was not given. It appears that for some reason the Planning Commission jumped through hoops to accommodate Topol. Again, we ask why? Could it be that Topol tried to circumvent public scrutiny of the project by requesting changes in the hearing date? The bottom line; notice was not given to Homewood residents.

Mr. Topol has manipulated the system to his advantage time and time again. There comes a time when he should be made accountable. He pays fines instead of complying with the County or TRPA and then he cries that he has paid all these fees and should be allowed to go forward. He tells TRPA one story and Placer County something else. Examples of the blatant manipulation of the system include: Added more living units in the West Shore Café then approved by the County; blocking off Fawn Street for his own personal use (Homewood Marina); placing “no parking” signs all along Highway 89 in front of his properties; promises to give up living units in his motel for the added unapproved units in the West Shore Café. If the County approved the transfer of motel units for the unapproved West Shore Café units then shouldn’t the motel be torn down now before the West Shore Café is opened? Mr. Antonucci stated at the NTRAC hearing in February that the motel rooms were going to be used toward the Villas at Harborside. Is a small motel room similar to bedrooms in an 1800 square foot house? How many times can he transfer the motel units?

If the public had known of the September 22nd hearing of the Planning Commission there would have been strong opposition to the project for the following reasons:
• The Villas at Harborside project violates the intentions of zoning in Homewood. High-density fractional ownership units are NOT APPROPRIATE NOR A LEGAL USE for these parcels in Homeood. The entire project should revert to the approved zoning—SFR.

• Parking requirements for this project represents a departure from typical parking requirements for high density projects in Placer County. The minimal parking requirements plus allowing “stacked” parking will result in SIGNIFICANT TRAFFIC AND SAFETY HAZARDS. Why would the parking requirements on “environmentally” sensitive Lake Tahoe be more lenient then other areas of Placer County?

• Twelve homes on four parcels versus four single family residences is a huge departure in COVERAGE and TRPA’s requirement for a view corridor.

Most Homewood residents oppose this project. Many residents will not speak out because they fear Topol will not let them store their boats at his marina. We wish to preserve Homewood’s quaint, low density, rural atmosphere and uphold the spirit and previously approved zoning (SFR). Thank you for your consideration in this very important matter.

Sincerely,

Lorie & Paul Cress

Residents for a quaint, low density, rural Homewood.
Melissa Shaw

From: Julie Regan
Sent: Thursday, March 30, 2006 5:16 PM
To: 'Earl Koberlein'
Cc: John Singlaub; Melissa Shaw
Subject: RE: Our opposition to the Villas at Horborside

Hello Dr. and Mrs. Koberlein -

Thank you for your letter. We will keep it in the project file and share with our Governing Board when the project goes before them.

Kind Regards,
Julie Regan

Julie W. Regan, APR
Communications Director
Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
775-588-4547 x 237

-----Original Message-----
From: Earl Koberlein [mailto:ewkdds@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Tuesday, March 28, 2006 4:21 PM
To: John Singlaub; Julie Regan; Allen Breuch
Subject: Fw: Our opposition to the Villas at Horborside

Dr. Earl Koberlein, DDS

Note!  New email address:
       ewkdds@sbcglobal.net
----- Original Message -----
From: Barb Koberlein
To: Earl Koberlein, Sr.
Sent: Tuesday, March 28, 2006 4:14 PM
Subject: Our opposition to the Villas at Horborside

The attachment is a letter which we sent to the Placer County Board of Supervisors at Large and to Supervisor Brace Kranz. We want you and your Department to also know that we are against the development. Our reasons are stated in the letter.

Sincerely, Earl and Barbara Koberlein

5090 West Lake Blvd, Homewood, Ca       (530)5254619

4/3/2006
April 25, 2006

Dear Mrs. Smith,

As a homeowner at Humwood, I oppose the Hanford-Wood project. The proposed addition will make it more dangerous and the Soil Watcher will also be in more danger and that our kids need.

Sincerely,

Charlotte Johnson
5040 W. Lake Bluff
Humwood, CA 96141
Ms. Irwin,

As a property owner and a member of the Homewood Homeowners Association, I am in agreement and totally support the propositions and criticism contained in Lord Derby Orr's letter of 10-13-05. Copy included.

In particular I am distressed with the amount of noise Mr. Apple has been allowed to make in the lake and the lack of adequate parking at the present time which will only be worsened by Mr. Lord's addition to continue this development.

Thank you for any consideration you can give this letter and Lord Derby Orr's letter of 10-13-05 included.

Charlotte Johnson
483 Crocker Road
Sacramento, California 95864

10-23-05
Charlotte Johnson
483 Crocker Road
Sacramento, California 95864

April 25, 2006

Dear Mr. Dingman,

As a neighborhood resident, I oppose the Harbordale project. The traffic conditions are now dangerous and this will make it worse. This will also bring in more frogs and that is not needed.

Thank you,
Charlotte H. Johnson
5040 W. Lake Blvd.
Northwood, CA 96141
Re: 5120 Westlake Ave.
Hermosa Bldg.
Applicant Mr. Lopez

Gentlemen:

This letter is to request you "DO NOT" approve the above request. Parking of both cars + trailers is a serious problem. Cars are being parked in our driveway at 5070 Westlake Blvd.

Thank you,

John S. Sonn
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitted By</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lorie Cress</td>
<td><strong>RE: The Villas at Harborside Project.</strong> The level of environmental reports prepared by both Placer County and TRPA on the above referenced project are too low. The proposed Villas at Harborside project consists of 9 quartershare units. Three quarter share units already exist and the West Shore Cafe was just completed. Any Environmental Documents should include the impact of the entire property and the cumulative effect of all including the proposed 9 units, the existing 3 units, the West Shore Cafe, the Homewood Motel and the Homewood Marina. Together the impact on the neighborhood is very dramatic both from a density aspect but especially from a traffic and safety issue. I request that an EIR document be prepared before the project is approved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorie Cress</td>
<td><strong>Non-Compliance Issue.</strong> Mr. Topol stated in a presentation at the West Shore Cafe to a group of 100+ concerned citizens of Homewood that he did not know what he was going to do with the Grubstake Lodge. He said he did not know if he would tear it down or not tear it down. Three TAU's were transferred from the Grubstake Lodge to the West Shore Cafe and/or the existing three Villas At Harborside units. In a meeting our group had with TRPA on August 18th, it was stated that as part of the compliance the Grubstake Lodge was to be torn down. Its now been over a year for the existing Villas at Harborside and over 3 months since the opening of the West Shore Cafe and the Grubstake Lodge is still standing and base on Mr. Topol's response at his presentation on September 2nd, he has no plans to tear the Grubstake Lodge down. Before any other approvals could be considered for Mr. Topol's projects (Villas at Harborside) at the Sept. 27 TRPA Governing Board hearing, this issue should be resolved. Mr. Topol should tear down the building before granting any approvals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Chapman/Darrel Garcia</td>
<td>We have observed the ongoing trees dying/removal on the above locations. When the West Shore Cafe was under construction there were quite a few &quot;old growth&quot; trees in the parking lot and around the structure. TRPA must have some a history/diagram of the trees that existed on the project before construction of the West Shore Cafe. After the structure was completed, in 2005, and just before the parking lot was going to be asphalted, many of the old growth trees started dying. They have subsequently been removed and covered with asphalt. The photos of before and after the West Shore Cafe parking lot will come by snail mail. Has TRPA tracked the loss of those trees and made adjustments in the coverage area of the West Shore Cafe? Once the trees were removed, more coverage area was made available for the parking lot. Has that coverage adjustment been made? Did TRPA make a determination as to why those trees at the West Shore Cafe suddenly died? In 2006 many trees on Lots 2-5 are dead and/or dying. Many of the dead trees were removed in late July and early August. The photos of the dead/dying trees will come by snail mail. The dead/dying old growth trees on lots 2, 3 &amp; 4 are puzzling since construction has not begun. TRPA should investigate why these trees died. What benefit would these dead trees have on the &quot;applicant's project&quot;? Will the &quot;applicant&quot; increase the size or locations of the proposed Villas project now that so many trees have died on Lots 2-4? Does the loss of trees affect &quot;Coverage&quot; for the proposed project? TRPA needs to investigate and determine the cause of death of so many trees and not grant any approvals until this investigation is completed. Lot 5 has several dead trees that have been removed. Again, TRPA should monitor and determine cause of death and what positive effect the dead/removed trees would have on &quot;applicant&quot;. This study should be done before the TRPA hearing on Sept. 27th. The Photos of the dead/dying trees both for the West Shore Cafe and Lots 2-5 will be sent to Jeff Cowen via snail mail.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Non-Compliance with 1995 TRPA Settlement agreement between TRPA and Mr. Nate Topol, etc. We are filing the complaint and will follow with photos of the non-compliance by snail mail. We do not live on the lake; in fact we live behind the Grubstake Eyesore. In reviewing the Settlement Agreement we note the following non-compliance issues: The 1995 Settlement Agreement, Item 3, specifically states that there should be "open access to the public, and will not be blocked, fenced, nor will the public be otherwise prevented from accessing that beachfront portion of the property". The photos taken from the Marina toward the West Shore cafe clearly show that there is no "open access to the public" and if they wanted to walk the beach and access the stairs over the piers, they would have to be knee deep in water. Item 6 goes on to address an "overlook on Fawn Street adjacent to the Marina,..."to design, develop and build so that bicyclist and pedestrians may have access to and otherwise enjoy viewscape from lakefront portion......." While a bike/pedestrian path was constructed right long a private residence as you can see from the photograph, the bike path is blocked with cars parked on that path. The photos you will receive show now only cars parked on the bike/walking path but no "overlook" and a very unsafe side of the Marina without IN addition, Item 8 states that future owners are bound to items 3, 4, 5 & 6 however we have been told by reliable sources that the current owners of the existing Villas at Harborside units have told people that the beach is private and to get off. We are requesting that TRPA review the CC&R's for the Villas at Harborside to be assured that Item 8 of the Settlement Agreement includes wording stating that Public Access to the beach on front of those properties is legal and should be abided by. Mr. Topol should be made to provide visible and safe access for the public from both Fawn Street and Silver Street across his entire "Homewood" properties. This should include signs, a clear route of ingress and egress, no obstacles along the beach such as boats, canoes, (see photos) that would block or otherwise hinder the use of the beach. The access by the marina is very hazardous at present. There are 3-4 very large fork lifts that are constantly in operation and there is no place for a person to safely get to the beach area. The three story boat storage units also block the route so do the dozens of rows of boats, canoes, etc., that cover the beach. The Photos Will Arrive addressed to Jeff Cowen via snail mail.

Homewood Marina, West Shore Cafe and Proposed Harborside Villas:1) In order to walk along the beach you must enter the water to use the stairs over the pier. The stairs should be relocated to the high water mark.2) As I understand it, the total coverage per the settlement agreement is 76,710 sqft. for lot's 1-9. How much coverage currently exists? And how much coverage will the proposed Harbor Villas add? Has TRPA received a certified, stamp plan from a licensed surveyor? If not, will it be required?3) The plan's I reviewed for coverage showed that Fawn Street was a public access and if you visit the site, Fawn street is an integral part of the Marina operation—it is used for customer parking. you will also note that Fawn street end's before the lake , how did this transfer to the owner—all feeder street's in Homewood end at the lake.4) The Grubstake motel is still in operation, I thought the TAU's were transferred for the room's at the West Shore cafe.

