



MINUTES

Regular Meeting

Reno City Planning Commission

Wednesday, August 07, 2024 • 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
Vacant	326-8862	Silvia Villanueva	326-8863

1 Pledge of Allegiance

Commissioner Rohrmeier 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.)

Written comments received were forwarded to the Planning Commission and entered into the record.

Jay Howard spoke in favor of the Canyons project.

Mary Harger spoke via Zoom in opposition of the Canyons project and expressed concerns regarding traffic.

4 Approval of Minutes (For Possible Action)

4.1 Reno City Planning Commission - Regular - June 20, 2024 6:00 PM (For Possible Action)

It was moved by Alex Velto, seconded by Manny Becerra, to approve. Motion Pass.

RESULT: Approve [6 TO 0]

MOVER:	Alex Velto, Commissioner
SECONDER:	Manny Becerra, Commissioner
AYES:	Drakulich, Armstrong, Becerra, Rohrmeier, Velto, Villanueva
NAYS:	
ABSENT:	
ABSTAIN:	
RECUSED:	

4.2 Reno City Planning Commission - Regular - July 17, 2024 6:00 PM (For Possible Action)

It was moved by Silvia Villanueva, seconded by Kerry Rohrmeier, to approve. Motion Pass.

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

5 Election of Officers (For Possible Action)

It was moved by J.D. Drakulich, seconded by Alex Velto, to appoint Commissioner Armstrong as Chair. Motion Pass.

RESULT:	Approve [6 TO 0]
MOVER:	J.D. Drakulich, Chair
SECONDER:	Alex Velto, Commissioner
AYES:	Drakulich, Armstrong, Becerra, Rohrmeier, Velto, Villanueva
NAYS:	
ABSENT:	
ABSTAIN:	
RECUSED:	

It was moved by Manny Becerra, seconded by Alex Velto, to appoint Commissioner Rohrmeier as Vice Chair. Motion Pass.

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

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 **POSTPONED ITEM** - Staff Report (For Possible Action): Case No. **LDC24-00061 (Manzanita Fence Major Deviation)** – A request has been made for a major deviation to increase the allowable front yard fence height from four feet to six feet. The ±0.25 acre parcel is located on the south side of Manzanita Lane ±295 feet east of its intersection with Lakeside Drive. The site is zoned Single-Family Residential 5 units per acre (SF-5) and has a Master Plan land use designation of Single-Family Neighborhood (SF). **[Ward 2]**

Mike Railey, Development Services Planning Manager, stated the applicant requested that this item be postponed.

The order of the agenda was changed to move Agenda Item 6.5 up to be heard after Agenda Item 6.2.

- 6.2 Staff Report (For Possible Action): Case No. **LDC24-00062 (Talus Valley Planning Area 23 Tentative Map Extension)** – A request has been made for a two-year time extension to record a final map (set to expire on November 4, 2024) for the previously approved residential tentative map (LDC21-00008 – Daybreak PUD Planning Area 23). The ±60.54 acre site is located east of Desert Way, approximately ±2,650 feet north of the future intersection of South Meadows Parkway and Rio Wrangler Parkway. The project site is within the Planned Unit Development (Talus Valley PUD) zoning district and has a Master Plan land use designation of Single-Family Neighborhood (SF). **[Ward 3]**

Jeff Foster, Associate Planner, presented the staff report.

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

Public Comment: No request to speak forms, correspondence, or voicemails were received and nobody registered to speak on Zoom for this item.

Questions:

Andy Durling, Wood Rogers, answered questions from Commissioner Villanueva regarding when the tentative map was originally approved and explained this is just a request for a two-year extension.

Mr. Foster explained for Commissioner Villanueva that time extensions are allowed by NRS.

Commissioner Becerra asked about Condition No. 5 regarding improvements to Rio Wrangler.

Mike Railey, Development Services Planning Manager, explained that this is simply a two-year extension to record a final map and will not modify any of the existing conditions previously placed on the project.

It was moved by J.D. Drakulich, seconded by Kerry Rohrmeier, to approve a two-year time extension on the Talus Valley Planning Area 23 tentative map, subject to original conditions of approval. Motion Pass.

