



**MINUTES**  
**Regular Meeting**  
**Reno City Planning Commission**

**Wednesday, April 7, 2021 • 6:00 PM**

**Reno City Council Chamber, One East First Street, Reno, NV 89501**

Commissioners			
Kathleen Taylor, Chair 326-8859			
John Marshall, Vice Chair	326-8863	Mark Johnson	326-8864
J.D. Drakulich	326-8861	Arthur Munoz	326-8862
Peter Gower	326-8860	Alex Velto	326-8858

**1 Pledge of Allegiance**

Commissioner Munoz led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**2 Roll Call**

Attendee Name	Title	Status	Arrived
Kathleen Taylor	Chair	Present	
John Marshall	Vice Chair	Late	6:02 PM
J.D. Drakulich	Commissioner	Present	
Peter Gower	Commissioner	Present	
Mark Johnson	Commissioner	Present	
Arthur Munoz	Commissioner	Present	
Alex Velto	Commissioner	Present	

*The meeting was called to order at 6:00 PM.*

**3 Public Comment**

Item 3 - General Public Comment - *Presented/Distributed at Meeting*

No voicemails were received. Written public comment received has been entered into the record and forwarded to the Planning Commission.

**4 Approval of Minutes (For Possible Action)**

4.1 Reno City Planning Commission - Regular - Mar 3, 2021 6:00 PM (For Possible Action) 6:02 PM

*Commissioner Marshall present at 6:02 p.m.*

*It was moved by Commissioner Gower, seconded by Commissioner Johnson, to approve the meeting minutes. The motion carried with six (6) in favor and one (1) abstention by Commissioner Drakulich.*

<b>RESULT:</b>	ACCEPTED [6 TO 0]
<b>MOVER:</b>	Peter Gower, Commissioner
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Mark Johnson, Commissioner
<b>AYES:</b>	Taylor, Marshall, Gower, Johnson, Munoz, Velto
<b>ABSTAIN:</b>	J.D. Drakulich

## 5 Public Hearings

Angela Fuss, Assistant Community Development Director, explained that all voicemails received have been transcribed and provided to the Planning Commission.

Karl Hall, City Attorney, confirmed that the requirements have been met and the voicemails do not have to be played during public comment.

- 5.1 Staff Report (For Possible Action): Case No. LDC21-00035 (Mt Rose Commerce Park) - A request has been made for a conditional use permit for: a) 24 hour uses; b) disturbance of a major drainageway; and c) to allow for grading that results in cuts greater than 20 feet in depth and fills greater than 10 feet in height. The ±88.68 acre site is located southwest of the intersection of South Virginia Street and Mount Rose Highway. The property is zoned Mixed Use Suburban (MS) and has a Master Plan land designation of Suburban Mixed Use (SMU). **[Ward 2]** 6:12 PM - *Item Pulled*

This item was pulled due to a noticing error.

- 5.2 Staff Report (For Possible Action): Case No. LDC21-00043 (Park Lane Self Storage – Phase 2) – A request has been made to amend an approved special use permit (LDC19-00009 – Park Lane Storage) for a 1) mini-warehouse facility; and 2) 24-hour operations to allow for expansion onto an adjacent ±0.484 acre property. With the expansion, the ±2.04 acre subject site is comprised of two parcels located on the east side of Wrondel Way, ±182 feet south of its intersection with Apple Street. The subject site is in the Mixed Use/South Virginia Transit Corridor (MU/SVTC) zone and has a Master Plan land use designation of Urban Mixed-Use (UMU). This project has requested to be reviewed, analyzed, and heard using the Title 18 standards in existence immediately prior to January 13, 2021. **[Ward 1]** 6:12 PM

Brent Nasset, Kimley-Horn, gave an overview of the project.

Kyle Chisholm, Assistant Planner, presented the staff report. Staff received no public comment on this and is able to make all the findings and recommends approval.

Disclosures: familiar with the site, visited the site, previous review of project

Public Comment: None

Mr. Chisholm confirmed for Commissioner Johnson all fire access requirements are met.