9/12/2006

Re: The Villas at Harborside. The focus of this complaint pertains to the minimal off-street parking requirement and the inappropriate use of stacked parking and its effect on the surrounding Homewood neighborhood. Upon completion, the Harborside timeshare housing project will consist of twelve single-family dwellings, on four lots, each containing 3-bedrooms and a loft, 3-bathrooms, with a total living area of 1,785 square feet per dwelling. Three of the dwellings have already constructed. Parking Demand Requirements Placer County Code Section 17.54.310 Timeshare Projects, states the following. Off-street parking for timeshare projects, residential and transient residential, shall be one and one-half space per unit, plus one additional space per bedroom for each unit with more than two bedrooms, plus one space for each permanent employee working on the project after completion and occupancy. As confirmed with Placer County, this would result in a minimum requirement of 14 off-street spaces for each lot containing three dwellings. However, Placer County goes on to state that even though Section 17.54.310 applies to all timeshare projects throughout the county, there is an exception on the West Shore of Lake Tahoe. This exception is contained in a manual, developed in February of 1994, known as the Placer County Design Standards and Guidelines for the Tahoe City Community Plan, Tahoe City Area General Plan and West Shore Area of Placer County. Pursuant to this 1994 Design Standards, Timeshare projects on the West Shore are considered Tourist Accommodations and as such fall under the off-street parking requirements of hotels and motels; that is, 1 space per guest room or unit. Thus, Placer County states that the maximum off-street parking requirement, for each 1,785 square foot, 3-bedroom residence at the Harborside project, is one space per dwelling. It seems common sense has gone out the window.
The intensity of use, and parking demand, for residential units, timeshare or not, is the same, and perhaps even greater on the environmentally sensitive West Shore, and yet the Placer County zoning requirements on the West Shore less restrictive than other areas of the county. This is truly a substance over form issue. That is to say, while Placer County may choose to call these, tenant in common, fee simple ownership, timeshare dwellings Tourist Accommodations and place them in the same parking demand category as 300 square foot motel rooms, they are not, and never will be, hotel or motel rooms by any interpretation. They are not similar in size or design, nor are they similar in frequency of use or length of stay. While their entitlements, TAUs, are derived from an older motel located adjacent to the subject property, with units approximately one-sixth of the size subject dwellings, that is not sufficient reason to classify these 1,785 square foot dwellings, hotel or motel rooms. On the West Shore of Tahoe, hotel and motel rooms can range in occupancy from 35% to 100% depending on the season. The subject dwellings are anticipated to sell for as much as $750,000 per quarter-share interest with homeowners dues at $500, per month, per dwelling. It is unlikely that any quarter share owner would not use his or her interval of use.

It is reasonable to anticipate, that unlike hotel and motel rooms, the 12 dwellings at the Harborside project will be occupied 52-weeks per year which will increase parking demand requirement beyond that of a hotel or motel room. A recent internet offering indicates that each Harborside dwelling can accommodate 6 to 8 residents which translate to at least of three cars, maybe four, not including casual callers, service and delivery vehicles or longer-stay visitors. Perhaps the parking demand requirement of 1 off-street parking space per guest room should be 1 space per sleeping room as in other jurisdictions. If the average hotel and motel unit on the West Shore of Tahoe is one sleeping room of 250 to 325 square feet, the term guest room or unit may be synonymous with sleeping room. Such an interpretation would yield a parking demand requirement to 3 off-street parking spaces per dwelling and 4 if you include the loft.

Stacked Parking: The developer has stated that through the feature of stacked parking (which is essentially tandem parking, that is one car behind another) he has a total of 8 off-street parking spaces per three dwellings. However, Chapter 12, of the 1994 Placer County Design Standards and Guidelines manual (page 12-2) makes no provision for stacked parking with Tourist Accommodations. Stacked parking is permitted for single family houses and similar residential uses, and is limited to no more than two vehicles. Guidelines, Section E. (page 12-6) of the Design Standard, states that; stacked parking areas are recommended only when vehicles are directed or parked by parking attendants. Chapter 12 (page 12-4) goes on to state that all maneuvering shall be accomplished on-site. Backing out onto a street is not allowed. The current parking lot design has no turn-around areas leaving little or no onsite maneuvering. Upon departure from the parking lots, as currently designed, the only option may be to back out onto highway 89 which would endanger pedestrians and bicyclists, impede the flow of traffic on highway 89, detract from a drivers comfort in a public roadway and reduce response time by emergency vehicles.

Another critical concern in terms of safety is the circulation or pattern of movement of pedestrians, bicyclists and automobiles within the stacked parking lot area. There is no provision for adequate ingress or egress by pedestrians or bicyclists from the public right-of-way, through the parking lot to the proposed dwellings. If the developer now wishes to assert that the Villas at Harborside, are in fact, single family houses to accommodate the feature of stacked parking; is the underlying land, Commercial or Single-Family Residential? If Commercial, stacked parking should not be permitted. If in fact the underlying land is intended to be Single-Family Residential; the developer should only be allowed 1 dwelling per lot. The Settlement Agreement between TRPA and Homewood, Dated February 22, 1995, clearly demonstrates the intent of mixed use, that is some lots to be commercial with other lots at the north end of the development to be single-family residential where a single driveway will serve each pair of side-by-side home sites (e.g., three driveways serving six home sites).

Conclusion Single-Family Residential; Commercial; Timesharing: Call the project what you will, the fact remains, 1 off-street parking space per 1,785 square foot dwelling is simply not enough. The provision of Code Section 17.54.310, that is 4.5 off-street parking spaces per dwelling, for the permitted use of timesharing, is by far, more appropriate. As to the feature of stacked parking one only need look at the current proposed parking lot design to realize that it simply will not work. It is deficient in onsite maneuvering and pedestrian circulation. Stacked parking in this application is not only inconvenient but also a detriment to public safety, the quality of life, and the general welfare, of the surrounding neighborhood.
**Paul Cress**

The 1995 Settlement Agreement between Topol/TRPA allowed for coverage of 77,781 square feet and including Lot 1 which is the first parcel south of Silver Street through Lot 9, the Hi & Dry Marina. This coverage area was agreed upon in the 1995 Settlement Agreement between TRPA and Topol. The agreement further states that 77,781 Sq. Ft. is considered the "total" coverage within the PROJECT AREA. In a presentation at the Homewood Homeowner’s Association Meeting on September 3rd, 2006, Mr. Topol stated that he owned a portion of Fawn Street. In looking at the Engineer’s rendering (Book U of Maps, Page 39) that area is not included on any of the drawings or included in coverage. Since Mr. Topol owns that area and is using it as part of the Hi & Dry Marina operation, it should be included in the "total" coverage area when calculating the 77,781 Sq. Ft.

Mr. Topol has a steel gate that drops down signifying his ownership. He also has a large three-tiered boat storage rack parked on that section of Fawn Street as part of the marina operation. That additional section of Fawn Street that is owed by Topol should be calculated and subtracted from the 77,781 Sq. Ft. There has also been additional paving to the north and west of the Hi & Dry Marina and in front of the Motel to accommodate additional 3-tiered boat rack storage units. That area should be calculated and subtracted from the 77,781 Sq. Ft.

The West Shore Cafe originally had quite a few "old growth" trees in the parking lot. Those trees died just before the parking lot was surfaced. Additional coverage was added once the trees were removed. That additional area should be calculated and subtracted from the 77,781 Sq. Ft. Both the Hi & Dry Marina and the West Shore Cafe extend onto the beach area and therefore the length of those two parcels differ and are longer in length than Lots 1-5 and Lots 7 & 8. Lot 6 & 9 should be calculated based on the exact length of the lot’s coverage area and be considered 100% coverage. (IE Lot 1 has a length of 178.46 while Lots 6 & 9 could be around 280-290) The additional coverage should be calculated and subtracted from the 77,781 Sq. Ft. The parcel between the Motel and the West Shore Cafe (Lot #7) is now being used to store paving materials and park employee cars. That area should be calculated and 100% coverage should be subtracted from the 77,781 Sq. Ft.

In addition, Mr. Topol informed us at his September 2nd presentation, which he has applied to use Lot #7 for a wedding/banquet/concert venue. (where will they park?) Because additional coverage has been added to existing and new construction subsequent to approvals, the TRPA should hire an independent (non-employee of Mr. Topol) to provide an accurate survey and assessment of the entire Homewood Project (Lot 1 - 9 + a portion of Fawn Street). This survey should be done prior to any approvals for the proposed Villas at Harborside.

**Lorie Cress**

Part of the "Conditions" of Mr. Topol's approval process requires creating a barrier between views of the three tiered boat storage racks from the Lake. Mr. Topol planted approximately fifty 20’ high trees that appear to be aspen or birch along with approximately 6 pines and between the trees are smaller shrubs. The trees are planted approximately 4’ out from his rock wall. The trees are planted right in the beach. The trees are surrounded with 100% beach rock. I could not tell if the trees are planted directly into the gravel or dirt was added to the hole before the trees were planted. Not only will the wave action erode any dirt but the trees will not survive due to the high water table on the beach. If there is a lake storm, the dirt that was placed in the holes to plant these trees will be washed into the Lake causing an erosion/silt runoff problem.

1. I believe these trees will not survive and we will be left with 50+ dead or dying trees to look at in addition to the boat storage units.
2. Setting a precedent by allowing dirt and plants/trees to be placed on the beach is unhealthy for Lake Tahoe. The dirt will be washed away by lake storms, any fertilizer placed around the trees will filter into the lake.
3. What backup plan has TRPA set in place when the trees die? If Mr. Topol is allowed to call the plantings in the beach a solution to a "condition" then we will be stuck with a bigger problem. This is not a solution, this is now another problem.
4. Topol should be stopped from planting on the beach.......he should be made to dig up his own paved area along his breakwater and to dig holes and plant the trees back from the beach.

Photos to follow to Jeff Cowen.
About 100 Homewood residents attended a presentation by Mr. Topol regarding his proposed Villas at Harborside project on Sat. Sept. 2, 2006. At that meeting Mr. Topol stated that he was going to apply and intending to use Lot 7 (between West Shore Cafe and Homewood Motel) as a wedding/concert venue. Placer County has stated that they have heard rumors about this proposal for Lot 7, but no application has been submitted at this date. Our group of Concerned Homewood Citizens contend that this is another tactic of Mr. Topol's in which he is not required to submit plans for his entire project. He has been allowed to submit peace meal plans for Lot 5, Lot 6, and currently Lots 2-4. Originally he had applied for only approval of Lot 4; however we have been told that TRPA made him apply for lots 2-4.

We believe that TRPA and Placer County should make Mr. Topol submit plans for the entire project (Lot 2 - Lot 9). The addition of 9 quarter share units) Proposed Villas at Harborside) alone will impose considerable increased density and parking issues in Homewood. Adding a wedding/concert venue that could accommodate possibly 300 people with NO PARKING will impose yet another huge impact on Homewood.

Finally, we have been told by TRPA that ultimately the Homewood Motel will be torn down. WHAT ARE THE PLANS FOR THAT PARCEL (LOT 8) ONCE THE STRUCTURE IS GONE? Lot 7 and lot 8 should be considered at the same time TRPA hears the Villas at Harborside. Highway 89 through Homewood is already highly impacted through the months of May - September with traffic congestion and parking issues. Mr. Topol said that he will "find" parking for any wedding/concert venue. He stated that he would bus people in for events. That is not a realistic scenario. People want access to their cars and will not be willing to be bused in from miles away. That is not an acceptable solution. The employees of both, the West Shore Cafe, Motel and Hi & Dry Marina, have no place to park. The clients of the Hi & Dry Marina whose boats are moored on the 150+- buoys in front of the marina have no place to park.
The excess guests of the Villas at Harborside and the West Shore Cafe have no place to park. THE ONLY PLACE ANY OF THESE PEOPLE CAN PARK IS ON HIGHWAY 89 OR ON THE SIDE STREETS OF HOMEWOOD. IN FRONT OF ONE HOUSE TO THE SOUTH OF THE MARINA EMPLOYEES HAVE STARTED PARALLEL PARKING THEIR CARS. THEY ALSO PARALLEL PARK ON FAWN STREET ALONG THE SIDE OF THE SAME PRIVATE RESIDENCE. THE CARS THAT PARALLEL PARK ON FAWN STREET BLOCK THE "BIKE/WALKING" PATH TO THE LAKE. (SEE PHOTOS SENT WITH COMPLAINT REGARDING BEACH ACCESS). THE CONGESTION AND TRAFFIC SAFETY ISSUES ARE NOT RECORDED IN MR. TOPOL’S TRAFFIC REPORTS WHICH WERE SUBMITTED WITH HIS APPLICATIONS.

