



Mail
PO Box 5310
Stateline, NV 89449-5310

Location
128 Market Street
Stateline, NV 89449

Contact
Phone: 775-588-4547
Fax: 775-588-4527
www.trpa.org

TAHOE BASIN AREA PLAN Errata

The attached cut-sheets replace Pages 3, 64-66, 90, and 131 of the Tahoe Basin Area Plan document.

imagine. plan. achieve.

Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan

November 2016

Prepared by:

Placer County Planning Services Division

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

Dyett & Bhatia Urban and Regional Planners

Stockham Consulting

Adopted by the Placer County Board of Supervisors:

Adopted by TRPA Governing Board~~Board of Governors~~:

More than fifty percent of North Lake Tahoe residences are used on a seasonal, recreational, or occasional basis. The North Lake Tahoe area is characterized by a high proportion of absentee property owners. Table 3.2-B shows the percentage of absentee ownership among various communities in the North Lake Tahoe area. Kings Beach and Tahoe Vista show the lowest rates of absentee ownership at 34 percent and 50.8 percent, respectively. Dollar Point, Carnelian Bay, and Tahoma have absentee ownership rates of over 60 percent.

Table 3.2-A: Housing Units and Occupancy

<i>Community</i>	<i>Total Units</i>	<i>Occupied</i>	<i>Vacant</i>	<i>Owner- Occupied</i>	<i>Renter- Occupied</i>
Carnelian Bay	947	256	691	171	85
Dollar Point	1,822	571	1,251	363	208
Kings Beach	2,372	1,362	1,010	552	810
Sunnyside/Tahoe City	2,119	744	1,375	402	342
Tahoe Vista	1,446	628	818	398	230
Tahoma	2,058	553	1,505	359	194
Total	10,764	4,114	6,650	2,245	1,869

Source: 2010 U.S. Census

Table 3.2-B: Seasonal Housing Units

<i>Community</i>	<i>Vacant Units Used for Seasonal Use</i>	<i>Percent of All Housing Units</i>
Carnelian Bay	654	69.1%
Dollar Point	1178	64.7%
Kings Beach	807	34.0%
Sunnyside/Tahoe City	1239	58.5%
Tahoe Vista	735	50.8%
Tahoma	1428	69.4%
Total	6041	56.1

Source: 2010 U.S. Census

HOUSING AFFORDABILITY

Overall, there is a shortage of quality housing at prices reflecting median income levels in the Plan area. This Area Plan seeks to correct this problem by encouraging a diverse range of quality housing, including housing for low and moderate income employees that are critical to local businesses.

The availability of affordable and moderately priced residential real estate is inadequate to serve the basin’s workforce. Table 3.2-C shows the median household income of various communities in the Plan area and the corresponding housing price that these households could reasonably afford based on industry metrics.

As shown in Table 3.2-C, Plan area households demonstrated a wide variety of median income levels from a low of \$38,026,543,349 in Kings Beach to a high of \$69,865,85,402 in Tahoe Vista in 2013. By comparison, Placer County had an average median household income of \$72,725,91,628 while the State’s median average household income was \$61,094,85,408. The Plan area offers a range of housing options, from low-quality aged cabins, apartments, and motel properties being used as low-income housing, to high-end luxury residences, condominiums, and fractional-ownership properties.



New Housing in Kings Beach

Table 3.2-C: Median 2013 Household Income

<i>Community</i>	<i>Median Household Income</i>
Carnelian Bay	\$62,36178,364
Dollar Point	\$67,62982,054
Kings Beach	\$38,02654,349
Sunnyside/Tahoe City	\$64,09171,791
Tahoe Vista	\$69,86585,402
Tahoma	\$51,75077,723
Placer County	\$72,72591,628
California	\$61,09485,408

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2013 American Community Survey

As shown on Table 3.2-D, each community in the Area Plan has a higher median housing value than the County median of \$342,000.

As shown in Table 3.2-E, the home prices that are considered affordable range from approximately \$163,047 to \$256,206. There are very few properties available at this price, and most properties on the market are significantly more expensive. Because quality, affordable housing options are limited, many local workers choose to live in communities outside the Lake Tahoe Basin, such as Truckee or Reno. This Area Plan includes policies to pursue additional housing options, including expanded opportunities for secondary dwelling units, mixed-use housing within Centers, and affordable housing projects.

