



## Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

June 20, 2023, 5:00 PM

Town Hall – Administrative Center | 10183 Truckee Airport Road, Truckee, CA

---

**1. Call to Order 5:00 PM**

**2. Roll Call**- Chair Gove, Commissioner Fraiman, Commissioner Clarin, Commissioner Cavanagh, Commissioner Taylor

**3. Pledge of Allegiance**

**4. Public Comment**

Chair Gove opened Public Comment.

Seeing none, Chair Gove closed Public Comment.

**5. Appointment Program**

**- Selection of Chair**

Commissioner Fraiman nominated Chair Gove for Chair.

Chair Gove declined.

Chair Gove nominated Commissioner Clarin for Chair.

Commissioner Clarin accepted the nomination.

**Commissioner Clarin was appointed to Chair Clarin and carried the following vote:**

**Ayes:** Chair Clarin, Vice Chair Gove, Commissioner Fraiman, Commissioner Cavanagh, Commissioner Taylor

**Noes:** None

**Abstain:** None

**Absent:** None

**- Selection of Vice Chair**

Chair Clarin nominated Commissioner Gove.

Commissioner Gove accepted the nomination.

**Commissioner Gove was appointed to Vice Chair Gove and carried the following vote:**

**Ayes:** Chair Clarin, Vice Chair Gove, Commissioner Fraiman, Commissioner Cavanagh, Commissioner Taylor

**Noes:** None

**Abstain:** None

**Absent:** None

**6. Approval of Minutes**

## 6.1 May 16, 2023 Minutes - Regular Meeting

### Edits:

- Page 4, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph, 3<sup>rd</sup> line, “developers can essentially”, instead of “essential”.
- Page 5, last bullet upper section, change to: “...try to get those foundations in.”
- Deliberation section: “Ham radios” instead of “hand radios.”

**Commissioner Cavanagh made a motion that was approved by Vice Chair Gove to approve the May 15, 2023, Minutes with the above changes. The motion passed and carried the following vote:**

**Ayes:** Chair Clarin, Vice Chair Gove, Commissioner Fraiman, Commissioner Cavanagh, Commissioner Taylor

**Noes:** None

**Abstain:** None

**Absent:** None

**Staff recommended the commission consider changing the agenda order to move Item 9.1, Tahoe Donner Downhill Ski Lodge before Item 7.1, Objective Design Standards, due to the recommendation to continue Item 9.1 and due to the number of community members in attendance for Item 9.1. It was also noted that Public Comment could be re-opened if members of the public came later thinking Item 9.1 would be heard later in the meeting.**

**Vice Chair Gove made a motion that was seconded by Commissioner Taylor to change the agenda to move agenda Item 9.1 before Item 7.1. The motion passed and carried the following vote:**

**Ayes:** Chair Clarin, Vice Chair Gove, Commissioner Fraiman, Commissioner Cavanagh, Commissioner Taylor

**Noes:** None

**Abstain:** None

**Absent:** None

## **9. Public Hearings (Major Review)**

- 9.1 Updated 6/20/23: Request to Continue the Public Hearing on the Tahoe Donner Downhill Ski Lodge (Planning Application 2022-00000071/DP-MUP; 11585 Snowpeak Way (also addressed as 11603 Snowpeak Way), 14943 Slalom Way, 12250 Viking Way, 14942 Slalom Way; APNs 046-250-009, 046-050-002, 046-050-001, and 046-040-002)**

**Recommended Action:** That the Planning Commission continue this agenda item (Agenda Item 9.1) to a date and time uncertain at the Planning Commission hearing on June 20, 2023 to allow the Town and the applicant to review the public comment received and provide responses, as appropriate. Staff also recommends that the Planning Commission extend the public comment period for the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (State Clearinghouse #2023050519) to the end of the week, 5:00 PM on June 23, 2023.

As a reminder, the Planning Commission should open the public hearing and continue it to a date and time uncertain. When a new hearing date is scheduled, an updated public notice will be provided consistent with the requirements of Development Code Section 18.180.030 (Notice of Hearing).

### **Clarifying Questions**

- What is the nature of response to Public Comment?
  - If there are no changes to the project between now and the next time the commission hears this project, the responses to the Public Comment will likely be in the Staff Report.
- The applicant also requested the delay?
  - They agreed to the delay.