MR. TOPOL ALSO USED TRAFFIC/PARKING FIGURES FROM MOTELS ON THE NORTH SHORE TO SUGGEST THE NUMBER OF CARS THAT WOULD BE REMOVED FROM STREET PARKING ONCE THE VILLAS AT HARBORSIDE ARE CONSTRUCTED. WHY DOESN’T MR. TOPOL USE THE ACTUAL FIGURES FROM HIS MOTEL? THE MOTEL IS IN SUCH BAD CONDITION, I DOUBT THERE ARE 1000 VISITS A YEAR TO THAT MOTEL. MR. TOPOL STATED HE DID NOT HAVE THOSE FIGURES.......HE OWNS THE BUSINESS, HE SHOULD BE MADE TO USE THOSE FIGURES.

THE CONCERNED RESIDENTS OF HOMEWOOD REQUEST THAT BEFORE TRPA GOES FORWARD WITH THE HEARING ON THE VILLAS AT HARBORSIDE, MR. TOPOL SHOULD BE REQUIRED TO SUBMIT THE PLANS FOR HIS ENTIRE DEVELOPMENT INCLUDING LOTS 2 - 9. THE ENTIRE PROJECT SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN ANY ENVIRONMENTAL REPORTS AS TO THE IMPACT ON HOMEWOOD AND LAKE TAHOE. WHILE THE BUOY FIELD APPEARS TO BE ANOTHER ISSUE, THE BUOY FILED AND HI & DRY MARINA WITH THE UNSIGHTLY 3-TIERED STORAGE UNITS IS ALSO A PART OF MR. TOPOL’S DEVELOPMENT. EVERYTHING SHOULD BE INCLUDED BEFORE ANY PROJECTS, INCLUDING THE VILLAS AT HARBORSIDE, ARE APPROVED.

CONCERNED HOMEWOOD CITIZENS

Lorie Cress

Mr. Topol has not complied with TRPA’s requirement for Scenic Quality as referenced in the TRPA Code of Ordinances. The Hi & Dry Marina is in non-compliance due to the three-tiered boat storage units which stretch approximately 100+ feet along the shores of Lake Tahoe. TRPA continues to address lakefront homeowners with issues like colors of exterior, roof color, fences, and vegetation requirements. The Settlement Agreement between TRPA and Mr. Topol was signed in 1995. Mr. Topol has been allowed to build a single family residence, three time-share homes and the West Shore Cafe in the ensuing ELEVEN years, yet Mr. Topol has not been directed to clean up, and hide the visual pollution that exists from both the highway and especially offshore.

We have seen time and time again in presentations done by Mr. Topol’s employees, depictions of grasses growing in front of the three-tiered boat storage racks but not in all the past ELEVEN years has TRPA demanded that something be done. Why is TRPA more lenient with commercial development then residential? It would seem the reverse should be true. TRPA should require Mr. Topol to remove/hide those hideous boat storage units from sight BEFORE ANY MORE DEVELOPMENT IS PERMITTED ON ANY OF HIS PROJECTS.

Photo of boat rack was emailed to Jeff Cowen today.

Mike Hawkins


The applicant proposes to circumvent a number of TRPA Codes of Ordinance, as well as the basic intent and charges of TRPA’s bi-state compact as established in the late 1960s (and as revised by the United States Congress in 1980) to preserve and enhance the environment and resources of the Lake Tahoe Basin. The bases cited for not conforming to established legal ordinances are in a 11 -year-old agreement between the applicant and TRPA staff that in essence permits the applicant carte blanche to do whatever he wishes, regardless of present regulations. Clearly, if existing and valid ordinances were being enforced today, this project would be significantly different!

Consequently, I strongly recommend that the TRPA Board of Governors disavow and invalidate the agreement of February 22, 1995 and disapprove the project in its present form and structure. The reasons and justifications for these actions follows:

As part of the action by the Board, the Mitigated Negative Declaration should not be approved, primarily because the invalid justifications provided by the applicant for circumventing the environmental ordinances do not in any manner mitigate the proposed environmental degradations.
Clearly, this project in its present form is not compatible with the intent and purposes of TRPA's compact. I cannot believe that the framers of the TRPA Compact (and perhaps the 1995 Agreement) ever envisioned that nine single-family residences would be constructed on three lots in such a way that a panoramic view of the Lake and distant mountains would be limited solely to a few owners to the exclusion of thousands of visitors and Basin residents. I strongly encourage the Board of Governors to disapprove this project in its present form. MBH

Marion Z. Burrows

Already there is a parking problem in Homewood. With the addition of nine time-shares instead of three homes on three lots, there will be more parking issues. If three homes (as ugly as these mega-homes are in my humble opinion) were built, at least the homes would have huge garage areas for the many huge toys as well as visitor parking contained on-site.

Most important as stated in previous messages from Homewood residents, is the piece-meal approach to development of the entire area by the owner, Mr. Topol. To TRPA, I add my request to that of others that TRPA request Mr. Topol to provide a plan for entire development of his Homewood holdings. His credibility then would be enhanced and the general public could realize that his statements regarding his concern about retaining the quality of a unique west shore community while proceeding with growth and development are sincere.
REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION
AND
COMMUNITY OUTREACH
Melissa and Jeff, I would like to thank you both for taking the time to meet with us this past Thursday. You were gracious enough to go over our allotted hour meeting but there is so much information to cover and so many different issues that it takes a tremendous amount of time. You answered many questions on Thursday, however I wanted to restate the issues that we discussed that required more research on your part and add a few additional questions or clarification of
issues that were discussed at the meeting:

1. Provide a photo copy of the Coverage Breakdown document that was based on the settlement between Topol and TRPA. That was the document that shows how many square feet were allocated to each parcel. My fax is on the blink so if you would fax it to my husband's fax which is 916 362-7888 or if you could scan and email it that would be great. I'm leaving this Wednesday for Tahoe.

2. I believe Jeff was going to look into the transferring of the TAU's to both the West Shore Cafe, the existing three time share units and the proposed units. Could you please email me the breakdown of each?

3. Regarding the discrepancy of the length of the parcels and the fact that the parcel map provided by Mr. Topol's engineers show the parcels going 50' under Lake Tahoe.......were you going to ask Mr. Topol to provide a certified survey and ask about the discrepancy or will TRPA do the survey? How can we follow up on this issue?

4. What, if anything, is going on with the non-compliance issue for the existing time share units and the tearing down of the Grubstake.

In addition, I was told that Topol blacktopped the parking lot of the Grubstake last Friday and that while Placer County attempted to stop the work the workers were ordered to complete the work. One rumor I heard was that TRPA also tried to stop it but Topol told his workers to proceed. Can you comment on TRPA's involvement?

5. What would be the time line to tear down the Homewood Motel if TAU's were transferred from the motel to the West Shore Cafe?

6. I inquired about an EIR and you said that TRPA uses a Scenic Quality Review document. Who prepares that document for this project and has it been completed? Is the person who lives out of state and is handling the "fast track" review of the project also the person who prepares the Scenic Quality Review? Does someone actually visit the site or is TRPA just relying on the conceptual rendering provided by Topol. Because, if there is not an on-site inspection, I feel that is a tremendous injustice to the residents of Homewood who will have to live with this project forever.

Can I request a copy of the Scenic Quality document?
7. In our discussion about the Zoning for the project, Jeff indicated that time share (residential) zoning was a legal zoning for the project. Mr. David Powell who is a member of the Homewood Homeowner's Board and was part of the Citizens Group that established the West Shore Community Plan will be contacting Jeff regarding this issue. It is my understanding that Placer County required the submission of a "Special Use Permit" because Time Share was outside the legal zoning for those parcels.

Jeff, who prepared the document you gave me titled: 159 Homewood/Commercial?

8. Can we get a copy of any letters from TRPA to Mr. Topol, his attorney or employees regarding issues relating to the Villas at Harborside project. In other words, we would like to see questions raised by TRPA regarding the project and Mr. Topol, his attorney or employee's response to those questions.

Melissa, I was very sorry to hear you are leaving TRPA and am requesting that either you or Jeff let me know who your replacement is as soon as you know. Also, if I am not already on the email list to be notified of any actions regarding this project, please add me to your list.

Melissa, you stated that as of now the project is considered "incomplete" and I wanted confirmation that the Villas at Harborside project will not be heard at the July TRPA Governing Board meeting.

I will be at Tahoe from 6/28-7/21 and mail can be sent to me:
Lorie Cress
General Delivery
Homewood, CA as of 6/28

If you are sending mail to that address would you please email to let me know mail is coming? I would be happy to drive over to TRPA to meet on any of these issues.
Thank you, Lorie Cress
Hi Lori,
You have caught me in the midst of uncovering loads of documents on the Harborside project. I am working on an in-depth response to your previous email and will add this question to the list.

I haven’t gotten anywhere on the asphalt sealing issue this past weekend. Our compliance division isn’t aware of a problem with it and I haven’t been able to call Placer County about it. Did you find anything out about that issue?

When we have a response ready for your previous email, I will send it to all on that list, okay?

JEFF COWEN
COMMUNITY LIAISON
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

JCOWEN@TRPA.ORG
(775) 588-4547 X 278

Hi Jeff; here is what Placer County's rule is regarding the Villas at Harborside. Does TRPA have a similar ruling.....ie some sort of Conditional Use Permit.
Thanks for the updates, Lorie
Hi Lorie and All,

Our response to the issues forwarded by you and others concerning Mr. Topol’s project have been an important priority and will be coming both electronically and via mail very soon. I apologize for the wait, but significant research and input from many people are being incorporated to offer meaningful answers.
You have forwarded many more questions since our meeting, and I attempt to answer those from your July 10 email below.

It is standard procedure for TRPA to outsource the review of certain projects. We are receiving record numbers of applications every year and it is important to expedite our review time during the summer months. Outsourcing review of certain projects serves two important purposes: 1) By freeing up our full-time planners, it speeds the review of many smaller projects; and 2) it provides better, more efficient customer service. During peak building season we often contract out to experienced planners like Melissa Douglas, who is reviewing the Villas project (not to be confused with Melissa Shaw, who was the full-time planner here supervising the review). Such contractors are retained and compensated by TRPA and are selected by us based on their experience with the type of project. We take full responsibility for their review and trust Melissa Douglas’ ability to carefully review the project and to protect Lake Tahoe as well as your community.

I think Melissa Shaw may have been mistaken when, at our meeting, she said Melissa Douglas had been requested by Mr. Topol. In fact it was Cathy Canfield, Mr. Topol’s own consultant, who was requested as the outside planner. The fact that we denied his first request does not mean that any request from an applicant has any bearing on who reviews the project. In the Villas case, we chose Melissa Douglas based on her prior experience as a full-time planner here. She has provided an important service to us on many projects, each with positive results for the environment.

Concerning the outside planner contracted to review the Villas project, there is no conflict of interest for several reasons. All applicants pay a filing fee that is based on the number of staff hours it takes to review their project. If the number of staff hours spent goes over the normal amount, an additional fee is due before the permit is either issued or denied. Our project review team is funded entirely by filing fees, so we must recover 100% of our cost to review. Therefore, all applicants, not just Mr. Topol, pay for someone to review their project. That doesn’t change the
review process and the findings that we must make for a project applicant to receive a permit.

