



MINUTES

Regular Meeting

Reno City Planning Commission

Wednesday, November 01, 2023 • 6:00 PM

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

Commissioners			
J.D. Drakulich, Chair 326-8861			
Harris Armstrong, Vice Chair	326-8859	Kerry Rohrmeier	326-8864
Manny Becerra	326-8860	Alex Velto	326-8858
Arthur Munoz	326-8862	Silvia Villanueva	326-8863

1 Pledge of Allegiance

The meeting was called to order at 5:59 p.m.

2 Roll Call

Commissioner Velto was absent.

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

None

4 Approval of Minutes (For Possible Action)

4.1 Reno City Planning Commission - Regular - October 4, 2023 6:00 PM
(For Possible Action)

It was moved by Harris Armstrong, seconded by Manny Becerra, to approve. Motion Pass.

RESULT:	Approved [3 TO 0]
MOVER:	Harris Armstrong, Vice Chair
SECONDER:	Manny Becerra, Commissioner
AYES:	Drakulich, Armstrong, Becerra
NAYS:	
ABSENT:	Alex Velto
ABSTAIN:	Arthur Munoz, Kerry Rohrmeier, Silvia Villanueva

RECUSED:

4.2 Reno City Planning Commission - Regular – October 18, 2023 6:00 PM
(For Possible Action)

It was moved by Arthur Munoz, seconded by Silvia Villanueva, to approve. Motion Pass.

RESULT:	Approved [6 TO 0]
MOVER:	Arthur Munoz, Commissioner
SECONDER:	Silvia Villanueva,
AYES:	Drakulich, Armstrong, Becerra, Munoz, Rohrmeier, Villanueva
NAYS:	
ABSENT:	Alex Velto
ABSTAIN:	
RECUSED:	

5 Presentation regarding the Reimagine Reno Master Plan including, but not limited to, the purpose, contents, and utilization of the plan.

Lauren Knox, Senior Planner, gave a presentation regarding the Reimagine Reno Master Plan.

Recess at 6:17 p.m. to address technical issue.

Reconvene at 6:22 p.m.

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. **LDC23-00066 (Liberty Flats Townhomes)** - A request has been made for a tentative map for a 21-lot single-family attached (townhome) subdivision. The ±0.71 acre project site located on three parcels on the southwest corner at the intersection of Holcomb Avenue and East Liberty Street (330 East Liberty Street). The site is located in the Mixed-Use Downtown Riverwalk District (MD-RD) and has a Master Plan land use designation of Downtown Mixed-Use (DT-MU). **[Ward 3]**

Derek Wilson, applicant representative, gave an overview of the project.

Brook Oswald, Associate Planner, presented the staff report and recommended approval.

Disclosures: familiar with the site, received emails, visited the site

Public Comment: Correspondence has been received for this item. These

were forwarded to the Planning Commission and have been entered into the record. No voicemails or request to speak forms were received for this item.

Commissioner Rohrmeier asked which side of lots 18-21 faces the street.

Mr. Wilson explained you would enter those lots from the alley. They have front doors on the interior side.

Commissioner Munoz stated they talk alot about infill in these meetings. This is necessary for the City of Reno for housing and also a good use of the limited available space we have inside our more densely populated areas. This is a good project.

Chair Drakulich agreed and stated this is a good project for downtown.

Commissioner Villanueva also agreed.

Commissioner Becerra asked the applicant if the public feedback regarding access points for pedestrians was addressed.

Mr. Wilson stated they want good pedestrian movement around the site. He confirmed the site will connect to the sidewalks on two sides.

It was moved by Silvia Villanueva, seconded by Kerry Rohrmeier, to approve the tentative map, subject to the conditions listed in the staff report. Motion Pass.

RESULT:	Approved [6 TO 0]
MOVER:	Silvia Villanueva,
SECONDER:	Kerry Rohrmeier, Commissioner
AYES:	Drakulich, Armstrong, Becerra, Munoz, Rohrmeier, Villanueva
NAYS:	
ABSENT:	Alex Velto
ABSTAIN:	
RECUSED:	

- 6.2 Staff Report (For Possible Action): Case No. **LDC23-00064 (RGM Storage Yard)** - A request has been made for a conditional use permit to allow for outdoor storage associated with a maintenance, repair, and renovation business (contractor's yard). The ±8.32 acre site is comprised of two parcels and is located on the south side of West Fourth Street ±460 west of its intersection with Stagg Lane. The subject site is within the Mixed-Use Suburban (MS) zoning district and has a Master Plan land use designation of Suburban Mixed-Use (SMU). **[Ward 1]**

Rob McCalla, President of Reliance Grounds Management, and Chase

Cassini, gave an overview of the project.

