



# MINUTES

## Regular Meeting

### Reno City Planning Commission

Wednesday, July 06, 2022 • 6:00 PM

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

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

**1 Pledge of Allegiance**

**2 Roll Call**

**Members Present**

Commissioner J.D. Drakulich, Commissioner Peter Gower, Commissioner Arthur Munoz, Commissioner Silvia Villanueva, Chair Kathleen Taylor

**3 Public Comment (This item is for either public comment on any action item or for any general public comment.)**

Correspondence was received, forwarded to the Planning Commission and entered as part of the record. No request to speak forms or voicemails were received.

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

4.1 Reno City Planning Commission - Regular - June 2, 2022 6:00 PM (For Possible Action)

*It was moved by Peter Gower, seconded by J.D. Drakulich, to approve. Motion Pass.*

<b>RESULT:</b>	Approved [3 TO 0]
<b>MOVER:</b>	Peter Gower, Commissioner
<b>SECONDER:</b>	J.D. Drakulich, Commissioner

<b>AYES:</b>	Drakulich, Gower, Villanueva
<b>NAYS:</b>	
<b>ABSENT:</b>	

4.2 Reno City Planning Commission - Regular - June 15, 2022 6:00 PM (For Possible Action)

*It was moved by Peter Gower, seconded by Silvia Villanueva, to approve. Motion Pass.*

<b>RESULT:</b>	Approved [4 TO 0]
<b>MOVER:</b>	Peter Gower, Commissioner
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Silvia Villanueva, Commissioner
<b>AYES:</b>	Drakulich, Gower, Taylor, Villanueva
<b>NAYS:</b>	
<b>ABSENT:</b>	

**5 Election of Officers (For Possible Action)**

*It was moved by Arthur Munoz, seconded by J.D. Drakulich, to elect Commissioner Velto as Chair. Motion Pass.*

<b>RESULT:</b>	Approved [5 TO 0]
<b>MOVER:</b>	Arthur Munoz, Commissioner
<b>SECONDER:</b>	J.D. Drakulich, Commissioner
<b>AYES:</b>	Drakulich, Gower, Munoz, Villanueva, Taylor
<b>NAYS:</b>	
<b>ABSENT:</b>	

*It was moved by Kathleen Taylor, seconded by Peter Gower, to elect Commissioner Drakulich as Vice Chair. Motion Pass.*

<b>RESULT:</b>	Approved [5 TO 0]
<b>MOVER:</b>	Kathleen Taylor, Chair
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Peter Gower, Commissioner
<b>AYES:</b>	Drakulich, Gower, Munoz, Villanueva, Taylor
<b>NAYS:</b>	
<b>ABSENT:</b>	

**6 Public Hearings – Any person who has chosen to provide his or her public comment when a Public Hearing is heard will need to so indicate on the Request to Speak form provided to the Secretary. Alternatively, you may provide your comment when Item 3, Public Comment, is heard at the beginning of this meeting.**

6.1 Staff Report (For Possible Action): Case No. **LDC22-00073 (Liberty Street Conversion)** – A request has been made for a tentative map to convert an existing office building into 27 commercial condominiums in the Mixed-Use Downtown Riverwalk District (MD-RD) zone. The subject ±0.663 acre site is located on the northwest corner at the intersection of

East Liberty Street and Hatch Street. The subject site has a Master Plan land use designation of Downtown Mixed-Use (DT-MU). **[Ward 3]**

*It was moved by Kathleen Taylor, seconded by Silvia Villanueva, to approve. Motion Pass.*

<b>RESULT:</b>	Approved [5 TO 0]
<b>MOVER:</b>	Kathleen Taylor, Chair
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Silvia Villanueva, Commissioner
<b>AYES:</b>	Drakulich, Gower, Munoz, Villanueva, Taylor
<b>NAYS:</b>	
<b>ABSENT:</b>	

Kerry Rohrmeier, representing the applicant, gave a presentation on the application request.

Leah Brock, Development Services Assistant Planner, presented the staff report.

