

# Letter: Tahoe City Lodge transparency lacking

**Publisher's note:** *This letter was sent to Placer County and TRPA officials. It is published with permission.*

To the North Lake Tahoe Community: Placer County & TRPA Legal Counsel and Staff,

I provided public comment at the Placer Board of Supervisors Jan. 9, 2018, meeting on **agenda item 4A**: granting 60 Tourist accommodation units (TAU) from the county inventory to Kila Properties for the Tahoe City Lodge project.

The county deferred to the applicant, Kila Properties, to answer my question about the introduction of three bedroom suites which will now be lock-off units for the Tahoe City Lodge which I had stated were not analyzed as part of the Tahoe Basin Area Plan and Tahoe City Lodge EIR/EIS or for public comment. I have asked Kila Properties to provide accountability of all 118 units as additional TAUs may be required for the proposed lock-off units: no response.

Also be aware that the TAUs are being provided to the applicant under an economic sustainability program pool that Placer County purports is necessary due to the tough financial climate in Tahoe to assist developers that need a kick-start. The TAUs are being paid back with transit occupancy tax collected by the condo-hotel with a term of 15 year and is a forgivable loan at a rate of 1.59 percent for almost \$900K (\$879).

It's astounding to me that the applicant doesn't just come out and explain the changes to the proposed room designs. Market demand is an answer, but be upfront with the public that supported you as well as those concerned about its size not being the right fit for such a small area. Understanding the

developer must pencil out return on investment, the applicant should be transparent that a condo-hotel of this magnitude (and it being the applicants first project of this size) will have some changes.

The project should have been 78 hotel rooms and 40 condo-hotel rooms, not the other way around as Tahoe City purports to desperately need a new lodging property. The public has been misled into believing this is a boutique hotel. It's a condo project and hotel rooms are ancillary. The 78 condo owners can utilize their investment for up to 90 days with restrictions on the number of consecutive days. Hmmm: I say, prime season days will be utilized by the owners.

Recognize and address that the Bechdolt Building, BofA and Savemart businesses and patrons, etc., will be affected by the increased volume of vehicles to the hotel, new golf course clubhouse (if it ever gets built), restaurant and new commercial entities. There will be loss of general parking and dedicated business parking which will impact all surrounding businesses. Loss of parking in favor of project only parking is not economically favorable or sustainable to those affected. Is the Tahoe City Lodge Project getting special treatment?

The issues surrounding the multiple use of the easement must be resolved in the interest of public health and safety. Three lanes of traffic where there is only one today is an issue that cannot be ignored.

Where is the criteria and analysis for a valid circulation analysis? Making a left-hand turn from the property on to Highway 28 will be troublesome with line of site issues (at the very least) which will be virtually impossible during the summer and even more dangerous in the winter with icy roads. The majority of the condo and hotel patrons will figure out they need to use the Savemart exit point and no analysis was done for that exit point in the EIR/EIS.

A master plan of how circulation, ingress and egress and shared parking that benefits all the businesses must be drafted and agreed upon. Along with snow removal plans not just for the hotel and golf course. The Tahoe City Lodge project site is not a blank slate. Other businesses do exist adjacent to and nearby the project site.

I still believe that the criteria used to state 132 parking places is adequate is flawed due to the unknown check-in time of guests and golfers along with night time winter activities, employees coming and going all hours of the day/night, restaurant patrons, etc. Furthermore, the variance granted for compact cars did not account for vehicle type utilized in the winter. Can you say snow? Lots of SUVs.

Be transparent that the project envisioned owning the Bechdolt Building as early renderings showed the Bechdolt Building having golf carts stored there and possibly an administrative office for the golf course MOU partners and a small restaurant.

I also provided comment at a recent Tahoe City PUD board meeting about issues between Kila Properties and the TCPUD about the clubhouse component of the project. Will it be rebuilt at current location or will a new building be erected and relocated as stated to the public during environmental analysis? What type of materials will be used to make the clubhouse a quality looking building? Who will run it? And many more: **link to 45-minute public comment** between TCPUD and Kila properties to better understand issues.

I requested the Placer BOS have staff conduct a design review of the TC Golf Course clubhouse component of the Tahoe City Lodge Project to resolve design, location, materials, parking, etc. issues: not scheduled as of Jan. 21.

**Ellie Waller, North Shore resident and Citizen Advisory Team member Tahoe Basin Area Plan**