*It was moved by Commissioner Gower, seconded by Commissioner Velto, in the case of LDC21-00043 (Park Lane Self Storage - Phase 2), based upon compliance with the applicable findings, to approve the amended special use permit, subject to the conditions listed in the staff report.*

Commissioner Marshall stated that for the same reasons he voted no on the first SUP, he will do so again this time.

*The motion carried with six (6) in favor and one (1) opposition by Commissioner Marshall.*

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>APPROVED [6 TO 1]</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Peter Gower, Commissioner
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Alex Velto, Commissioner
<b>AYES:</b>	Taylor, Drakulich, Gower, Johnson, Munoz, Velto
<b>NAYS:</b>	John Marshall

5.3 **Resolution No.** : Staff Report (For Possible Action - Recommendation to City Council): Case No. LDC21-00032 (Lakeridge Place Phase II) - A request has been made for: 1) an amendment to the Master Plan land use designation from Parks, Greenways, and Open Space (PGOS) to Single-Family Neighborhood (SF); 2) a zoning map amendment from Open Space (OS) to Single Family 6,000 square feet per dwelling unit (SF6); 3) a tentative map to establish 46 townhomes; and 4) special use permits for: a) attached dwelling units in the SF6 zoning district; and b) cuts in excess of 20 feet in depth and fills in excess of ten feet. The ±6.61 acre site is located ±750 feet west of the intersection of Golf Club Drive and Plumas Street. This project was submitted prior to the comprehensive update to the zoning code (Zoning Code RENOVation) and will be reviewed, analyzed, and heard using the Title 18 standards in existence immediately prior to January 13, 2021. **[Ward 2]** 6:25 PM

Michael Pagni, representing Toll Brothers, gave an overview of the project. He stated that the driving range will close due to legal reasons regardless of the decision tonight.

Brook Oswald, Associate Planner, presented the staff report. Staff received 272 written comments and 85 voicemails (267 in opposition, seven in favor, and one neutral). The proposed Master Plan amendment is generally inconsistent with applicable Master Plan Policies. Staff is unable to support the proposed development due to the loss of OS without mitigation or other offsetting public benefits. If the Planning Commission moves to recommend approval, staff recommended conditions of approval have been provided.

Disclosures: familiar with site, site visits, read emails, read transcripts of all voicemails received for public comment, spoke with members of the public, spoke with applicant's representative. Commissioner Gower lives within the area of the proposal, watched videos included with emails.

Public Comment:

Chair Taylor decided to start public comment with a one hour limit and will re-evaluate if they are repetitive.

There were 85 voicemails received.

Christine Escobar  
Dickson Harbo  
Alice Tullek  
Ann Barnett  
Ann Bydelek  
Anthony Springer  
Bob Alessandrelli  
Carol Boyes  
Carolyn Bernard  
Connie Brandts  
Dale Ring  
David Zundel  
Dennis Yamamoto  
Diane Goulding  
Don Dees  
Donald McFall  
Donna Munson  
Eric Schunick  
Gary Whitfield  
George Summerhill

Chair Taylor paused the public comment and asked the Commission if they wanted to continue with the voicemails. They all agreed that they have heard enough and that the issues had been adequately described. Most of the information was repetitive and the commissioners have read the transcripts of the comments.

There were five voicemails received that were in favor and were played for the Commissioners.

Jennifer Shiffman

Laura Wick

Jamie Serrano

Mike Wood

Philip Fell

Karl Hall, City Attorney, confirmed that it is okay to move on without playing all of the voicemails.

Chair Taylor closed public comment at 7:33 p.m.

Mr. Oswald answered questions from Commissioner Gower regarding staff's analysis of master plan findings. It was analyzed under the master plan open space policies and other policies. It is a balancing act trying to determine what is appropriate. The previous City Council decisions to zone this OS was considered and staff struggled with this because there are policies supporting infill development.

Mr. Oswald answered questions from Commissioner Johnson about the history of the master plan land use designation and the zoning.

Mr. Oswald answered questions from Commissioner Marshall stating that the staff report at the time of the zone change in 2007 stated there was no opposition from the owner. He did find two letters in that file that do state opposition that were not included in the staff report.

