



MINUTES

Regular Meeting

Reno City Planning Commission

Wednesday, January 18, 2023 • 6:00 PM

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

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

1 Pledge of Allegiance

Commissioner Munoz led the Pledge of Allegiance.

2 Roll Call

| Members Present |
|--|
| Chair Alex Velto, Commissioner Mark Johnson, Vice Chair J.D. Drakulich, Commissioner Peter Gower, Commissioner Arthur Munoz, Commissioner Silvia Villanueva, Commissioner Harris Armstrong |

Commissioner Villanueva was absent at roll call and arrived at 6:07 p.m.

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

Correspondence was received for a future agenda item. That was forwarded to the Planning Commission and entered into the record.

The following provided public comment at this time:

- Danny Cleous
- Kelly Orr
- Lisa Manning
- Donna Keats

(Commissioner Villanueva present at 6:07 p.m.)

- 4 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.**

- 4.1 Staff Report (For Possible Action): Case No. **LDC23-00016 (TCA Leroy Street)** – A request has been made for: 1) a tentative map to develop a 16 lot single-family residential detached subdivision and; 2) a major site plan review for: a) cluster development and; b) grading resulting in cuts deeper than 20 feet and/or fills greater than ten feet in height. The project is located on a ±6.64 acre portion of the 10.14 acre site which is generally located 500 feet east of the intersection of Mae Anne Avenue and Leroy Street directly adjacent to Interstate 80 (I-80). The site has a zoning of Single-Family Residential - 3 dwelling units per acre (SF-3) and General Commercial (GC) and Master Plan land use designations of Single-Family Neighborhood (SF) and Suburban Mixed-Use (SMU). **[Ward 1]**

Andy Durling, Wood Rodgers, gave an overview of the project.

Brook Oswald, Associate Planner, presented staff analysis and recommended approval.

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

Public Comment: None

Questions:

Mr. Durling explained the elevation difference and distance between the site and the property across Leroy Street for Commissioner Munoz.

Loren Chilson, Headway Transportation, answered questions from Commissioner Villanueva's regarding the traffic analysis and trips generated.

Mr. Durling explained for Commissioner Gower that the City and County do the addressing for projects. This would have Hanson Drive addresses, not Leroy Street.

It was moved by Arthur Munoz, seconded by Alex Velto, to approve.

Motion Pass.

| | |
|------------------|--|
| RESULT: | Approved [7 TO 0] |
| MOVER: | Arthur Munoz, Commissioner |
| SECONDER: | Alex Velto, Chair |
| AYES: | Velto, Johnson, Drakulich, Gower, Munoz, Villanueva, Armstrong |
| NAYS: | |
| ABSENT: | |

- 4.2 Staff Report (For Possible Action - Recommendation to City Council):
Case No. **LDC23-00029 (3655 Warren Way Rezoning)** - A request has been made for a zoning map amendment from Single-Family Residential – 3 units per acre (SF-3) to Multi-Family Residential – 21 units per acre (MF-21). The ±1.0 acre project site is located on the west side of Warren Way ±425 feet south of its intersection with West Moana Lane. The site has a Master Plan land use designation of Suburban Mixed-Use (SMU). **[Ward 2]**

Lisa Nash, Christy Corporation, requested a continuance to the March 1 meeting. They would like time to take in public comment they received last night and to evaluate what they are specifically going to ask for.

Jason Garcia-LoBue, Planning Manager, stated this item will not be continued to a date certain because it will need to be re-noticed.

Correspondence was received. That was forwarded to the Planning Commission and entered into the record.

Public Comment:

Donna Keats
Andre Moreno

Voicemails received from the following:

Andre Moreno
Jacqueline Baton
Laura Beth Lathrop
Marcie Ross

Commissioner Munoz requested that the voicemails be replayed when this item is rescheduled.