Jeff Foster, Associate Planner, presented the staff report and recommended approval.

Disclosures: visited the site, familiar with the site, received emails

Public Comment: Voicemails and correspondence have been received for this item. The voicemails were played during the meeting and the correspondence has been forwarded to the Planning Commission and entered into the record.

Spoke in Chambers:

Lawrence McNutt
Mikayla Morrison
Cole Hill
Jorge Marin
Suzanne J Edwards
Crystal Ptak
Olivier Jouin

Other Request to Speak Forms (did not speak in Chambers):

Jacob Daniel Morris

Mr. Foster answered questions from Commissioner Munoz regarding penalties for this type of situation. A stop work order and a notice of violation were issued. There is a Code Enforcement process with fines that build up over time if things are not rectified.

Mr. Foster answered questions from Commissioner Munoz regarding the process for bringing a property into compliance that has been used before it is permitted. He explained that the applicant came in and spoke with a city planner where they were advised to apply for a conditional use permit. They also applied for a stockpiling permit that would allow them to operate as they are currently for up to 12 months if the conditional use permit is not approved tonight.

Mr. Foster explained for Commissioner Becerra that the shared driveway entrance provides access to the former motel site on the east and employee parking on the west. The public suggestion to use a driveway further to the west appears to be a tough ask for several reasons and it would require an NDOT encroachment permit.

Mr. McCalla confirmed for Commissioner Becerra that there are not any issues with the neighbors that they can't work through. He explained their

efforts to comply with requests and respond to complaints heard at the NAB meeting related to access and future plans to mitigate dust from the property.

Mr. McCalla explained for Commissioner Becerra their snow removal work. They will be plowing Stagg Avenue and he offered to plow the nearby multi-family area for free in an effort to be a good neighbor.

Mr. Foster answered questions from Commissioner Villanueva regarding access and confirmed that the access the employees use is currently paved.

Commissioner Rohrmeier asked what the paving and parking plan is, noting it is unusual to not see that in a conditional use permit.

Mr. Foster explained there is no plan to do anything other than what they are already doing. Engineering approved it as it is and there is no formal parking plan other than that.

Mr. Foster explained for Commissioner Rohrmeier that the applicant has a business license for their other locations but the business license for this location is pending. He also explained that there are no parking ratios associated with outdoor storage. He reiterated that Engineering has looked at it and is not requiring a formal parking area in terms of striping and paving.

Commissioner Rohrmeier asked why there is not a consideration of this as a parking use in addition to outdoor storage.

Mike Railey, Planning Manager, explained Code would define this as a storage yard. It is not open to the public and is not something that would require a formal parking or paving plan.

Mr. Foster answered questions from Commissioner Armstrong regarding enforcement for idling conditions. Traditional idling conditions require signage be posted on fences reminding operators to not idle. The staff report has a condition to address idling (#9). If it becomes an issue, it would be addressed by code enforcement.

Cindi Gil-Blanco, Code Enforcement Supervisor, explained the process stating they would get a complaint and then investigate. She also explained the steps they take if it is an ongoing issue.

Mr. Foster explained for Chair Drakulich that the conditional use permit is what is holding up the applicant's business license.

Mr. Foster explained for Commissioner Armstrong the dust mitigation efforts.

An agency was contacted today and the applicant is in the process of obtaining a dust control permit.

Commissioner Becerra expressed support for the applicant's request for a conditional use permit.

Chair Drakulich expressed support as well and saw here tonight that the applicant is here to be a good neighbor.

Commissioner Rohrmeier stated she appreciates the effort that went in to coming tonight and hearing from the neighborhood. There is a lot still to be figured out on this site. It is not far enough along and she will not be supporting the application.

Recess at 7:45 p.m.
Reconvene at 7:59 p.m.

