



COUNTY OF EL DORADO PLANNING COMMISSION

City of South Lake Council Chambers
1901 Airport Road, South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150
<http://www.edcgov.us/planning>
Phone: (530) 621-5355 Fax: (530) 642-0508

Walter Mathews, Chair, District 4
Rich Stewart, First Vice-Chair, District 1
Lewis Ridgeway, District 2
Tom Heflin, District 3
Brian Shinault, District 5

Char Tim Clerk of the Planning Commission

MINUTES

**Special Meeting
October 16, 2014 – 9:00 A.M.**

CALL TO ORDER

Meeting was called to order at 9:05 a.m. Present: Commissioners Stewart, Mathews, and Shinault; David Livingston-County Counsel; and Char Tim-Clerk of the Planning Commission.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Motion: Commissioner Stewart moved, seconded by Commissioner Shinault, and carried (3-0), to approve the agenda as presented.

AYES: Shinault, Stewart, Mathews
NOES: None
ABSENT: Ridgeway, Heflin

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

AGENDA ITEMS

1. (14-1418) Community Development Agency, Long Range Planning Division, recommending the Planning Commission host a workshop to receive information and provide feedback and direction on the Draft Meyers Area Plan.

Dave Defanti, Assistant Director-Community Development Agency, Long Range Planning Division, presented the item to the Commission and stated the purpose of the meeting was for the following:

- Share where they are at and work at creating a project description for CEQA analysis; and
- Refine the project so staff can kick-off the environmental review process.

He stated that after the CEQA review, there will be at least 5 public hearings on the Plan. He also announced that there was a Board of Supervisors workshop on this Plan scheduled for October 28, 2014 in this same meeting room.

Brendan Ferry, Long Range Planning Division, conducted a PowerPoint presentation and made the following comments:

- Spoke on the background, process, comparison of existing and draft plans, highlights of draft plan, and outstanding issues (i.e., maximum height limits, commercial floor area, density, Meyers Advisory Council, community incentive program, CTC asset lands, and support for small businesses); and
- Spoke on the process to implement the Area Plan and next steps.

Mr. Defanti reinforced that the intent of today's meeting was to help draft the project description for the CEQA analysis and emphasized that nothing would be finalized today. He provided handouts on the key issues and a draft motion identifying the outstanding issues.

Commissioner Stewart made the following inquiries of staff:

- Do alternatives need to be analyzed?
- Confirmed that talk was more on non-residential parcels;
- Inquired on the interaction between the Meyers Area Plan and TRPA Plan;
- Since Hwy 50 goes down middle of Meyers and causes challenges getting from one side to the next, is anything in the works to resolve that issue; and
- What is the demand for Commercial Floor Area?

Chair Mathews inquired on what the 3 feet in maximum building height encouraged.

Angela Olson, Meyers resident, made the following comments:

- Owns 2 commercial buildings and a home in Meyers;
- Spoke on the existing 1993 Plan and on the TRPA document that changed the area to one big zone and went from 10 units/acre to 40 units/acre;

- Wants a community survey;
- TRPA shouldn't push their agenda onto Meyers; and
- Community wants 35 feet in building height but TRPA is not agreeable to that.

Jennifer Quashnick, Environmental Scientist, made the following comments:

- Wants better public process as this hasn't been clear;
- Community should be deciding growth, not TRPA;
- As a group, they have been trying to engage the community in this;
- Submitted letter for the record;
- Spoke on the 22 pages in the TRPA code which has exceptions to the 35 foot building heights; and
- Zoning changes are very confusing.

Jason Holland, Meyers resident, made the following comments:

- Not much has changed in the 6 years he has lived in Meyers;
- Just a few buildings currently highlight what Meyers should look like;
- They want to be their own community but are still under the guise of TRPA;
- Need to lower the barriers to make it easier for businesses;
- Supports version 2;
- This is paralysis by analysis; and
- Encourages everyone to be engaged and doesn't think there is a lack of information available to the public.

Doug Clymer, Meyers resident, made the following comments:

- Questioned how staff was defining "small business"; and
- 33,000 square feet of commercial floor area is not a lot when done correctly.

