



MINUTES

Regular Meeting

Reno City Planning Commission

Wednesday, March 17, 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 Drakulich led the Pledge of Allegiance.

2 Roll Call

Attendee Name	Title	Status	Arrived
Kathleen Taylor	Chair	Present	
John Marshall	Vice Chair	Present	
J.D. Drakulich	Commissioner	Present	
Peter Gower	Commissioner	Late	6:56 PM
Mark Johnson	Commissioner	Present	
Arthur Munoz	Commissioner	Late	6:04 PM
Alex Velto	Commissioner	Present	

The meeting was called to order at 6:02 PM.

3 Public Comment

Voicemail from Dan Griffith was heard at this time expressing concern regarding potential development of the Lakeridge Place project.

All public comment received has been logged and entered into the record and forwarded to the Planning Commission. All general public comment received were for projects that will be scheduled for public hearing at a later date.

(Commissioner Munoz present at 6:04 p.m.)

Item 3 - Voicemail transcription - *Presented/Distributed at Meeting*

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

4 Approval of Minutes (For Possible Action)

4.1 Reno City Planning Commission - Regular - Feb 17, 2021 6:00 PM (For Possible Action) 6:07 PM

It was moved by Commissioner Marshall, seconded by Commissioner Johnson, to approve the meeting minutes. The motion carried with five (5) in favor and one (1) abstention by Commissioner Drakulich.

RESULT:	ACCEPTED [5 TO 0]
MOVER:	John Marshall, Vice Chair
SECONDER:	Mark Johnson, Commissioner
AYES:	Taylor, Marshall, Johnson, Munoz, Velto
ABSTAIN:	J.D. Drakulich
ABSENT:	Peter Gower

5 Public Hearings

5.1 Staff Report (For Possible Action): Case No. LDC21-00036 (6000 Plumas Street Redevelopment) - A request has been made for: 1) a tentative map to develop a 314-unit condominium subdivision; and 2) a conditional use permit to allow for more than 100 single-family attached/condominiums. The ±9.48 acre site includes three parcels and is located at the southeast corner of Plumas Street and South McCarran Boulevard on the former location of the Lakeridge Tennis Club. The subject site is within the General Commercial (GC) zoning district and has a Master Plan land use designation of Suburban Mixed-Use (SMU). **[Ward 2]** 6:08 PM

Garrett Gordon, representing Lyon Living, gave an overview of the project.

Nathan Gilbert, Associate Planner, presented the staff report. Staff received numerous comments of concern and they have all been forwarded to the Planning Commission and added to the public record. Primary concerns are related to traffic, appropriateness of density, compatibility, and building height. Staff can make the findings and recommends approval.

Disclosures:

Spoke and/or met with the applicant and applicant's representative, phone calls received, read emails, visited the site, listened to voicemails, familiar with the site. Campaign donation received from Lyon last year and was publicly disclosed.

Public Comment:

134 emails/voicemails were received, forwarded to the Planning Commission and added as part of the public record. 26 of the public comments received were voicemails in opposition and they were played during the meeting.

(Commissioner Gower present at 6:56 p.m.)

Public comment was closed at 7:15 p.m.

Commissioner Munoz asked why we are hearing through multiple emails that there was a promise made to rebuild the swimming pools and keep the tennis courts and that didn't happen.

Garrett Gordon explained there was an entitlement process by a prior developer who may or may not have made promises to the community, but that was a zoning process and that cannot be conditioned. The City Council rezoned the property to General Commercial with specific uses that are allowed. The club was in pre-foreclosure when Lyon Living purchased the property. Capital improvements were not being updated and it was set to go to the auction block. Lyon Living picked it up with the full intention of doing a multi-family project. During their due diligence process it was decided there was no way to salvage the building.

Commissioner Drakulich asked about Reno Land's involvement.

Mr. Gordon stated Reno Land was involved during the zoning stage. As of right now, this is a Lyon Living project. The applicant is a Lyon Living affiliate. Reno Land is no longer involved.

Commissioner Velto asked how the project would change the ingress and egress for the tennis club and how it would impact traffic.

Mr. Gordon explained that the traffic study took into consideration Rancharra and the Lake Ridge Golf Course project traffic. The study concluded that to improve traffic flow on McCarran, the left hand turn onto McCarran should be eliminated, the deceleration lane heading eastbound on McCarran will be removed, and finally the right-in would be removed. The project is designed with just a very simple right out. That coupled with the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) improvements that are coming, the situation will get better.

