



MINUTES

Regular Meeting

Reno City Planning Commission

Wednesday, February 01, 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

The meeting was called to order at 6:02 p.m. Commissioner Armstrong 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 Silvia Villanueva, Commissioner Harris Armstrong

Commissioner Munoz – absent

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

4 Approval of Minutes (For Possible Action)

4.1 Reno City Planning Commission - Regular - December 8, 2022 6:00 PM
(For Possible Action)

*It was moved by Mark Johnson, seconded by Peter Gower, to approve.
Motion Pass.*

RESULT:	Approved [5 TO 0]
MOVER:	Mark Johnson, Commissioner
SECONDER:	Peter Gower, Commissioner
AYES:	Velto, Johnson, Drakulich, Gower, Armstrong

NAYS:	
ABSENT:	Silvia Villanueva

4.2 Reno City Planning Commission - Regular - December 21, 2022 6:00 PM
(For Possible Action)

It was moved by Mark Johnson, seconded by Harris Armstrong, to approve. Motion Pass.

RESULT:	Approved [6 TO 0]
MOVER:	Mark Johnson, Commissioner
SECONDER:	Harris Armstrong, Commissioner
AYES:	Velto, Johnson, Drakulich, Gower, Villanueva, Armstrong
NAYS:	
ABSENT:	

5 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.

5.1 Staff Report (For Possible Action): Case No. **LDC23-00037 (Caramella Ranch Tentative Map Extension)** – A request has been made for a two-year time extension for a previously approved tentative map for 955 single-family residential lots (LDC19-00048 – Caramella Ranch Estates), of which 106 lots remain to be final mapped. The ±24.36 acre remaining portion of the original ±297.37 acre project site is located on the northwest side of Western Skies Drive between its intersection with Banta Avenue on the south and Sapphire Point Drive on the north. The project site is within the Planned Unit Development (Caramella Ranch Estates PUD) zoning district within the Southeast Neighborhood Planning Area (SENP) Overlay and has a Master Plan land use designation of Special Planning Area (SPA). **[Ward 2]**

Jeff Borchardt, applicant, gave an overview of the project and the request for a tentative map two-year time extension.

Leah Brock, Assistant Planner, gave the staff presentation and recommended approval.

Disclosures: visited site, familiar with site

Public Comment: no correspondence, voicemails or request to speak forms

Questions:

Mr. Borchardt explained for Commissioner Johnson the order of the two phases and confirmed the infrastructure services would be able to be served before a final map could be approved.

It was moved by Mark Johnson, seconded by Harris Armstrong, to approve a two-year time extension on the Caramella Ranch Estates Phase 5 tentative map, subject to original conditions of approval. Motion Pass.

RESULT:	Approved [6 TO 0]
MOVER:	Mark Johnson, Commissioner
SECONDER:	Harris Armstrong, Commissioner
AYES:	Velto, Johnson, Drakulich, Gower, Villanueva, Armstrong
NAYS:	
ABSENT:	

- 5.2 Staff Report (For Possible Action): Case No. **LDC23-00031 (Vintage at Redfield Major Deviation)** – A request has been made for a major deviation to increase the required 2:1 building height/setback ratio by 50% resulting in a 3:1 building height/setback ratio to allow for the construction of a senior affordable housing apartment complex. The ±2.646 acre site is located on the northeast corner of the intersection at Redfield Parkway and Baker Lane. The subject site is within the Mixed-Use Urban (MU) zoning district and has a Master Plan land use designation of Suburban Mixed-Use (SMU). **[Ward 2]**

Dane Hillyard, applicant representative, gave an overview of the project and request for a major deviation.

Leah Brock, Assistant Planner, gave the staff presentation and recommended approval. Staff received one letter of opposition with the main concern being the proposed building height.

Disclosures: received and read emails, visited site, familiar with site

Public Comment: Correspondence was received and distributed to the commission before the meeting. No voicemails were received. Sandra Picollo gave public comment.

Questions:

Ms. Brock explained for Commissioner Drakulich this building is located over 70 feet from the residential homes across Baker Lane.

Ms. Brock answered questions from Commissioner Gower regarding setback

requirements and confirmed that the major deviation would not be required if the fifth story were set back further.

Mr. Hillyard explained for Commissioner Gower they got funding for this project from the Home Means Nevada program, City of Reno has awarded funding for bond capacity, and the HOME Consortium has awarded us our federal home funds. So there are timelines involved to produce the affordable housing in order to keep the financing in place. To set the fifth story back eight feet would require a redo of the fifth floor and we may not be able to maintain the same number of units. It would delay us at least six months.