Diane Verwoest, Meyers resident, made the following comments:

- No conflict of interest;
- Community wants to see common sense development;
- Lower density;
- Community is not well represented;
- Process needs to be more transparent; and
- Community survey is needed.

Colleen Shade, Land Use and Environmental Planner, made the following comments:

- Attended all but one of the community workshops;
- Member of the Tahoe Chamber;
- Not much has happened in Meyers;
- Number of elements in version 3 are really good;
- Goals have not changed from version 2 and are excellent;
- Wonderful transportation goals;
- Spoke on incentive program that was removed in version 3, which she considered was taking a step backward;

- Spoke on community fears; and
- Spoke on a community plan.

Steve Noll made the following comments:

- There has been a lot of reinvestment of existing businesses;
- Spoke on incentives, commercial floor area and lack of tourist accommodations;
- Displayed photo boards for a visual presentation showing existing buildings and building heights;
- Prudent to analyze higher density; and
- On behalf of Chamber, encouraged support of version 2.

Natalie Yanish, President of the South Lake Tahoe Association of Realtors, stated that version 3 is more restrictive and she supports version 2 which allows more progress.

Jesse ?, Meyers resident, made the following comments:

- No tourist businesses are available (i.e., hotels);
- Understands mentality to not grow;
- Fear of over-growth is fine, but not of growth;
- No one wants to come to Meyers;
- Need to make money off of the traffic that goes through Meyers; and
- Need to have open minds.

Scott Fair, Meyers resident, made the following comments:

- Spoke on growing up in Meyers;
- Local, family community;
- Spoke on local businesses;
- Doesn't want to see much change to community;
- Agrees with the intentions of versions 2 and 3; and
- Common balance is needed, with no loopholes for large businesses.

John Dayberry, Meyers Advisory Council member, made the following comments:

- Has been on the Meyers Advisory Council since its inception;
- No conspiracy, but there is a lack of funding and organization in order for them to get all of the information out to the community;
- They are not empowered as the Council, but instead are just volunteers; and
- They are unable to protect Meyers as the Meyers Advisory Council.

Janet Mcdougall made the following comments:

- Has a lot of potential to be a local serving village;
- Small town concept is important for this area;
- Thoughtful, well-planned development is needed;
- Locals left out of the policy process;
- Meyers Community Council has put in a lot of effort and the community now needs a more formal representation; and

- Locals need to have input.

Laurel Ames, Tahoe Area Sierra Club Group, made the following comments:

- This is not an urban center but a community;
- Heavy hand of TRPA is not needed and is out of scale;
- Need to look at community plan as a vehicle for the future of Meyers;
- Tree protection plan is needed;
- CalTrans needs to be involved to help place traffic calming items in place; and
- Submitted letter for the record.

Adam Lewandowski, TRPA Planner, provided clarification on the Regional Plan and the existing community plan.

Sue Novasel worked on the original Meyers Area Plan and provided history on it.

Raeanne Barrett, Meyers Advisory Council, made the following comments:

- Not that far off as a community;
- Concern is building height and density;
- Need to allow more flexibility;
- Supports smart growth and redevelopment;
- Huge community involvement; and
- Spoke on incentives.

Joelle Tiko, Meyers resident, made the following comments:

- Agreed with Ms. Barrett's comments;
- Not fearful and some flexibility is needed to allow Meyers to grow some;
- Restrict too much and the existing businesses will deteriorate; and
- Small local motel is needed.

Terry Daniels, made the following comments:

- Meyers hasn't changed in the last 35 – 40 years and its time;
- Community is tired;
- Economic component is needed and this plan does that;
- Supports what the County is moving towards;
- Community has been involved and there has been lots of media on this subject;
- There is no conspiracy;
- Supports the Plan; and
- Not interested in having box stores, but growth is needed.

Chair Mathews closed public comment.

Commissioner Stewart made the following comments:

- Inquired how the Plan was going to revitalize the area;
- Version 3 appears to be more restrictive and has taken away some of the incentives;

- Is version 3 recommended by staff or did it just evolve based on feedback and discussion with the community?;
- Public comments state they want to revitalize the area but also keep it quaint; and
- Inquired on if any indepth economic study to revitalize Meyers was done as it would be helpful as a guide.