Mr. Oswald answered questions from Commissioner Marshall regarding any benefit gained in exchange for maintaining OS during the original subdivision development. He explained that the history is convoluted but he could not find anything related to any additional density provided for keeping the OS. There is a fair amount of dense development in the surrounding area.

Mr. Oswald confirmed for Commissioner Marshall that staff's recommendation for denial of the master plan amendment and the zone change was not premised on anything

that happened as a result of the approval of the original development plan but focused on whether or not this should remain OS.

Mr. Pagni answered Commissioner Munoz stating the tentative close date for the driving range is the end of this season. It is remaining open until the development starts on the adjacent site.

Commissioner Velto asked what the intended use of the driving range area is if it is closed.

Mr. Pagni stated it is not what you would traditionally think of as OS. It is used for commercial purposes now and the public cannot enter it unless they are a paying customer of the golf course facility. That is the question we are posing to you tonight, since the driving range will go away, is this an appropriate, compatible use.

Mr. Pagni answered questions from Commissioner Velto regarding assurances that can be given that the golf course will remain. The condition of approval proposed by the applicant to come forward with a boundary line adjustment or parcel map to create a separate legal parcel of this six acre site before we come in with a final map will ensure that this zoning change is limited to just this six acre site. That will mean that the remainder of the course remains zoned as OS and no change can come forward without a public process.

Commissioner Velto noted that is a step in the right direction to create assurance and asked if there is something that can be done with the deed to the land that says it will continue to be a golf course or some way to record a document that would ease the concerns of the public.

Mr. Pagni stated this application is limited to the six acres so that is all he can really talk about and all that the Planning Commission can impose conditions on. The assurance is that the owner of the golf course is in the business of operating golf courses and he wants this golf course to remain a success.

Mr. Pagni confirmed for Commissioner Velto that they are open to exploring the possibility of providing some other OS benefits, but they don't know what that would look like. In a perfect world, we would have a code that says this is the impact for developing OS and here is the mitigation you have to pay. That doesn't exist and that is part of the challenge of turning down a project because of that. If this is the sole concern, it's something we will look at between now and when it goes to City Council.

Chair Taylor asked staff to remind the Planning Commission what our role is here

tonight.

Angela Fuss, Assistant Community Development Director, explained that this is a bundled application with a master plan, zoning map, tentative map and special use permits. Because you have a master plan and a zone change, the Planning Commission is a recommending body to the City Council.

Commissioner Marshall asked if they need to vote on all of the elements.

Ms. Fuss stated if you recommend denial on the master plan and zone change, you will need to vote on the others separately.

Mr. Oswald explained for Commissioner Gower that we don't have anything in code that gives us a standard to go by for mitigating OS.

Commissioner Gower noted the zoning map amendment finding to promote conservation of OS and protection of other natural resources and asked the applicant how what they are proposing conserves OS.

Mr. Pagni stated he would start with the premise that this isn't really OS as defined by the master plan. It is developed land and doesn't serve the normal functions that OS does. He noted the example of the property next door with a parking lot and restaurant that are zoned OS. He stated they are open to discussing OS mitigation.

Ms. Fuss expanded on questions she is hearing on how OS is defined. She discussed the master plan section that identifies characteristics of PGOS designation. Typically it provides active or passive recreational needs. It also provides protection of scenic and environmental quality. And so to this point, while it is private property and is a business, it also provides another level of OS as it is a scenic area and is not a built environment. It provides benefits to air quality and traffic. A golf course is an active recreational use. Other characteristics identified in the master plan is that OS can be owned by the general public but it can also be privately owned such as a golf course or a homeowner's association open space. It could also be private land that is under a conservation easement. Golf courses are identified as a recreational component of OS.

Mr. Pagni suggested a short recess so he can craft an OS mitigation condition with the applicant if that would be helpful to the Planning Commission.

Ms. Angela confirmed for Chair Taylor that they can take a 15 minute break for the applicant to bring back a proposal and see if the Planning Commission is interested in discussing it.