Commissioner Velto asked about visibility for cars at the stop sign to exit onto McCarran.

Mr. Gordon stated it would meet all visibility standards per Reno Code and will be approved by the City of Reno Public Works department. Visibility will be better than it was given the plan for a six foot sidewalk, curb and gutter, and no impediments looking left.

Commissioner Velto asked if there is an acceleration lane when exiting.

Mr. Gordon confirmed there is an acceleration lane.

Loren Chilson, Traffic Engineer for the project, stated the acceleration lane will remain with the project and provide a better opportunity for drivers to merge with traffic on McCarran.

Commissioner Velto noted the plan to get rid of the turn land on McCarran going westbound and asked if there is a way to extend the left turn lane to Plumas that is just past that.

Mr. Chilson stated it is feasible. The traffic study did not show that the queuing would spill back onto McCarran so he does not know that it is absolutely necessary.

Commissioner Velto stated the same goes for the other direction and asked if making that longer too is something they would be in favor of doing, or if the city would have to do that.

Mr. Gordon stated that extending those left-hand turn lanes, one onto Plumas and the eastbound left onto Lakeside would be something they would be able to do. Those improvements are paid for by the developer, not the city.

Commissioner Velto stated this area is already rated as an "F" and asked how this project addresses the traffic concerns.

Mr. Chilson stated we are all aware there is an existing congestion issue on McCarran during peak hours. That is why it is addressed in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). We created a 40 foot setback, which is above and beyond what would be required, anticipating that the RTC corridor study specific to this area may identify widening as a long-term improvement. Beyond that, it is possible the recommendation of that corridor study could say to lengthen the turn lanes and that is a potential solution that we would support.

Commissioner Velto asked what the building setback would be if the RTC decides to add a third lane.

Mr. Chilson stated that an additional lane would take up roughly 12 feet so with our setback of 40 feet we would still be within what code requires.

Commissioner Velto asked what the RTC plan is for McCarran in the area of this project.

Dan Doenges, RTC, stated they do have a project proposed in the first five years of the RTP. The RTC Board will be looking at approval of the draft 2050 RTP at their meeting this Friday. The project looks at operations and safety improvements for this segment of McCarran Blvd. There is not a detailed scope yet.

Commissioner Velto asked how likely it is that the RTC will install a third lane here.

Mr. Doenges stated the changes are very likely, it is just a matter of timing.

Commissioner Gower asked about plans for the existing retaining wall where the sidewalk is proposed along McCarran.

Andy Durling, Wood Rogers, stated that they would be reconstructing a retaining wall in order to construct portions of the six foot sidewalk east of the egress driveway onto McCarran.

Commissioner Gower asked about retaining the pedestrian space in the future if the RTC widens the corridor and takes out the sidewalk.

Mr. Doenges stated that with a lot of their roadway projects, whenever appropriate and feasible, they will go in and add multi-modal amenities as well.

Commissioner Gower asked for confirmation that regardless of what happens, there will be a guarantee there will be pedestrian connectivity along the south side of McCarran from Plumas to Lakeside.

Mr. Doenges stated the RTC would do everything in its power to maintain that. With a 40 foot setback, there will probably be ample room to work with.

Commissioner Gower asked for the applicant's perspective on that and if pedestrian space will be retained.

Mr. Durling stated that would be our hope as well. The final project still requires quite a bit of scoping and studying by the RTC but we feel like it is feasible to make that work in the space that's there.

Commissioner Gower asked if that is a yes or a maybe yes.

Mr. Durling confirmed that is a yes.

Mr. Chilson stated for Commissioner Gower which projects were included in the traffic study. Looking at the net difference in traffic comparing what has been there and what is created, splitting them up into three driveways would be about 20 to 30 vehicles over the period of an hour and it is not significant enough to change the conditions that are there today in a substantial way.

Mr. Doenges clarified for Commissioner Johnson that in the first five years of the 2050 RTP they have identified a project to look at safety and operations. In addition to that, they are going to be kicking off a separate study later this year looking at the entire McCarran loop. There is another project in the 2050 RTP in the 2031 to 2050 time frame that does address widening this section of McCarran from Lakeside to Manzanita.