RESULT:	Approve [6 TO 0]
MOVER:	J.D. Drakulich, Chair
SECONDER:	Kerry Rohrmeier, Commissioner
AYES:	Drakulich, Armstrong, Becerra, Rohrmeier, Velto, Villanueva
NAYS:	
ABSENT:	
ABSTAIN:	
RECUSED:	

- 6.3 Staff Report (For Possible Action): Case No. **LDC24-00059 (Furukawa Rock Drill)** - A request has been made for a conditional use permit to allow heavy machinery and equipment rental, sales, and service in the Mixed-Use Suburban (MS) zone. The ±1 acre site is located on the south side of Security Circle ±250 feet east of its intersection with North Virginia Street. The site has a Master Plan land use designation of Mixed-Employment (ME). **[Ward 4]**

(Recess at 7:41 p.m. Meeting resumed at 7:51 p.m.)

Jeff Foster, Associate Planner, presented the staff report.

Disclosures: none

Public Comment: No request to speak forms or voicemails were received and nobody registered to speak on Zoom for this item. Correspondence received was forwarded to the Planning Commission and entered into the record.

Questions:

Commissioner Becerra asked if Condition No. 5 is the standard applied any time there is visible heavy equipment.

Mr. Foster explained that outdoor storage requires screening and in this case it

just happens to be for heavy equipment.

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

RESULT:	Approve [6 TO 0]
MOVER:	Silvia Villanueva, Commissioner
SECONDER:	J.D. Drakulich, Chair
AYES:	Drakulich, Armstrong, Becerra, Rohrmeier, Velto, Villanueva
NAYS:	
ABSENT:	
ABSTAIN:	
RECUSED:	

- 6.4 Staff Report (For Possible Action): Case No. **LDC24-00058 (Lo-Bar Social)** - A request has been made for a conditional use permit to allow accessory indoor live entertainment between 11 p.m. and 2 a.m. The ±0.09 acre site is located on the north side of California Avenue ±265 feet east of its intersection with South Arlington Avenue. The site is zoned Mixed-Use Downtown – Riverwalk District (MD-RD) and has a Master Plan land use designation of Downtown Mixed-Use (DT-MU). **[Ward 1]**

Jeff Foster, Associate Planner, presented the staff report.

Brook Oswald, Applicant representative, gave an overview of the project.

Disclosures: familiar with the site, visited the site, gave public comment on a 2004 SUP, spoke with the applicant’s representative, patron of the establishment, read emails from residents in the area

Public Comment: Correspondence received for this item was forwarded to the Planning Commission and entered into the record. There were no request to speak forms and nobody registered to speak on Zoom. One voicemail from Paige Hall was played at this time.

Questions:

There were questions regarding other establishments in the area and whether they have live entertainment and what their restrictions are. Staff did not have specific information on those other establishments readily available.

Mr. Foster explained there are a variety of live entertainment/cabaret uses that have been looked at over the years in this area of downtown. Part of the endeavor to put together a unified set of conditions moving forward was in response to recognizing that things had been done piecemeal over the years in

terms of different bars having different conditions. Moving forward, all live entertainment uses that are looking to exceed the code allowed standards will be looked at with a unified set of conditions.

Commissioner Rohrmeier asked if this is the first request where this adaptive code enforcement condition was added.

Mr. Foster stated it is his understanding that this is the first application that has come forward since the unified conditions were proposed in June of this year. There were a couple of businesses that did have a very similar condition to this as well.

Mr. Foster explained for Commissioner Villanueva that the applicant is currently allowed by right to have indoor live entertainment until 11:00 p.m. any day of the week. They are now proposing to have the ability to operate indoor live entertainment until 2:00 a.m. any day of the week.

Commissioner Villanueva stated it is a great bar and she is in favor of live music but feels that it needs to be balanced with the type of community they want to build in midtown and downtown. She is not opposed to extending the hours, but thinks they should include some restrictions and suggested allowing music until 2:00 a.m. on Thursday, Friday and Saturday, or maybe until midnight every night. To just piecemeal and give certain bars certain dates and times will become problematic moving forward as they continue to do infill and revitalize downtown and midtown.

Mr. Foster stated that in terms of standardizing allowed days and hours across the board in another condition of approval as part of the unified conditions of approval that came out in June of this year, that is a possibility. It is up to the Planning Commission if they want to restrict things further but staff is not recommending that. He suggested having the applicant explain their business model approach as that might help inform the Planning Commission's decision.