No one here has any knowledge of the Grubstake blacktopping issue. Sealing legally existing pavement is an exempt activity as it falls under the category of normal maintenance and repair.

Theresa Avance is the full-time planner taking over our review of the project. Melissa Shaw and I are passing your concerns as well as our findings on to her.

Your question concerning your group’s legal options to stop the project is awaiting a response from our legal staff. What I can tell you for now is that we use our project review process to address all compliance issues on a property. Before the proposed Villas project is approved, our compliance officers will be asked to investigate and report on issues in the project area. If and/or when that happens, the list will be available upon your request.

According to Angela Silva, Mr. Topol’s consultant, the demolition of the Grubstake is waiting for a demolition permit from Placer County and a Qualified Exempt Permit from us. It sounds like the wheels are in motion there.

If all goes as planned, the more lengthy response will be coming the beginning of next week.

Regards,

JEFF COWEN
COMMUNITY LIAISON
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
JCOWEN@TRPA.ORG
(775) 588-4547 X 278

From: LCress7199@aol.com [mailto:LCress7199@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, July 10, 2006 11:12 AM
To: Jeff Cowen
Cc: Allen Breuch; danbestranch@thegrid.net; 4homewood@sbcglobal.net; Kcarling@charter.net; bearsnsquirrels@sbcglobal.net; PCDress7199@aol.com;
Hi Jeff; I was wondering what headway you are making in the Villas at Harborside questions I emailed you on June 25th?

Our group has a question regarding the hiring of an outside consultant for that project. It is our feeling that by allowing Mr. Topol to select the consultant to "fast track" the review of his Villas at Harborside project and then pay for her to do the review.....would constitute a conflict of interest? Is that a standard procedure for TRPA to allow the selection of the reviewer by the applicant?

I looked into the blacktop paving of the Grubstake and was told that Placer County tried to step in but that another agency had told Topol he could do it. Wouldn't TRPA have to approve any blacktopping particularly since the Grubstake TAU's are suppose to have been used for one of the existing projects. If Topol is supposed to tear down part or all of the Grubstake for transfer of TAU's then why did he blacktop the parking lot with blacktopped paths to each of the Grubstake Lodge units?

Is there some sort of legal recourse we have to request that all the Villas at Harborside project be stopped until all the "non-compliance" issues with the existing projects are resolved? Melissa Shaw stated that he was in "non-compliance" with the transfer of TAU's and I believe he is in non-compliance with the buoy field, and the Homewood Marine boat storage. Can you inform our group all of the issues that Mr. Topol is in "non-compliance"

Has anyone been selected to take Melissa Shaw's place in coordinating the Villas at Harborside project?

I'm at Tahoe and would be happy to meet with you.
Hello Susan Gearhart,

We recognize that the outcome of the Villas at Harborside project is important to the Homewood community, and have raised the level of review to our Governing Board. Once our staff-level review is complete, we will write a recommendation, either for denial or approval, and ask that it be placed on the soonest available Governing Board agenda. The Board will let us know when the project will be heard at one of its monthly meetings. We can’t say when that will be. Please keep an eye on the “Meetings & Notices” page of our website at http://www.trpa.org/default.aspx?tabindex=0&tabid=100 for this and all other matters of concern in your community. All Governing Board meetings are open to the public and are held on the fourth Wednesday of every month.

I have been responding to other questions and concerns raised by members of the Homewood community and will send notice to the group’s email list when we know the project has been scheduled. The staff members reviewing the project are aware of the specific concerns raised by the surrounding community.

I noticed that your email address is on that list, so you should be receiving a copy of my answers to questions sent to me by Lorie Cress. Keep an eye out for that as well. The letter includes an explanation of how to request a specific time on the agenda of a Board meeting to comment on a project. Otherwise, there is a set period on every monthly agenda for open public comment.
As for the Negative Declaration you mentioned, Placer County would have overseen that process since Negative Declarations are part of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). We are a bi-state agency and have a similar process, called a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI), which has not become part of the permitting process for the Villas as of yet. Perhaps Placer County could better address any issues with the Negative Declaration.

Thank you for your concern and for contacting us.

Sincerely,

JEFF COWEN
COMMUNITY LIAISON
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
JCOWEN@TRPA.ORG
(775) 588-4547 X 278

From: Angela Moniot
Sent: Friday, July 21, 2006 8:08 AM
To: Jeff Cowen
Subject: FW: Harbor Villa's @ Homewood

Can you handle? Thanks

From: Grasslandladyvm@aol.com
Sent: Thursday, July 20, 2006 9:36 PM
To: Angela Moniot
Subject: Harbor Villa's @ Homewood

Hello,
I am a homeowner in Homewood. Villa’s at Harborside, in Homewood should be on your agenda as an item for development soon. Could you possible return my email with a date that it is going to be discussed. We are very interested in attending. We believe the Negative Declaration process is not the instrument to evaluate the cumulative impacts of this project due to traffic, parking, water quality and several other issues on the Neg.Dec. presently. This project must be reviewed for the cumulative impacts of development
Thank You,
Susan R. Gearhart
Hi Lorie,

We would like to invite you and other concerned citizens for another meeting, where we can discuss our response to your questions, when you return to the Lake. There is consensus here that your questions and issues have complex responses that would be better presented and understood face to face.

Let us know what dates and times are good for you and we will schedule a meeting with other experts here. I am mailing the documents you requested to you in Sacramento.

I wanted to clarify that the Grubstake Lodge is more than just the restaurant on the highway. There are several buildings behind it and the three TAUs for the Villas came from just one structure in the back.

We have been following this closely and Brian Judge, our Compliance Chief, visited the Grubstake after your email about the blacktopping. He investigated and found that there is legally existing pavement there; it was just covered with dirt. That is why repaving was Exempt from our regulations, which we told Placer County.

You may have gotten the impression from our meeting with Melissa Shaw that the Old Post Office café was to be torn down; but the TAUs were not transferred from that building.

I contacted Angela Silva, the Midkiff & Associates consultant on
the Villas project, to ask about the demolition. She is looking into it and any reason for delay.

Best Regards,

JEFF COWEN
COMMUNITY LIAISON
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

JCOWEN@TRPA.ORG
(775) 588-4547 X 278

From: LCress7199@aol.com [mailto:LCress7199@aol.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 25, 2006 3:06 PM
To: Jeff Cowen
Subject: Fwd: Demolition Permit for Grubstake

Jeff, It appears that there are two stories coming from Mr. Topol with regards to a Demolition Permit. Can you look into this or refer me to the proper person so we can find out the real story.
Hi Lorie,
I am asking Jordan Kahn from our legal team and Theresa Avance, the senior planner on the project, to keep some time open around 1 pm on the 24th in case that date works for your group. In the height of the building season, there isn’t too much flexibility with people’s schedules around here, so I hope that time works out.

I will be there as well and hope we can help you all understand what we look for when we are reviewing a project like the Villas.

I believe I have answered some of your questions already in earlier emails. Could you re-assemble what I haven’t covered and send it to me?

Regards,

JEFF COWEN
COMMUNITY LIAISON
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

JCOWEN@TRPA.ORG
(775) 588-4547 X 278
Subject: Re: Demolition Permit for Grubstake

Hi Jeff, I was wondering if August 24th around 1pm would be a good date for you to meet with our group. I am still waiting for responses from a few people. There would possibly be six or seven people if everyone is free on the same date. I'll email you as soon as I know if the 24th will work.

Thank you for the mail regarding the Villas project, but as you know, there is still lots of information/facts that we will need. I sent you two emails, possibly three that outlined the information we would like to have. Do you have any questions about what we are requesting? Thanks.....Lorie
Hi Lorie and All,

I have just been notified that Villas at Harborside will be on our Governing Board’s August 23rd agenda. After nearly a year, our review is approaching completion and the TRPA staff summary will be available on our website the week before the Governing Board meeting.

I suggest we move our meeting to Friday, August 18 so that we can go over the staff summary with you.

Lorie, I truly hope that your recovery is going well so that you can make it.

Let me know what times or alternative dates are good for your group and we will do our best to schedule things at this end.

Regards,

JEFF COWEN
COMMUNITY LIAISON
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

JCOWEN@TRPA.ORG
(775) 588-4547 X 278
Hi Lorie,
I am asking Jordan Kahn from our legal team and Theresa Avance, the senior planner on the project, to keep some time open around 1 pm on the 24th in case that date works for your group. In the height of the building season, there isn’t too much flexibility with people’s schedules around here, so I hope that time works out.

I will be there as well and hope we can help you all understand what we look for when we are reviewing a project like the Villas.

I believe I have answered some of your questions already in earlier emails. Could you re-assemble what I haven’t covered and send it to me?

Regards,

JEFF COWEN
COMMUNITY LIAISON
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

JCOWEN@TRPA.ORG
(775) 588-4547 X 278

Hi Jeff, I was wondering if August 24th around 1pm would be a good date for you to meet with our group. I am still waiting for responses from a few people. There would possibly be six or seven people if everyone is free on the same date. I'll email you as soon as I know if the 24th will work.
Thank you for the mail regarding the Villas project, but as you know, there is still lots of information/facts that we will need. I sent you two emails, possibly three that outlined the information we would like to have. Do you have any questions about what we are requesting? Thanks.....Lorie
Hi Lorie and All,

It looks like emails are rolling again.

For clarification, the Homewood Motel had 11 verified Tourist Accommodation Units (TAUs). Three were banked with the condition that interior walls were torn down, doors were removed and plastered over, and four units became one. Those three were transferred to the West Shore Café. Since eight TAUs remain there, there is no condition that the building must be demolished.

I have forwarded your email below to Pat Dobbs, our planner who has been diligently pursuing the demolition and transfer of TAUs from the Grubstake to the Villas.

We are looking into this with the intention of resolving the issue before our meeting on the 18th. We can discuss more of the details at our meeting.

Also, as soon as the staff summary for the Governing Board is available, we will email it to this group.

Regards,

JEFF COWEN
COMMUNITY LIAISON
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
Jeff I was reviewing previous emails from you that included a discussion about the Grubstake. You said at that time that you were getting information from Angela Silva from Midkiff & Associates as to why the structures that were used for the TAU's for the West Shore Cafe and the first phase of the Villas at Harborside have not been torn down? I understand that there are several structures on the Grubstake Property, however we want to know which were designated for the West Shore Cafe and 1st Phase of the Villas at Harborside and why they are still being rented out today?

In addition, we would like to be informed, at the August 18th meeting at 1pm, what other non-compliance issues are still outstanding with any of Topol's projects in Homewood and if he has made application for any additional permits?
Hi Lorie and All,

The Villas at Harborside project has been postponed to the September 27 Governing Board meeting at the North Tahoe Conference Center in Kings Beach. This was an unexpected request from the applicant. Hopefully we can still meet on the 18th since you were previously hoping for as much lead time as possible.

According to our Rules of Procedure, the staff summary will not be available until the week before the meeting. We will email that to your group as soon as it is available. There is still plenty to discuss at our meeting at 1 p.m. on the 18th. Once you get the staff summary in September, let me know if you would like another meeting.

TRPA Governing Board meetings are always open to the public and occur on the last Wednesday of each month. Project hearings are listed on the agenda three weeks before the meeting. Since this project may generate a lot of public comments, we are requesting to the board that the project be on the agenda as “Time Certain”, versus at unscheduled time throughout the day, so that people don’t have to wait an indeterminate amount of time for the hearing.