## **Public Comment**

### **Chair Clarin opened public comment.**

**Greg McDougall, past president of Tahoe Donner:** Asks staff to address the issues submitted in written comments and to look at traffic safety, evacuation fire and housing issues, and environmental issues. States we do not have a Conditional Use Permit for this project because one cannot be found. Without one, we cannot legally enforce any restrictions on the lodge. Questions why an EIR (Environmental Impact Report) wasn't required for this project. States the law requires an EIR for any project that may have a significant environmental impact.

**Roland Lee, second homeowner in Tahoe Donner:** Just heard about this meeting today. Doesn't agree with the way trees are being marked in Tahoe Donner by the Forest Service. Is not supportive with enlarging something that was not previously approved. Feels it is wrong to rush things.

**Jeff Shellito, Tahoe Donner homeowner:** Part of the group "Tahoe Donner Change"; supports the postponement of the hearing. Feels there is enough engineering, environmental and legal issues that deserve the extra time. Thinks the letters that were submitted by the Tahoe Donner Change Group's legal counsel and the hydrologist they employ to review the project and the letter from the Center for Biological Diversity need to be taken into account, as well as the input for the mitigated negative declaration and general comments. Supportive of replacing the lodge but not the project that is being submitted.

**Cheryll Cross-Powell, Tahoe Donner resident:** Main concerns are regarding the increased disturbed underground water due to extensive foundation and excavation depth increases. The plans are requiring foundational excavation to a depth of 10 to 12 feet and moving the foundation forward towards the Eagle Rock lift. The NV5 report that was put out by Tahoe Donner showed water in three of four subsurface borings at a depth of six to eight feet in a drought year. No subsurface water surveys were done in that area.

**Trish Hackemack, Tahoe Donner resident:** Concerned about noise the new lodge will bring. Opposes the size of the project. The new lodge is too big for the site and usage. The Tahoe Donner Association should have a conditional use permit. Concerned for a four-season ski area; the traffic alone in the winter is bad as is. Worries about risk of flooding and drainage issues from all of that work. The potential wastewater and sediment discharge could threaten Alder Creek. Where would all of the wastewater go? What would the ramification be if the current Tahoe Donner plans are not subject to the long-term goals of Truckee 2040?

**Jeff Connors: Former president and treasurer of Tahoe Donner:** Agree with the previous comments stating the homework has not been done on this project, the conditions put forth are not the real conditions. Question for Chair Clarin: Since you have been actively involved in Tahoe Donner in a similar role, do you have the ability to remain unbiased? Is there a conflict? Feels like that should be considered. The comments were still open but there was a recommendation made, doesn't understand how a recommendation could have been made while the comment period was still open. The residents do not want this.

**John Henry Byer, Tahoe Donner resident and registered California Geophysicist:** Interested in the June 19 report by Greg Cayman, a registered California hydrologist. Feels his points are well

thought out and they present various concerns that have been discussed by previous public comments. Feels more work should be done regarding drainage in and around the site.

**Michael Sullivan, resident of Tahoe Donner:** 40 years ago, there were no crowds in Tahoe Donner. Now he has to step over people at the lodge. Volunteered on a committee to analyze the ski area to see what the members' needs were. Discovered building codes have changed since the construction of the old building. The new building standards take up more space and cost more money. Worked with three firms who design ski resorts and came up with a plan for a 24,000 sq. ft. structure that would satisfy the needs of Tahoe Donner.

**Charles Wu, past president of Tahoe Donner:** The consensus is to replace the current lodge. The issue is the appropriateness of the building regarding size. This ski lodge isn't just for the members, it is for everybody in the public. It is a commercial enterprise. Doesn't understand how this fits in the 2040 General Plan. The proposed lodge doesn't seem like a replacement because of the increase in size and the amount of people this new lodge will bring.

**Chair Clarin closed public comment.**

### **Commission Response to Public Comment**

- The possibility of a conflict of interest has been discussed already with staff and the commission and it was not determined to be a conflict because this winter, I did not do architectural standards and have not seen this project come in front of me or made any public comments about it.
- A recommendation to postpone this application has not been decided, that will be decided during this meeting during Deliberation.
- It is not the Town of Truckee that voted yes or no on Tahoe Donner's vote. It was Tahoe Donner members. When Tahoe Donner submits an application to the Town, the cost is immaterial. Regarding the size – if it is within the legal boundaries of the property then the Town doesn't have the discretion to require something different. If the members have an issue with the size, the members need to go back to the Tahoe Donner Board and change the size through them to send in to the Town of Truckee. The Town's job is to ensure the project meets the Town of Truckee's rules, regulations, and codes; not Tahoe Donners.

