



# MINUTES

## Regular Meeting

### Reno City Planning Commission

Thursday, June 08, 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 Villanueva led the Pledge of Allegiance.

#### 2 Roll Call

*Commissioner Gower present at 6:05 p.m.*

*Commissioner Munoz absent*

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

Alex Salazar Barajas spoke regarding housing costs.

*(Commissioner Gower present at 6:05 p.m.)*

Thomas Barajas spoke regarding global health issues.

Public Comment was reopened at 6:18 p.m.

Daniel Davis spoke regarding wage inequality.

Public Comment was reopened at 7:28 p.m.

Genesis Rojas Serrano spoke regarding education.

Juan Medina Vasquez spoke regarding nepotism influence on employment opportunities.

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

4.1 Reno City Planning Commission - Regular - May 17, 2023 6:00 PM (For Possible Action)

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

<b>RESULT:</b>	Approved [4 TO 0]
<b>MOVER:</b>	Silvia Villanueva, Commissioner
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Peter Gower, Commissioner
<b>AYES:</b>	Drakulich, Gower, Villanueva, Armstrong
<b>NAYS:</b>	
<b>ABSENT:</b>	Arthur Munoz
<b>ABSTAIN:</b>	Alex Velto, Mark Johnson
<b>RECUSED:</b>	

**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. **LDC23-00057 (Comstock Cottages Phase 2 Time Extension)** – A request has been made for a two year time extension to a previously approved 196-lot single-family attached residential tentative map subdivision (LDC19-00071 – Comstock Cottages Phase 2). The ±36.26 acre site is located ±500 feet southeast of the intersection of Talus Way and North Virginia Street on the east side of the Union Pacific rail line. The site is located within the Single-Family Residential - 8 dwelling units per acre (SF-8) zoning district and has a Master Plan land use designation of Single-Family Neighborhood (SF).  
**[Ward 4]**

John Krmptic, representing the applicant, gave a presentation on their request for an extension.

Brook Oswald, Associate Planner, gave the staff presentation and recommended approval of the request.

Disclosures: familiar with the site, spoke with the applicant’s representative

Public Comment: none

Questions:

Mr. Krmpotic confirmed for Commissioner Johnson that work is continuing on the final map process for the rest of the development separate from the issues with the railroad crossing.

Mr. Krmpotic confirmed for Commissioner Villanueva that the cuts and fills for Phase 1 are similar to this one.

*It was moved by Peter Gower, seconded by J.D. Drakulich, to approve a two year time extension on the Comstock Cottages Phase 2 tentative map, subject to original conditions of approval. Motion Pass.*

<b>RESULT:</b>	Approved [6 TO 0]
<b>MOVER:</b>	Peter Gower, Commissioner
<b>SECONDER:</b>	J.D. Drakulich, Vice Chair
<b>AYES:</b>	Velto, Johnson, Drakulich, Gower, Villanueva, Armstrong
<b>NAYS:</b>	
<b>ABSENT:</b>	Arthur Munoz
<b>ABSTAIN:</b>	
<b>RECUSED:</b>	

- 5.2 Staff Report (For Possible Action - Recommendation to City Council)  
Case No. **LDC23-00056 (Carville Park Senior Apartments SPD)** – A request has been made for a zoning map amendment from Multi-Family Residential - 14 units per acre (MF-14) to Specific Plan District (SPD). The ±4.53 acre site is located on two parcels on the south side of Carville Drive ±110 feet east of Sutro Street. The site has a Master Plan designation of Mixed Neighborhood (MX). **[Ward 3]**

Pat Biernacki, development partner of the applicant, presented a project overview.

Jeff Foster, Associate Planner, gave the staff presentation and recommended approval.

Disclosures: visited the site

Public Comment: none

Questions:

Mr. Biernacki answered questions from Commissioner Johnson regarding relocation of residents during remodeling. HUD has strict rules on renovations of deferred maintenance buildings and will monitor the entire renovation and temporary relocations. The land owner covers all of the moving costs with no change to the rent. A nationally HUD certified temporary relocation company

that is experienced with seniors will be used.