Disclosures: familiar with the site and received email

Public Comment: none

Questions: none

Discussion: none

*It was moved by Commissioner Taylor, seconded by Commissioner Villanueva, in the case of LDC22-00073 (Liberty Street Conversion), based upon compliance with the applicable findings, to approve the tentative map, subject to the conditions listed in the staff report. Motion carried unanimously with five (5) commissioners present.*

- 6.2 Staff Report (For Possible Action): Case No. **LDC22-00075 (North Hills Multi-Family)** – A request has been made for a conditional use permit to allow a 408 unit multi-family development that will result in fills greater than 10 feet in height. The ±21.52 acre site consists of three parcels and is located ±234 feet south of Buck Drive in between US Highway 395 and North Hills Boulevard. The site is within the General Commercial (GC) zoning district, and has a Master Plan land use designation of Special Planning Area (SPA). **[Ward 4]**

Sev Carlson, representing the applicant, gave an overview of the project.

David Giacomini, Civil Engineer, presented information regarding the

traffic study in the area.

Grace Whited, Development Services Associate Planner, presented the staff report.

Disclosures: received and read emails, familiar with the area, familiar with the site, spoke with applicant's representative

Public Comment:

Two request to speak forms were received and two people registered to speak via zoom (only one was online).

David Baggett spoke in opposition  
Robbie Frank spoke in favor  
April Barker spoke in opposition

Correspondence was received. 1 in favor; 22 in opposition. All correspondence was forwarded to the Planning Commission and are a part of the record. No voicemails were received.

Questions:

Commissioner Munoz asked how the city justifies compatibility in this area for three story buildings.

Ms. Whited explained that the GC zone allows for 65 feet in height so this would be under what is permitted. Staff feels it is fairly compatible. There is commercial to the north of the site and lower density residential to the east of the site. This would serve as a nice transition with higher density closer to the freeway.

Mr. Giacomini answered questions from Commissioner Gower regarding the Level of Service information included in Table 4 of the traffic study. Traffic mitigations suggested in the report include coordination with the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC).

Commissioner Gower asked about the phasing plan for the project related to the timing of the RTC road improvements.

Mr. Carlson explained they are looking at a four year horizon. If they are at full buildout and occupancy at the end of four years, they should be in the same timeframe as the RTC improvements are anticipated to be completed.

Commissioner Gower referred to the Washoe County School District comments regarding intersection improvements for safe routes to school that are far away from this project and asked how staff deals with a request like that.

Ms. Whited explained that is out of scope of this development. Those comments would be more of a recommendation for Public Works or RTC. It is not an improvement that this project can make.

Mr. Giacomini answered questions from Commissioner Taylor regarding trip generation. There will be approximately 200 trips generated.

Commissioner Taylor stated the RTC timeframe for improvements to North Hills and Buck Drive is 2026-2030 so we could be seeing that trip generation prior to any improvements from RTC.

Mr. Giacomini confirmed that could be the case. He also stated that his initial traffic study did not take those improvements into account and the RTC asked him to include them.

Commissioner Taylor asked if he is saying that without the RTC improvements the level of service is sufficient for the trip generation.

Mr. Giacomini clarified that is not what he is saying. In the initial traffic study he requested that they perform counts again after the completion of the construction project and during school times.

Commissioner Taylor stated it is possible that we could see no RTC improvements on North Hills Road and Buck Drive at the time of full buildout of this project. The improvements may happen in 2030 with a full buildout in 2026.

Mr. Giacomini responded stating it is speculative and he can't speak for RTC.

Mike Mischel, Engineering Manager, confirmed for Commissioner Taylor that without the RTC improvements, the traffic in the area will be worse. It would be adding traffic to intersections that already don't operate at satisfactory levels.

Commissioner Taylor asked staff how this project fits into the compatibility of the surrounding uses.

Ms. Whited explained that multi-family fits in well here because there are services in walkable proximity and it is adjacent to a bus line. It is also a nice

transition from a higher density adjacent to a freeway to a lower density detached single family to the east.

Chris Waechter, Civil Engineer for the project, answered questions from Commissioner Villanueva regarding the drainageways on the site. They are not seeing any issues of erosion in this area being that the storm water can be isolated to the parking areas which direct to the north in consistent draining patterns.