### **Deliberation:**

- Would be in favor of continuing this item considering the applicant agreed to the continuation. There isn't a staff presentation ready tonight so it doesn't seem like there is another route.
- We do need to keep in mind that what's not before us is the size or the nature of this building. That has been decided by the Tahoe Donner Board.
- Commissioner Cavanagh disclosed she is a Tahoe Donner resident, employee and the lodge is 7 minutes from her home. Has been receiving emails and studied the web pages on this topic for years. Has discussed this topic with Tahoe Donner staff as well as members. Also been following this on NextDoor.
- If the applicant has agreed to postpone this in hopes to respond to some of the public comment, can see postponing it. Otherwise, we have all of the information and came prepared to discuss it.
- If we said yes to this project, it is still up to Tahoe Donner if they want to build it, correct?
- Yes. It's happened before where we approve something and then the applicants decide they don't want to approve it and come back with something else and start all over again; isn't that correct?
- Yes.

- Its my understanding that one of our rules is to decide whether or not we accept the Mitigated Negative Declaration document. If we accept that, it leads us to saying yes to the Development Permit. Not the appropriateness of the project.
  - Staff: Yes, you are looking at the environmental review and the findings, so it is the two components. If you felt like you don't have enough information you would continue it and if you felt like you could make those findings and that you didn't see any impacts, then you would take a different action.
- In favor of continuing this. Giving the applicant more time to respond to public comment may be in their best interest and provide us with more information to make a better decision and allow this to move forward in a way that is more acceptable to everybody. Don't want to prolong this too far into the future. This has been worked on for years and needs to have a resolution.
- It sounds like we are all in agreement.
- Do we want to do a date uncertain to have an adequate time to prepare this? Can't we put it at our next meeting?
  - Staff: We don't want to rush if we need to bring in experts to review our comments.
- There are some pretty big issues brought up and it should be done right the first time instead of fixing it later.
- It is outside of our control, but we may see this project again in its current form.

**Vice Chair Gove made a motion that was seconded by Commission Fraiman to continue Planning Application 2022-00000071 (Tahoe Donner Downhill Ski Lodge) to a date and time uncertain and to extend the public comment period for the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration to the end of the week, 5:00 PM on June 23, 2023. The motion passed and carried the following vote:**

**Ayes:** Chair Clarin, Vice Chair Gove, Commissioner Fraiman, Commissioner Cavanagh, Commissioner Taylor

**Noes:** None

**Abstain:** None

**Absent:** None

## **7. Workshop Item**

### **7.1 Objective Design Standards**

**Recommended Action:** That the Planning Commission receive a presentation on the draft objective design standards, receive public comment, and provide feedback on the draft language.

#### **Clarifying questions:**

- What is podium parking?
- What is a crusher screen?
- Do we really need to talk about car elevators in this town?
  - We have received some applicant requests for car elevators.
- What was the garage height? Is the 12-foot plate height?
  - The 12-foot height is the highest point of the garage at the front of the building.
- That seems ridiculously low. If you have an SUV with a rocket box on it you're not going to get in an eight foot garage door. That is a regular vehicle for Truckee.
- If we are talking about banning construction on a slope greater than 30 degrees. Is that on parcels that are on newly formed subdivisions? Or does that affect the lots in Tahoe Donner that aren't built on?
  - It would not impact existing single-family subdivisions. If the subdivision went into a multifamily parcel in Tahoe Donner, it would impact that.
- Where is the "Affordability to purchaser or renter" covered?