Mr. Biernacki confirmed for Commissioner Villanueva that the current one occupant per unit will stay the same after the renovations.

*It was moved by Mark Johnson, seconded by Silvia Villanueva, to recommend that City Council approve the zoning map amendment by ordinance. Motion Pass.*

<b>RESULT:</b>	Approved [6 TO 0]
<b>MOVER:</b>	Mark Johnson, Commissioner
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Silvia Villanueva, Commissioner
<b>AYES:</b>	Velto, Johnson, Drakulich, Gower, Villanueva, Armstrong
<b>NAYS:</b>	
<b>ABSENT:</b>	Arthur Munoz
<b>ABSTAIN:</b>	
<b>RECUSED:</b>	

- 5.3 Staff Report (For Possible Action): Case No. **LDC23-00058 (1565 Plumas Street Townhomes)** - A request has been made for a tentative map to establish a 17-lot single-family attached (townhome) subdivision and associated common areas. The ±0.99 acre site is located on the west side of Plumas Street ±120 feet south of its intersection with Mount Rose Street. The site is within the Multi-Family Residential – 14 units per acre (MF-14) zoning district with the Plumas Neighborhood Residential Core Planning Area Overlay (PL) and has a Master Plan land use designation of Mixed Neighborhood (MX). **[Ward 1]**

Gabe Whitler, Odyssey Engineering, representing the applicant, presented a project overview.

Jeff Foster, Associate Planner, gave the staff presentation and recommended approval.

Disclosures: familiar with or visited the site, lives near the site, read emails

Public Comment:

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

Kelly Jesch, resident of Ward 1, spoke in opposition with concerns regarding traffic issues and suggested reducing the number of units.

Derek Cromer, lives across the street from the development, spoke in opposition to the number of units requested with concerns regarding traffic and

parking issues.

Candace Borrego, owns property next door, expressed concerns regarding traffic and parking issues.

Questions:

Commissioner Drakulich expressed concern regarding the left turn in causing traffic issues.

Mr. Foster stated Engineering analysis was done and the left turn in was not deemed to be a concern.

Mr. Foster confirmed for Commissioner Armstrong that the MF14 zoning for this site has been in place since at least the mid-90s.

Mr. Foster confirmed for Commissioner Armstrong that the proposed height of the townhomes is in compliance with the existing Plumas Neighborhood Residential Core Overlay District standards and that this is a request for approval of a tentative map because the applicant wants to sell these as residential townhome units rather than renting them as apartments.

Mr. Foster explained for Commissioner Armstrong the process for determining when a full traffic study is required.

Mr. Foster confirmed for Commissioner Villanueva that this project could have gone straight to building permit without having to come to staff and the Planning Commission if it were apartments rather than townhomes. Because it is proposed as a for sale product via a tentative map, the tentative map is what triggers coming to the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Villanueva asked about the issue with access that triggered a requirement for the applicant to provide a design exception request to be approved by the City Engineer.

Mr. Whitler explained that given the nature of infill projects there are offset driveways and access points that very rarely will meet the full standard. There is no location on the site where an access point could be added that would meet the standards.

Mr. Foster explained for Commissioner Villanueva that the tentative map process does not require design or elevations elements. The building permit plan reviewers will make sure that it meets the code requirements.

Mr. Foster explained for Commissioner Johnson that there is a minimum level of articulation and character that will be required for all of the buildings on the site. The sides of the buildings facing the street will be the sides with the highest level of articulation requirement.

Commissioner Gower noted that the traffic issues we are experiencing on Plumas are symptomatic of a broader system wide issue in that area and asked about the RTC proposed improvements that are referenced in the staff report.

Mr. Foster stated the hope is that RTC's planned future improvements will help alleviate some of the traffic concerns in the area.

Mr. Whitler answered questions from Commissioner Johnson regarding the proposed trash enclosure. The intent is to provide a commercial style trash enclosure on the site with commercial style bins instead of having 17 trash cans being picked up on the street. He confirmed there will be a significant set of CC&Rs establishing the rules for that.