It was moved by Mark Johnson, seconded by Silvia Villanueva, to continue. Motion Pass.

| | |
|------------------|--|
| RESULT: | Continued [7 TO 0] |
| MOVER: | Mark Johnson, Commissioner |
| SECONDER: | Silvia Villanueva, Commissioner |
| AYES: | Velto, Johnson, Drakulich, Gower, Munoz, Villanueva, Armstrong |
| NAYS: | |
| ABSENT: | |

- 4.3 Staff Report (For Possible Action): Case No. **LDC23-00025 (Riviera Planned Community)** – A request has been made for a tentative map to establish a five-lot single-family attached (condominium) subdivision and associated common areas. The ±0.31 acre project site is located southeast of Riviera Street, ±75 feet from its intersection with Idlewild Drive. The project site is located within the Multi-Family Residential – 14 units per acre (MF-14) zoning district and has a Master Plan land use designation of Mixed Neighborhood (MX). **[Ward 1]**

Mike Vicks, Monte Vista Consulting, gave an overview of the project.

Don Clark, Cathexis, also provided an overview.

Carter Williams, Assistant Planner, presented staff analysis and recommended approval.

Disclosures: read and received correspondence, familiar with the site

Public Comment:

Eric Robbins (not present when called to speak)

Tim Hosfeldt

Jennifer Matilainen

Fred Contreras

Anna O’Bryan

Scott Wright

Dalen O’Bryan

Nathanial Vass

Tina Dils

Jennifer Heeran

Norman Huckle

Mike Matilainen

There were two Request to Speak forms submitted after the vote:

Barbara A. Siemann

Kim Malfa

Questions:

Mr. Clark explained for Commissioner Gower there was not an extensive outreach process. They did go through the NAB meeting public process and felt they had addressed the comments received in that process. They did not meet with the neighbors. It is designed within the standards. He clarified that the roof area that is being called a roof deck is actually not a deck on top of the building. It is tucked in the middle and only faces the street.

Mr. Williams confirmed for Commissioner Johnson that this could be an apartment complex by right and the reason it is being seen by the Planning Commission is because it is being broken into a tentative map for individually sold units. He also confirmed that the building height and setback requirements would be the same. A large two-story building could be built 20 feet from the property line in the back by right.

Mr. Williams explained for Commissioner Johnson that currently stormwater flows are directed to adjacent properties. With the grading of the lot and the inclusion of the infiltration basin most of the stormwater flows will be directed to the street to connect with existing facilities.

Mr. Williams explained for Commissioner Johnson that a sanitary sewer letter was submitted with the application that identified that the impacts would not trigger a full report to be submitted and that was accepted by the engineering division.

Mr. Vicks explained for Commissioner Johnson where the trash enclosure would be located on the site.

Mr. Clark further explained that the trash receptacles will be screened completely from the neighbors.

Mr. Vicks confirmed for Commissioner Johnson that an HOA will govern snow removal and landscape maintenance.

Mr. Williams explained for Commissioner Villanueva what the process is for something that is permitted by right. This agenda item is a request for a tentative map for a subdivision of the parcel so that there is an opportunity for individual ownership.

Mr. Williams answered questions from Commissioner Villanueva regarding the proposed building height and explained that code contemplates a trigger for considering shadowing on development that exceeds 35 feet. This project building cannot exceed 35 feet in height.

Mr. Williams confirmed for Commissioner Villanueva that the hours of operation for construction starting at 7:00 a.m. is standard but can be modified.

Mr. Williams explained for Commissioner Villanueva that ADA parking is not required for single-family residences and is not proposed. Parking requirements are being met in this proposal.

Mr. Williams explained for Commissioner Armstrong there is no code requirement for privacy. It is not related to the findings for this request and is not something staff analyzes. Regarding compatibility, there are wall articulation standards built into code. Most areas in the city don't have a specific design style that needs to be met to address compatibility. From staff's perspective we are looking at whether the building meets articulation elements and streetscape standards.

Mr. Clark explained for Commissioner Munoz that going this route instead of building what would be allowed by right would raise the value of the property. By doing them as condos the quality of construction and materials is higher, including the maintenance and ongoing care of the property.

Mr. Clark explained the proposed underground parking for Vice-Chair Drakulich.