- There is nothing in this objective that helps affordability. Everything listed increases the cost of construction.
- Feels the “Affordability to purchaser or renter” should be removed from the described objectives.
- If there are no efforts made to figure out how to make things less expensive, then why even acknowledge it?
- Has an architect designed a test fit of these standards to see if they could understand them and if they were objective and clear?
  - No.
- Have any cost or feasibility studies for parking or affordability been conducted? Can a developer conform to these standards, build parking the way they need to only having 24 dwelling units per acre in our high-density areas and make it cost effective?
- That would be worth while to look into or get some anecdotal evidence from talking to developers, architects, or contractors in town.
- Thinks there needs to be more clarity around how these standards are inclusive or exclusive of each other and how they layer onto each other.
- Some things are defined as number of units but feel some would be better defined by building types.
- Page 28 talks about a minimum storage capacity- do we need to dictate the size of a closet, and is a 6ft x 6ft closet the right size and is that going to constrict to a developer how they lay out a building? Regarding the building variety one and how it relates to affordability- If you had 40 units and had to have 10 different designs; affordability is out the window and that makes every unit a custom unit.
- Didn’t understand in the Residential Mixed Use Development Standards- how there is a minimum of two units per acre and a maximum of four units per acre. How does that conflict? There is a note about workforce housing but that’s not a huge range. I am curious how that would pencil out on a development.
- Confused on the Downtown Visitor Lodging Zoning because the only DVL Zoning parcel in the Town of Truckee is Coburn Crossing which is already developed.
  - Staff: That one is an existing rule that we haven’t changed, we are just carrying it forward.
- Do we know what in here is existing and what has changed?
  - Everything is new with the exception of that section.
- The maximum multifamily residential unit size is going to be a maximum average residential area shall be 1,000 sq. ft.- what is the purpose of that? That is pigeonholing us into studios, one bedroom and two-bedroom units and no three- and four-bedroom units.
- 150 participants, there are how many people in Truckee?
  - 17,000.
- So, 1% of the population has dictated this whole thing?
- This brings up gambrels and A-Frames. Those are junk, people do not want them.
- “Buildings need to be parallel to the front line.” That wouldn’t allow homes to have solar. I feel surprised by that.
- “Have to have at least one tree at an entry way.” Insurance and the fire department wouldn’t let that happen.
- Regarding the flexibility if the project is super huge to come to the Planning Commission- why wouldn’t that be offered to anybody, why does it have to be a big project?
- Regarding the 45-foot-deep house max – that would eliminate my “Tahoe tunnel”, which is probably the only affordable new construction.
- What is the depth in yours?
- 56 feet.
- I think it’s 45 feet without a break in plane?
- You cannot create rules and expect it to be affordable it needs to be the other way around.
  - That was a question we asked in our community survey. We also asked our focus group if they would like to see different standards for affordable housing and they

- said they didn't want to see markedly different housing for affordable units, specifically.
  - We are trying to find a balance. Affordable housing projects also have the option for density bonuses and are allowed to relax our standards through that process.
- We want housing to be affordable but do not want barracks around town.
- There may be some subset of the standards shown here that can be added like the entryway feature that's a variation on what is shown here as a bonus or reduction of outdoor space like we saw in Soaring Ranch, those are the types of things you would possibly trade for a density bonus?
  - Yes, the current density bonus standards can relax up to four of the standards which includes the outdoor space like you saw with Soaring Ranch.
  - There is also the potential with the General Plan Update with implementation of the General Plan that will be creating the Town Density Bonus program, which will be specific to what kind of housing our community wants to see. That is a pathway where we can relax some of these standards for specific types of projects.
- 150 people answered out of 15,000 that live here, and the remaining people don't know that these exist and that doesn't mean that they don't care.
- The consultants here have gone through a process reviewing other development standards so I wouldn't say those 150 people dictated what is in here, they informed what is in here.
  - The Objective Design Standards are also based in our Design Guidelines, which has been a community document since the early 2000s.

**Chair Clarin opened Public Comment.**

**Seeing none, Chair Clarin closed Public Comment.**

**Discussion:**

- Regarding the language in general- this is supposed to give clarity to people who are trying to meet the standards so we should make it less antiquated and say things "will" or "must" and not use the word "shall". Language like "at least" or "minimum" or "maximum", is a lot easier to interpret.
- It is very common to use "shall be".
- I would advocate for simplifying the language.
- For a unit of measure, I would like to see the units in numerals, not spelled out. Numerals pop out of a paragraph, and it would be easier for people.
- Is there a legally with that? When writing a real estate contract, the numbers are written and then spelled out next to it.
- That is a contract.
- The usage of the percent sign and the word percent should be consistent in this chapter.
- Regarding the comfortable walking conditions – how much more could you dictate in here off site as to the connection to the outer world, I can't see where you could do that. Is there any idea you have been considering there?
  - No, the consideration is more in terms of the street frontage and the pedestrian realm where someone is walking on the public sidewalk. We have talked about how this would help connecting multifamily residential projects to our sidewalk infrastructure, but we need to have a conversation with engineering to see what works with their requirements.
- I don't see a place in here to put that.
- Was there a spot in here that says one of the multi-subdivisions had to have a circumnavigating sidewalk on it?
  - There is not a specific requirement for a circumnavigating sidewalk.
- That might be one place you could say a multifamily development would have to have a sidewalk all the way around it or at least more.