Individual public comments are given a 3-minute time limit.
There is no need to request time from the board in advance if the project is on the agenda. When the chairperson announces the opening of public comments on the project, anyone can approach the podium. The board appreciates it when one person approaches as a representative of a group. It is also wise to be organized, specific and succinct. Sometimes a group

Requesting specific time from the Board is only necessary if you want to address a topic not on the agenda. Then you must request time from either the Chairperson, Allen Biaggi, or TRPA Executive Director John Singlaub at least two weeks prior to the meeting date. All meeting times, locations and agendas are posted on our website, www.trpa.org under “Meetings and Notices.”

I am continuing to research the information you have requested and will bring everything to our meeting at 1 p.m. on the 18th.

Regards,

JEFF COWEN
COMMUNITY LIAISON
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

JCOWEN@TRPA.ORG
(775) 588-4547 X 278

From: LCress7199@aol.com [mailto:LCress7199@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 02, 2006 6:14 PM
To: Jeff Cowen
Cc: 4homewood@sbcglobal.net; johnhartshorne@sbcglobal.net; thmac@macco.org; bearsnsquirrels@sbcglobal.net; raynlois@infostations.com; gary@garymckelvey.com
Subject: More Questions

Jeff, several members of our group were asking about how the coverage was designated for Topol's lots. Would you please bring to our Aug. 18 meeting a copy (that we could keep) that shows the coverage breakdown of each parcel and as we talked about yesterday on the phone, how the original figures of 77K+-SF was determined.
We know that you can have 25% coverage on a parcel. Did the calculation for Topol's coverage in any way include land under Lake Tahoe? As we discussed at our first meeting with you and Melissa, the parcel side lengths could only mean that at least 50" of land was under Lake Tahoe. That is a very important issue to our group.

Is there someone we can contact to see what is the status/legality of Topol's buoy field? Again we are looking for issues that have not been resolved between TRPA and Topol. Any issue or non-compliance issue we can find out about.

At our last meeting Melissa Shaw mentioned that in order to address the TRPA Governing Board there was a person we had to register with and a date that we had to register. Is that true and if so who do we contact and how soon do we need to sign up?

Thanks again for all your help, Lorie
Hi Allen,

Thanks for the call and for sparing some time for this meeting. The agenda for Friday is attached. Please call me if you or Steve have any questions.

A couple of Placer County issues that might come up are the Villas negative declaration and permissible use. The homeowners (between 5 and 7 plan to attend) are concerned that the applicant's Initial Environmental Checklist will resemble the Negative Declaration document on file with you and have a list of concerns that are also attached (agencies).

As far as the permissible use, the group has mentioned a West Shore General Plan that calls for single family homes only(?). TRPA's Plan Area Statement 159, however, is a commercial-use area where tourist accommodation is the main and historic use. Gabby Barrett down here remembers Bill Combs and others got together a few years ago to possibly amend the planning statements for the Homewood areas, but doesn't remember what the outcome was. The group meeting here on Friday would probably appreciate any history on that subject or to know if there are any options for future changes in the planning. I have already explained Pathway 2007 and the Place-Based Planning meetings to them.

Overall, the group seems to be concerned about community character and scenic quality. They have had some bad experiences with the owner and distrust his intentions.

Thanks again, I look forward to meeting Steve.
Dear Jeff & Theresa,
I was very happy to meet you both yesterday. My understanding of your procedures is much clearer now. I can also see that you are very limited in your manpower resources. However, would please share this note with your staff as the buoy field has now become the problem we warned it would become. Thank you for your time and well-organized presentation.

Sincerely,

John Hartshorne
916-847-2633

----- Forwarded Message -----
From: LCress7199@aol.com
To: bearsnsquirrels@sbcglobal.net; raynlois@infostations.com; thmac@macco.org; 4homewood@sbcglobal.net; johnhartshorne@sbcglobal.net; gary@garymckelvey.com
Sent: Saturday, August 19, 2006 11:43:54 AM
Subject: Boat Accident

As as part of our conversation yesterday at the TRPA Hearing regarding the safety of Topol's buoy field, last night about 11:30 pm a boat hit the farthest boat in Topol's buoy field. I understand 2-3 sheriff's boats, ambulance, etc were involved. Rumor has it one person has broken neck. I bet you will quickly see a new light out at the end of the buoy field. Why does is always have to be at the expense of someone else that Topol gets things done. Once again he has defied laws and to the detriment and the health and welfare of others. Sadly, appears that no governing body cares. I will call the Sierra Sun tomorrow and hopefully this will appear in the newspaper. If anyone has connections to the Sac. Bee it would be great if we could get an article in that paper as well.
Thanks, Lorie
Good Monday!

Following a meeting with concerned Homewood Homeowners on Friday, this agency has been presented with a great opportunity to meet our Triple Bottom Line and to promote interagency collaboration.

Theresa, Jordan and I met with about 7 neighbors of the Villas at Harborside project area along with Steve Buelna and Rick Brown of Placer County. A suggestion was made that we, Placer County, the PUD, and perhaps the sheriff do an inter-agency walkthrough of the site to get a feel for what compliance issues exist and how the property is being managed.

The project area has been plagued with compliance issues for nearly two decades and a central concern for all involved is allowing any new projects to go forward while so many problems exist. Public access, beach access, vegetative screening and other scenic mitigation requirements, are among the issues, but many others may exist which we and other agencies cannot confirm without a site visit. Jordan helped everyone understand that the owner's buoy field is very difficult for us to address without new shorezone regulations being adopted yet, but our records show that it has been grossly out of compliance since at least

Theresa is exploring possibly mandating all compliance and mitigation issues be resolved through conditions of acknowledgement of the condominium project currently under
her review. The project is going to GB in September. I am currently tracking the Transfer and Banking of all TAU's in the project area. Theresa needs TRPA verification of any issues before completing her review.

The community and Placer County have approached us with this idea and it seems an important opportunity to address a host of issues that have reflected poorly on us. Our own records, as well as the owner's reputation with Placer County and the surrounding community, demonstrate that he may react better to enforcement than to pleas to his conscience.

Let me know how everyone feels about this so that we can go through past conditions and set a date with other participants.

Thank you,

JEFF COWEN
COMMUNITY LIAISON
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
JCOWEN@TRPA.ORG
(775) 588-4547 X 278
Dear Mr. Powell,

Thank you for your comments and for forwarding your concerns on to us. As you requested, the attachment will be forwarded to all the appropriate people here and we welcome your hard copy as well. You can send it to me at

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
ATTN: Jeff Cowen
PO Box 5310
Stateline, NV 89449

Perhaps you could also request that your presentation be shown by proxy at the Governing Board hearing on September 27. If that is something you would like to pursue, email the presentation and your request to Judy Nikkel [mailto:jnikkel@trpa.org]

JEFF COWEN
COMMUNITY LIAISON
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

JCOWEN@TRPA.ORG
(775) 588-4547 X 278

-----Original Message-----
From: David Powell [mailto:JDPowell@stanford.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, September 05, 2006 10:59 PM
To: Jeff Cowen
Cc: RICHARD BROWN
Subject: Comments concerning the Villas at Harborside

Mr. Cowen,
I have prepared the attached comments concerning the Villas at Harborside. Please distribute to the appropriate staff. I am also sending them by regular mail if that is more expeditious for you. In addition, I have prepared a Powerpoint presentation of the same material and can send that to you if it would be of use. Unfortunately, I will be out of town on September 27, so will not be able to present it at the public hearing.

Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

David Powell
530-525-7913
650-712-9015
No Problem Mike. Thanks for taking the time to give us a thorough statement.

By the way, I double checked with the Sierra Sun about posting the Governing Board agenda each month. We stopped doing it for a while in that paper because their schedule for accepting notices would have published our notice five days behind our official deadline of 20 days. The notices have continued to be run in both the Bonanza and the Tribune and are posted at all area post offices and libraries.

We will now be running our notices in the Sierra Sun every month, without fail. The timing is not what had hoped for and we will continue to work with them so that the notices may eventually be run 20 days prior to the meeting.

Thanks again. I'll keep in touch.

JEFF COWEN
COMMUNITY LIAISON
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

JCOWEN@TRPA.ORG

(775) 588-4547 X 278
Jeff, Teresa,

Attached is my TRPA General Complaint Form regarding the Villas at Harborside project. For several reasons I had to use a revised format rather than the printed Form. I hope this is no problem.

If you have any questions, please contact me (530/581-2812).

Mike Hawkins
Hi Lorie,

We have recently received nine complaint forms and one more letter (from David Powell). I am amassing and will help Theresa assemble the complaints/comments we have gotten over the last six months or so for the staff summary and packets to GB.

Theresa, Melissa Douglas and I are making real headway in our research of the project and Theresa is feeling more comfortable laying out the groundwork for the staff summary. She, Rick Brown, Allan Breuch and I took a walk around the property on September 5 and compared notes. The visit has helped immensely.

Regards,

JEFF COWEN
COMMUNITY LIAISON
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

JCOWEN@TRPA.ORG

(775) 588-4547 X 278
Hi Jeff, have you received many complaints regarding the Villas at Harborside? I know quite a few people said they were sending them.

I am curious how these complaints will affect the hearing date or if they will have any impact on the schedule. I recall you saying at our meeting on August 18th, that if you received enough complaints that Mr. Singlaub might pull planners from other jobs to do the research.

I assume, at this point, that the hearing date is still Sept. 27th?

Thanks,  Lorie Cress
Hi Lorie and All,

Yes, there have been several names for the parcels over the years and different boundary lines between the different lots. The maps that accompanied the coverage breakdown sheet you refer to refer to Parcels A, B, C and the Remainder. You are correct, the Remainder parcel does not include the Marina although the total amount of coverage is applicable to all lots from Fawn Street to Silver Street.

I referred to Parcels A, B, and C as lots 1, 2, and 3 because I thought they corresponded to the current project area maps. Those parcel boundaries have all been changed since then and Lots 1-6 are approximately Parcels A, B, C, and a portion of the Remainder parcel. Not only that, but Placer County has assigned new APN numbers to these lots as well. This is explained by the attachments.

I have finally located the coverage breakdown document you have been diligently reminding me Melissa Shaw had at our first meeting. It is called Exhibit A and B, I apologize if the document is upside down or sideways. These will clear up some of the your concerns, but please understand that the coverage amounts you see on each lot were based on single family homes being
built on the northern lots. Those calculations were also based on building envelopes, both of which have changed considerably. When the proposed project was changed by the applicant, those coverage amounts did not have to be held to.

I have been speaking about the coverage amounts on each lot with others here today and understand that we do want deed restrictions recorded for each of the lots, but the amount of coverage assigned to each lot does not have to match what is in Exhibits A and B.

The amount of proposed coverage on all lots is contained on a large site plan, that I cannot copy immediately. I will send them to you as soon as possible.

On the West Shore Cafe lot, only the deck extends beyond high water, not the footprint of the building. There did not have to be a different boundary line for that lot to allow the deck to be built since it is part of the pier. I am still researching this issue for more clarity. That is all I know right now.

I hope this helps. I'll keep in touch.

Regards,

JEFF COWEN

COMMUNITY LIAISON

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

JCOWEN@TRPA.ORG

(775) 588-4547 X 278
Hi Jeff; we were going over the document "Coverage Calculations for Villas Project Area" that was included in the packet at our August 18th meeting. In that document individual coverage is shown forLots 1 - 3, Lots 7, 8 & 9 were included in one calculation and Lot 6 was left out.

Since the West Shore Cafe deck (Lot 6) goes down onto the beach, I am sure the parcel lengths are much longer then the other lots in the project, but I cannot tell from the Survey done by Vail & Co. in Book U of Maps page 39 from Placer County. All the lots show lengths that include Lake Avenue and under Lake Tahoe. You stated that TRPA calculations do not include Lake Avenue or coverage under the lake. My guess is that Lake Avenue must be included in Lot 6.

I need the breakdown of Lots 6, 7, 8, & 9 and I need it asap. There is no way we can calculate coverage without the breakdown of each parcel.