Mr. Oswald explained that part of the applicant's business model is to bring in traveling bands. Allowing live entertainment until 2:00 a.m. provides flexibility and the ability to connect with bands during the week who normally wouldn't stop in Reno when traveling through.

Commissioner Villanueva stated she is trying to be considerate of the neighbors and wants a vibrant downtown where they can co-exist.

Josh Callen, LoBar Owner, stated it will be a busy bar regardless of the late night live music. They are doing everything they are required to do and want to be respectful of the neighborhood. Complaints from neighbors are not due to

music but due to people showing up along California. He also discussed the desire to not restrict the arts and the need for a better nightlife downtown.

Commissioner Drakulich stated that Conditions 9 and 10 cover what Commissioner Villanueva is talking about. He stated it was interesting to learn from the applicant that the complaints are not about the music. He has been there and noted that security is usually at the door closing it when people come in so it is never just held open and loud. He is ready to support this request and wants to promote live music. He thanked the owner for coming to the community and investing here.

Commissioner Velto stated he is supportive of the proposal. The location makes sense to have live music and there should be opportunities for live music every night of the week. He does not like Condition 10 and does not like the idea of giving the responsibility to an administrator to potentially change what he thinks is good for the city. Having been to this location he noted you can't really hear the music when standing outside the building. It is well insulated and the way it is set up makes sense.

Commissioner Beccera suggested it might be helpful in the future for staff to have some comparisons with businesses that have a CUP until 2:00 a.m. He asked about the building ventilation since they are required to close windows and doors at 9:00 or 10:00 at night.

Mr. Callen stated they have an HVAC system and want their customers to be comfortable.

Commissioner Villanueva agreed with Commissioner Velto regarding Condition 10. If there are continuing noise violations, they should go through due process and not have it be an administrator decision.

Commissioner Becerra asked what the criteria would be for future complaints in this type of situation.

Mike Railey, Development Services Planning Manager, explained that typically complaints would come through Code Enforcement. The intent of Condition 10 is to allow staff to work with business owners to come up with supplemental mitigation to address code enforcement complaints and bring them into compliance. If that condition is removed, it would go through Code Enforcement and ultimately lead to either fines or revocation of their conditional use permit through the process that exists in code.

Mr. Railey confirmed for Commissioner Becerra that there are no decibel level limits set for the downtown corridor.

Commissioner Becerra stated he has a hard time with no decibel level being set because what is loud to one neighbor might not be considered loud to another neighbor. We need something to gauge that in order to strike a balance in good faith.

Commissioner Velto stated he is inclined to approve this without Condition 10 and asked Mr. Oswald if there is a reason they would want Condition 10 to remain.

Mr. Oswald stated he believes the mechanism is already in place through Code Enforcement so they would prefer to not have Condition 10.

Commissioner Drakulich stated that what he likes about Condition 10 is the grounds for the administrator to require additional noise mitigation. He asked Mr. Railey if that is the same process that would happen with Code Enforcement.

Mr. Railey stated it is to some degree. If the situation ever did come up to use Condition 10 and the business owner said they were not going to do any of the suggestions from the administrator to address the issue, it would essentially revert back to the standard process. Having Condition 10 is a chance to try and work issues out before it gets to that next level.

Commissioner Drakulich asked for clarification if going through Code Enforcement without having Condition 10 in place could make the process harsher and quicker.

Mr. Railey confirmed that it very well could be.

Mr. Foster confirmed for Commissioner Villanueva that there is not a noise threshold in code for this area.

Commissioner Villanueva asked if they grant this application as broad as it is now and then the city puts noise restrictions in place later, can they retroactively apply that condition.

Mr. Foster stated no, it would be allowed to exist as is.

Discussion:

Commissioner Velto stated he would like this business to succeed and have more music. He proposed approving it with a modification to Condition 10. He likes the idea of encouraging cooperation and working with Code Enforcement

but he does not like the last sentence that says if any additional noise mitigation is not successful in addressing noise compliance issues it will be considered cause for revocation of the permit. He suggested removing the last sentence. He does not want this to be a tool for people who don't like this to try and shut it down.

Commissioner Rohrmeier stated that Condition 10 is not easy to enforce and suggested removing Condition 10. If they are a nuisance, they will get their license revoked, it's as simple as that. She does not know why they are talking about stopping at 2:00 a.m. in a 24-hour town.

