



GLENSHIRE
DEVONSHIRE
RESIDENTS
ASSOCIATION
15726 GLENSHIRE DR
TRUCKEE, CA 96161

April 2, 2006

Denyelle Nishimori, Associate Planner
Truckee Community Development Dept.
10183 Truckee Airport Road
Truckee, CA 96161

Dear Denyelle,

The Glenshire/Devonshire, The Meadows and Cambridge Homeowner Associations would like to reiterate our previous concerns to Canyon Springs (formerly Tahoe Boca), project which were submitted in our May 24, 2004, comment letter. Although the current site plan has addressed some of our early concerns, we are confident the original comments are still relevant and would like to be reassured these concerns will continue to be addressed or expanded in the revised EIR. Please find attached a copy of our original letter.

Over two years have elapsed since the Canyon Springs (Tahoe Boca) plan was submitted. New realities in Truckee exist today which would influence decisions on not just this project, but all future developments. New Town policies such as the encouragement of 2nd housing units and escalating real estate economics of the area (ability to purchase and build) are two such variables that need to be included in the equation to determine the appropriate density.

First we would like to reaffirm our position that we are not against development. We are opposed to the proposed density of this project. The resulting enormous increase in traffic and the effects of circulation on the local roads will create significant impacts to our roads and alter the character and quality of life of our neighborhoods.

Please accept the following comments based on the new project description and the new variables that exist in 2006, but did not exist in 2004.

- **Density:** The reduced density now being submitted is misleading. The proposed density of 213 is the baseline density. Dropping the density bonus request is not a response to community input as referenced in the "Notice of Preparation" letter.
- **Traffic Study:** We continue to object to the traffic study in the Glenshire area being conducted in the month of August. This study should reflect the demographics of community and our neighborhood traffic patterns. The month of August is vacation month for our memberships. The study should be based on the fulltime primary and secondary units not vacation or second homeowners.

Therefore the study should be conducted during the work week and while school is in session.

- **2nd Housing Unit Policy:** The Towns need to create affordable housing, and its encouragement for property owners to provide these units will have an effect on density and traffic. The second unit is a separate variable from the required "affordable housing" component and must be addressed specifically in the traffic and density count. A policy or equation to determine how many 2nd units will be built should be included in the allowed and acceptable density count. New subdivisions will have more 2nd units than existing subdivisions because the town is encouraging the 2nd units. Until the town adopts a policy and defines this policy for the entire town of Truckee the traffic counts and required mitigations are immeasurable. This must be addressed before the project is reviewed by the Planning Commission.
- **Site Planning:** It's inevitable a new subdivision will have more second units than established ones, especially when the second unit can not be prohibited. It is much easier to site plan a second unit when a lot is vacant. Existing homes are limited and have constraints.
- **Economics:** The affordability of lots and building is continuing to sky rocket. Many people will take advantage of the 2nd unit as rental income, to help finance the ability to buy and build their homes.

The combination of the 2nd Unit policy, site planning and economics will have a direct effect on density, which in turn will have direct effect on traffic. The increased traffic will have a direct effect on traffic mitigation. All of these variables are a nexus to neighborhood compatibility and town character.

This undetermined density should not be a hidden density. It should be a specific potential number and therefore included in the maximum approved density. For example if it is determined that 30% of new development will have 2nd units then, a development of 100 units will only be able to create 70 lots, because 30 of the lots will have a 2nd unit and thus will have reached the maximum allowed density.

Our Associations believe the revised EIR should include investigation and consideration of these above concerns, and, in addition, the Town should address and create a firm number and sensible equation for 2nd units and their effect on density and traffic.

On behalf the of the Glenshire/Devonshire, The Meadows and Cambridge Homeowner Associations,



Geoff Sullivan Stephens
General Manager