Chair Mathews made the following comments:

- Understands concerns on transparency;
- Drawbacks of surveys is that they can be subjective;
- The best information is the public testimony received at public hearings;
- Challenge of Meyers is that it is in the right and wrong location;
- Doesn't think a motel/hotel would locate in Meyers;
- Hwy 50 running through Meyers is a challenge; and
- Barriers are already built in due to how Meyers is set up.

Commissioner Shinault made the following comments:

- He is a design professional and a Meyers resident;
- Current community plan has many restrictions but the design elements are looser than other area;
- Doesn't think the 3 foot difference in building height maximum does much;
- Traffic is difficult on weekends;
- Properties aren't large enough to handle 40 units/acre;
- Meyers is in a scenic corridor, which hasn't been discussed; and
- Density and height are not an issue.

The Commission went through line by line of the draft motion that contained outstanding issues and provided staff their comments and feedback, which included the following:

- 42 feet for maximum building height;
- Liked versions 2 and 3 for CFA allocations;
- 40 units per acre;
- Keep Community Center Land Use designation as drafted in versions 2 and 3;
- Re-establish the incentive program identified in version 2;
- Keep Meyers Advisory Council as a less formal body;
- Split on whether to maintain zoning of CTC asset lands or rezone to Recreation and/or Conservation; and
- No comment provided on how to support small business through policies.

There was no further discussion.

No action was taken.

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 11:42 a.m.

APPROVED BY THE COMMISSION
Authenticated and Certified:

Walter Mathews, Chair

PC 10/16/14
#1
Distributed by
Staff at
meeting.

DRAFT MOTION for Planning Commission's Consideration

October 16, 2014

The Planning Commission requests the Draft Meyers Area Plan be revised as follows for the purposes of environmental review:

1. Allow a maximum building height of _____ to best meet the objectives and policies in the Area Plan to balance building design and scenic quality
2. Allocate Commercial Floor Area as follows to best meet the objectives and policies in the Area Plan:
 - a. Maintain the CFA allocations in the 2nd Draft Area Plan, **OR**
 - b. Maintain the CFA allocations in the 3rd Draft Area Plan, **OR**
 - c. Allocate the County's CFA free of charge on a first come, first served basis, **OR**
 - d. Allocate the County's CFA for a fee on a first come, first served basis, where the funds would pay for capital improvements and maintenance in Meyers
3. Allow Density of _____ units per acre for Hotels & Motels (TAUs) to best meet the objectives and policies in the Area Plan to promote a walkable, bikeable community while keeping Meyers rural
4. Allow Land Use Designations as follows:
 - a. Keep the Community Center Land Use designation as drafted in the 2nd and 3rd Draft Area Plan, **OR**
 - b. Maintain the three Special Land Use Areas in the Meyers Community Plan
5. Allow the Community Incentive Program as follows:
 - a. Reestablish the Top Tier of the Community Incentive Program per the 2nd Draft Area Plan, **OR**
 - b. Remove the Top Tier of the Community Incentive Program per the 3rd Draft Area Plan
6. Allow the Meyers Advisory Council (MAC) as follows:
 - a. Formalize the MAC either as an elected Municipal Advisory Committee or as an appointed body by the County's Governing Board subject to the Brown Act, **OR**
 - b. The MAC will remain a less formal body not subject to the Brown Act
7. Zone the CTC Asset Lands parcels as follows:
 - a. Maintain the zoning as proposed in the 3rd Draft Area Plan for the nine CTC Asset Lands parcels, **OR**
 - b. Zone all nine CTC Asset Lands parcels as Recreation and/or Conservation, **OR**
 - c. Treat CTC parcels the same as adjacent private land, per the 2nd Draft Area Plan
8. Allow support for small businesses as follows:
 - a. Maintain the policies, as proposed in the 3rd Draft Area Plan, to favor redevelopment of existing businesses over undeveloped parcels, **OR**
 - b. Reestablish the policies, as proposed in the 2nd Draft Area Plan to eliminate the above mentioned policy

PC 10/16/11
 #1
 2 pages
 Distributed by
 staff at meet.