Commissioner Drakulich expressed support for Commissioner Rohrmeier's suggestion to remove Condition 10.

Commissioner Becerra also expressed support for the recommendation to remove Condition 10. He explained that he did like Condition 10 because it seemed to give teeth to the ability to take back a little bit if folks get out of hand. Originally he thought it might be good to use that condition for the first month to see what days of the week they might get some complaints and then use that data to see trends and make changes.

Commissioner Villanueva discussed the difference between asking to go until 2:00 a.m. every day and not just for certain days like other special events. She wants to see them succeed but noted that they are here to have a voice for the residents and businesses equally. In this particular case 2:00 a.m. is fine but she recommended restricting it to maybe Thursday, Friday and Saturday. She thinks it is a little too broad given there are currently no noise standards within the city. If that changes in the future they can come back and request more at that time. She stated she is trying to find the right balance here and the request goes a little too far for the present day.

Commissioner Velto stated that for them to come back and request a change later is an expense. We want this business to succeed and it's not an easy process to tell them to just try this out for a few years and come back to us once you have data and go through this process again. That is not something we should do to a small business we want to see succeed.

Commissioner Becerra stated what is hard for him is that they don't have a standard for a decibel level to go off of here and he asked when that would be addressed.

Mr. Railey explained that it is an issue staff is currently working on and is a work in progress.

Commissioner Becerra asked if they can include a condition that says in the future if a decibel noise level standard is adopted it would apply here.

There was discussion regarding the existing noise ordinance in Title 18 and Mr. Foster clarified that it applies to non-residential development adjacent to residentially zoned property. The residential property across the street from this site is not residentially zoned.

Commissioner Rohrmeier asked for clarification regarding whether any future noise ordinance for commercial or mixed-use zoned properties would be grandfathered in.

A Deputy City Attorney explained that if a new noise ordinance were adopted and City Council wanted it to apply to existing uses, they would have to explicitly make that retroactive in the ordinance.

Chair Armstrong read the appeal process into record.

Commissioner Villanueva clarified that she is in favor of expanding the allowability of live music, she just can't get behind the piecemeal way of going about this. There are a lot of other businesses and it would have made a lot more sense if this could have been streamlined to make everything consistent rather than having some bars with certain allowances and other bars with different allowances.

It was moved by Alex Velto, seconded by Kerry Rohrmeier, to approve the conditional use permit, subject to the conditions listed in the staff report, with the removal of Condition 10. Motion Pass.

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

- 6.5 Staff Report (For Possible Action - Recommendation to City Council)
Case No. **LDC24-00050 (The Canyons PUD Amendment)** – A request has been made for an amendment to The Canyons Planned Unit Development (PUD) handbook to: a) increase the number of residential units from 81 to 126; b) reduce the number of land use categories and villages; c) modify the allowed uses within each land category; d) make changes to various environmental standards including grading, feral horse

management, and open space requirements; and e) make changes to other development standards including site, building, and roadway design, among other modifications. The ±161.23 acre site is located east of the eastern terminus of Mine Shaft Drive. The site is within The Canyons PUD zoning district and has the Master Plan land use designations of Single-Family Neighborhood (SF) and Parks, Greenways, and Open Space (PGOS).

[Ward 2]

Nathan Gilbert, Development Services Principal Planner, presented the staff report for the amendment request.

Brook Oswald, applicant representative, presented an overview of the project and their amendment request.

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

Public Comment: Correspondence received for this item was forwarded to the Planning Commission and entered into the record. No request to speak forms or voicemails were received.

Questions:

Mr. Oswald confirmed for Commissioner Drakulich that this was brought to the NAB where Ward 2 provided good feedback and he addressed the concerns that he was able to at that time.

Commissioner Becerra asked about the sustainability components that were refined down.

Mr. Oswald explained that working with staff there were some concerns with how some of the sustainability components would be enforceable and how they would monitor it so the decision came to pull those back.

Mr. Gilbert explained the key concern was the language and enforceability. Staff does not typically like standards that aren't standards in a PUD handbook.

Commissioner Rohrmeier asked if those standards could have been accomplished with a development agreement.