Mr. Doenges explained for Commissioner Johnson that they partner with the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) on a number of projects. NDOT is funding the McCarran Blvd. study and the RTC will be managing the project. Specific funding for the widening portion has not been identified but it will likely be a mix of state and regional funds and hopefully federal funds as well.

Commissioner Johnson asked if NDOT's involvement could potentially modify the time frame in which this could be developed.

Mr. Doenges confirmed that projects do shift around sometimes between the required four year updates to the RTP. A project could move forward if the need was demonstrated for that to happen.

Mr. Gordon stated the RTP that will go to the RTC Board this Friday has already been ratified by each jurisdiction. The City of Reno bumped up improvements in this section to the nearest term time frame of 2021 to 2025 in direct response to hearing concerns from the neighbors and constituents last year. The developer has already been in negotiations with RTC to sell the right-of-way they need for this third lane even before we start construction.

Chair Taylor asked about the entrance and exit on Lakeside Drive.

Mr. Chilson stated that existing driveway is relatively close. It serves more than just this project and it must be maintained in its current location. This project would use that as a

secondary access. It was analyzed and it functions within policy levels.

Chair Taylor asked if there is any concern with the proposed property users going through another development to get onto Lakeside.

Mr. Durling stated there is an existing easement there for joint access.

Chair Taylor asked if the RTC feels that what is being proposed will mitigate traffic impacts.

Mr. Doenges stated what is being proposed looks like it would be much safer and will allow for more uninterrupted traffic flow. It is something the RTC will be examining in our study coming up in a few months.

Mike Mischel, Community Development Engineering Manager, confirmed that he concurs with Mr. Doenges' statement and with the recommendations in the traffic study. This project will have a negligible impact to the intersections of Lakeside and Plumas and it will enhance the safety of traffic along McCarran Blvd.

Commissioner Marshall discussed tree preservation and asked about what would happen with the trees when the road is widened.

Mr. Gordon stated the City of Reno has asked us to study potentially bringing the sidewalk and public access on the south side of the tree line. We have been working with Public Works and RTC on a tree preservation plan when a third lane comes in that would likely be relocation of our sidewalk to the back of the trees.

Mr. Durling stated there would be a handful of trees that would be impacted. The 40 foot setback provided allows for a large buffer of trees that would be preserved.

Mr. Chilson stated the widening would typically occur in the existing right turn lane which would no longer be used. The widening would not be extending the curb very far beyond where it is today. He also explained they would probably not need the acceleration lane once a third lane is added.

Commissioner Marshall asked if there are safety concerns in this area with heavy bike traffic.

Mr. Chilson stated that the driveway has good sight lines and the volumes out of the driveway are not a substantial increase that would cause concern for cyclists. Overall he did not see anything of great concern.

Commissioner Marshall discussed the importance of maintaining trees for screening on Plumas and S. McCarran if a third lane is added.

Mr. Gordon asked how Commissioner Marshall would envision that condition working if the right-of-way is sold to RTC and the trees are their property.

Commissioner Marshall stated he did not want to take a lot of time negotiating here but what's important is that the screening remains.

Mr. Durling confirmed for Commissioner Gower that the retaining wall would be moved south to accommodate the potentially expanded acceleration lane and sidewalk.

Mr. Durling explained for Commissioner Gower the tree survey they conducted showing the trees that will be retained and the ones that will be removed and mitigated. They will be trying to minimize the impact to the trees as much as possible.

Commissioner Marshall asked about the surrounding actual density as opposed to zoned density for dwelling units per acre map. He asked if the compatibility finding can be based on the actual density of surrounding development versus the conceptual maximum densities allowed.

Mr. Gilbert responded stating yes. He also stated that he would temper that with supporting master plan policies as well as overall compatibility.

Mr. Durling confirmed for Commissioner Velto that the Wells Fargo building to the west as well as the office building to the east are about 45 feet in height.

Mr. Durling confirmed for Commissioner Marshall that there was a penthouse element of the Lake Ridge Tennis Club that was 55 feet in height. The rest was at around 45 feet.

Commissioner Marshall asked about the connectivity to the SPD to the south.