Table 3.2-D: Median 2013 Housing Unit Value

<i>Community</i>	<i>Median Housing Unit Value (owner-occupied)</i>
Carnelian Bay	\$491,100
Dollar Point	\$468,200
Kings Beach	\$348,300
Sunnyside/Tahoe City	\$596,100
Tahoe Vista	\$519,300
Tahoma	\$539,100
Placer County	\$342,000
California	\$366,400

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2013 American Community Survey

Table 3.2-E: Housing Affordability, 2013

<i>Community</i>	<i>Median Household Income</i>	<i>Affordable Home Based on Income</i> ¹	<i>Median Housing Unit Value</i>
Carnelian Bay	\$62,361,783,364	\$235,092	\$491,100
Dollar Point	\$67,62982,054	\$246,162	\$468,200
Kings Beach	\$38,02654,349	\$163,047	\$348,300
Sunnyside/Tahoe City	\$64,09174,794	\$215,373	\$596,100
Tahoe Vista	\$69,86585,402	\$256,206	\$519,300
Tahoma	\$51,75077,723	\$233,169	\$539,100
Placer County	\$72,72591,628	\$274,884	\$342,000
California	\$61,09485,408	\$256,224	\$366,400

¹ Estimate based on four-times annual income. Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2010 Census and 2013 American Community Survey

This amendment recognizes the uneven distribution of commodities and allows Placer County to establish a more balanced land use pattern over time. It promotes redevelopment of Placer County's Town Centers, which will improve environmental conditions and support the local economy.

Non-Contiguous Project Areas in Town Centers

This program allows a project site to include non-contiguous parcels within Town Centers. To utilize this program, all project components must be located on developed land in a mixed use zoning district within a Town Center, and all applicable development standards still apply. Projects utilizing this option will require TRPA approval.

Placer County's Town Centers are subdivided into small parcels, most of which have more land coverage than is currently allowed. Assembling a large enough project area can be a significant impediment to redevelopment. This amendment will allow property owners to assemble non-contiguous parcels for different project components, thereby accelerating redevelopment, BMP installation and related environmental benefits. A comparable ordinance was used in the South Lake Tahoe Redevelopment Plan Area.

Secondary Residences

This program is intended to serve as a TRPA-certified local government housing program and would allow for secondary residences on parcels less than an acre in size subject to the requirements outlined in TRPA Code Section 21.3.2. (see Figure 4-8 for new parcels gaining a right to develop secondary residences). To qualify for the program, properties must be deed restricted to prohibit not allow tourist uses, vacation rentals or be converted to TAUs, and must also be deed restricted for affordability. Consistent with the TRPA four-year Area Plan recertification process, the program shall be evaluated for efficacy and necessary adjustments.

Consistent with State Law, Placer County's Housing Element promotes residences to provide housing at affordable and moderate cost levels. TRPA Code currently prohibits secondary residences on parcels less than one acre in size. The amendment promotes quality housing and improved environmental conditions by reducing the need for the Region's employees to commute daily from housing outside the Region.

This program is consistent with Regional Plan Policy HS-3.1, which directs TRPA to work with local jurisdictions to remove identified barriers preventing the construction of necessary affordable housing in the region, including workforce and moderate-income housing, secondary residential units and long-term residency in motel units.

Part 5: Transportation Plan
Placer County Tahoe Basin Area Plan

- T-P-38 Placer County and TRPA shall prioritize additional mobility strategies in a manner consistent with TRPA's Congestion Management Process required by federal regulation (23 CFR 450.320) for urban metropolitan planning organizations. TRPA's CMP is currently under development and will be implemented in 2017 in collaboration with local jurisdictions and public transit providers.
- T-P-37T-P-39 Measure vehicle trips within the Area Plan boundary at the time of the four year Area Plan recertification process with TRPA. Should vehicle trips surpass trip projections in Chapter 19 of the TBAP EIR/EIS, work jointly with TRPA to revise mobility strategies in the Area Plan transportation chapter to address the increased vehicle trips.