- Unsure if that makes it too difficult to build?
- More requirements, more money.
- I think there is a gross lack of sidewalks here and if we have the potential to require that as part of new projects that would be really helpful.
- A lot of people walk here and walking on the street isn't the safest situation.
- Agree with something like a sidewalk requirement that could be based on four multifamily projects or for new subdivisions.
- The diagram with the parking in the center and the multifamily around- that is a very confusing diagram, and I cannot picture a development that looks like that. The diagram that was shown in the presentation illustrates the same concept in a clearer way by using open space and having parking behind and then clustering of the buildings. Maybe replacing the two diagrams would be beneficial.
- We need to make it clear what we want to see, not just what fits.

### **Questions for the Community:**

#### **Is wildfire mitigation adequately addressed in these standards? Do you know of any fire-resistant materials or technologies that should be encouraged or required?**

- We already have WUI in place. Are we going to have more local standards like requiring HardieBacker? I feel like we have enough legislature in place.
- In here it talks about how wood is a remarkable material and I wholeheartedly disagree.
- How often do you have to paint HardieBacker, Trex, fake stone and real stone compared to wood? There's no comparison.
- I think WUI is adequate and don't think we need to add to it.
- I think the devastating wildfires aren't how we build the buildings it's how we manage the forests.
- There is a lot of defensible space work happening with is cool to see.
- Technology changes so we should be open to that as different products emerge.

#### **Is enough emphasis given to the public realm and supporting comfortable walking conditions?**

- I think we approved a commercial project up in Tahoe Donner on Zurich and they were required to put in sidewalks, but there's no sidewalks on either side of the property so they are putting in a sidewalk in front of their project they're not building, so the sidewalk doesn't go anywhere. Does that meet this intent to give an emphasis to support comfortable walking conditions?
- Wanting to require multifamily projects to create sidewalks is great but the sidewalks have to go somewhere; there has to be some thought behind them.
- Look at West River Street – we are going to get more sidewalks and more parking, it is happening.
- I thought the Legacy Trail is what we did for walking. It is a pedestrian access that goes all over town and connects all of the communities.
- I think this is a very broad question that deal with all types of sites. Mixed-use, single-family, multifamily, new subdivisions.
- Are sidewalks going to be required in Gray's Crossing parcel F?
- That is a new subdivision, so yes.
- Wouldn't that fall within the Gray's specific plan?
- Staff: Our Development Standards don't currently have a specific sidewalk standard. The engineering standards determines when we put frontage improvements on a project. If you want to put in sidewalk requirements we can, we just need to make sure they're objective and to the projects you want to see. There's potential we can look at specific frontage roads like Donner Pass Road from Coldstream to Frates. Those already have sidewalks for the majority of that stretch but if there's other areas, you'd like sidewalks we can create those objective design standards. If you are okay with how it is currently being

processed through the Engineering Division then we can defer to them. There are always going to be projects with variances or maybe shouldn't have the standard applied if we had the ability to review them on a case-by-case basis. The state has taken that away from us in some instances. There are options for developers to either do density bonuses to get waivers or in the future use the town density bonuses or go the flexible design path where they can work with the town to determine what fits for their project.

- I feel like engineering is doing a good job of dictating where we need sidewalks for projects.
- The question pertains to comfortable walking conditions, not specifically sidewalks.
- If that's the case, where a sidewalk requirement would fit would be for a new subdivision so we can put sidewalks in residential neighborhoods where people will use them.
- That is what these standards apply to, new subdivisions.
- If we can put something in about surrounding or a little more connection on the multi-families that would be great.