Mr. Carlson answered questions from Commissioner Villanueva regarding emergency response and access. The application has been reviewed by RFD and RPD and no concerns were identified.

Ms. Whited answered questions from Commissioner Villanueva regarding impact fees mentioned in the report. The closest fire station is Station 10 with a response time of 7 minutes so the buildings will have to be sprinklered. Police impact fees are relatively new and will be collected at the time of building permit. They will be used to maintain adequate service for new developments.

Ms. Whited answered questions from Commissioner Villanueva regarding water and sewer hookups mentioned in the report when the vet business in the area had to connect to a septic tank. She stated the applicant will need to obtain water and sewer will serve letters prior to construction to make sure there is adequate infrastructure for this development.

Commissioner Villanueva referred to the Washoe County School District concerns mentioned by Commissioner Gower. The school district has very valid concerns but it seems that with some of these developments, a school won't be built unless we have the development. I don't know if that is appropriate or how policies should work but that seems to be how it does work. A school does need to be built but this project won't be able to address any of the WCSD concerns.

Mr. Giacomini answered questions from Commissioner Munoz regarding the dates and times he was in the area observing traffic for his report.

Commissioner Gower discussed the finding regarding mitigation of traffic impacts and asked staff how they are to address that finding in a situation like this where we will not achieve an acceptable LOS until some time in the future.

Mr. Mischel stated this applicant is doing everything within reason to provide mitigation. The key here is to get RTC to do their project as quickly as possible.

Commissioner Gower asked if the city still looks at the concept of concurrency.

Mr. Mischel stated we rely on RTC to do capacity street projects. We have representatives on that board and it is up to us to lobby as best we can for our projects. We can't make these guys go out and improve half of Lemmon Valley. They are doing what they can do within reason.

Commissioner Taylor discussed the WCSD comments regarding traffic concerns noting they don't usually see comments like that from the WCSD.

Ms. Whited confirmed that she has not seen it before. The WCSD comments range depending on the project so it is not a consistent thing we see. She thinks because traffic is an issue up here they felt it necessary to comment on it. She also noted that the WCSD comments were submitted on the initial traffic study before the RTC asked that their planned improvements be included.

Discussion:

Commissioner Gower stated we have a scenario where we have a finding we have to make relative to mitigating traffic. We also have a finding we have to make relative to conformance with the Master Plan. The Master Plan includes the concept of a Concurrency Management System so it is essentially the provision of services to support growth. Essentially it says that if the infrastructure isn't there to allow the city to meet its service targets, which include the LOS standards, then the development shouldn't move forward. The challenge that we have relative to that finding and that policy is that within the ability of this project and this developer they are doing everything within reason to make that finding and to address that policy. Asking them to do more would be like asking them to do RTC's job for them. The challenge we find ourselves in is that there is a likelihood of there being 1-5 years where the LOS at these intersections will be worse. In the near-term we are going in the wrong direction relative to that finding and policy. In the longer-term, once the RTC moves forward with their projects we are in a scenario where it is an improvement. The Regional Road Impact Fees contribute to the RTC's ability to improve the conditions in that area. So we really have a trade off of are we comfortable moving forward with a project that would provide funding to allow the RTC to implement the improvements, or are we uncomfortable with the near-term scenario where the LOS gets worse and we can't make our findings.

Vice Chair Drakulich stated it's hard to see a project like this, which I'd like to

see. I believe there is compatibility there and I like the product. It could have been bigger with more units and they did not propose that. There are businesses to the south and the north. I think residential does fit. We are just rolling the dice on if the RTC is going to get it done in time so we don't impact the residents. I don't have a good answer there but I would like to see some level of a solution. I don't know if there is any level of condition to where maybe they can't take occupancy until RTC is moving forward. Their impact fees are going to be paying for that.

Commissioner Munoz stated the lose of more commercial space to residential is a detriment to that community. We are forcing everybody that lives up there to travel out for their shopping and entertainment and to meet their needs that cannot be met up there. Adding another 408 residents in an already extremely crowded area is a bad idea and I cannot justify it. The traffic will not be addressed until 2030 and then so many years after that before it is actually implemented and something is done about it. That road was recently redone and when they do decide to make that into four lanes they will have to take some properties out there. There is not enough room and it is barely big enough for two lanes as it is now. I do not think the product with three stories fits the area.