Mr. Durling explained the plan would be that this site would be fully fenced in. Being that it is infill we would expect pedestrians to utilize the sidewalks and they are relatively short blocks.

Mr. Gordon provided more information regarding the earlier tree question. The developer would be willing to agree to a condition to replace the screening trees at a two to one replacement ratio in the event that trees are lost when a third lane is added.

Commissioner Marshall explained the issue will be that small trees don't screen. It is not so much the ratio of mitigation but what is important is the commitment to have enough mature trees to maintain compatibility with the neighborhood.

Commissioner Marshall discussed a previous 350 unit project that was appealed and denied by a Hearing Officer for traffic and parking concerns. This project is 36 units less. He asked if that resolves the parking and traffic concerns the Hearing Officer had.

Angela Fuss, Assistant Community Development Director, explained this proposed project meets parking requirements and the previous project did not. With regard to traffic, staff did find the previous project as well as this one in conformance with requirements.

Commissioner Marshall asked why the Hearing Officer determined the traffic requirements couldn't be met.

Ms. Fuss stated she does not know and would have to go back to the records for the previous project.

Commissioner Marshall asked if the developer can be conditioned to provide at no cost the right-of-way for the third lane expansion should that occur.

Jonathan Shipman, Assistant City Attorney, stated there are impact fees being paid which is supposed to address the traffic impact. It might be a bit of a problem if we get into double dipping. He confirmed for Commissioner Marshall that he would need to do more analysis on that.

Mr. Gilbert explained for Commissioner Johnson the new code update standard is one parking space for 1,250 square feet. He clarified that any unit greater than 1,250 square feet would require a second parking space.

Mr. Gilbert responded to Commissioner Johnson and explained the new Title 18 has a new process called a Minor Conditional Use Permit. That would typically be an administrative review. The code also allows the option to run those together. In this instance because the Tentative Map request would go to the Planning Commission, the applicant elected to elevate the request to the Conditional Use Permit.

Commissioner Johnson asked if there has been any concern or review from the Fire Department standpoint with respect to any kind of mitigation requirements or concerns with the addition of this amount of traffic in this area.

Tray Palmer, Fire Marshal, responded stating no. The Pinehaven fire had several evacuations and there was a little bit of back up on McCarran but that is to be expected. This project does meet all fire code aspects and it will be required to have fire sprinklers.

Commissioner Johnson referenced a comment about an agenda item for City Council on rezoning that was tabled and asked about the status of that item.

Ms. Fuss stated this project is in a general commercial zoning district. City Council has not initiated a zone change. They tabled that discussion to an unknown date.

Commissioner Gower noted this is between two neighborhoods and stated he is trying to understand what the city's priorities are related to infill in this area.

Mr. Gilbert stated he would have to double-check as far as the base designation. The site abuts a major intersection on a suburban corridor and the master plan designation of suburban mixed use would support higher intensity based on its proximity to the intersection. There are numerous supporting policies in both the suburban corridor designation as well as the suburban mixed use designation for targeted density at locations adjacent to a major arterial in a suburban corridor.

Commissioner Gower stated with that targeted density we know this is an area where the infrastructure can support this type of density but he is also looking at these master plan policies that talk about infill development in some of these existing neighborhoods and they refer very strongly to the compatibility with existing land uses. He asked how staff weighs those two things in a scenario like this. Staff is leaning more towards the proximity of the development to the McCarran corridor.

Mr. Gilbert stated that specifically he would site the master plan policy on housing which talks about transition in densities. The applicant's presentation showed elevations comparing that. Additional supporting policies talk about the transition in densities towards these nodes.

Commissioner Gower asked staff if they feel compatibility is mitigated going the other direction into the existing neighborhoods where it is a substantial decrease in density.

Mr. Gilbert stated in staff's analysis of the competing master plan policies, that transition would be appropriate towards a major intersection like this. The 18 dwelling units per acre immediately to the south would be tempered with analysis on appropriate site design, and that is up to the Planning Commission to decide. As far as the density in and of itself, master plan policies would support a transition towards these nodes that needs to be tempered with appropriate design.

Mr. Gilbert confirmed for Commissioner Marshall that the nearest bus stop on McCarran is about .8 miles towards Kietzke.

Chair Taylor referenced some of the public comment regarding zoning and asked Mr. Durling if he could provide some insight into what happened between the zoning with Reno Land and what's happening now with Lyon Living.