**Do these regulations support and encourage enough flexibility to design while respecting existing look and feel of "Truckee funk" architecture?**

- The more regulations are required; the more things look the same. My answer is no, but I don't think you can if you need to be objective.
- For things like the articulation on the facades, it seemed like there was flexibility and ranges for some. Unsure if that gives builders enough flexibility.
- Staff: The first question is the million-dollar question we have asked ourselves a lot. We have lost a lot of that ability and the only way to do objective design standards is to put some rigidity in place, unfortunately. We did try to build in some flexibility. We tried to look at proportions and percentages over strict dimensions but if there are other areas where we can incorporate that type of language instead of what we have, we are happy to explore them.
- Are the two types of siding a minimum or a maximum?
- Staff: There was a minimum two high quality climate appropriate and fire-resistant materials. That's not just siding but other types of materiality on the structure.
- Wood is not a long-term weathering material at all. I am stuck on that.
- Why brick only in downtown?
- Staff: We allow the brick in Downtown Truckee because it is something we see in downtown and typically don't see it elsewhere in our community.
- Things change. Years ago, we wanted parts of the structure to look like itself but now architects are purposely differentiating areas of homes. There is no flexibility in changing things for later when we write it for the style today.
- The example of materials list is pretty limited.
- Who is using shingles anymore?
- This is a style thing, trends come and go.
- Staff: Trex is not allowed downtown currently. The deck floor for 1882 has been approved but other than that, it hasn't been approved elsewhere.
- Staff: We have the ability to modify these in the future. We recognize trends change over time. We are trying to put something in place today because that is what the State of California is telling us we have to do. In the future, if we find that some of these materials are no longer trending or there are other materials that would add to the Truckee funk, we can work on amending the ordinance. This is not a stagnant document. We understand there are going to be aspects of this that don't work and will only find those when we start implementing these.
- Will applicants be able to come in and request a variance?
- Staff: Yes, that is essentially through the flexible approach if someone doesn't want to adhere to the more rigid standards, they can still pursue their design, it just means it's not the streamlined pathway that is mandated under the Objective Design Standards.

- Would they be able to do that at the staff level or would they have to come to Planning Commission?
- Staff: It would depend on the permit type. Projects less than 11 residential units are reviewed at the staff level unless there's another permit that layers on top that makes it more discretionary.
- If somebody wanted to go around these and not be streamlined and they're smaller than 11; is it possible to do that?
- Staff: Yes. Before these requirements came into place, we reviewed small projects at the staff level and discussed design guidelines rather than standards. We talked with architects or the designers of their projects and had an iterative process where we would suggest tweaking parts.
- According to this, Trex is not an allowable material?
- Staff: I don't know if it is a prohibited material, we do allow fiber cement, so there is potential we can create specific allowances for composite decking or that type of material. If there's specific locations you want to see them in, we can also identify that in the code.
- The materials section is related to exterior cladding not really speaking to decking and fence materials. There is a differentiation so we can make that clearer, we can. The idea is a composite decking isn't appropriate as the cladding for a building.
- So not as a vertical surface but okay as a horizontal surface?
- Correct.
- It should say that then.
- It also says editions use only materials found in the existing structure. Architecturally right now, people are purposely designing to not do that so I'm not sure why that is in there.
- Regarding the 15% additions of square feet, that is a really small amount.
- Cement and plywood are technically composite materials.
- The answer to the question for us is no, but how do we get to a yes, the Truckee way.

**Should certain types of recreation amenities be required? If so, which?**

- No.
- I think the standards offer some examples, but they don't dictate them and I don't think they should.
- All agree.

**Should there be more standards for low impact design and sustainability?**

- I feel like a building needs to be designed and modeled with the current version of the energy code to see if it can meet compliance standards. Right now, we have solar requirements for multifamily which we didn't have for low and mid-rise. If we're disallowing some different sort orientations of buildings making sure we can be in compliance with the energy code I think is really important. There are other avenues to take to get to that efficiency. Especially when we are talking about fenestration with the windows because there are some strict requirements in the energy code related to windows.
- Regarding flat roofs, having an SRI for that roofing product would be an affordable win in terms of sustainability.
- Since we are trending towards dark colors, there are SRI coatings that increase reflectance on roofs that would decrease heat retention.
- We do have Title 24, which is the most stringent energy compliance standards in the country.
- If we're looking for standards for low impact design and sustainability, there's a lot of standards in place that are going to be required.
- Yes, anything built with the new 2022 energy code and Title 24 is excellent.
- In terms of low impact development, the state has requirements for that, and I don't think we need to go beyond that.
- Staff: We did a design workshop and staff looked at solar orientation as a standard within our code and we had a hard time coming up with something that wouldn't turn out to be