Mr. Hillyard explained for Commissioner Drakulich that to get the financing they look at everything including the number of units.

Commissioner Villanueva noted some of the concerns heard tonight were regarding traffic and safety. She asked for confirmation that this project will be built whether the deviation request is approved or not.

Ms. Brock stated that is correct. This is within the mixed use urban zoning district which allows for this use, number of units, and height.

Ms. Brock confirmed for Commissioner Gower that a building on this parcel could be taller than the proposed building. In the mixed use urban zoning district anything over 85 feet in height requires a site plan review.

Discussion:

Commissioner Johnson stated this is the second one of these we have had in a couple of months where we are looking at a major deviation as being reasonable from staff's perspective because it is on the opposite side of a road from residential property. They do have unlimited height but our code has safeguards in place to minimize the impact between the two. It is invisible in code as to whether it applies immediately adjacent or across the road. He likes the project but is concerned in terms of the approach being taking. He suggested a future agenda item to discuss this concern.

It was moved by Silvia Villanueva, seconded by J.D. Drakulich, to approve the major deviation, subject to conditions listed in the staff report. Motion Pass.

RESULT:	Approved [6 TO 0]
MOVER:	Silvia Villanueva, Commissioner
SECONDER:	J.D. Drakulich, Vice Chair
AYES:	Velto, Johnson, Drakulich, Gower, Villanueva, Armstrong
NAYS:	

- 5.3 Staff Report (For Possible Action): Case No. **LDC23-00034 (Roter Investments of Nevada Self Storage)** – A request has been made for a conditional use permit to establish a 523-unit mini-warehouse facility in an existing tenant space within the property known as Reno Town Mall. The ±15.94 acre project site is located south of West Peckham Lane, ±295 feet west of its intersection with South Virginia Street. The project site is located within the Mixed-Use Urban (MU) zoning district and has a Master Plan land use designation of Suburban Mixed-Use (SMU). **[Ward 2]**

Robert Rothe, applicant, gave an overview of the project.

Carter Williams, Assistant Planner, gave the staff presentation.

Disclosures: visited site, received and read correspondence, familiar with site

Public Comment: Correspondence was received. No voicemails or request to speak forms were received.

Question:

Mr. Williams answered questions from Commissioner Johnson regarding the finding for mitigating traffic impacts and screening. We don't have information on specific loading/unloading plans yet but there is a requirement in code for screening loading areas. Staff felt comfortable with the finding knowing that the trip generation would decrease from retail to self storage. Depending on what the loading/unloading plan holds, it may require some screening along the street.

Mr. Rothe answered questions from Commissioner Johnson regarding the loading/unloading plan. StorQuest wants to maintain the way the parking is situated. They are agreeable to putting in a large area marked no parking. He confirmed there is no requirement for loading only through the overhead doors in the back.

Mr. Rothe explained for Commissioner Johnson it would not be cost effective to create a second story and the applicant has not proposed that.

Commissioner Gower asked Mr. Rothe to respond to comments received with concern that this is shortsighted redevelopment.

Mr. Rothe stated the redevelopment or transitioning of the mall has been underway for 15-20 years. We saw the viability of Raley's before they

vacated. Our transition is to try and focus on the community and what the community needs versus trying to wait it out to see if Sports Authority will reopen.

Mr. Rothe confirmed for Commissioner Gower that he is confident this use is compatible with the other tenant uses. All of the tenants are in favor of it.

Discussion on the motion:

Commissioner Johnson stated this is an excellent opportunity for adaptive reuse for a site like this. He expressed concern that there is a finding about traffic impacts and there is a condition that it will be worked on separate from the Planning Commission. Having an actual site plan that identifies the issues and the approach would be a better way to review this project and make that finding rather than it just being a condition.

It was moved by Silvia Villanueva, seconded by Peter Gower, to approve the conditional use permit, subject to conditions listed in the staff report. Motion Pass.

RESULT:	Approved [6 TO 0]
MOVER:	Silvia Villanueva, Commissioner
SECONDER:	Peter Gower, Commissioner
AYES:	Velto, Johnson, Drakulich, Gower, Villanueva, Armstrong
NAYS:	
ABSENT:	

- 5.4 Staff Report (For Possible Action): Case No. **LDC23-00032 (Jacobs Glow Plaza and Festival Area Amendment)** – A request has been made for an amendment to conditional use permit LDC22-00038 to expand the permit boundary to include an additional parcel for the purpose of promoting Glow Plaza on the additional parcel. The ±8.373 acre site is located on seven parcels generally located south of West 4th Street, east of Washington Street, and ±200 feet west of Ralston Street. The site is zoned Mixed-Use Downtown – Northwest Quadrant (MD-NWQ) and Mixed-Use Downtown Entertainment District (MD-ED) and has the Downtown Mixed-Use (DT-MU) Master Plan land use designation. **[Ward 1]**

Garrett Gordon, applicant representative, gave an overview of the project.