Mr. Durling explained they had goals for what they were hoping to achieve but they did not come to fruition. As they got into the due diligence they found the former tennis club had asbestos and was in pre-foreclosure. Then there was the Pandemic that closed health clubs. There were a lot of strikes against it that led to the decision to not save the club and to look at an appropriate use in infill development.

Mr. Shipman explained for Chair Taylor that the campaign contribution reported does not trigger a requirement to disclose or recuse.

Commissioner Velto discussed the findings that need to be made and stated that he feels this project meets what is required by code and exceeds a lot of the requirements.

Commissioner Marshall discussed the need to do infill development right. We need to be sensitive to local resident concerns while firmly advancing our master planning policies. This narrows down to height, density, and design for this project.

Commissioner Munoz state he is struggling with the fact that there is nothing in the area that fits this kind of housing.

Commissioner Johnson stated he agrees that it is right for a denser level of development than what's around it. He discussed design concerns and whether the project design is compatible with the surrounding development. The development around this area is individual buildings oriented to create garden apartments and it sets up a land use pattern that is a number of smaller buildings with spaces and views in between. Part of this proposed project is a similar and denser version of that. The issue he has is what is being proposed for the larger buildings on the south side of the site. Those larger, blockier buildings with more mass are planned for the area that is transitioning into those garden apartments. We are reviewing this in terms of whether or not it is an appropriate site design. The scale and mass of the buildings are extremely jarring to me on the south side of the project. Conditional use permit finding 2 is what he is struggling with.

Commissioner Drakulich stated this appears to be a quality project that has meet findings and does meet a need.

Commissioner Gower stated that based on the findings and discussion tonight, he is comfortable making the findings. As long as the applicant adheres to the commitments made on the record tonight, I'm comfortable making the findings.

Chair Taylor stated that once we changed the zoning on this, we opened it up for the density. She stated she can make the findings. Traffic was her biggest concern but after hearing the traffic mitigations, she can make the findings.

Mr. Gordon confirmed for Chair Taylor that they do agree with the elongated left turns as discussed with Commissioner Velto.

It was moved by Commissioner Velto, seconded by Commissioner Drakulich, in the case of LDC21-00036 (6000 Plumas Street Redevelopment), based upon compliance with the applicable findings, to approved the tentative map and conditional use permit, subject to the conditions listed in the staff report adding the following conditions: Condition No. 6 "The applicant shall pay for the elongation of the left turn lanes on McCarran going both ways; Condition No. 7 "The applicant shall replace trees in the event they are lost because of a third lane being put in on McCarran".

Commissioner Johnson stated he will vote against the motion based on the condition use permit finding 2 with respect to the project site design.

Commissioner Munoz stated that he cannot make finding 2.

The motion carried with five (5) in favor and two (2) oppositions by Commissioners Johnson and Munoz.

(Chair Taylor called for a recess. Meeting to resume at 9:13 p.m.)

RESULT:	APPROVED [5 TO 2]
MOVER:	Alex Velto, Commissioner
SECONDER:	J.D. Drakulich, Commissioner
AYES:	Taylor, Marshall, Drakulich, Gower, Velto
NAYS:	Mark Johnson, Arthur Munoz

5.2 Staff Report (For Possible Action - Recommendation to City Council): Case No. LDC21-00042 (WES Court Hobby Condos Zone Change) - A request has been made to rezone a ±30.24 acre subject site comprised of three parcels from Mixed-Use Suburban (MS) to Mixed Employment (ME). The subject site is located west of US 395 and south of the terminus of Wes Court. The site has a Master Plan land use designation of Mixed Employment (ME). **[Ward 4] 9:15 PM**

(Meeting resumed at 9:15 p.m.)

Gabe Wittler, Odyssey Engineering, gave an overview of the project.

Nathan Gilbert, Associate Planner, presented the staff report and corrected an error in the zoning map. Staff received public inquiry but there are no public comments to report.

Disclosures: no disclosures, familiar with site

Public Comment: None

Mr. Gilbert confirmed for Commissioner Johnson that this zoning will preclude residential development on the site.

It was moved by Commissioner Gower, seconded by Commissioner Munoz, in the case of LDC21-00042 (WES Court Hobby Condos Zone Change), based upon compliance with the applicable findings, to recommend that City Council approve the zoning map amendment by ordinance. The motion carried unanimously with seven (7) commissioners present.