Commissioner Taylor stated she agrees with Commissioner Gower, it is an interesting position. But rarely do we have such a black and white answer from the Engineering team where we hear yes it's a bad situation now and if we put 400 more houses out there it will be much worse. Traffic out there is pretty heavy. I'm having a hard time supporting the benefit. I always look at housing too because we do need housing but we have people saying they have concerns and the WCSD has concerns with traffic. We don't see that a lot in our packets or the information we receive. I am not comfortable moving forward with this project as it is.

Commissioner Villanueva stated it is a tough decision. Ideally development and RTC and the City infrastructure would move in lockstep and everything would work together but it does appear that development is happening faster than the infrastructure. That appears to be happening all over the city. I am not a proponent of spawl but multi-family is a good thing. The traffic issues make us realize we do need to start looking at public transit as an option. That does not negate the need for thoughtful development. In considering everything, I do like that this development is on this side of the freeway with residential uses and businesses because on the other side we have a bunch of warehouses. The WCSD says that new schools are dependent on regional residential growth. I don't agree with it but it does appear that we are getting infrastructure and schools only when commercial development or residential development are first developed. I am for it. I don't generally like these type



of developments but given the compatibility in this case, given that it is multi-family, given that it is also near public transit I think a lot of those concerns I generally have are alleviated.

***It was moved by Commissioner Villanueva in the case of LDC22-00075 (North Hills Multi-Family), based upon compliance with the applicable findings, to approve the conditional use permit subject to the conditions listed in the staff report. Motion failed without a second.***

***It was moved by Commissioner Munoz, seconded by Commissioner Taylor, in the case of LDC22-00075 (North Hills Multi-Family), based upon non-compliance with the applicable findings, to deny the conditional use permit.***

Commissioner Gower reiterated that the magnitude of the near-term impacts relative to traffic and my ability to meet that finding 3 regarding mitigating impacts prevent me from being able to approve this project. It's not just that we have an intersection that is at a LOS D migrating into an E or an F scenario. We have intersections that are functioning at the lowest level of service and we are saying we are going to add to that and create a situation where up to five years or more depending on the RTC it could be a bad situation traffic-wise out there that would be exasperated by this project. It is that near-term magnitude for me that doesn't allow me to make that finding. In 2030 we could be in great shape with this project but with the magnitude of the near-term I can't quite get there.

***Motion carried with three (3) in favor and two (2) oppositions by Commissioner Villanueva and Vice Chair Drakulich.***

Vice Chair Drakulich read the appeal process into the record.

***It was moved by Silvia Villanueva, seconded by , to approve. Motion Fail.***

<b>RESULT:</b>	Approved [0 TO 0]
<b>MOVER:</b>	Silvia Villanueva, Commissioner
<b>SECONDER:</b>	,
<b>AYES:</b>	
<b>NAYS:</b>	
<b>ABSENT:</b>	

***It was moved by Arthur Munoz, seconded by Kathleen Taylor, to deny. Motion Pass.***

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>Denied [3 TO 2]</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Arthur Munoz, Commissioner
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Kathleen Taylor, Chair
<b>AYES:</b>	Gower, Munoz, Taylor
<b>NAYS:</b>	J.D. Drakulich, Silvia Villanueva
<b>ABSENT:</b>	

**7 Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Liaison Report**

No update.

**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.

Jason Garcia-LoBue, Planning Manager, reported tonight was the first meeting using our new Primegov system.

The next Planning Commission meeting will be on Thursday, July 21 as there will be a City Council meeting on the July 20.

Staff is currently preparing training for August 3.

He reported on actions taken by City Council and the status of Title 18 updates.

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

Commissioner Villanueva requested a presentation from WCSD regarding development of schools in the community.

**10 Public Comment (This item is for either public comment on any action item or for any general public comment.)**

None

**11          Adjournment (For Possible Action)**

The meeting adjourned at 7:43 p.m.