Meyers Area Plan - Key Issues Evolution

October 16, 2014

Maximum Height Limits

Zoning Districts	Existing Max Height (1993 Community Plan)	Proposed Max Height - 2nd MAP Version	Proposed Max Height - 3rd MAP Version
Meyers Community Center	42 ft.	45 ft.	35 ft.
Meyers Industrial	42 ft.	35 ft.	35 ft.
Upper Truckee Residential/ Tourist	42 ft.	42 ft.	35 ft.

Commercial Floor Area

	Existing CFA (1993 Community Plan)	Proposed CFA - 2nd MAP Version	Proposed CFA - 3rd MAP Version
Small Businesses	25,400 SF	15,000 SF	18,650 SF
Other Businesses		18,650 SF	15,000 SF

Density

	Existing Max Density (1993 Plan) (units/ acre)	Proposed Max Density (units/acre) - 2nd MAP Version	Proposed Max Density (units/acre) - 3rd MAP Version
Tourist Accomodation	40	40	15
Multi-Family Residential	15	20	20

Land Use

Zoning Districts	Existing Max Height (1993 Community Plan)	Proposed Max Height - Previous MAP Version	Proposed Max Height - Current MAP Version
Meyers Community Center	Three Districts	One District	One District
Meyers Industrial	Same	Same	Same
Upper Truckee Residential/ Tourist	Same	Some MFR Changes	Some MFR Changes

Meyers Advisory Council

	Existing 1993 Community Plan	2nd MAP Version	3rd MAP Version
MAC	Community Plan Team	Less Formal version of MAC	Formalized MAC; Either Elected MAC or Appointed by Gov Bd

Community Incentive Program

	Existing Max Height (1993 Community Plan)	Proposed Max Height - 2nd MAP Version	Proposed Max Height - 3rd MAP Version
Community Incentive Program	No Program	Two Tiered Program	One Tier Program (Top Tier Removed)

Support for Small Businesses

	Existing 1993 Community Plan	2nd MAP Version	3rd MAP Version
Small Businesses	N/A	Limited Policies, Less CFA Allocated	Additional Policies, More CFA Allocated

Meyers Residents and Business Owners

PC 10/16/14
#1
Distributed by
Jennifer Quashnick
during meeting

El Dorado County Development Services
2850 Fairlane Court, Building "C" Placerville, CA 95667
3368 Lake Tahoe Blvd, Room 302 South Lake Tahoe, CA

October 16, 2014

Dear Members of the El Dorado County Planning Commission:

Thank you for opportunity to provide comments regarding the process surrounding the update of the draft Meyers Area Plan. This memo aims to summarize our key issues and efforts.

First, we want to clarify that we are not against new growth. Although we came together over concerns about the large, out-of-scale developments that would be allowed by the September 2013 draft the new Meyers Area Plan, we quickly learned the public had not been well-engaged in the update process, and had not been provided the information necessary to understand many of the changes to Meyers land use and zoning brought by the TRPA Regional Plan Update's Town Center "overlay." Our top issues are:


1. We want the community to have an informed say in the plans for our future growth.
2. We are a small community having a new plan pushed on us by TRPA, a bi-state agency of unelected, appointed Board members.
3. Our key interest is that a clear and transparent process be undertaken to ensure the Meyers community decides its own future. This requires information be provided in a form that is *clear and understandable* to the general public.


Upon realizing the community was generally unaware of the new Plan's changes, we began a volunteer effort last February to bring information to the public and request TRPA and others lead a transparent and clear process. Our efforts include, but are not limited to:


- Walking neighborhoods and speaking with the public and hosting a public meeting on 2/6;
- Preparing comments, flyers, Letters to the Editor, and obtaining signatures on petitions;
- Creating an email list, website, and Facebook page¹ in order to inform the public; and
- Working with the South Tahoe Chamber of Commerce to inform the public and request more engagement, including a validated survey, to obtain feedback from the Meyers area community.

We support new development in the Meyers area. However, we do not believe the parameters of our future growth should be dictated by non-local, unelected officials, nor by large corporations wanting to build projects in our area. There are many unresolved issues that have not been properly vetted among the Meyers area community, and a great deal of confusion remains. Our primary interest is ensuring that future growth in our area is based on what the majority of the community wants to see.

Sincerely,


Jennifer Quashnick
13-year resident


Diane Verwoest
44 yrs resident.