Why were Lots 1 - 3 listed separately in the handout, while Lot 6 was not listed, and the remaining lots were lumped together?

The Settlement Agreement states that the land coverage calculation of 77,781 SF included all of the Homewood Resort Project Area (Including Hi & Dry Marina)--is that correct?

I know how busy you are, but this is very important and we need it for a meeting tomorrow evening.

By the way did you ever find the document that shows the actual building coverage footprint for each lot? When you, I and Melissa met earlier this year she showed both of us that sheet. It was larger then legal size. It would be extremely helpful. Thanks, Lorie
Good Day All,

I just wanted to clarify to everyone that I encourage the use of our new, online complaint forms (for General and Noise issues) for any issue at all. Any comments and concerns about proposed projects, violations, policy issues, threats to environmental quality, etc., will most definitely be brought to the attention of everyone at TRPA and/or Governing Board members or Hearings Officer who needs to know or who can take action. The online General Complaint forms are submitted to myself and our Violation Resolution Unit.

I apologize for any misunderstanding. My conversation with Mike centered on his concern that the complaint forms were not submitted directly to all members of the Governing Board. A big part of my job here when concerns are being raised about proposed projects is to assemble the myriad comments, in any form, and bring them to the attention of the appropriate planners and managers as well as highlighting them in the staff summaries that go to the Board.

I also did not want to discourage anyone from submitting comments to the Board directly. The option of sending comments to Judy Nikkel, our top Executive Assistant, is still
open as is the option of sending correspondence to board members individually. Their contact information is on our website at http://www.trpa.org/default.aspx?tabindex=0&tabid=91. Judy Nikkel assembles the staff summaries into briefing packets for the Board and all of the comments and the content of complaint forms that I assemble will be included. Sometimes, people feel more comfortable doing it that way. I hope to continue building trust with communities so that the new forms and discussions with me become the main mode of communication.

We are taking an aggressive, new approach to customer service and I am excited to be a part of it.

Again, I apologize to Mike and all of you for any misunderstanding.

Regards,

JEFF COWEN

COMMUNITY LIAISON

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

JCOWEN@TRPA.ORG

(775) 588-4547 X 278
As most of you know, Jeff Cowen of TRPA has been encouraging the use of the TRPA General Complaint Form to let TRPA know your thoughts on proposed projects, actions, etc. I have learned from Jeff that these Forms are primarily for staff use relative to violations of ordinances or other matters that are within the perogative of staff to solve. Therefore, the contents of your Complaint may or may not reach the Board of Governors. Consequently, if you believe your comments and complaints are related to a decision(s) that the Board will act upon, you should make a more direct contact with Board members. It is my understanding that there are two possible approaches:

1. Mail, e-mail or Fax your concerns to each member of the Board. (Their names and addresses are listed on the TRPA web pages.)

2. Send your comments as an enclosure to Ms. Judy Nikkel, Executive Secretary, TRPA, asking that your comments be included in the information package provided each member before the appropriate meeting. (Ms. Nikkel's e-mail address is undoubtedly jnikkel@trpa.org.)

Mike Hawkins
Hi Lorie and All,

Okay, I think the document you have been asking for is the actual site plan for the proposed timeshare units. I'll have to send the site plans out to be scanned and email them to you as soon as I can.

On the other matters, any and all projects in the Harborside project area, from Fawn to Silver, cannot exceed 77,781 sq. ft. in coverage. If the owner runs out of coverage, he will have to move it from somewhere in the project area. The area where coverage was removed must be restored/revegetated. Any coverage that exists beyond the total allowed is illegal and must be removed. We are working toward resolving any overcoverage issues that may exist through our staff summary and permit conditions.

All of the coverage that now exists on the site will be counted toward the total allowed of 77,781. Theresa, Rick Brown, Allen Breuch and I visited the project area on September 5 and saw some things that do not appear or are incorrect on the site plans. Earlier this week, we requested a new "as-built" survey be acquired by the consultant, Midkiff and Associates. This
survey will be physically "truthed" by us before we complete our review. A new registered surveyor will conduct the survey and Midkiff's office has been informed of our concerns.

The coverage of the deck on the West Shore Cafe is counted toward the total 77,781 for the project area as is the parking lot. I was responding to your statement:

"Since the West Shore Cafe deck (Lot 6) goes down onto the beach, I am sure the parcel lengths are much longer than the other lots in the project, but I cannot tell from the Survey done by Vail & Co. in Book U of Maps page 39 from Placer County. All the lots show lengths that include Lake Avenue and under Lake Tahoe. You stated that TRPA calculations do not include Lake Avenue or coverage under the lake. My guess is that Lake Avenue must be included in Lot 6."

What I stated in my last email was, "On the West Shore Cafe lot, only the deck extends beyond high water, not the footprint of the building. There did not have to be a different boundary line for that lot to allow the deck to be built since it is part of the pier."

I hadn't mentioned coverage. For any pier to be built, there must be some connecting structure to private property. I also misspoke about the deck extending beyond high water since the deck stops at high water (also shown on the photos submitted by you and others). The deck is built over the backshore setback, part of which is the old Lake Avenue parcel. A deck is allowed over a backshore setback since it is not a building foundation and is accessory to a pier. Still, the coverage is counted toward the total allowed for the project area.

Mr. Topol had to provide commercial floor area for the restaurant seating on the deck and pier. Again, I am still researching the permitting of the West Shore Cafe.

JEFF COWEN

COMMUNITY LIAISON
Hi Jeff, after reviewing your email and the attachments, I do not believe that the attachments are the same as the document that Melissa Shaw showed both of us at our meeting in June.

Exhibit A indicates the APN numbers for each parcel 1 - 8. Exhibit B is the breakdown of coverage calculations and was based Lot 1 - 5 being single family residences. These Exhibits show the square footage on one sheet and the parcel numbers on a separate sheet.

The document that Melissa Shaw presented at our June meeting was quite different. There was only one oversized sheet of paper which was a parcel map of Lots 1 - 9 and typed inside each parcel was the allotted square footage. On that document the calculations for lots 1 -5 showed square footage calculations in the 6,000+ SF range. Your Exhibit B shows square footage for Lots 1 - 5 of 4,710 - 4,712 SF. So, I'm still looking for the document Melissa brought to that meeting.

The information I need is the following:
(For clarification, by coverage I mean the amount that has been used for buildings, walkways, driveways, parking lots, decks, etc.)
1. what is the coverage breakdown for the existing parcels (Lot 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9). Please provide the breakdown for each parcel.
2. what is the proposed coverage breakdown for the proposed Lots 2 - 4? Surely TRPA must have those figures to determine if the 77,781 SF maximum allotment has not been exceeded.

You stated in your email (referring to Exhibit B): "the coverage amounts you see on each lot were based on single family homes being built on the northern lots"........when the proposed project was changed by the applicant, those coverage amounts did not have to be held to". I am unclear about this statement, didn't the applicant have to adhere to the 77,781 SF maximum allotment?

If the villas coverage exceeded the SFR coverage allocations (the building footprints are bigger for 3 buildings then 1 SFR) what other coverage area was reduced to comply with the Settlement Agreement?

As my husband stated in his General Complaint; we believe coverage may have been added to the parcels that have existing structures as follows:

**Lots 9 (include a portion of Fawn Street)**
Lot 8 (more paved area for boat storage)
Lot 7 is being used for storage and parking
Lot 6 was paved over after trees died
Lot 1 and Lot 5 should also be re-surveyed.

Is TRPA going to survey the entire Homewood project for coverage compliance?

Your email stated that the coverage area for the West Shore Cafe would not include the deck because it is part of the pier. **The deck is attached to the building and is used for outside dining. A deck that is attached to a single family home is considered coverage.**

**Why would the West Shore Cafe be exempt from those rules?**

Since the pier is also used for dining and shouldn't the pier be included in the 77,781 SF maximum?

Looking forward to your response. Thanks, Lorie Cress
From: Jeff Cowen
To: "LCress7199@aol.com"; "Myron Hawkins"; danbestranch@thegrid.net; 4homewood@sbcglobal.net; Kcarling@charter.net; bearsnsquirrels@sbcglobal.net; PCress7199@aol.com; raynlois@infostations.com; carsdaddy@sbcglobal.net; yasumirh@sbcglobal.net; colleen.connell@sbcglobal.net; ewkdds@sbcglobal.net; conniepeel@comcast.net; rockwood@inreach.com; thmac@macco.org; billymac3@macco.org; Grasslandladyvrn@aol.com; s.casagrande@comcast.net; babreuner@earthlink.net; CHJCrocker@aol.com; SheriZip@aol.com; bmaclaughlin@macco.org; "dennie1"@@moment.net; Cgray123@aol.com; juliehlandis@sbcglobal.net; mjallen02@comcast.net; peekskids@comcast.net; vakessler@ips.net; colorcal@ips.net; NEDENGI@earthlink.net; alanlisamatt@sbcglobal.net; Tracy@jaquier.net; Rjvia2@cs.com; Wallunas@sbcglobal.net; BREUNER@aol.com; macechap@dcn.org; paulamathis1@yahoo.com; kbreuner@manatt.com; johnhartshorne@sbcglobal.net; Sgnorts@aol.com; darylnbob@yahoo.com; gwb1937@gmail.com; Tse@pngusa.net; spleau@futureford.com; whitehowes@comcast.net; DaveWhite1@aol.com; mzbrowrowes@sbcglobal.net; Virginia Graham; Steve Kastan; Vatistas, Paul; Sabina Strauss; Leah/Gary Kaufman; Jerry Wotel; Ellie Waller; David McClure; rickbrown@prodigy.net; rstanbrown@sbcglobal.net; jmaclaughlin@macco.org; johnhartshorne@sbcglobal.net; Grebitus1926@aol.com; Richard Mallett (H); Collin Strasenburgh; McCaffery Sue/Jim; Lynne Larson; Cindy Wotel; Carolyn Willette; Carol Beck; Dennis Schlumpf; Dick Read;
CC: Julie Regan; Theresa Avance;
Subject: Villas at Harborside Removed from September Agenda
VILLAS AT HARBORSIDE PROJECT REMOVED FROM SEPTEMBER 27 GOVERNING BOARD AGENDA

The proposed Villas at Harborside project in Homewood that was to be heard by the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Governing Board September 27 has been rescheduled for a later date. The project involves building timeshare condominiums near the West Shore Café and High and Dry Marina.

TRPA staff and the project applicant requested the postponement until outstanding issues, including compliance with past permits and completion of a new property survey, can be resolved. The proposed project has been controversial within the Homewood community and TRPA staff members want to ensure the project application is thorough and complete, according to Agency officials.

“We are working with the applicant and the community to resolve outstanding issues so that everyone’s concerns are addressed,” said Jeff Cowen, Community Liaison for TRPA.

A new hearing date for the project has not been set. The TRPA staff summary of the project that would have been released to the public this week will not be released until the week before the next hearing date. The TRPA Governing Board holds public meetings once a month and encourages the public to attend. Meeting notices and agendas are posted on the agency’s website at www.trpa.org. All interested parties should
contact the TRPA Community Liaison before the meetings to confirm agenda items.

The Tahoe Regional Planning Agency cooperatively leads the effort to preserve, restore, and enhance the unique natural and human environment of the Lake Tahoe Region now and in the future. For additional information, call Jeff Cowen at 775-588-4547, ext. 278. Stay up to the minute at the TRPA Press Room.

JEFF COWEN
COMMUNITY LIAISON
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

JCOWEN@TRPA.ORG
(775) 588-4547 X 278
Hi Tom,

We presented a revised version of last year's Proposed Shorezone Plan, Alternative 6 to the Governing Board in May this year. We are expecting to hear back from them on it this fall. A presentation on the proposal is on our website under "About TRPA", then under Issues, then under "Water", then under "Shorezone".