It was moved by Arthur Munoz, seconded by Harris Armstrong, to approve the conditional use permit, subject to the conditions listed in the staff report. Motion Pass.

RESULT:	Approved [5 TO 1]
MOVER:	Arthur Munoz, Commissioner
SECONDER:	Harris Armstrong, Vice Chair
AYES:	Drakulich, Armstrong, Becerra, Munoz, Villanueva
NAYS:	Kerry Rohrmeier
ABSENT:	Alex Velto
ABSTAIN:	
RECUSED:	

- 6.3 Staff Report (For Possible Action): Case No. **LDC24-00011 (Santerra-Quilici Secondary Access)** - A request has been made for a major site plan review for grading resulting in cuts greater than 20 feet and fills greater than ten feet, and for grading within the Parks, Greenways and Open Space (PGOS) zoning district. The ±5.4 acre development area is comprised of portions of four parcels located east of the Union Pacific Railroad tracks and Gavica Lane and extending east from Crystal Park Road and south from South Verdi Road in the City of Reno and City of Reno Sphere of Influence. The development area is a mixture of right-of-way (no zoning), Large-Lot Residential – 0.5 Acre (LLR-0.5) and Parks, Greenways and Open Space (PGOS) zoning. The Master Plan land use is a mixture of Public/Quasi-Public (PQP), Large-Lot Neighborhood (LL) and Parks, Greenways and Open Space (PGOS). A limited portion of the site area is located within the Mortensen-Garson Overlay District (MGOD). **[Ward 5]**

Chris Baker of Manhard Consulting, Applicant Representative, gave an overview of the project.

Jeff Foster, Associate Planner, presented the staff report and recommended approval. He explained the scope of what they are looking at tonight is just the approval of the secondary access road.

Disclosures: familiar with the site, received voicemails and emails, spoke with the applicant's representative, present when this was previously brought to the Planning Commission

Public Comment: Correspondence has been received for this item. That was distributed to the Planning Commission and is part of the record. No voicemails were received for this item.

Spoke in Chambers:
Chance Reading
Carly Borchard

Chair Drakulich expressed concern regarding the traffic safety issues discussed during public comment and asked staff if there are mechanisms to be proactive and address concerns.

Mr. Foster stated it is entirely outside of the decision tonight to deal with safety issues on county roads. However, we do want to address the safety issue. Frank Peralta, City of Reno Development Services Engineer, has been the engineer assigned to the overall project and is committed to dealing with the safety issues as they come forward to final improvement plans. Mr. Foster explained the potential addition of Condition 14 would ensure that the intersection meets City of Reno standards and operates safely.

Mr. Baker confirmed for Chair Drakulich that the applicant is open to the addition of Condition 14 with a modification changing the reference of NDOT to Washoe County since they control the right-of-way.

Mr. Foster stated they would prefer to leave NDOT in the condition and add Washoe County. NDOT apparently has some jurisdiction in that area too.

Mr. Baker stated NDOT does have jurisdiction in the area but only for the freeway on ramp to the north.

Mr. Foster clarified that if NDOT is not required to review the plans, there would be no associated time delays. Engineering would like to keep NDOT in the condition.

Mr. Baker requested that “if required” be included in parenthesis after NDOT in the condition.

Mr. Foster confirmed for Commissioner Villanueva this is a major site plan review which was triggered by cuts of more than 20 feet and fills greater than 10 feet. He also confirmed the findings that need to be made on this item include consistency with the Reno Master Plan, compliance with Title 18, traffic mitigation impacts, rational phasing plan, and the requirements for a major site plan review only as related to the secondary access.

Mr. Foster confirmed for Commissioner Becerra that the proposed Condition 14 would address the concerns raised during public comment within what can be done for this project. The safety issues associated with the intersection that would be created by the new access road and the existing roadway network in that immediate area would be addressed by Condition 14.

Mr. Baker explained for Commissioner Becerra that clearing vegetation was their suggestion to address concerns that were raised and Condition 14 requires that we provide a clear horizontal and vertical line of site to the South Verdi Road access. Clearing of the area south of the driveway will be included in the improvement plans we will provide to the railroad for approval.

Mr. Foster answered questions from Commissioner Villanueva regarding how this secondary access meets the master plan policies.