Discussion:

Commissioner Villanueva stated she would ask for a reduction in the number of units proposed but 17 units are allowed here. Traffic could be rough during peak hours but this is a good project.

Chair Velto stated he likes seeing the density bonus being used. This is a good infill project that achieves a lot of the goals in the master plan. Traffic is a concern but he does not know that what is already allowed there is more of a concern than what is being proposed.

Chair Velto read the appeal process into the record.

***It was moved by J.D. Drakulich, seconded by Harris Armstrong, to approve the tentative map, subject to conditions. Motion Pass.***

<b>RESULT:</b>	Approved [6 TO 0]
<b>MOVER:</b>	J.D. Drakulich, Vice Chair
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Harris Armstrong, Commissioner
<b>AYES:</b>	Velto, Johnson, Drakulich, Gower, Villanueva, Armstrong
<b>NAYS:</b>	
<b>ABSENT:</b>	Arthur Munoz
<b>ABSTAIN:</b>	
<b>RECUSED:</b>	

5.4 Staff Report (For Possible Action): Case No. **LDC23-00052 (Panda Express Variance)** – A request has been made for a variance from the

freestanding sign requirements of the General Commercial (GC) zone to: a) increase the number of allowed freestanding signs from one to two and b) increase the allowed sign copy area from 250 square feet to 500 square feet. The ±4.60 acre project site is located south of Sky Vista Parkway, ±182.9 feet east of its intersection with Vista Knoll Parkway. The project site is located within the General Commercial (GC) zoning district and has a Master Plan land use designation of Special Planning Area/Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan/General Commercial (SPA/RSCJP/GC). [Ward 4]

David Ford, Superior Electrical Advertising, presented an overview of the requested variance.

Carter Williams, Assistant Planner, gave the staff presentation. The project is not in conformance with master plan policies as outlined in the staff report and staff recommends denial of the application.

Disclosures: read emails, familiar with the site

Public Comment:

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

Lori Wray, Scenic Nevada, spoke in opposition.

Judith Lockwood (voicemail) spoke in opposition.

Robert Goodman (voicemail) spoke in opposition.

Susan Pitts (voicemail) spoke in opposition.

Questions:

Commissioner Gower asked to hear from the applicant regarding their hardship that would require a variance.

Christian Oka, Superior Electrical Advertising, answered questions from Commissioners Gower and Villanueva regarding the applicant's perspective on staff's recommendation and what the hardship is on the applicant. He discussed safety concerns that the signage would address as well as the need for more visibility of signage due to the location of the property. People driving on Lemmon Drive will not know the center is there until they have passed it.

Discussion:

Chair Velto stated he does not think this project meets any of the elements for a variance request. There are no exceptional or extraordinary circumstance. The explanation by the applicant is generalized in nature and would apply to all freeway signage. There is not an undue hardship to the owner of the property due to a strict application of the rule because it applied equally to all potential companies that are on the sides of the road. There would be visual pollution which could be detrimental to public health.

Chair Velto read appeal process into the record.

***It was moved by Peter Gower, seconded by Harris Armstrong, to deny the variance. Motion Pass.***

<b>RESULT:</b>	Approved [6 TO 0]
<b>MOVER:</b>	Peter Gower, Commissioner
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Harris Armstrong, Commissioner
<b>AYES:</b>	Velto, Johnson, Drakulich, Gower, Villanueva, Armstrong
<b>NAYS:</b>	
<b>ABSENT:</b>	Arthur Munoz
<b>ABSTAIN:</b>	
<b>RECUSED:</b>	

## **6 Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Liaison Report**

Commissioner Johnson reported on the regional workshop on the Natural Resources Plan. He also reported there is continuing discussion about potential modifications for Projects of Regional Significance review of charter schools.

## **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.

Nathan Gilbert, Principal Planner, reported the Planning Commission will be receiving a memo from staff next week regarding clarification on the requirements for road repair during construction and temporary construction impacts.

- 7.4 Report on actions taken by City Council on previous Planning Commission items.

Mr. Gilbert reported on City Council actions taken on Planning Commission items.

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



None

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

None

**10 Adjournment (For Possible Action)**

The meeting was adjourned.