



MINUTES

Regular Meeting

Reno City Planning Commission

Wednesday, December 20, 2023 • 6:00 PM

City of Sparks, Legislative Building, 431 Prater Way, Sparks, NV 89431

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

Commissioner Velto led the Pledge of Allegiance.

2 Roll Call

All commissioners present.

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

None

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. **LDC24-00022 (Legacy Village Townhomes Map Extension)** – A request has been made for a two-year time extension to record a subsequent final map on up to 96 remaining lots (set to expire on February 8, 2024) which was part of a previously approved residential tentative map (LDC21-00011 – Legacy Village Townhomes). The ±9.5-acre site is generally located on the west side of Lemmon Drive southwest of the intersection of Bernoulli Street and

approximately 1,750 feet north of the intersection with Military Road. The project site is within the General Commercial (GC) zoning district and has a Master Plan land use designation of Suburban Mixed-Use (SMU). [Ward 4]

Ryan Sims of Axion Engineering, Applicant Representative, gave an overview of the project and request for time extension.

Daniel Martoma, Associate Planner Specialist, presented the staff report and recommended approval of the requested time extension.

Disclosures: familiar with the site

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

Questions:

Commissioner Velto asked how staff evaluates requests for time extensions.

Mr. Martoma explained it is a codified allowance that the Planning Commission can grant an extension in cases like this. The applicant mentioned economic and housing market constraints and staff is in support of granting the extension.

Mike Railey, Planning Manager, further explained there are no set findings required to grant a time extension. Staff essentially makes sure the rules were followed along the way and that it is in conformance with the original conditions.

Mr. Martoma explained for Commissioner Armstrong that two years is the maximum extension allowed.

Commissioner Becerra asked what the confidence level is that this project will move forward if the extension is granted.

John Foley, Paradiso Communities, stated anticipation of the market is positive. They have started the first 17 homes and are getting ready to start the seven model homes in the next 90 days. We have 100% confidence that we will get the map in time before the two years is up.

Discussion:

Commissioner Velto stated he is in favor of granting an extension given the circumstances.

Commissioner Munoz stated when this originally came to us two years ago the Planning Commission did deny this under the pretense the area could not handle the traffic created from the amount of homes proposed and what's changed since then is two more projects a quarter mile from this. This doubles that number and the infrastructure in the area right now cannot handle it.

It was moved by Alex Velto, seconded by Harris Armstrong, to approve a two-year time extension on the Legacy Village Townhomes tentative map, subject to original conditions of approval. Motion Pass.

RESULT:	Approved [6 TO 1]
MOVER:	Alex Velto, Commissioner
SECONDER:	Harris Armstrong, Vice Chair
AYES:	Drakulich, Armstrong, Becerra, Rohrmeier, Velto, Villanueva
NAYS:	Arthur Munoz
ABSENT:	
ABSTAIN:	
RECUSED:	

4.2 Staff Report (For Possible Action – Recommendation to City Council):
Case No. **LDC23-00003 (Heiser Master Plan Amendment and Rezoning)** – A request has been made for: 1) a Master Plan amendment from ±85.2 acres of Large-Lot Neighborhood (LL) to ±62.1 acres of Suburban Mixed-Use (SMU) and ±23.1 acres of Parks, Greenways, and Open Space (PGOS); and 2) a zoning map amendment from ±85.2 acres of Large Lot Residential -1 acre (LLR-1) to ±85.2 acres of Specific Plan District (SPD). The ±85.2 acre site is located south of Interstate 80, ±1320 feet east of Exit 9 (Robb Drive). **[Ward 5]**

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

Leah Piccotti, Associate Planner, gave an overview of the project and recommended approval.

Disclosures: familiar with the site, conversation with the applicant, spoke with the applicant's representative, visited the site

Public Comment: no correspondence, request to speak or voicemails were received

Questions:

Ms. Piccotti answered questions from Commissioner Velto regarding density and explained there is no maximum density in MS, so there will be no density if this goes through. As of right now with LLR-1 you could have 85 single family

homes and with the change it would go to no limit on the density. The applicant is proposing 1,000 homes but the SPD caps them at 750, unless they provide an updated traffic analysis.

Commissioner Velto asked why the other projects nearby were not required to provide acreage dedicated to parks.

Ms. Piccotti stated she can't answer that as she did not work on those projects, but it is a Master Plan policy to implement parks.

Commissioner Velto expressed concern regarding increased costs to the builders making homes less affordable if they are required to dedicate land for parks.

Ms. Piccotti stated there are conflicting policies in the master plan. Looking at this overall area, staff is not seeing the parks and recreation that are part of the concurrency management system.