Mr. Gilbert stated there are other tools that could do that and there is nothing precluding the developer from doing that. They did incorporate some measurable sustainability standards with things like EV charging that are

measurable and enforceable.

Commissioner Rohrmeier noted the handbook sounds a lot like Title 18 and asked what differentiates the PUD handbook from Title 18.

Mr. Gilbert stated it is a lot of Title 18 but the tool that the handbook provides is higher level things like the park and trail connectivity. This was the path they pursued and staff thinks it is an adequate project.

Commissioner Villanueva asked about the fire response times noting it is beyond six minutes and now more houses are being added.

Mr. Gilbert stated the master plan does allow that in limited circumstances. The handbook maintains wild land urban interface standards and they would be required to have fire sprinklers.

Commissioner Villanueva asked if there is a map comparing what was presented originally and now with the additional housing.

Mr. Oswald explained one of the major differences is the addition of the loop road and he noted that having two access points does help with fire response.

Mr. Oswald confirmed for Commissioner Villanueva that they are providing the same amount of open space with the current proposal. He also confirmed there will be cuts and fills and those will be reviewed by staff and the Planning Commission when there is a final grading plan. They have done soil samples and nothing dangerous has been discovered at this point.

Commissioner Becerra referenced the discussion regarding pulling the developer proposed sustainability standards back because they are unenforceable and asked what the process would be to raise the bar in the Reno code standards if staff sees that as a developer trend.

Mr. Gilbert stated the Planning Commission has the ability to discuss and make a recommendation to Council on what the standards should be.

Commissioner Velto asked staff if the requirement in the handbook to come up with an emergency response plan is adequate in order to ensure there is fire safety.

Mr. Gilbert stated yes. The applicant and staff met with the Fire Marshall more than once during the course of this review and there are more applications to go.

Commissioner Velto asked if there is anything that concerns staff about increasing the number of units.

Mr. Gilbert stated this sets the baseline and staff's initial concern was the grading impacts that would facilitate the increased density. The revisions made through this process have addressed those concerns.

Mr. Oswald reviewed the proposed changes to the grading for Commissioner Rohrmeier.

There was discussion to clarify the sustainability standards that were proposed versus what is required and enforceable.

Mr. Oswald explained for Commissioner Becerra that they did have some lofty goals and after working with staff they got them down to some fundamentals that are enforceable.

Commissioner Becerra stated it is important when people go above and beyond that they have a mechanism to capture that.

Mr. Oswald confirmed for Commissioner Becerra that all trails and parks will have public access.

Commissioner Villanueva expressed concern about the proposed open space changing. Even though it will be the same amount of open space the quality of it is different.

Mr. Oswald stated they believe the quality of what they are protecting with open space is better now than what was originally proposed.

Discussion:

Commissioner Velto stated he hears a lot of concerns about what this project will look like and he is struggling to understand why there is a concern that there would be a loss of open space because until they have a tentative map they don't know what it will look like. Because of that, he can't assume there will be a loss of open space. A lot of the concerns being raised are premature and they are supposed to be looking to see if they can make the findings for the amendments. The amendments are supported by staff and they seem reasonable.

Commissioner Rohrmeier stated she could make the findings if they were here for a zoning request for single family and open space because they would be compelled to consider the zoning exclusively without a project. By adding the

PUD handbook we are here to evaluate the details of how this differentiates itself from code. She would be curious to see the layout and exact locations of building footprints, the architecture and its sustainability, and all of the features that make it above and beyond. This is a special place with constraints like cultural resources, water resources, and wildlife. A lot of concerns were received from public comments around transportation. Having a handbook compels us to have more detail in our determination. This is an amendment versus a new project but a PUD handbook commands more than straight code and she is not seeing that here.

Commissioner Villanueva stated she views PUDs typically as being unique where they can't use the development code because of unique circumstances, but with this project she sees it as them trying to get around the development code to develop in a place where it probably shouldn't have been initially developed. She is generally in favor of more housing as long as it is thoughtful. She thinks this is not conducive to the character of the neighborhood to the master plan and has a lot of issues with the changes being requested.

Commissioner Velto stated he can make the findings because of the fact that they already approved the handbook. At that time they were accepting of the fact there were no design standards or other things they wanted to see and now they are just looking at the amendments. He can make the findings on the amendments. In hindsight, it might have been better the first time this came through if they looked at some things and questioned what was in the handbook. Given where they are now, he does not want to penalize the applicant for not having done that the first time. In his view, this isn't the appropriate time to tell them we should have done it differently. He wants to keep his decision focused on what the amendments are.