ANGELA OLSON


Robin S. Olson

¹ meyersresident@live.com; www.meyersresident.com; Meyers for Meyers (Facebook page)



Quality Inn and Suites,
South Lake Tahoe
Acres = 2.5
Rooms = 120
TAU/ACRE = 48
Coverage = Approx. 100%



Hampton Inn, Truckee
Acres = 3.10
Rooms = 109
TAU/ACRE = 35
Coverage = Approx. 75%



Super 8 Motel,
South Lake Tahoe
Acres = 3.23
Rooms = 108
TAU/ACRE = 33
Coverage = Approx. 80%



Cedar House, Truckee
Acres = 1.34
Rooms = 42
TAU/ACRE = 32
Coverage = Approx. 75%

PC 10/16/14
#1
2 pages
Steve Wall

Building Height Study



FLAT PITCH ROOF



4 PITCH ROOF



6 PITCH ROOF



8 PITCH ROOF



10 PITCH ROOF



12 PITCH ROOF



Tahoe Area
Sierra Club
Group

PC 10/16/14

1

2 pages

Distributed by Laurel Ames
during meeting.

October 16, 2014

El Dorado County Development Services
2850 Fairlane Court, Building "C" Placerville, CA 95667
3368 Lake Tahoe Blvd, Room 302 South Lake Tahoe, CA

Dear Members of the El Dorado County Planning Commission:

The Tahoe Area Sierra Club (TASC) thanks you for the opportunity to comment on the future planning of the Meyers Community. Your notice indicates that you are collecting information for CEQA purposes and these comments are prepared with that in mind.

The first issue is the format of the plan for Meyers, and your choices are an Area Plan or a Community Plan. The planning process in Meyers has been contentious due to the nature of the TRPA imposing its one-size fits all economic development plan process on the small town of Meyers. On the west slope this would be akin to dropping the Placerville land use plan on El Dorado. In other words, it's the wrong concept, the wrong size, the wrong zoning, and the wrong outcome for the Meyers Community. For example, the TRPA's Area Plan voids the county's usual zoning practices for the Meyers area, and re-zones a large number of properties into one big catchall of Multi-Use. This misguided effort results in Commercial/Industrial uses placed within Residential uses to become one big Multi-use zone, as practiced in Houston, Texas. The Community Plan, on the other hand, provides the standard zoning protections that the county uses throughout the west side and in the Tahoma area.

The Meyers community for years has worked together, without the heavy hand of the TRPA, to create a Community Plan that meets the needs of the general community. As a practical matter and in terms of addressing the Meyers area as a community, the existing Community Plan, developed by the community, provides for future commercial construction, apartments, and homes and has not been subject to the divisive uproars over projects supported by the TRPA to be imposed on the community.

In terms of CEQA, the existing Meyers Community Plan should provide a basic structure that will be shown to generally protect the environment, is of a scale that will not substantially increase internal vehicle trips, will protect its exceptional scenic surroundings, and provides the zoning that the community desires.

Environmental issues to be resolved must address the restoration of the SEZ values of the two creeks and one drainage that includes the golf course, as channeled along the CCC building, and potentially spread back to its historic width on the northeast side of Highway 50. Meyers benefits from very flat land and very well-drained soils, such that water quality improvements will be much simpler than in other Area Plans in the basin. However, it is also important to develop and assure that BMPs that recognize the unique drainage of Meyer's soils are installed as a requirement of the new plan.

In addition, Meyers Community must adopt a tree-protection ordinance that respects and honors the 800+ year old juniper trees that are spotted throughout the community. Hwy 50 and Hwy 89 provide challenges to the community that neither the Area Plan nor the Community Plan have addressed. As the gateway to the South Shore, Meyers faces the difficult dilemma of a preponderance of through traffic - - it behooves the county to join with Meyers in analyzing and developing ameliorations of that traffic, whether overpasses, significant traffic slowdowns, and other transportation techniques.

The TASC urges you to recommend the Community Plan format for the future of Meyers and for the CEQA analysis.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment at this information-gathering meeting, and look forward to reviewing your next documents in this process. If you have any questions, please contact me by phone or email as shown below.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Laurel Ames".

Laurel Ames
Conservation Chair
Tahoe Area Sierra Club Group
laurel@watershednetwork.org
530-541-5752