Mr. Clark explained for Commissioner Villanueva they would likely want to stay with the normal construction hours that are applied across the city and not reduce those hours. He also answered questions regarding the proposed design and stated they tried to pay attention to the impact it would have on the neighborhood.

Mr. Williams confirmed for Commissioner Gower that Joey Winter from the City of Reno was present for the NAB meeting on this item. Mr. Williams stated he did not receive any comments from the NAB members.

Discussion:

Commissioner Gower stated he does not have any concerns with making the findings for the proposal itself. He expressed concern about feeling blindsided with the community objection to the project. The NAB process is intended to provide an opportunity for the community to voice concerns and have a conversation with the developers to hopefully resolve some of the concerns. The proposal is within the right and is less intense than what can be built on the property. There is a missed opportunity here for the project proponent to be a good neighbor and have these conversations ahead of time.

Jason Garcia-LoBue, Planning Manager, explained the Development Services review process. There were NAB comments submitted through that process and staff addressed some of those. More comments were heard tonight.

Commissioner Velto stated he was also surprised by the comments from the public tonight but is not sure the Planning Commission can hold that against the applicant given that they did attend the NAB. He stated he can make all of the findings based on what is permitted by right and this is a less intense project. A lot of the concerns from the neighbors would still exist and might be worse if the applicant were to build what is allowed by right instead of what they are proposing.

Commissioner Johnson stated there were at least a half dozen comments provided in the meeting packet from the NAB so he is not surprised by the opposition tonight. The biggest concern is compatibility. This could have been designed any number of ways but the standards for the city would not have allowed this building to look like the buildings across the street or the single family buildings next to it. The articulation standards require the in and outs, ups and downs, and material changes. As long as it meets code, holding the aesthetics against the project is not something that we as a commission can really do. We are not looking at a zone change and what is allowed in the existing zone could be worse than what is proposed. It is the kind of project that we are typically asking for at this commission.

Discussion after the motion:

Commissioner Munoz stated he is empathetic on this. He agreed that this checks all the boxes but nobody wants a larger building right behind them. There are findings we have to go by and we don't have a choice on that. Regarding compatibility, he stated I do not like the way it looks but that is my opinion and I am not allowed to put my opinion in this. I do agree with the commissioners but not as willingly as I'd like to.

Motion to approve passed and Vice-Chair Drakulich read the appeal process into the record.

It was moved by Alex Velto, seconded by Silvia Villanueva, to approve. Motion Pass.

| | |
|------------------|---|
| RESULT: | Approved [6 TO 1] |
| MOVER: | Alex Velto, Chair |
| SECONDER: | Silvia Villanueva, Commissioner |
| AYES: | Velto, Johnson, Drakulich, Gower, Villanueva, Armstrong |
| NAYS: | Arthur Munoz |
| ABSENT: | |

- 4.4 Staff Report (For Possible Action): Case No. **LDC23-00026 (Grand Point Townhomes South)** - A request has been made for: 1) a tentative map for a 30-lot single-family attached (townhome) subdivision; 2) a conditional use permit for more than 20 residential units in the Multi-Family Residential – 14 units per acre (MF-14) zoning district; and 3) alternative equivalent compliance to vary from: a) reduced setback requirements with a conditional use permit; and b) residential street tree requirements. The ±2.25 acre site is located on the east side of Grand Point Way approximately ±675 feet south of its intersection with Mae Anne Avenue. The site is within the McQueen Neighborhood Planning Overlay zoning district (MQ) and has a Master Plan land use designation of Suburban Mixed-Use (SMU). **[Ward 5]**

Stacie Huggins, Wood Rodgers, gave an overview of the project.

Leah Brock, Assistant Planner, provided staff analysis and recommended approval. Two letters of support were received from NAB members. Letters of opposition received sited traffic, reduced setback, infrastructure, noise and number of units as concerns. These were forwarded to the Planning Commission for review.

Disclosures: spoke with the applicant's representative, received emails, familiar with the area, previously visited the site

Public Comment:

Lisa Manning

Ian Fransson

Voicemails from the following:

Johanna Marrow

Valerie Santana

Questions:

Mark Cendagorta, project engineer, responded to questions from Commissioner Gower regarding stormwater drainage from the site. There will be 60% less runoff going to the eastern swale in the fully developed condition than there is now.