Or follow this link: http://www.trpa.org/default.aspx?tabid=126

As soon as the Governing Board asks to put it on one of our monthly agendas, we will advertise it widely. Public input has been a driving force behind the proposal.

Regards,

JEFF COWEN

COMMUNITY LIAISON

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

JCOWEN@TRPA.ORG

(775) 588-4547 X 278
Jeff- has the Lakeshore Zone project been released yet- i looked for it but have seen no sign's of it--if not , do you know when????

-----Original Message-----
From: Jeff Cowen [mailto:jCowen@trpa.org]
Send: Monday, September 18, 2006 4:40 PM
To: LCress7199@aol.com; Myron Hawkins; danbestranch@thegrid.net; 4homewoood@sbcglobal.net; Kcarling@charter.net; bearssnsquirrels@sbcglobal.net; PCress7199@aol.com; raynlois@infostations.com; carsdaddy@sbcglobal.net; yasumirh@sbcglobal.net; colleen.connell@sbcglobal.net; ewkdds@sbcglobal.net; conniepeel@comcast.net; rockwood@inreach.com; Tom MacLaughlin; Bill MacLaughlin III; Grasslandladyvrn@aol.com; s.casagrande@comcast.net; babreuner@earthlink.net; CHJ Crocker@aol.com; SheriZip@aol.com; Bill MacLaughlin III; "dennie1@"@moment.net; CGray123@aol.com; juliehlandis@sbcglobal.net; mjallen02@comcast.net; peekskids@comcast.net; vakessler@jps.net; colorcal@jps.net; NEDENGIE@earthlink.net; alanlisamatt@sbcglobal.net; Tracy@jaquier.net; Rjvia2@cs.com; Wallunas@sbcglobal.net; BREUNER@aol.com; macechap@dcn.org; paulamathis1@yahoo.com; kbreuner@manatt.com; johnhartshorne@sbcglobal.net; Sgnorts@aol.com; darylnbob@yahoo.com; gwb1937@gmail.com; Tse@pngusa.net; spleau@futureford.com; whitehowes@comcast.net; DaveWhite1@aol.com; mzborrowes@sbcglobal.net; Virginia Graham; Steve Kastan; Vatistas, Paul; Sabina Strauss; Leah/Gary Kaufman; Jerry Wotel; Ellie Waller; David McClure; rickbrown@prodigy.net; rstanbrown@sbcglobal.net; Jim MacLaughlin; johnhartshorne@sbcglobal.net; Grebitus1926@aol.com; Richard Mallett (H); Collin Strasenburgh; McCaffery Sue/Jim; Lynne Larson; Cindy Wotel; Carolyn Willette; Carol Beck; Dennis Schlumpf; Dick Read
Cc: Julie Regan; Theresa Avance
Subject: Villas at Harborside Removed from September Agenda

TRPA Press Release
Hi Mr. Gearhart,

I hope to let the same email group know the next time the Villas at Harborside project is put on the Governing Board agenda further in advance. We usually know all the agenda items 20 days before the meeting. Sometimes, circumstances change and things are added or amended.

Other than November and December, Governing Board meetings are on the fourth Wednesday of the month. The complete schedule and meeting locations are on our website. Follow this link: http://www.trpa.org/default.aspx?tabindex=0&tabid=100

Also notice on the top of that page are links to agenda packets.

Let me know if I can help you in any other way.

Regards,

JEFF COWEN

COMMUNITY LIAISON

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

JCOWEN@TRPA.ORG
Jeff,
Today is only the 18th of September, thanks for giving us such a timely message, 10 days before the meeting. Hopefully when it is scheduled you can let us all know in such a timely fashion. Are the TRPA Governing Boards Mtgs. always on the 4th Wednesday of the month?
Sincerely,
James W. Gearhart
No problem Lorie, thanks for the compliment.

We hope the press release will run in the Sierra Sun and local papers tomorrow to let folks know who weren't on the email list. We appreciate you helping notify those that live outside the Basin.

Villas may go next month, but since the applicant realizes the October 15 grading season closure will halt any ground breaking until May 1, it could be re-scheduled further into winter.

Best Regards,

JEFF COWEN
COMMUNITY LIAISON
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

JCOWEN@TRPA.ORG
(775) 588-4547 X 278


**Subject:** Hearing Rescheduled

Hi Jeff; wow, I was pretty surprised to read your press release last night. I will say that I am pleased that some of our issues are going to be thoroughly examined before decisions are made.

I need to contact by snail mail the many people who do not have email addresses and let them know about the rescheduling of the hearing. Do you have any idea at this time when this project will be heard? Could it be as soon as next month or will it be months away?

You have done a wonderful job of working with us on our issues and I feel so fortunate that we have someone like you to work with. It has been a year since we first found out what was going on with this project and you are the first person who we feel has heard our side. Thank you for all the time and effort you have put into this. Lorie
Hi Mr. Higgins,

Sorry it has taken me a while to get back to you. I finally located the document you referred to and you are correct. For TRPA review, the standards apply to the Tahoe City Community Plan Area only.

As John Hitchcock, our Scenic Program Manager, points out below, in many areas our regulations aren't suited as well as the county’s are for parking standards. Parking standards have a lot to do with safety and keeping the public right-of-way clear. We do require parking and traffic studies be completed if a proposed project will result in a large increase in Daily Vehicle Trip Ends (DVTE). Since the Villas project is moving Tourist Accommodation Units from one part of the project area to another, the increase has not been determined large enough to call for those studies.

Allen Breuch of Placer County walked the Villas at Harborside project area with us and mentioned that there are also emergency access standards on commercial and tourist accommodation parking areas which the project must meet. As a reminder, Steve Buelna is the Placer County planner on the project. His number is 530-581-6285.

I hope this has helped. Let me know if there is anything I can help you with.

Regards,
From: John Hitchcock  
Sent: Monday, September 18, 2006 2:41 PM  
To: Jeff Cowen  
Subject: RE: Harborside, Homewood

Jeff,

I need to look at the document he is referring to but generally his statement is correct. The parking demand table in the Tahoe City Community Plan should only apply to Tahoe City but before I commit to this statement I need to review the plan. The Homewood area never completed or adopted a community plan therefore we defer to the plan area statements for land use decisions. The County did adopt the West Shore Plan which we did which could result in conflicting land use designations.

On another note, we generally defer to the local jurisdictions on parking issues.

I’ll be in tomorrow. If you need an answer right away please ask Theresa, Lisa, or Brenda.

John

From: Jeff Cowen  
Sent: Monday, September 18, 2006 2:00 PM  
To: John Hitchcock  
Subject: FW: Harborside, Homewood

Hi Captain,

The Villas at Harborside, Homewood project is getting hot. I am responding to the email below and need to know if the Tahoe City Design Review Committee has a jurisdiction that
stretches down to Homewood.

Opponents of the project are diligently looking for loopholes/ordinances that will work in their favor. I would also like to know if the argument for parking standards would hold water with our GB.

Thanks, I hope your in, haven't seen you today.

JEFF COWEN
COMMUNITY LIAISON
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
JCOWEN@TRPA.ORG
(775) 588-4547 X 278

---

From: Dan Higgins [mailto:4homewood@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, September 18, 2006 1:01 PM
To: Jeff Cowen
Subject: Harborside, Homewood

Re: The 1994 Standards & Guidelines for Signage, Parking and Design, Tahoe City Community Plan, Tahoe City Area General Plan and West Shore Area of Placer County

Hi Jeff,

In the Introduction Section of the above Standards & Guidelines, under Approval Process: Applicability, there is the following foot note.

1. For Placer County purposes the March 7, 1994 adopting ordinance limits the applicability of this document to the Tahoe City Design Review Committee's area of jurisdiction.

For TRPA purposes the February 23, 1994 adopting ordinance limits the applicability of this document to the Tahoe City Community Plan Area.
Does this mean that the Parking Demand Table in this document, that is, Time Sharing (Residential Design) Use Hotel/Motel Rate, which is 1 space per guest room or unit, is not applicable to project in the West Shore Area?

Thanks,

Dan Higgins

PS In order to address the Board at the September 27 hearing do we need to preregister before the hearing date?
Hi Lorie and All,

No news yet about the Villas at Harborside project going to the Governing Board in October. The new survey with land coverage information has not been submitted to us for analysis and we haven't heard from the project applicant when that will be complete. If it turns out that there is more than 77,781 sq. ft. of existing coverage, then some will have to be removed and the areas will need to be restored. No more coverage can be transferred into the project area, the limit has been set by the Settlement Agreement.

I have finally managed to scan the main site plan for the project. I apologize for the technical difficulties, I was avoiding sending the plan out to the print shop to be copied for you since we would have to charge for that. The attached images can be laid on top of one another to make up just about the entire site plan. Let me know if there are any problems or if the information you requested is not there.

As to the schedule of our Shorezone environmental document, we expect the final document along with proposed ordinances to be released to the public and TRPA's Governing Board sometime in October. The shorezone document covers
the allowable amount of new piers and buoys on Lake Tahoe over the next 20 years. The final document will also include comments we have received over the last two years and our responses to them. Once the document has been available to the public to review for 60 days, the Governing Board may take action to certify the document and adopt the new ordinances. The Board can potentially take action immediately following the 60-day period or hold off until a later date. Either way, a public hearing will be held at the Governing Board meeting and the public will be invited to attend and to offer any testimony at that time.

I will be sure to include notice to you and this group as soon as the final document is available and when it is scheduled for a public hearing at the Governing Board meeting.

Regards,

JEFF COWEN

COMMUNITY LIAISON

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

JCOWEN@TRPA.ORG

(775) 588-4547 X 278
Hi Jeff; do you have any idea if the Hearing on the Villas will be in October?

Were you able to get the document copied that indicates the square footage for each parcel (Lot 1 - 9)? You said you would mail that to me.

Has the surveying been done? Since the 1995 Settlement Agreement clearly states that Topol cannot exceed the 77K square footage, what happens if he already has exceeded that amount? He wouldn't be able to buy more coverage would he as that would be a departure from the Settlement Agreement.

On Sept. 20th I sent you an email asking about the buoy issues. Did you get that email? In that email I also asked that our group be informed as soon as you know when the hearing will be.

Thanks again for all you help, Lorie Cress
VILLAS AT HARBORSIDES PROJECT WILL NOT BE HEARD
BY TRPA GOVERNING BOARD THIS MONTH

The proposed Villas at Harborside project in Homewood will not be on the
October agenda of the TRPA Governing Board as the applicant and agency staff continue to resolve outstanding issues. Last month, Agency staff requested a compliance report and a new site survey from the applicant. The project is still under review and involves building timeshare condominiums near the West Shore Café and High and Dry Marina.

A new hearing date for the project has not been set, but it may be scheduled for the November meeting. TRPA staff summaries and recommendations are released the week prior to each month's Governing Board meeting. Board meetings are open to the public and rotate between the south and north shores of Lake Tahoe. Please note, the November Board meeting will be held on November 15 at the North Tahoe Conference Center in Kings Beach. Meeting notices, agendas, and staff summaries are posted to the agency’s website on the "Meetings and Notices" page at www.trpa.org.

The Tahoe Regional Planning Agency cooperatively leads the effort to preserve, restore, and enhance the unique natural and human environment of the Lake Tahoe Region now and in the future. For additional information, call Jeff Cowen, the Community Liaison, at 775-589-5278. Stay up to the minute at the TRPA Press Room.

JEFF COWEN
COMMUNITY LIAISON
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

JCOWEN@TRPA.ORG
(775) 589-5278
Good Day Brenda Cooley,

Thank you for your comments and for sharing your concerns with us. Your email has been forwarded to Theresa Avance, our planner on the project. We have received many comments from the public on this project and continue to compile them to be included in our report to the TRPA Governing Board when the project is heard by them.