Leah Brock, Assistant Planner, gave the staff presentation and recommended approval. Staff received approximately 15 letters of opposition and comments from one NAB members. A lot of the concerns were related to the signage.

Ms. Brock stated that the signage has already been approved and this is really a question of content.

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

Commissioner Johnson made the following disclosure: "At the applicant's request I am disclosing the fact that my wife, Alicia Barber, publishes a blog known as The Barber Brief regarding her opinions on certain developments in the City of Reno. On this matter I have sought guidance from the City Attorney's Office. Pursuant to NRS 281a.4204a the law presumes that the independence of judgment of a reasonable person in the public officer's situation would not be materially affected by the public officer's commitment in a private capacity to the interests of another where the resulting benefit or detriment accruing to the other person is not greater than that accruing to any other member of any general business, profession, occupation or group that is affected by the matter. Here I have a commitment in a private capacity to my wife. Item 5.4 is a request for an amendment to a conditional use permit to expand the permit boundary to include an additional parcel for the purpose of promoting Glow Plaza on the additional parcel of the site located south of West of 4th Street, east of Washington Street, and 200 feet west of Ralston Street called the Jacobs Glow Plaza and Festival area. While my wife recently published opinions in her blog drawing attention to the potential impact of the project on residents living in the immediate vicinity, the benefit or detriment of the project accruing to my wife is not greater than that accruing to any other member of the general public. The independence of judgment of a reasonable person in my situation would not be materially affected by my commitment in a private capacity to my wife and because this is not a clear case of disqualifying conflict of interest I am making this disclosure but do not intend to recuse myself from this item."

Public Comment: Correspondence was received and distributed to the Planning Commission before the meeting. No voicemails were received.

Mark Wray
Lori Wray

Questions:

Ms. Brock confirmed for Chair Velto that Glow Plaza would be allowed a 125 sq.ft. maximum freestanding sign with a maximum height of 25 ft.

Chair Velto asked if staff has an opinion as to whether the Glow Plaza erecting an allowed billboard would be more or less detrimental to the public than

advertising on a billboard that already exists.

Ms. Brock responded stating no opinion.

Ms. Brock confirmed for Chair Velto that the billboards that are currently on the Sands will still exist and the size will not change as a result of tonight's vote. She also confirmed that only the content would change.

Ms. Brock answered questions from Commissioner Johnson and confirmed that the Sands is allowed to add more signs. She explained there is a condition of approval that will not allow the Sands to be advertised on the Glow Plaza site.

Mr. Gordon explained for Commissioner Villanueva that the Glow Plaza is owned by the applicant, Reno Real Estate Development and the Sands is owned by JSR. Reno Real Estate Development is the applicant because they are amending the conditional use permit that is in Reno Real Estate Development's name.

Ms. Brock confirmed for Commissioner Gower that they are not being asked to make judgment on any aspect of the project other than the inclusion of this parcel for the advertising of content on the Sands sign.

Ms. Brock confirmed for Commissioner Gower that the Glow Plaza site would still be allowed signage per what is allowed in the mixed use district.

Commissioner Gower asked why that would be allowed if it becomes part of a single permitted area and can advertise on the Sands sign.

Ms. Brock stated she would need to dig through the sign code to answer that.

Commissioner Gower stated he would like the answer to that on the record.

Commissioner Gower noted public comment concerns about setting a precedent here using properties in the gaming overlay district to advertise content for properties outside of it. He asked the applicant if he thinks this will open pandora's box.

Mr. Gordon stated absolutely not given the uniqueness of the situation.

Ms. Brock stated that in this particular case, there are two frontages, one for the parcel with the Sands and one for the parcels with the existing entitlement and each frontage would be allowed signage. However, under area wall maximums it breaks it down by parcel so theoretically all wall sign area shall

not exceed 400 sq. ft. per parcel.

Mr. Gordon answered questions from Commissioner Johnson and explained that this is a standalone use and site. This request is only to advertise for the Glow Plaza. We could not amend that use permit to bring in other parcels for other uses. If something else came along in the future, it would likely require an entitlement and could not tag onto this because this only deals with outdoor entertainment. If we tried to expand that, we would have to come back to you and meet the same findings.