Mr. Durling stated he respectfully disagrees with staff. The concurrency requirements as stated directly from ReImagine Reno say that developers are required to pay a residential construction tax or impact fee. They may choose to develop parks or dedicate park land. There is an either/or here so concurrency is not what staff is talking about. The concurrency requirement is the payment of residential construction tax. The master plan policies are aspirational goals and not requirements. The people that will live here in the future will be located within a half mile of existing parks. There will not be an individual neighborhood park developed but the elements in a neighborhood park will be spread throughout some of the development areas. Blanketing this SPD with a four acre park requirement is not congruent with what the ultimate build out could be.

Blake Smith, Applicant, explained this was three separate parcels and they took concepts from when Somerset was developed and applied them here. They wanted to do master planning of the parks and utility system. There would be no connectivity with the trail system if we did not work with the other properties.

Chair Drakulich asked if there would be any connectivity to the east.

Mr. Durling stated there are some existing pathways. These would be more like hiking trails to provide access to existing footpaths and no roadways.

Commissioner Becerra stated there seems to be two different interpretations about the parks.

Mike Railey, Planning Manager, stated he does not disagree with anything the applicants have said. By paying the tax, the concurrency requirements of the master plan are met. He also agrees with Ms. Piccotti that there are conflicts in the master plan. It is well within the purview of the Planning Commission to change what staff has proposed if you feel what the applicants have proposed is more appropriate.

Ms. Piccotti explained for Commissioner Villanueva examples of what would require administrative review.

Ms. Piccotti explained for Commissioner Villanueva the rationale for the signage requirement. As a whole we are trying to reduce the number of billboards within city limits. This area of I-80 is considered a gateway to Reno and we want to make sure we are maintaining the scenic value. To change that would require an amendment to the SPD.

Ms. Piccotti answered questions from Commissioner Rohrmeier regarding slope constraints in parks.

Mr. Smith confirmed for Commissioner Becerra the plans for pedestrians and cyclists will be similar to what was done in Somerset.

Mr. Smith responded to Commissioner Rohrmeier's suggestion of passive parks in sloped areas that could not be used for buildings. He also discussed the opportunity for open space areas.

Ms. Piccotti explained for Commissioner Becerra there was no wildlife mitigation required beyond what was expressed in the letter from NDOW.

Mr. Durling explained that NDOW has a database with species habitat areas and they do not anticipate there being any impacts in the disturbed drainageway area.

Ms. Piccotti confirmed that recreational facilities are permitted on slopes greater than 30%. She also clarified that staff is not suggesting requiring four acres of flat land for a park. What we're looking for is four acres of recreational amenities for the residents that will essentially be landlocked in this area. There is no reason why that needs to be four acres of flat land.

Mr. Durling confirmed for Chair Drakulich that they are understanding that the four acre dedication can come from any portion of the property and not specifically the north or south pads.

Mr. Railey suggested clarifying language that a minimum of four acres of parks and/or recreational land be dedicated outside of the depicted pad areas included in the SPD.

Ms. Piccotti explained for Commissioner Villanueva that there is no language about major deviations in the SPD. A deviation beyond 10% would have to come to the Planning Commission.

Discussion:

Commissioner Becerra expressed support for these types of projects and conversations. It is good that we can empower the private sector to get things done.

Commissioner Armstrong stated many of his questions were addressed previously. His main concern at the beginning was that the requirement for the four acres was supposed to be on the flat pads. He is comfortable with amendment to clarify that language.

Discussion on the motion:

Commissioner Villanueva stated she would not support the motion after requesting clarification of the amendment to Condition 1.

It was moved by Manny Becerra, seconded by Alex Velto, to adopt the Master Plan amendment by resolution and recommend that City Council approve the Master Plan, and zoning map amendment, subject to Condition 1 and conformance review by the Regional Planning Commission, with the amendment that the four acres for park space be outside of the identified pad areas and in lieu of the \$1,000 per unit park tax. Motion Pass.

RESULT:	Approved [6 TO 1]
MOVER:	Manny Becerra, Commissioner
SECONDER:	Alex Velto, Commissioner
AYES:	Drakulich, Armstrong, Becerra, Munoz, Rohrmeier, Velto
NAYS:	Silvia Villanueva
ABSENT:	
ABSTAIN:	
RECUSED:	

5 Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Liaison Report

No Liaison report.

6 Staff Announcements

- 6.1 Report on status of Planning Division projects.
No announcements.
- 6.2 Announcement of upcoming training opportunities.
- 6.3 Report on status of responses to staff direction received at previous meetings.
- 6.4 Report on actions taken by City Council on previous Planning Commission items.

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

Commissioner Becerra requested a summary of the year's projects that have come before the Planning Commission.

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

No request to speak forms, correspondence or voicemails were received.

9 Adjournment (For Possible Action)

The meeting was adjourned at 7:41 p.m.