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Peter Gower, Commissioner
SECONDER:	Arthur Munoz, Commissioner
AYES:	Taylor, Marshall, Drakulich, Gower, Johnson, Munoz, Velto

5.3 Staff Report (For Possible Action): Case No. LDC21-00023 (WES Court Hobby Condos) - A request has been made for: 1) a tentative map to develop 170 hobby commercial condominium lots and associated common areas; and 2) a major site plan review to allow: a) hillside development, and b) grading with cuts greater than 20 feet and fills greater than 10 feet. The ±29.56 acre site is located on two parcels west of U.S. 395 and south of the terminus of Wes Court. The site is within the Mixed Use/Dandini Regional Center (MU/DRC) zone (a concurrent request for Mixed Employment (ME) zoning is in process) and has the Mixed Employment (ME) Master Plan land use designation. **[Ward 4]** 9:29 PM

Gabe Wittler, Odyssey Engineering, gave an overview of the project.

Nathan Gilbert, Associate Planner, presented the staff report and proposed the addition of Condition No. 10 as written in the presentation.

Disclosures: familiar with site

Public Comment: None

Mr. Wittler confirmed for Commissioner Munoz that there will be no residential type use allowed.

Commissioner Gower asked if commercial kitchen use would be allowed.

Mr. Gilbert stated no. He explained that Exhibit C would be the associated standards for this hobby concept use.

Commissioner Gower stated he does not see anything that would expressly prohibit that.

Mr. Gilbert stated it would be inconsistent with this land use.

Mr. Gilbert responded to questions from Commissioner Johnson regarding parking and confirmed that this will be providing more than what is required. If this turns into something with a higher parking demand than was anticipated, it would be evaluated at the building permit or business license review.

Mr. Wittler confirmed for Commissioner Johnson there will be an association with CC&R's to govern their own restrictions above and beyond code. He also confirmed that they will accommodate each building with water, sewer and power service.

Commissioner Marshall discussed the significant risk of occupation and suggested adding something to Exhibit C regarding no overnight use or residential use.

Mr. Gilbert confirmed that Exhibit C can be modified to articulate that.

It was moved by Commissioner Munoz, seconded by Commissioner Johnson, in the case of LDC21-00023 (WES Court Hobby Condos), based upon compliance with the applicable findings, to approve the tentative map and major site plan review, subject to the conditions listed in the staff report, with modifications to Exhibit C stating no overnight occupancy and restricting to office and hobby condo uses as outlined, and the addition of Condition No. 10 as presented by staff. The motion carried unanimously with seven (7) commissioners present.

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

6 Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Liaison Report

Commissioner Johnson reported they have not had a meeting since the last Reno Planning Commission meeting. The next meeting is scheduled for March 25th.

7 Staff Announcements

- 7.1 Report on status of Planning Division projects.
- 7.2 Announcement of upcoming training opportunities.
- 7.3 Report on status of responses to staff direction received at previous meetings.
- 7.4 Report on actions taken by City Council on previous Planning Commission items.
10:06 PM

Angela Fuss, Assistant Community Development Director, welcomed Commissioner J.D. Drakulich.

Commissioner Drakulich introduced himself.

Ms. Fuss reported the Stan Lucas case was heard by City Council last week and City Council initially denied it. The applicant sued the City and the judge remanded the case back to City Council where it was denied again.

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

Commissioner Velto expressed an interest in general best practices for planning.

Commissioner Marshall offered to take him on a tour of Tahoe to see scenic values.

Angela Fuss, Assistant Community Development Director, stated the American Planning Association offers free webinars. There has been discussion about bringing someone in to help educate City Council and Planners on planning issues.

Chair Taylor suggested there may be some resources on the Regional Planning Commission website.

Commissioner Marshall stated this was a missed opportunity tonight for staff to articulate why infill is so critical and why it is promoted in the master plan. It is an opportunity for education.

9 Public Comment

Email received opposed to development in the Lake Ridge area was forwarded to the commissioners and entered into the public record.

Item 9 - General Public Comment - *Presented/Distributed at Meeting*

10 Adjournment (For Possible Action)

The meeting was adjourned at 10:16 p.m.