*Recess at 8:11 p.m. Meeting resumed at 8:23 p.m.*

Ms. Fuss stated staff would need more time to evaluate and make a recommendation on whether or not a specific mitigation proposal is sufficient. Ideas that were discussed include increased residential construction tax (park fee) along with dedication of land that is nearby for a park site.

Mr. Pagni stated they are conformable moving forward with a decision tonight knowing that this item remains open. It is a unique policy question to begin with and will end up with Council at some point.

Ms. Fuss explained for Commissioner Velto that the decision today should include reasons why you support or do not support this so City Council has a clear understanding of why you are recommending approval or denial.

Ms. Fuss explained for Commissioner Velto that this application is just for six acres and does not include any additional deed restrictions or conditions on the remainder of the golf course.

Ms. Fuss stated that commissioner comments are part of the record that is forwarded to City Council. If there is something that you like or dislike about this project, you don't necessarily have to condition the master plan zone change because you can't, but your comments as to why you can either support or not support is what we would like to have on the record so that City Council understands what your reasons are for approving or denying this to lead them to potentially modifying the project if it were to move forward by the time it gets to them.

Mr. Pagni confirmed for Chair Taylor that the applicant is willing to accept the decision of the recommendation of this body moving forward to the next level without any OS mitigation plan.

Commissioner Velto asked if this concept of mitigating lost OS has been applied in the past.

Ms. Fuss explained that this application falls under the current master plan policies and previous projects have been evaluated under different plan policies. We are also looking at each project on a case by case basis.

Mr. Oswald confirmed for Commissioner Johnson that there is a condition that says the roadways will be private. He also explained that a final hydrology report will be



submitted with the final map. Based on the initial information provided regarding drainage and stormwater management, staff feels comfortable enough to move on to the next stage of analysis.

Stacie Huggins, Wood Rodgers, verified for Commissioner Johnson the height and scale of the buildings proposed in Phase 2. They will be two story buildings 35 feet in height.

Mr. Oswald responded to Commissioner Johnson stating a condition can be added that limits the building height to 35 feet and two stories.

Commissioner Munoz noted there are only seven houses with a view of the driving range that would be impacted by losing that OS. He wondered if we are preserving anything if the driving range is going to be closed anyway and stated he is interested in other commissioners' thought.

Chair Taylor stated that to her it doesn't matter if the driving range closes or not. It's zoned as OS and that's what she is looking at.

Commissioner Velto stated he struggles with this as well because he can see both perspectives. If they close the driving range, it eliminates the purpose of the OS as it is, aside from there being greenery and open air. He is more stuck on the concept of changing the designation or getting rid of OS. He is optimistic that there will be improvements and ways to offset the loss of OS but he is back and forth on this. He asked if anyone else has thoughts on what you do with OS when it's fundamental or primary purpose goes away.

Commissioner Drakulich stated that is what he wrestled with the most is we're losing that driving range regardless. It's a tough decision. We do need to protect OS. He will support development in a lot of areas but not at the loss of OS. He stated that Commissioner Munoz made a good point about only seven houses with a view that would be impacted, but Ms. Fuss brought up a good point as well about the broad definition of OS. He stated that he would be denying this.

Commissioner Gower stated for him it's really a fundamental policy question. Do we want to have infill development in an area that is supported by existing infrastructure that is adjacent to existing uses where there is access and a plan for improvement to traffic on McCarran. The benefit from a master planning perspective is that theoretically if you put 46 housing units here, then 46 housing units at the top of Ridgeview, for example, may not be needed. The zoning map Finding B is what he is having trouble with. If you are going to take away OS there has to be a plan to mitigate that. To meet that finding there needs to be micro scale offsets. An example of a micro benefit could be trail

improvements. Without a solid mitigation plan, he can't approve the zoning map amendment.

Commissioner Johnson stated he can't make the finding that changing this to something other than OS meets master plan Finding A. The conditional use permit and tentative map are basically in conformance. The only issue with those is Finding B which is substantial conformance to the master plan.

Commissioner Marshall stated if this were not OS but a vacant lot, it would be a perfect spot for infill. He is against changing OS unless there is some significant good reason we should do so. The way the application is currently set, he could not support the master plan or the zone change. If this were zoned otherwise, he would support the other elements of the proposal.