Please keep an eye on the "Meetings and Notices" page of our website for notification when this project will be heard at one of the Governing Board's monthly public meetings. Notices are also posted in newspapers and at post offices.

Thank you also for your concern for Lake Tahoe's environment.

Sincerely,

JEFF COWEN

COMMUNITY LIAISON

TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

JCOWEN@TRPA.ORG
Good Day Tom,

Thanks for your patience. We are hopeful that our Shorezone proposal will be released for a 60-day public review period this month. As I stated in my last email, once released for review, the TRPA Governing Board cannot take action on it for 60 days. However, the Board may desire to take action on it at a later date. The official "public comment" period was last year, but we will be accepting comments for consideration and possible inclusion in our proposal to the Board as the proposal circulates. As well, the Board will take public comments at whichever of its public meetings they decide to take action on the plan. The difference between the public comment period and the review period is that after the comment period, we must respond to comments and include them in summaries to the Board; during the review period we are not required to respond. The proposal as it stands now is similar in kind to the proposal presented last year, that is why a public comment period has not been required at this time.

As to the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan (BPMP), there is a copy of the plan on our website at http://www.trpa.org/documents/docdwnlds/BPMP_FINAL.pdf.

We will be updating the project list in the plan in early 2007. If you have specific ideas for projects or if you want to concentrate on just the West Shore portion of the plan, you should contact the Tahoe City Public Utility District and talk with them about including it in the update. We will be doing a full
BPMP update possibly starting in 2008—this will be where we get extensive public comment and re-vamp certain elements of the plan. If you would like to offer ideas for the major update, you can contact our Bicycle Transportation Planner, Karen Fink at kfink@trpa.org, or call her at 775-588-4547, ext. 204.

I will let you know as soon as the Shorezone proposal is circulated for review.

Thanks again for you patience and for your interest in what we are doing.

Regards,

JEFF COWEN
COMMUNITY LIAISON
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY

JCOWEN@TRPA.ORG
(775) 589-5278

From: Tom MacLaughlin [mailto:thmac@macco.org]
Sent: Thursday, October 12, 2006 7:34 AM
To: Jeff Cowen
Subject: RE: Villas at Harborside Not on October TRPA Agenda

Thank’s for keeping me in the loop. Has the comment period started for the lakeshore/buoy plan? Has the westshore bike trail plan been release? Please advise, THM
Hi Lorie and All,

Yes, I did get your email about the wedding/concert venue. If a wedding/concert venue is applied for, we can’t guess whether it would be approved. We treat all property owners equally and fairly and there is nothing stopping anyone from applying for a permit. Unfortunately, the answers to many questions like this are, “It depends.” We would look at the permissible uses in the Plan Area Statement, coverage, traffic analysis, scenic quality and the rest of our Code of Ordinances for compliance once a complete application is submitted. Such a proposal, as with the current application, would have to answer both Placer County’s rules and TRPA’s.

The way the plans are being presented to us, the current Villas project will use all available coverage, including coverage from the Motel. There will be no coverage left for any other projects, unless they propose to remove something else. A wedding/concert venue may not require any coverage at all. For example, placing chairs on the lawn once a month for a wedding will not automatically create coverage. A concentration of events like weddings/concerts over a short time, however, could cause disturbance and compaction enough to create coverage. Again, it depends on the proposal. The owner may also be able to do these
activities under TRPA’s Qualified Exempt rules of temporary activities, without a permit. That route would limit the number of occurrences and prohibit the creation of land coverage.

In many respects, we are looking at the current, proposed Villas project with an eye on the entire project area (lots 1-9). Coverage, scenic quality, and compliance with past permits are among the things we are looking at across the project area. We don’t require property owner’s to give us plans they may not have yet. I will mention to Theresa that Mr. Topol may be planning something on the Motel parcel in the future and ask that she inquire if that is part of the redevelopment plans for the project area. If it is part of his plans, it may not affect the current proposal. Thank you for mentioning it to us.

We have no desire to “piece-meal” different projects on the property, but neither do we have a precedent or anything in our Code that insists a property owner cease submitting applications or that no re-development occurs. Since we required that this property be consolidated permanently into one “project area”, regardless of ownership, then proposed expansions or intensifications of use, like a wedding/concert venue, will be scrutinized for their impact across the project area and, as mentioned above, for impacts to traffic. TRPA has historically deferred parking requirements to the local jurisdictions, but we can and have worked with them on projects to require or uphold certain standards. The stacked parking plans for the Villas project are being looked at by both Placer County and TRPA. Our staff summary to the Governing Board will show our conclusions for the parking and snow removal plans.

As for parking across the project area, we have received numerous comments and concerns from the community about parking in the area. All of these comments will be included in the staff summary to the Governing Board. At this time, TRPA staff is not reviewing parking issues on the rest of the area because the project before us proposes to have all of its parking resolved on site. If we agree that the plans support that resolution, then there will be no increase to offsite parking or to another portion of
the project area. Parking issues on the remainder of the property won’t be reviewed unless an intensification/expansion is proposed that can’t resolve parking onsite.

That said, we are aware of the parking problems in the area and will attempt to resolve them as soon as the opportunity arises.

Regards,

JEFF COWEN
COMMUNITY LIAISON
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
JCOWEN@TRPA.ORG
(775) 589-5278

From: LCress7199@aol.com [mailto:LCress7199@aol.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 19, 2006 9:28 AM
To: Jeff Cowen
Cc: bearsnsquirrels@sbcglobal.net; PCress7199@aol.com; raynlois@infostations.com; rstanbrown@sbcglobal.net; thmac@macco.org; billymac3@macco.org; 4homewood@sbcglobal.net; jmaclaughlin@macco.org; johnhartshorne@sbcglobal.net; Grebitus1926@aol.com; rickbrown@prodigy.net
Subject: Re: Villas at Harborside Not on October TRPA Agenda

Jeff, I think I previously emailed you regarding the issue of Topol's plan to request approval from Placer County to allow a wedding/concert venue (parcel 7) between the Motel parcel and the West Shore Cafe. If Topol asks for approval of the wedding/concert venue AFTER the villas are approved...would he be allowed to do that? Would there be coverage available? Would this be a TRPA issue or using a parcel for a wedding/concert venue just be Placer County?

Has TRPA asked to look at the entire project (Lot 1 - 9), and all the plans Topol has for the properties rather taking the project piecemeal? For instance, in addition to using Lot 7 for a wedding/concert venue, if he tears down the motel to transfer the TAU's, what are his plans for that parcel?

What about the parking issues for his entire development (Lot 1 - 9).....have they been resolved?

What about the parking issues for the Villas. Have those issues been resolved or would TRPA approve the parking lots (stacked) as proposed by Topol?
Hi Lorie,

There are a couple of other issues we forwarded to Mr. Topol after the site visit. Public access signs on the piers, improving access around the boat launch, we have also asked about his plans to put the utilities along the highway underground. The big issue is transferring TAUs to the three existing units. Everything is on hold until that is complete.

No doubt, neighbors have seen a lot of activity in the project area recently as past permit conditions are implemented.

All the Best,

JEFF COWEN
COMMUNITY LIAISON
TAHOE REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
JCOWEN@TRPA.ORG
(775) 589-5278

Thanks for the update. I'm so surprised about the coverage being pretty accurate......Are there other issues that need to be resolved or has Topol pretty much complied with TRPA issues?

If you could please notify our group of any possibilities in advance that would be greatly appreciated. I will follow your suggestion of writing
everyone and asking them to contact TRPA for an exact date of the hearing. Thanks again for all your work. My biggest concern is that if they year it in December no one will attend.

-----Original Message-----
From: jCowen@trpa.org
To: lcress7199@aol.com
Cc: tavance@trpa.org
Sent: Tue, 17 Oct 2006 3:29 PM
Subject: RE: Villas at Harborside Not on October TRPA Agenda

Hi Lorie,

We received the new survey and Theresa and I went to the site to truth it last Monday. Some of the boat racks weren't being counted as coverage since they were not on pavement. Theresa has asked that they be counted as coverage and that more accurate surveying is done on the three condominiums.

There is nothing astounding to report. Some things were in a different place than shown on the survey, but the sizes and coverage amounts of those items were accurate. Theresa and I used a measuring wheel and found the dimensions on the Marina and Motel parcels were accurate.

It was very difficult for me as an inexperienced reader of site plans to judge the amount of coverage that was actually on site. Things seemed more expansive than the square footage shown on the plans, but the measurements all jived. Theresa has much more experience and wasn't surprised.

It appears there will be minimal differences in the amount of coverage available for the new buildings.

Thank you for your submission of photos and the complaint form pertaining to the recent landscaping projects. Theresa and I had a chance to look at the trees up close and she wants to look into
the chances they will thrive there.

As to the meeting notification, we post final agendas for Governing Board meetings no later than 7 days before the meeting date. The staff summaries are also available for review at our offices and on our website seven days prior to the meeting date. We send out notices to affected property owners much earlier, but with the caution that the agenda might change.

After I received your email below, I tried to find out if we can give you and the email group more advance notice and it is possible, but I can’t guarantee it. Some items are agendized 25 days before a meeting, but can be pulled later. The agenda is so changeable, that we don’t send out official, finalized versions until seven days before. I understand that this is not enough time for you to mail your notices and wish we could guarantee knowing sooner. I will send the group notice as soon as possible, which will hopefully be in advance of the seven day point. A possible solution would be to send your notice with future Board meeting dates and locations and instructions to check the GB Agendas on our website seven days prior.

I might have mentioned this before, but the November and December Governing Board meetings will be a little early due to the holidays. The meeting dates are November 15 and December 20. The applicant still wants to go forward as soon as possible, so the project proposal could still be heard this year.

By the way, please note that as of last Thursday, we have added direct phone numbers at the Agency. The old number will continue to be the TRPA main number and our extensions will continue to work, but our direct numbers allow customers to call our desks without going through the system.

I hope this helps.
Best Regards,

JEFF COWEN
COMMUNITY LIAISON
From: lcress7199@aol.com [mailto:lcress7199@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, October 16, 2006 12:44 PM
To: Jeff Cowen
Subject: Re: Villas at Harborside Not on October TRPA Agenda

Hi Jeff; based on your memo, the Villas project is still under review.Have you received the survey of the property?

Also, how much in advance of a Governing Board hearing date is the agenda posted? Said another way, is there a deadline date for notification of a project which will appear on the agenda......10 days, 15 days??We will need to notify Homewood residents by snail mail of the hearing date and if there is only a weeks notice, I doubt they would get the notice in time.

-----Original Message-----
From: jCowen@trpa.org
To: Grebitus1926@aol.com; carsdaddy@sbcglobal.net; yasumirh@sbcglobal.net; ewkdds@sbcglobal.net; rockwood@inreach.com; SheriZip@aol.com; babreuner@earthlink.net; ncbeck@vfr.net; danbestranch@thegrid.net; abreuch@placer.ca.gov; rickbrown@proidy.net; bearsnsquirrels@sbcglobal.net; sbuelna@placer.ca.gov; mzburrwes@sbcglobal.net; Kcarling@charter.net; s.casagrande@comcast.net; Cgray123@aol.com; CHJCrocker@aol.com; colleen.connell@sbcglobal.net; LCress7199@aol.com; PCress7199@aol.com; john@keepahoeblue.org; Grasslandladyvrrn@aol.com; v-graham@sbcglobal.net; johnhartshorne@sbcglobal.net; mbh1@inreach.com; MHeckel@placer.ca.gov; 4homewood@sbcglobal.net; gkJ157@sbcglobal.net; bkranz@placer.ca.gov; juliehlandis@sbcglobal.net; cookiejarlynne@pacbell.net; billymac3@macco.org; jmaclaughlin@macco.org; thmac@macco.org;