Ms. Huggins answered questions from Commissioner Gower regarding the landscape plan. The additional trees they are providing to mitigate for the reduced setback will not be in a swale area. She also confirmed that the concrete portion of the drainage is on the adjacent property owner's property.

Ms. Huggins confirmed for Commissioner Munoz that people will be able to walk through the site utilizing pedestrians paths provided with the project.

Ms. Huggins explained for Commissioner Villanueva why they are requesting a setback variation.

Ms. Huggins answered questions from Commissioner Johnson regarding the proposed retaining wall.

Ms. Huggins answered questions from Commissioner Gower regarding the site constraints and discussed access and circulation options that were explored.

Commissioner Gower asked staff to explain how they can make the Alternative Equivalent Compliance (AEC) finding regarding making no greater impact on adjacent properties.

Ms. Brock explained for Commissioner Gower that the 10 foot side setback that is required per the MF14 zoning district is still being met. In code the side setback for MF14 is 5 feet, except when adjacent to Single Family Residential it is 10 feet. The side setback for the zoning district is 10 feet. In this particular case there is no greater impact on the neighboring properties than there would be with any other development that could be occurring on that property with a 10 foot side setback. This is an inconsistency in code because what happened is the applicant was held to this higher standard of 20 feet because they chose to bundle the minor use permit with the tentative map instead of piecemealing it in order to be transparent when they came before the Planning Commission.

Ms. Huggins explained for Commissioner Munoz the screening plans for the properties to the south. Trees will be provided for screening and additional landscaping can be provided if the Planning Commission feels that is appropriate.

Commissioner Munoz expressed concern regarding headlights shining into neighboring properties to the south. He asked if the developer would be willing to include an additional condition for some type of screening there other than trees.

Ms. Huggins stated she would need to discuss with the developer what other screening options could be used there. She also noted that the existing resident to the south is 45 feet from their property line and there is significant landscaping that already exists along that property line.

Commissioner Munoz clarified that he is not looking for a wall but a more solid type of landscaping other than trees.

Commissioner Villanueva stated that she likes the development generally but asked Ms. Huggins to also find out from the developer if they could reduce the number of units on the site.

Ms. Huggins answered questions from Commissioner Gower regarding parking. We have approved designs like this before with short driveways. There were concerns that people would park on the street and it is only 28 feet wide. The applicant has agreed to include CC&Rs that don't allow for parking on the street. Design standards for this type of development require two parking spaces per unit and that is provided in the garages.

Commissioner Gower asked if there is a mechanism that can be put in place to keep residents from parking a third vehicle there.

Ms. Huggins confirmed they can put a note about that in the CC&Rs. They will also put signs in the guest parking areas that clarify they are guest parking spaces only and cannot be used by the residents. She confirmed they would be willing to have that as a condition of approval.

Commissioner Gower asked about the garage depth and whether it was a consideration that they are limiting ownership to people with smaller vehicles.

Ms. Huggins stated that is not the intent. They are standard garage depths. They can park on Grand Point which is a public street.

Ms. Huggins responded to Commissioner Munoz's earlier question and explained that where the road comes up to the south property line it is in 3 feet of cut so it is lower than the south property. The headlights won't shine into the adjacent properties but we would be willing to plant a hedge along that portion of the road to mitigate headlights.

Commissioner Munoz stated that would satisfy his concern.

Ms. Huggins responded to Commissioner Villanueva's earlier question and stated they cannot lose a lot on this site given the infrastructure that is needed. We believe 30 units is appropriate for this site and still meets all the intents of code.

Commissioner Villanueva expressed concern with this setting precedent.

Ms. Brock confirmed for Commissioner Villanueva that AEC has not been

used for this type of project before. She explained that AEC is not an option for all sections of code. It only pertains to Articles 8, 9 and 10. This particular item regarding the setback is in Article 9 so precedent would only be set for obtaining an AEC for items in Article 9.