Chair Taylor stated she is not in favor of rezoning OS. She has respect for Reno staff and is hesitant about going against staff recommendation because of all the work and effort they put into these staff reports. She will not be supporting any of the parts of this project.

Commissioner Velto stated what makes this difficult for him is the posture of the application. If the owner of the golf course were at the table and trying to develop it, it would be easier to make the findings regarding the master plan because there might be able to be a condition that ensures the golf course continues to exist.

Ms. Fuss recommended four separate motions including reasons for approval or denial.

***It was moved by Commissioner Marshall, seconded by Commissioner Johnson, in the case of LDC21-00032 (Lakeridge Place Phase II), based upon noncompliance with the applicable findings, to recommend the City Council deny the Master Plan Amendment.***

Commissioner Johnson seconded the motion stating he is unable to make Finding A.

Chair Taylor stated she cannot make Finding A.

Commissioner Drakulich supported the motion based on Finding A.

Commissioner Gower stated he cannot make Finding A.

Commissioner Munoz supported the motion stating the same reason.

Commissioner Velto stated given what is presented at this time he cannot make Finding

A.

*The motion carried unanimously with seven (7) commissioners present.*

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	John Marshall, Vice Chair
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Mark Johnson, Commissioner
<b>AYES:</b>	Taylor, Marshall, Drakulich, Gower, Johnson, Munoz, Velto

5.4 **Motion:** Motion to recommend Council deny the zoning map amendment 8:59 PM

*It was moved by Commissioner Marshall, seconded by Commissioner Johnson, in the case of LDC21-00032 (Lakeridge Place Phase II), based upon noncompliance with the applicable findings, to recommend the City Council deny the zoning map amendment.*

Commissioner Johnson seconded the motion stating he is unable to make Finding B.

Chair Taylor stated she cannot make Findings A and B.

Commissioner Gower stated he cannot make Finding B absent any sort of mitigation plan that offsets the OS and includes local mitigation offset for the OS and macro scale mitigation for the OS.

Commissioner Munoz stated he cannot make Findings A and B.

Commissioner Velto supported the motion for the same reasons stated by Commissioner Gower.

*The motion carried unanimously with seven (7) commissioners present.*

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	John Marshall, Vice Chair
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Mark Johnson, Commissioner
<b>AYES:</b>	Taylor, Marshall, Drakulich, Gower, Johnson, Munoz, Velto

5.5 **Motion:** Motion to recommend Council deny the tentative map and special use permits 9:03 PM

*It was moved by Commissioner Marshall, seconded by Commissioner Johnson, in the case of LDC21-00032 (Lakeridge Place Phase II), based upon noncompliance with our previous recommendations, to recommend the City Council deny the tentative map and special use permits.*

Commissioner Johnson seconded the motion for the same reason stated by the motion maker.

Commissioner Marshall stated his motion is based on the fact of the noncompliance with applicable zoning in the master plan, not based on the specifics, aside from Commissioner Johnson's noted issues with the subdivision tentative map and special use permits.

Commissioner Gower supported the motion for the same reasons Commissioner Marshall articulated.

Commissioner Munoz supported the motion for the same reasons as Commissioner Marshall.

Commissioner Velto supported the motion for the same reasons.

***The motion carried unanimously with seven (7) commissioners present.***

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	John Marshall, Vice Chair
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Mark Johnson, Commissioner
<b>AYES:</b>	Taylor, Marshall, Drakulich, Gower, Johnson, Munoz, Velto

- 5.6 Staff Report (For Possible Action - Recommendation to City Council): Case No. LDC21-00048 (22 on Lakeside Zoning Map Amendment) - A request has been made to rezone a ±3.07 acre subject site comprised of three parcels from SF3 - Single Family Residential (SF-3) to MF30 – Multifamily Residential (MF-30). The site is located on the east side of Lakeside Drive ±175 feet north of West Peckham Lane with a flag lot extending access to Warren Way. The site has a Master Plan land use designation of Suburban Mixed-Use (SMU). **[Ward 2]**  
9:12 PM

*Break taken at 9:05 p.m. Meeting resumed at 9:12 p.m.*

Derek Kirkland, Wood Rodgers, gave an overview of the project.