Commissioner Villanueva expressed concern regarding losing 105 trees and how this proposal aligns with tree preservation policies.

Mr. Baker answered questions from Commissioner Villanueva regarding their first proposal for a secondary access and explained the differences between that and this current proposal for a secondary access. Overall there may be more trees removed with this current proposal but they are not as substantial in size as with the previous currently approved route. This is a significantly better solution and complies with the master plan better than the currently approved project.

Mr. Foster explained for Commissioner Munoz that the previously approved secondary access was not for fire access only and would accommodate some residential trips.

Commissioner Villanueva asked why staff believes the current infrastructure is appropriate for the secondary access.

Mr. Foster explained that is not within the scope of what we are charged with reviewing reviewing at this time.

Mike Railey, Planning Manager, explained this is a request for grading. Staff is charged with reviewing if the grading is appropriate and meets the master plan policies. We are not contemplating this in terms of the safety of the overall project.

Mr. Foster confirmed for Commissioner Villanueva that the proposed grading is appropriate with the infrastructure that is in place now.

Commissioner Villanueva asked why that is, given that it is right next to the highway and there is potential for slope failure with the removal of so many trees.

Mr. Foster explained the design of this secondary access roadway is being done by qualified engineers that have to comply with all of our requirements and standards.

Commissioner Villanueva discussed required compliance with Title 18 and asked about the timing of having that finding before the Planning Commission today while staff is saying some of that is addressed later in the building permit process.

Mr. Railey explained that when staff reviews grading plans that are submitted, we look for compliance with Title 18 requirements and those get conditioned with the request. When the applicant comes in with their final improvement plans, staff will verify that those conditions are being met.

Commissioner Becerra asked when members of the public can plan for safety discussions so there is a solid solution that works for everyone.

Mr. Foster stated that within the context of what is being addressed tonight, staff feels that safety at the intersection is being addressed. There are members of the public having discussions trying to bring about change for the greater area but there is nothing that this particular project can get involved with there.

Mr. Railey clarified that when we say we only look at the grading, we also look at the safety aspects of the grading in the context of this request. What we are looking at tonight is the safety associated with this specific request.

Commissioner Becerra stated he appreciates that but since we are all about adding conditions and working together to find solutions, I want to know from Mr. Baker if there is a commitment to work with Ms. Borchard and others to

find a solution that works for everyone

Mr. Baker stated they have done that throughout the process but the ultimate decision is up to the City of Reno and Washoe County. We just get to propose ideas, not determine whether or not those ideas get approved.

Commissioner Becerra stated it is not about approval, it's about how we work together. He asked Ms. Borchard if that was satisfactory to her or if she would like to see something more.

Ms. Borchard stated she would love to be involved with this. She has been working with RTC and Washoe County and does not know, personally, that there is a solution on Crystal Park Road. Our road network was not planned, it just evolved. These roads are not even two-lane roads. They are not striped, have no gutters, no sidewalks, and barely have a curb. It is not safe. She is willing to work with anyone involved. She does not think it is fair to put it on the developer, but their development is generating the traffic that will be impacting these roads. Who is responsible for addressing that and at what point.

Commissioner Munoz stated that he voted against this road the last time it came up. The use of the area and the entire project is not something he would have approved. But where we are now, he does feel that the developer and the city are doing their very best to make this area work and function as it should. Regardless of how he feels about the project, they are putting in the effort and he can make the findings.

Commissioner Rohrmeier stated what we are seeing today versus what was presented in the past is a marked improvement. The reduction in the walls and the limited cuts and fills from an engineering standpoint is a substantially better secondary access. Condition 14 shows good faith in working with the neighbors and she can make the findings.

Chair Drakulich stated we have an applicant that has been very active with the neighbors on this specific item and they have done a great job.

Commissioner Villanueva stated just because the applicant has met with the community does not mean they have met all of the findings. She does not believe this is an appropriate or safe place for a secondary access. The slope is too steep and we're losing a lot of trees. She does not think it meets the policies of the master plan.

It was moved by Harris Armstrong, seconded by Kerry Rohrmeier, to approve the major site plan review, subject to the conditions listed in

the staff report with the addition of Condition 14 amended to reflect NDOT as applicable and Washoe County. Motion Pass.