- odd. Is there a study that could show us that this solar orientation is better than a parallel to the front property line orientation so we can say that is a greater benefit to the design.
- The last two houses I built I gave had a solar analyst to make sure before we designed it to make sure it had the proper solar gain on it. We were purposely placing it to get the gain.
  - Staff: So, having an energy consultant provide a study showing two different orientations?
  - No, then you're just adding more money.
  - They're already doing it and they already can do it.
  - Is there any room in the roof section? I noticed you have to have different types of rooves and articulation in the roof. Is there any way to incorporate it in there somewhere?
  - Requiring every house to be parallel to the street within 10 feet creates a suburban feel.
  - In an urban setting it creates a nice uniform streetscape and a sense of place. I think that is the idea for these standards.
  - Not for a new subdivision.
  - It's just homogenized americana it looks bad.
  - Not something that looks like a suburb, but something that looks like an urban setting with townhouses and things.
  - If these standards are followed it is going to look like a suburb.
  - I just bought a lot on a street where the houses are lined up identically facing the front of the street and they're achieving something there. It depends on the scale. If you're talking about half-acre lots, orient them however you want; but if you're talking about something that is 50 feet wide or a tight higher density area that uniformity can provide a sense of place. If you're talking about the suburbs where things are spread out you're going to end up with anywhere USA, and we don't want that.
  - It is important to get really decent solar exposure. How do you achieve what you're trying to achieve while getting the energy gain?
  - Staff: We could also create different requirements based off of the average size of the parcel if it is a half-acre vs a parcel with a 50-foot frontage in a more urban setting. There could be different requirements in terms of where it's located in terms of the front's property line or how it's oriented.
  - Using Tahoe Donner as an example, most of those lots are 70-75 wide 1/3 acres, and you can place the house wherever you want. I think that adds character.
  - The streets aren't on a grid there. So, the houses are going to be facing every which way because the streets of Tahoe Donner are all curved.
  - We don't have anything where the streets are all on a grid.
  - Staff: There's a limited amount of land that's going to allow single-family subdivisions within our community.
  - Ironically, orienting the houses in line and parallel to the street is probably the cheapest and easiest option and lowest common denominator. Orienting them the other way is probably more challenging and more expensive. We're now putting a rule in place and it drives the standard. Why put anything in there? The developer is going to choose the cheapest route which would be making them all straight in a line. If a developer wants to provide more interest, it's going to be more challenging and more expensive to do, but we are not going to allow that possibility by putting that into the design guidelines.
  - Yeah, that is an objectivity that doesn't need to be there.
  - It's forcing a developer to go with straight.
  - We might want to give them the option to go with something different.
  - Consultant: There is a difference in the building orientation requirements for new single family subdivisions vs new multifamily development. New single-family subdivisions, the orientation requirement is 10% of the front façade should be parallel to the front setback line so there's a gesture to the orientation of the street but the rest could be oriented in any way that would make sense for the developer. So, everything wouldn't be the same in the new single-family subdivisions.
  - How do you do that on a cul-de-sac?

- Consultant: We can add some information about how that measurement would be done, typically it's taking a tangent of the circle and partially orienting it to that.
- State laws are already dictating low impact and sustainability in a high-quality way. I don't think we need more requirements.
- Correct. The town is also working on other sustainability related building code options, too. So, I think we're covered here.
- The consensus is there shouldn't be more standards.

**Are there terms that need defining?**

- On page 18, it says "untreated smooth corrugated metal", smooth and corrugated can't be the same thing.

**Final Discussion**

- Thinks the 12-foot garage maximum needs to be pulled out.
- Everyone is to email comments, suggestions, and edits to staff before the next meeting. Set a deadline for Wednesday, June 28<sup>th</sup>, at 9 AM
- Has an architect consultant gone through this? Do we have anybody like Brendan Riley?
- Staff: Yes, we have a focus group of five architect/developers from Truckee. Brendan Riley, David Tirman, Chisty Thompson, David Bourke, and Scott Ryan.

**8. Public Hearings (Minor Review) - None.**

**10. Staff Reports –**

- Objective Design Standards again.
- A carwash project.
- Possibly an appeal for Code Compliance.

**11. Information Items-**

None.

**12. Commission Member Reports**

None.

**13. Adjournment. 7:36 PM** To the next meeting of the Planning Commission, July 18, 2023, 5:00 PM at 10183 Truckee Airport Road, Truckee, CA 96161.