Discussion:

Chair Velto expressed concern with pushing back on the proposed number of units. They have done a lot of good things with the space and this is the type of project we want to see and would be good for the area.

Commissioner Gower stated the number of units they are trying to fit on this site is resulting in a site plan that generates compatibility issues along the southern property line which play into the AEC consideration. He expressed concern regarding the mechanisms of how staff is interpreting code and the findings that have to be made for the AEC request. Finding 4 asks if this creates a bigger issue going from 20 to 10 and it does. Staff is essentially saying we really need to not consider that because it could have been processed differently. Fundamentally, it is a great infill project but when it is done in a way that is trying to put too much onto a site it does a little bit of injustice to the site and the surrounding property owners. We are just trying to squeeze a sidewalk and landscaping and drainage swales into such a small area along these property lines that I question if that is the appropriate intensity for the site and if there is a better way to do it. We heard that there isn't really a better way to do it and that led to my question about the number of units.

Commissioner Villanueva stated this could really be a good project for the area but the way it is being presented makes it really difficult to make the findings. She would be open to continuing this to see what options are available.

Commissioner Johnson stated he understands the concern about the density. There has been a real effort here to address some of the challenges. There is precedent in this area for this side yard back yard setback situation we are looking at as some of the existing neighboring houses have a less than 10 foot setback side yard to the back yard of their neighbors because they are on a cul-de-sac. He understands the rationale for using the AEC. He does not think this is setting a precedent. The AEC here is for us to review if the additional trees and the situation with the adjacent properties are suitable as an alternative to the 20 foot setback. The applicant has done due diligence to make this project work on the site in a way that responds so some of our concerns. I don't look at this as potentially overbuilding. I think they are doing everything they can to fit within the parameters of a challenging site in a way that maximizes the land use capabilities and the housing that we are looking for. There are findings that get into compatibility with the neighbors and some

traffic issues but the AEC is more of a design aspect for us to review.

Discussion on the motion:

Commissioner Villanueva stated she wants to see this project move forward but can't make the findings.

Commissioner Armstrong confirmed that the motion includes the two additional conditions that were discussed regarding parking restriction signage and planting a hedge.

It was moved by Harris Armstrong, seconded by Alex Velto, to approve. Motion Pass.

| | |
|------------------|---|
| RESULT: | Approved [5 TO 2] |
| MOVER: | Harris Armstrong, Commissioner |
| SECONDER: | Alex Velto, Chair |
| AYES: | Velto, Johnson, Drakulich, Munoz, Armstrong |
| NAYS: | Peter Gower, Silvia Villanueva |
| ABSENT: | |

- 4.5 Staff Report (For Possible Action): Case No. **LDC23-00027 (Grand Point Townhomes North)** - A request has been made for: 1) a tentative map for a 78-lot single-family attached (townhome) subdivision; 2) a conditional use permit for: a) more than 50 residential units in the Neighborhood Commercial (NC) zoning district; b) fills greater than ten feet in height; and c) cluster development; and 3) alternative equivalent compliance to vary from the residential street tree requirements. The ±5.10 acre site is located on the southeast corner of the intersection at Grand Point Way and Mae Anne Avenue. The site is within the NC zoning district in the McQueen Neighborhood Planning Area Overlay (MQ) zoning district and has a Master Plan land use designation of Suburban Mixed-Use (SMU). **[Ward 5]**

Stacie Huggins, Wood Rodgers, gave an overview of the project.

Leah Brock, Assistant Planner, presented staff analysis and recommended approval.

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

Public Comment:
Johanna Marrow
Ian Fransson

Lisa Manning

Questions:

Loren Chilson, Headway Transportation, explained for Commissioner that they did not evaluate for a stop light at the intersection of Munoz Mae Anne Avenue and Grand Point Way. The project trip generation is so low that no analysis was required for that.

Jason Garcia-LoBue, Planning Manager, confirmed that Development Services did review this and it is below the traffic threshold that would require traffic mitigation at that intersection.

Mark Cendagorta, project engineer, explained the site stormwater flow for Commissioner Gower. There will be an 80% net reduction in runoff.