Nathan Gilbert, Associate Planner, presented the staff report stating that Mr. Krikland covered the scope of the project.

Disclosures: toured sight, read emails, presentation from the applicant's representative, read transcription from voicemails, correspondence with the applicant's representative

Public Comment:

All public comment and voice mails received were forwarded to the Planning Commission and are part of the public record

Voicemails from the following were played during the meeting (some of the public comment received also included opposition to LDC21-00041):

Carla Mitchell  
Denise Morris  
Don Lamers  
Linda Cross  
Marion Robinson  
Mark Foree  
Mary Slagle  
Nancy Hathaway  
Sandy Nelson  
Sonja Foree  
Suzanne Troutrel  
Virginia Nolte  
William Dreher

Public comment was closed at 9:37 p.m.

Mr. Gilbert confirmed for Commissioner Marshall that all of the existing zoning in the area that is less than MF30 is non-conforming with the master plan designation.

Staff answered questions regarding density, neighborhood engagement efforts, density bonus allowances, and triggers for discretionary review on MF30.

Commissioner Johnson stated he cannot make Finding M. The density we are looking at is an intensification adjacent to established facilities. The transition should be going for more intense at Moana to less intense at Peckham. Although this is in conformance with the master plan, he can't make the finding about what it does to an existing neighborhood and the zoning that is there.

***It was moved by Commissioner Velto, seconded by Commissioner Drakulich, in the case of LDC21-00048 (22 on Lakeside Zoning Map Amendment), based upon compliance with the applicable findings, to recommend that City Council approve the zoning map amendment by ordinance. The motion carried with six (6) in favor and one (1) opposition by Commissioner Johnson.***

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>APPROVED [6 TO 1]</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Alex Velto, Commissioner
<b>SECONDER:</b>	J.D. Drakulich, Commissioner
<b>AYES:</b>	Taylor, Marshall, Drakulich, Gower, Munoz, Velto
<b>NAYS:</b>	Mark Johnson

- 5.7 Staff Report (For Possible Action): Case No. LDC21-00041 (22 on Lakeside) - A request has been made for: 1) a tentative map to develop 22 single-family attached townhome lots and associated common area; 2) conditional use permits to allow a) more than 20 single-family attached dwellings, and b) fills greater than 10 feet; and 3) a major deviation to reduce the rear and southern side setbacks from ten to five feet. The ±1.34 acre site is located on the west side of Lakeside Drive ±175 north of West Peckham Lane. The site has a Master Plan land use designation of Suburban Mixed-Use (SMU). **[Ward 2]** 10:09 PM

Derek Kirkland, Wood Rodgers, gave an overview of the project.

Nathan Gilbert, Associate Planner, stated Mr. Kirkland presented a comprehensive overview of the request and he is available for questions.

Disclosures: same disclosures as before.

Public Comment:

All public comment and voice mails received were forwarded to the Planning Commission and are part of the public record.

Voicemails from the following were played during the meeting:

Carol Reichman  
Chelsea Harris  
Linda Cross  
Zachary Schultz

Public comment was closed at 10:31 p.m.

Mr. Kirkland confirmed for Commissioner Johnson they are using the ten percent slope that is the maximum allowed by the fire department for a public street even though this will be a private street.

Michael Mischel, Engineering Manager, confirmed for Commissioner Johnson that they will look at sight distance with the site triangle requirements when the project comes in

for site improvement plans.

Mr. Gilbert answered questions from Commissioner Johnson regarding side yard setbacks and setback deviations.

Mr. Kirkland confirmed for Chair Taylor that 22 units is what they are requesting on the tentative map.

Kristy Vanzant, architect for the applicant, confirmed that they are open to introducing more articulation to break up massing as suggested by Commissioner Johnson.

