

DRC Meeting
2-6-2014 3:30pm start

Committee: Cindi Yakimow, Barbara Wilcox, Judy Carini, Kevin Strange, Jon Shanser
Stacy Wydra = Placer County Planning Services

The early part of the meeting focused on the role of the DRC, to whom does it make recommendations (to the Planning Director) and what happens to them, and a commitment by the County to update the DRC on Planning Director decisions.

There was also a discussion about the Toyota display in the Intrawest Village – question to County/Planning = define “what is temporary?” General dissatisfaction with the current display; how did it get approved?

Alex presentation:

Need to define for DRC: Purpose? Outcomes? What is desirable (subjective)?

Alex’s suggestion: Map out issues (Macro to Micro) first

- Scale
- Public/Open spaces
- View Corridors

(Jon) Concerns about building height + separation of new buildings from Intrawest’s Village

(Alex) The current “illustrative design” proposal is “conceptual” and one of many possible outcomes in conformance with the proposed Design Guidelines. The County will be reviewing the Specific Plan as it oversees the preparation of the draft EIR, and this process will undoubtedly result in corrections and adjustments to the overall plan proposal including Appendix B

The application is complete except the updated studies. (Judy) is the application complete? Application will be 100% complete when the DEIR is publicly circulated.

(Alex) “The DRC should be discussing Appendix B only.” “The DRC input will help to ‘shape’ the project”.

(David S.) “Apdx B needs to be revised” due to several missing elements (no plaza, no pedestrian open space, no ice rink)

(Alex) made suggestion to have the DRC conduct several meetings to discuss Appendix B and that as a consequence there should be a number of issues that KSL would consider during an update to Appendix B. He also reminded everyone that the County does not force changes to a project description (nor does the DRC). We ask.

(Chevis) Process is different here in that usually the DRC will review design elements after the County approves the project. This project has 20-25 years of life, designs need to be appropriate. They will re-do now and on-going but do not plan to resubmit a revised Specific Plan or Appendix B at this time.

Clarification from Alex: The DRC will be reviewing “design components” only not the entire Specific Plan

(Ed) Desires principles such as space between buildings, light etc. to be discussed.

(Alex) Suggested ideas for the next agenda to get things started:

- Building Form
- Building Coverage
- Open Space
- Light Access at ground level

(Judy) Would like to proceed page by page to cover all the details. Alex suggests covering the large items which will flush out the smaller items as they go through the documents.

(Alex) Suggestion to the DRC: each member goes through & comes up with own concerns, meet with Alex; Alex would like to see measureable progress at the DRC meetings.

(Alex) to Judy: Need to identify a secretary to keep notes & suggestions for the County. Judy said the DRC had already discussed this need.

(Jon) asked Alex for his suggested list of early Macro items for discussion for the DRC. Alex agreed to compile and send to all members of the DRC.

.....

MAC Meeting
2-6-2014 6:00PM start

(A good portion of the discussion was repetitive from prior discussions, so no new notes were taken on repeat issues and answers)

(Mike) (PSD)

Phase II of Creek – should have final doc by end of March. PSD is very concerned about the drought! For 2013 it was the driest year on record since 1890’s. Rain was only at 12% of average at the end of January = lowest on record. District was formed in 1964 = 50 year anniversary.

(Alex) went on to explain the Project submittal process, EIR preparation and Public Review process. Current status: Revised NOP due out 2/2014 and will describe changes and will collect public input pertaining to environmental issues. There will be a 30 day “scoping” period. No public meeting will be held by the County.

The DEIR is due out Fall/winter of 2014 and will have a 45 day public review period.

Economic impacts will be addressed at the Planning Commission Level and BOS. Expectation is to see more robust design guidelines in the next few months. Development Agreement is where any transfer fees would be spelled out.

(Ed) Specific Plan – does it have any provision for Park Mitigation? (Alex) said to submit any ideas for “park” or community area upgrades directly to Andy Fisher. Because recreational habits are different in

SV, the typical “park requirement” will be different here. (i.e. instead of putting in a grass park, perhaps upgrading the trail systems would be more appropriate)

(Ed) Could it be in other areas? (Alex) Yes, possibly but that is not something that is in the current proposal. He said that the concept of a west valley park did not receive very much positive interest and that, based on what he has heard and seen from the community, recreational values were more focused on linear parks, trails and trail access improvements and less on traditional “active” recreation such as playing fields. He also suggested that there is a really nice existing park and that (in his opinion) additional active recreation improvements (tennis/basketball courts, flush toilets, squash ball courts, etc.) should probably be focused there. He also encouraged individuals to directly contact Andy Fisher in the Parks Department to convey ideas.

(Alex) responded to Ed’s question if the Army Corp of Engineers will have to issue a permit and hold public hearings on the creek improvement project. He and Chevis stated yes a permit but no public hearing likely given that it is “not a discretionary approval”.

(Alex) Building “0” has been removed from the project but still could be developed under a conditional use permit. New approvals would be required as a separate process.

(Ed) There was once some discussion on analysis of financial impact. Can you give us an update?

(Alex) “Impacts on neighboring neighborhoods” are not a standard; analysis of project impacts are the rule and will be analyzed for this project. To the extent that surrounding areas are affected such impacts are analyzed but those impact areas are limited (e.g. noise, aesthetics, traffic).

(??) There was a question about the “alternatives” requirement in CEQA, and a reference to the situation that occurred at Homewood.

(Alex) CEQA does not require analysis of “alternative designs”, but rather requires analysis of alternatives to the project that would reduce project impacts while feasibly attaining most of the project’s basic objectives. The Homewood project absolutely included an alternatives analysis. The term feasibility is predicated, in part, on whether or not an alternative can physically be implemented and whether or not it would be financially viable. Sometimes an alternative can be physically implemented but the economic analysis shows that it would not be financially viable. That’s one of the major functions of the economic analysis for the project and the project alternatives.

(Ed) what metrics are out there for analyzing how big the project should or needs to be? Chevis has previously mention ratio of residential to commercial, stating current village is unhealthy at 100 sf lodging to 23 sf commercial. The goal for commercial should be 10-15%. He also now mentions his “key objective” is the # bedrooms per skiable acre as 1.6 now. Now we have 1100 rentable bedrooms in Squaw and it should be 7.800. Ed mentioned this is not Whistler or Vail since we have so many nearby bedrooms in Truckee and North Tahoe.

(Chevis) While maintaining the culture, still need to be competitive w/ Vail, Aspen, etc. We fall short on the “destination ski experience” + beds in a destination resort.

(Chevis) The MAC is a “non-ski amenity”.

(Alex) The EVA road (between Resort and Village) will be included as “optional” in the NOP.

(Alex) clarifying the role of the DRC vs MAC stated the SVDRC will “review design guidelines in the specific plan to guide future development” and the MAC will consider “everything else”.