Commissioner Johnson asked if there is a different activity, could that also include the Sands parcel under its conditional use permit in order to achieve the same signage benefit.

Mr. Gordon stated I don't think there is any prohibition in code defining a site, that a site is limited to one entitlement.

Commissioner Johnson stated we have heard this evening the example of a situation similar to this at another property in town and asked staff if there has been any verification that is actually happening.

Ms. Brock responded stating not that I know of.

Ms. Brock explained for Commissioner Villanueva this is an amendment of the conditional use permit to expand the boundary to include the Sands parcel. There is no pathway for the Sands to apply for off premise signage. The only pathway for this would be to include the Sands parcel in the entitlement for the Glow Plaza so that it would be considered onsite signage. The references to content apply to what advertising would be allowed on the sign that already exists.

Discussion:

Commissioner Drakulich stated the discussion and questions have been helpful. What he sees is something that is consistent with downtown and its goals.

Commissioner Gower stated that based on staff's response to his question in terms of the limited scope of this request, he is able to separate the decision making process from when we saw this the first time. He is concerned about the precedent question and the potential proliferation of signage to advertise what was previously considered off premise. There are no findings that address precedent so he has to reconcile that by thinking that each individual consideration in the future would be evaluated under their own unique criteria.

Commissioner Johnson stated the issue he struggles with is that this site is already entitled with a larger benefit for signage to promote what is happening on the site. He is trying to reconcile what is already allowed on the site with what is being asked and questioning if we are going beyond the intent of Title 18. He stated that he struggles with making finding number one under the conditional use permit because he questions what we are doing and having that meet the purpose of the zoning district in which the site is located.

Chair Velto stated the Master Plan has an entire guiding principle, Principle #3, which is encouraging a thriving downtown and university district. Some of the portions of the master plan, 3.1c Tourism Entertainment, is to encourage reinvestment in established casinos in the introduction of new uses and activities that strengthen downtown's appeal as a tourism and entertainment destination. Strive to make downtown the location of choice within the region for annual events, cultural celebrations, and other community gatherings. 3.3b talks about tourism, arts and entertainment. It says we should continue to support casinos as a core component of the city's tourism industry in the downtown entertainment district while seeking to broaden the range of tourism, arts, and entertainment oriented uses that appeal to more diverse demographics. He stated he is confused as to why this is an issue. We agreed to support the Glow Plaza and we should be doing everything we can to encourage it to exist, consistent with the master plan. We should individually assess each project and not point at precedent. We don't want this project to fail. There will be a sign no matter what. It is a question of what that sign says. There is no special benefit or inconsistencies with the zoning code. If we have any concern as to what Title 18 means, a safe bet for us to assess it is to look at the master plan and the master plan overwhelmingly supports what the applicant is trying to pursue.

Commissioner Johnson stated the one point of rebuttal he would make is that in the entire master plan with discussion about supporting casinos and a thriving downtown there is not a single mention about that support being based on approving digital signage to let everybody know what's going on down there.

Commissioner Villanueva stated she does not think this would set precedent because it is very rare. This particular application is just expanding the boundary of sites owned essentially by the same applicant which sets it apart from other parcels or businesses that might request offsite business advertising.

Commissioner Armstrong stated there is no prohibition on this in code and he does not agree with the precedent setting argument.

Chair Velto read the appeal process into the record after the vote was taken.

It was moved by J.D. Drakulich, seconded by Harris Armstrong, to approve the conditional use permit amendment, subject to conditions listed in the staff report. Motion Pass.

RESULT:	Approved [5 TO 1]
MOVER:	J.D. Drakulich, Vice Chair
SECONDER:	Harris Armstrong, Commissioner
AYES:	Velto, Drakulich, Gower, Villanueva, Armstrong
NAYS:	Mark Johnson
ABSENT:	

6 Planning Commission Training: Staff Presentation on Annexations and Discussion

Chair Velto requested that this training be continued to the next meeting.

7 Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Liaison Report

Commissioner Johnson reported on last week’s meeting. The next meeting will be at the end of February.

8 Staff Announcements

8.1 Report on status of Planning Division projects.

Jason Garcia-LoBue, Planning Manager, reported the next meeting will have a presentation from RTC and NDOT about road projects in the North Valleys. An appeal was received on the Riviera tentative map project.

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.

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

Commissioner Drakulich expressed support for a future item regarding major deviations as mentioned under Agenda Item 5.2 tonight.

Commissioner Villanueva reiterated the discussion at the last meeting regarding the need for a reasonable amount of agenda items because it does not allow for a fair and democratic process when people are required to be here until 2:00 a.m. to give public comment.

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 8:32 p.m.