*It was moved by Commissioner Drakulich, seconded by Commissioner Munoz, in the case of LDC21-00041 (22 on Lakeside), based upon compliance with the applicable findings, to approve the tentative map, conditional use permits, and major deviations subject to the conditions listed in the staff report, with an added condition to require additional building articulation on Units 16 and 17. The motion carried unanimously with seven (7) commissioners present.*

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	J.D. Drakulich, Commissioner
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Arthur Munoz, Commissioner
<b>AYES:</b>	Taylor, Marshall, Drakulich, Gower, Johnson, Munoz, Velto

5.8 Staff Report (For Possible Action): Case No. LDC21-00040 (Spectrum - Dandini Mixed Use Site) - A request has been made for a special use permit for: 1) hillside development; 2) grading that results in cuts deeper than 20 feet in depth and fills greater than ten feet in height; 3) grading disturbance of a major drainageway; 4) an accessory drive-thru facility; and 5) operations between 11:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m. associated with a proposed mixed-use development containing multifamily residential, hotel, and restaurant uses. The ±25.66 acre site is comprised of four parcels located north of Dandini Boulevard between US 395 and Spectrum Boulevard. The site is in the Mixed Use/Dandini Regional Center (MU/DRC) zone and has a Master Plan land use designation of Suburban Mixed-Use (SMU). This project has requested to be reviewed, analyzed, and heard using the Title 18 standards in existence immediately prior to January 13, 2021. **[Ward 4]** 10:55 PM

Ken Krater, gave an overview of the project.

Nathan Gilbert, Associate Planner, stated Mr. Krater presented a thorough overview of the request.

Disclosures: no disclosures, familiar with the site, site visit, read emails, spoke with applicant.

Public Comment:

Emails received were forwarded to the Planning Commission and are part of the public record. No voicemails were received.

Mr. Krater answered questions from commissioners regarding use, public outreach and mitigation efforts.

*It was moved by Commissioner Johnson, seconded by Commissioner Munoz, in the case of LDC21-00040 (Spectrum - Dandini Mixed Use Site), based upon compliance with the applicable findings, to approve the special use permit, subject to the conditions listed in the staff report, with the addition of Condition 38. The motion carried unanimously with seven (7) commissioners present.*

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Mark Johnson, Commissioner
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Arthur Munoz, Commissioner
<b>AYES:</b>	Taylor, Marshall, Drakulich, Gower, Johnson, Munoz, Velto

## 6 Annual Report to the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency

6.1 Staff Report (For Possible Action): Acceptance of the City of Reno Annual Report to the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency. 11:23 PM

This item was continued to the April 21st Planning Commission meeting.

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>CONTINUED [UNANIMOUS]</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Peter Gower, Commissioner
<b>SECONDER:</b>	John Marshall, Vice Chair
<b>AYES:</b>	Taylor, Marshall, Drakulich, Gower, Johnson, Munoz, Velto

## 7 Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Liaison Report

The last meeting included information on training for Regional Planning Commissioners and some information on an RFQ to assist in the development of a Natural Resources planning document.

The next meeting is scheduled for April 29th.



**8 Staff Announcements**

- 8.1 Report on status of Planning Division projects.
- 8.2 Announcement of upcoming training opportunities.
- 8.3 Report on status of responses to staff direction received at previous meetings.
- 8.4 Report on actions taken by City Council on previous Planning Commission items.  
11:27 PM

Angela Fuss, Assistant Community Development Director, reported that the Santerra Quilici project appeal was approved by City Council and the second reading is scheduled for next week. There have been three City Council meetings in the last two weeks to discuss budgets. There will be a strategic planning meeting for next week.

Staff will be bringing a work program to the Planning Commission on April 21st.

Arlo Stockham was the Interim Assistant City Manager and has returned to the Community Development Director position.

Jeff Borchardt will take over the Planning Commission meetings starting with the April 21st meeting.

**9 Commissioner's Suggestions for Future Agenda Items (For Possible Action)**

None

**10 Public Comment**

Emails received during the meeting and have been forwarded to the Planning Commission and have been entered into the record.

Item 10 - General Public Comment - *Presented/Distributed at Meeting*

**11 Adjournment (For Possible Action)**

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 p.m.