Discussion:

Commissioner Gower stated the intensity of development and the way it is laid out on the site is more appropriate than with the previous project to the south. This mitigates some of the compatibility issues they had on the property to the south.

Commissioner Johnson responded to concerns expressed during public comment. Regarding the potential for crime in the area, usually that decreases when vacant lots are developed. Regarding open space, this site has always been intended to be developed and there is open space and a park nearby.

Commissioner Villanueva agreed this is a good site for this type of development. The neighboring commercial stores and connectivity for other forms of transportation can assist in alleviating traffic issues.

Mike Mischel, Engineering Manager, responded to concerns regarding traffic analysis of the intersection. This project, along with the project to the south, do not rise to the level of requiring a full comprehensive traffic study of the area.

It was moved by Alex Velto, seconded by Harris Armstrong, to approve, with the additional signage condition. Motion Pass.

| | |
|------------------|--|
| RESULT: | Approved [7 TO 0] |
| MOVER: | Alex Velto, Chair |
| SECONDER: | Harris Armstrong, Commissioner |
| AYES: | Velto, Johnson, Drakulich, Gower, Munoz, Villanueva, Armstrong |
| NAYS: | |

ABSENT:

- 4.6 Staff Report (For Possible Action): Case No. **LDC23-00018 (Aspire at North Hills)** - A request has been made for a conditional use permit to allow a 192 unit multi-family development. The ±8.64 acre subject site consists of four parcels with ±308.63 feet of frontage on North Hills Boulevard and ±179 feet of frontage on East Golden Valley Road. The subject site is located within the General Commercial (GC) zoning district and has a Master Plan land use designation of Suburban Mixed-Use (SMU). **[Ward 4]**

Derek Wilson, Rubicon Design Group, gave an overview of the project.

Leah Brock, Assistant Planner, presented staff analysis and recommended approval.

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

Public Comment:

Danny Cleous
Robin Lovelace
Kelly Orr
Selena Munoz
Richard Pruett
Hailey Troyan
Sharon Burke
Natalie Larson

Voicemails received from 11/17/22:

Richard Williams
Susan Holt
Veronica Rivera
Luis Midianda

Questions:

Mike Mischel, Engineering Manager, answered questions from Commissioner Munoz regarding traffic. He stated he does not know when 395 is planned to be widened. There was a traffic study done for North Hills Blvd. with this project.

There was an apartment complex project proposed down the street six months ago that also did a traffic study on North Hills Blvd. He confirmed for Commissioner Munoz that it is his recollection that the project proposed down

the road was denied due to traffic.

Commissioner Villanueva referenced public comment regarding flooding and asked if drainage is an issue on the site.

Mr. Wilson stated that is not something he has heard. The way to fix that is to build something there. He believes drainage and detention basins do work. He confirmed there is a detention basin planned for this site.

Mr. Wilson explained for Commissioner Armstrong the density differences between Spanish Springs and Golden Valley areas. Spanish Springs is a large housing area to the north that all funnels into one spot where everyone does their commercial shopping. The North Valleys is more spread out. When a retailer looks at a site they evaluate the population in the area around that site and in Golden Valley you don't have the same kind of density you have in Spanish Springs.

Mr. Wilson elaborated further on the stormwater issue for Commissioner Gower. He explained the destination of flows for the site and the function of the proposed detention basin.

Ms. Brock explained for Commissioner Gower the process of evaluating project requests. When it comes to traffic issues, staff relies on the engineering team to provide comments and coordinate with Public Works.

Jason Garcia-LoBue, Planning Manager, further explained that staff uses the master plan as our guiding policy document. We also rely on input from other agencies and for this item we did get input from the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) and the school district that is included with the staff report. Conditions of approval are included to address concerns that may be raised. Public Works and Utilities Services are keeping tabs on capacity issues.

Ms. Brock responded to an earlier question regarding widening of 395. According to the Regional Transportation Plan, it is scheduled to be done in the 2026 to 2030 timeframe.