RESULT:	Approved [5 TO 1]
MOVER:	Harris Armstrong, Vice Chair
SECONDER:	Kerry Rohrmeier, Commissioner
AYES:	Drakulich, Armstrong, Becerra, Munoz, Rohrmeier
NAYS:	Silvia Villanueva
ABSENT:	Alex Velto
ABSTAIN:	
RECUSED:	

- 6.4 Staff Report (For Possible Action): **LDC24-00005 (Elks Lodge RV Park)** – A request has been made for a conditional use permit to allow for the establishment of a recreational vehicle (RV) park in the Mixed-Use Urban zoning district. The ±5.37 acre site is located on the north side of Kumle Lane approximately 600 feet west of the intersection of Kumle Lane and South Virginia Street. The site has a zoning designation of Mixed-Use Urban (MU) and a Master Plan land use designation of Suburban Mixed-Use (SMU). **[Ward 2]**

AnnMarie Lain, DOWL, Applicant Representative, provided an overview of the project.

Brook Oswald, Associate Planner, presented the staff report and recommended approval.

Disclosures: familiar with the site, received emails, spoke with the applicant’s representative, visited the site, received the presentation from the applicant before tonight’s meeting

Public Comment: Correspondence and voicemails were received for this item. These were forwarded to the Planning Commission and have been entered into the record. The voicemail was also played during the meeting. No request to speak forms have been submitted for this item.

Commissioner Villanueva stated this is a good use of the area.

It was moved by Manny Becerra, seconded by Harris Armstrong, to approve the conditional use permit, subject to conditions listed in the staff report. Motion Pass.

RESULT:	Approved [6 TO 0]
MOVER:	Manny Becerra, Commissioner
SECONDER:	Harris Armstrong, Vice Chair
AYES:	Drakulich, Armstrong, Becerra, Munoz, Rohrmeier, Villanueva
NAYS:	

ABSENT:	Alex Velto
ABSTAIN:	
RECUSED:	

6.5 Staff Report (For Possible Action): Case No. **LDC24-00014 (Reno Sikh Temple)** - A request has been made for an alternative equivalent compliance to decrease the ground floor interest requirement for transparent windows and doors from 25 percent to ±15.1 percent in favor of enhanced pedestrian amenities. The ±0.75 acre site is located on the southwest corner of East Second Street and Locust Street. The site is within the Mixed-Use Urban (MU) zoning district and has a Master Plan land use designation of Urban Mixed-Use (UMU). **[Ward 3]**

Eric Larude with Robinson Engineering, Applicant Representative, gave an overview of the project.

Carter Williams, Assistant Planner, presented the staff report and recommended approval.

Disclosures: visited the site, familiar with the site, received emails

Public Comment: None

Mr. Williams answered questions from Commissioner Rohrmeier and Commissioner Villanueva regarding the transparency requirements.

It was moved by Arthur Munoz, seconded by Manny Becerra, to approve the alternative equivalent compliance, subject to conditions listed in the staff report. Motion Pass.

RESULT:	Approved [6 TO 0]
MOVER:	Arthur Munoz, Commissioner
SECONDER:	Manny Becerra, Commissioner
AYES:	Drakulich, Armstrong, Becerra, Munoz, Rohrmeier, Villanueva
NAYS:	
ABSENT:	Alex Velto
ABSTAIN:	
RECUSED:	

7 Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Liaison Report

Commissioner Armstrong reported on actions taken at the October 26, 2023 meeting. Three public hearings on regional planning conformance reviews were heard as well as three resolutions of appreciation. The next meeting will be on November 20, 2023.

8 Staff Announcements

8.1 Report on status of Planning Division projects.

Mike Railey, Planning Manager, reported on City Council actions. Valley View Estates PUD project was continued by City Council. The applicant withdrew their appeal on the Viewpoint Apartments the day of hearing.

Due to planned IT upgrades, the venue for some future meetings has changed. The December 20 and January 3 meetings will be at the City of Sparks City Council Chambers. The January 18 meeting will be held at the Washoe County Commission Chambers.

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 Becerra requested that the presentation given by Angela Fuss at the workshop be forwarded to Planning Commissioners.

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 was adjourned at 9:48 p.m.