Commissioner Becerra agreed with Commissioner Rohrmeier that it would be great to have more detail and asked if it is okay to add a condition that when they bring a tentative map they will include additional design details.

Mike Railey, Development Services Planning Manager, stated they can add conditions and require changes to the handbook.

Commissioner Becerra also agreed with Commissioner Velto regarding not creating a new burden now.

Commissioner Villanueva stated it is her understanding that they are able to develop as the project was originally presented, it would just be without the additional housing and amendments.

Commissioner Rohrmeier stated it is her understanding that the way the original

handbook was written, the project would not be fiscally feasible now.

Mr. Oswald confirmed they looked at what would make the project pencil. He discussed changes in the market and other factors that contribute to the challenges with the existing handbook.

Commissioner Villanueva stated they are basically being asked to make compromises despite the code because the numbers don't pencil out.

Commissioner Rohrmeier suggested the applicant provide a constraints map that goes beyond just slopes and includes things like the archaeological and wildlife constraints and the regional trail and bring that back with a tentative map showing the actual buildable area.

Commissioner Villanueva questioned what they would really get out of that added condition. It won't change the constraints that already exist. They would have more detail but it doesn't change the reality of where these houses are going to be built and that is the root of the problem. She expressed concern that if this is approved tonight, they can't go back and say no at the point of a tentative map.

Commissioner Rohrmeier stated they can deny a tentative map.

Commissioner Villanueva stated yes, but she has seen district court cases that come down on that.

It was moved by Kerry Rohrmeier, seconded by Manny Becerra, to recommend that Council approve the handbook amendment to The Canyons Planned Unit Development, subject to Condition 1 and the addition of a constraints map submitted at the time of the tentative map. Motion Pass.

RESULT:	Approve [5 TO 1]
MOVER:	Kerry Rohrmeier, Commissioner
SECONDER:	Manny Becerra, Commissioner
AYES:	Drakulich, Armstrong, Becerra, Rohrmeier, Velto
NAYS:	Silvia Villanueva
ABSENT:	
ABSTAIN:	
RECUSED:	

- 6.6 Staff Report (For Possible Action - Recommendation to City Council):
Case No. LDC24-00063 (Calvary Chapel Zone Change) - A request has been made for a zoning map amendment from Industrial Commercial (IC) to Mixed Employment (ME). The ±2.16 acre site is located on the east side of Edison Way, ±728 feet south of its intersection with Mill Street.

The site has the Master Plan land use designation of Mixed-Employment (ME). [Ward 3]

Nathan Gilbert, Principal Planner, presented the staff report.

Brook Oswald, applicant representative, gave an overview of the project.

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

Public Comment: No correspondence, voicemails or request to speak forms were received for this item.

It was moved by Manny Becerra, seconded by J.D. Drakulich, to recommend that City Council approve the zoning map amendment. Motion Pass.

RESULT:	Approve [6 TO 0]
MOVER:	Manny Becerra, Commissioner
SECONDER:	J.D. Drakulich, Chair
AYES:	Drakulich, Armstrong, Becerra, Rohrmeier, Velto, Villanueva
NAYS:	
ABSENT:	
ABSTAIN:	
RECUSED:	

7 Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Liaison Report

Commissioner Velto reported that Commissioner Armstrong is now the Chair of the Regional Planning Commission.

8 Staff Announcements

- 8.1 Report on status of Planning Division projects.
- 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.

Mike Railey, Development Services Planning Manager, reported that City Council appointed a new Planning Commissioner who will be present at the next meeting. Staff will bring forward a training item at the next meeting. He reported on actions taken by City Council. They upheld the Planning Commission's recommendation for approval of the Chism Mobile Home Park Master Plan Amendment and Zone Change. City Council heard the Rancharra Village 7 tentative map appeal and upheld the Planning Commission's recommendation with some added conditions.

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

Commissioner Becerra asked that the City Council Member liaison be invited to the next meeting for the training agenda item.

Commissioner Villanueva requested a presentation from the consultant company the city hired for improvements to the Truckee River about ideas they are considering.

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 9:14 p.m.