Ms. Brock confirmed for Commissioner Gower that based on information provided by the partner agencies staff was able to make all the findings and recommends approval.

Craig Rowe, Tanamera Construction, responded to Commissioner Villanueva stating the project would be ready in about two years for people to move in.

Mr. Wilson confirmed for Commissioner Villanueva that the school district's

concerns were addressed and they will keep the existing walking connection at the back of the school.

Loren Chilson, Headway Transportation, responded to Chair Velto and discussed how the Reno Regional Transportation Plan and funding work.

Discussion:

Commissioner Munoz stated his frustration with projects in the North Valleys comes with silence from the North Valleys. He thanked the people from Ward 4 for showing up tonight. We keep hearing that we need to build more houses before we get retail or commercial. When projects like this come in on commercial property, they soak up another property we can no longer use for the things that we need up there. Staff works extremely hard and takes great care in putting together the staff reports but the bigger picture is not being seen here. We keep hearing they are going to fix the roads. We do not need this project in order to get the roads fixed. I am torn because I like this project, but in five years. We are not ready for it now.

Chair Velto stated Commissioner Munoz is a great advocate for the community he lives in any time we have these projects in the North Valleys. He agrees there should be more commercial in the North Valleys and that the roads need to improve. This project in particular is designed in a way that its location mitigates traffic. The effect of commercial development there would be worse and more burdensome on the roads. There is a lot of area nearby that is zoned commercial and it is not being built on. If commercial were cost effective at this point, we would see commercial projects. This is an infill project, potentially walkable, near a school and conforms with the Master Plan.

Vice Chair Drakulich stated this location is a better place for residential. There are areas closer to the freeway that would be better for commercial development. We are not seeing proposals for commercial development there and there are existing commercial developments that have available vacant spaces.

Commissioner Johnson stated there was an extreme disconnect between the applicant and staff presentations and public comment. Public comment spoke more about the broader picture. We have questioned for a long time what the last project will be that is going to be too much and the answer is never “this one”. We keep approving things because the mitigations are coming. The fundamentals of this project match our desired approach to infill but there is and has been that bigger picture issue. We are balancing a project that on its merits makes sense but on its location and timing could be problematic.

Commissioner Munoz stated I asked to be on the Planning Commission when a spot was vacant. I was asked to talk to a group of developers to interview me basically to see if I was okay for the job. To see if my views lined up with theirs. I knew what needed to be done for me to get here to protect my community. This last November the community spoke up and said enough is enough and elected someone that would try and do what is right for the community. We have had 1,700 people sign a petition saying we do not want this up here. It does not work for us right now. Nobody in North Valleys wants this up here. I am torn because I like the project. It is a good fit. I don't like losing commercial to residential. This would be a good project five years down the road when our roadways are fixed and our freeway is widened.

Commissioner Villanueva stated she is also torn on this project. It is a great project but the schools are beyond capacity and the infrastructure really isn't there but we don't have the authority to tell the developer what to build there and they have property rights.

Discussion on the motion:

Commissioner Gower stated we are at a crossroads again in the North Valleys with individual projects. It is not fair to penalize this property owner with a proposal that complies with all of the elements of code. If the city or the community came forward with data and specific evidence relative to an individual project that says this project tips the scale and we cannot move forward with any future development, then that's it and future projects are on notice that the North Valleys can handle no more. The city responded to me and my question saying that based on the expert opinions of the other agencies, based on the model that Mr. Chilson outlined on how the community deals with funding infrastructure using development, that is what we have to live with and operate in. Until that changes and there is specific information that says this project doesn't meet those findings, then time and time again we will be in this position of having to answer these types of questions and make these tough decisions. I don't have compelling information counter to what staff presented to be able to say that this is the project that we draw the line in the sand with.

Vice Chair Drakulich read the appeal process into the record.

It was moved by Alex Velto, seconded by J.D. Drakulich, to approve. Motion Pass.

| | |
|------------------|--|
| RESULT: | Approved [5 TO 2] |
| MOVER: | Alex Velto, Chair |
| SECONDER: | J.D. Drakulich, Vice Chair |
| AYES: | Velto, Drakulich, Gower, Villanueva, Armstrong |

| | |
|----------------|----------------------------|
| NAYS: | Mark Johnson, Arthur Munoz |
| ABSENT: | |

- 4.7 Staff Report (For Possible Action): Case No. **LDC22-00077 (Peavine Employment Center MSPR)** - A request has been made for a major site plan review to allow: 1) disturbance of a major drainageway; and, 2) grading resulting in cuts deeper than 20 feet and/or fills greater than ten feet in height. The ±210.52 acre site is generally located to the southeast of the intersection of Red Rock Road and Trail Drive. The site has a zoning of Specific Plan District (SPD) and Master Plan land use designations of Mixed-Employment (ME) and Parks, Greenways, and Open Space (PGOS). **[Ward 4]**

Stacie Huggins, Wood Rodgers, gave an overview of the project

Brook Oswald, Associate Planner, presented staff analysis and recommended approval. The presentation included a proposed modification to Condition of Approval No. 5 regarding the timing of required screening to be in place.

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

Public Comment:

Gary Overholt

Kelly Orr

Timothy Stoffel

Norman Huckle

Questions:

Mr. Oswald confirmed for Commissioner Munoz that staff worked with Washoe County Health and this was not identified as an area of concern. He will reach out to Washoe County Health again to confirm that there are no soil issues. There is an option of adding a condition that states prior to a grading permit being issued the applicant will submit a Phase 1 Soil Report for staff to review.

Gabe Wittler, Odyssey Engineering, explained for Commissioner Gower the drainage and detention plans for the site. It is the responsibility of the developer or land owner to maintain the detention facilities.

Lindy Deller, Panattoni Development, answered questions from Commissioner Gower regarding plans for maintenance of the drainageways and confirmed that is their normal practice and has functioned well.

Mr. Oswald explained for Commissioner Gower the finding regarding compatibility with surrounding development. It is limited to the impact of the grading and cuts.

Mr. Wittler answered questions from Commissioner Johnson regarding the grade of the site.

Discussion:

Commissioner Villanueva stated her position on this from the last time has not changed and she incorporated by reference her statements on this from the meeting in March 2022.

Chair Velto stated what we are looking at now has changed and it is important to look at it with a fresh set of eyes understanding that the scope now is a little different. Staff and the applicant have addressed some of the concerns we heard from the public.

Commissioner Gower stated the decision space has changed. We are now looking fairly narrowly at the disturbance of the drainageway and cuts and fills.

Commissioner Johnson stated we are looking at a mass grading project in an area that has never been graded to this level. The disturbance of a major drainageway is being handed very appropriately but he can't make the finding related to compatibility with surrounding development due to the nature and magnitude of the grading.

Chair Velto stated it is important to remember we are focussed solely on disturbance of a major drainageway and grading. With that limited scope I can make the findings.

Vice Chair Drakulich read the appeal process into the record.

It was moved by Alex Velto, seconded by J.D. Drakulich, to approve, with the addition of a condition requiring the applicant to submit a Phase 1 Soil Report as discussed. Motion Pass.

| | |
|------------------|---|
| RESULT: | Approved [5 TO 2] |
| MOVER: | Alex Velto, Chair |
| SECONDER: | J.D. Drakulich, Vice Chair |
| AYES: | Velto, Drakulich, Gower, Munoz, Armstrong |
| NAYS: | Mark Johnson, Silvia Villanueva |
| ABSENT: | |

This item was continued to the February 1 meeting.

6 Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Liaison Report

Nothing to report.

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.

There will be four items on the next meeting agenda that have been noticed.

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

Chair Velto suggested a limit on the number of agenda items. He would prefer more meetings to longer meetings.

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

Danny Cleous
Council Member Ebert

10 Adjournment (For Possible Action)

Commissioner Villanueva thanked everyone who stayed for the meeting.

Chair Velto stated it is completely inappropriate for the body that reviews us to make statements like were made tonight and try to pressure us to vote a certain way and demean us for engaging in a deliberative process. That is not how this process is supposed to work.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:04 a.m.