

PLUMAS REDEVELOPMENT CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT

LDC25-00016

CITY COUNCIL | APRIL 23, 2025

- 9.3± acres
- 273 multifamily units
- 2 buildings
 - Building 1 – ±45'-55' split level
 - Building 2 – ±45'
- Increased front setback
- 2.4± acres of landscape area (1-acre more than code requirement)
 - 219 trees required
 - 309 trees provided
 - 155 existing mature trees preserved
 - 154 new trees planted
- Onsite amenities
- Ample parking – 437 spaces provided (305 required)



Less intense than currently approved project



Conforms with codes and standards



Staff recommended approval



Planning Commission unanimous approval

Project Specifics

	Allowed in GC Zoning	Current Approved Plan	Proposed Plan	Difference
Housing Type	Higher density residential products	Condominiums	Market Rate Apartments	-
Density	419 units (45 du/acre)	314 units (34 du/acre)	273 units (29 du/are)	- 146 units (Code) - 41 units (Approved)
Building Height	65-feet 5-stories	40-50 feet 4-stories	45-55 feet 4 stories	- 10-15 feet (Code) + 5 feet (Approved)
Front Setback	10-feet	±40-feet (building)	±40-feet (parking) ±80-140 feet (building)	+ 30 feet (Code)
Parking		Required: 325 stalls Provided: 392 stalls	Required: 289 stalls Provided: 438 stalls	+ 149 stalls (Code) + 46 stalls (Approved)

Chronology of Applicant's Outreach

Date	Event	Result	Next Steps
1/22/25	City Council Hearing	90-day continuance for Applicant and Appellant to work on compromise	Applicant initiated conversation with Appellant
01/24/25	Call with CM Duerr	CM Duerr designated herself as facilitator between parties	Meet with Appellant
1/28/25	CM Duerr called Applicant and looped in Appellant	Applicant agreed to provide grading plan. Appellant agreed to provide formal written comments by 2/3/25	Virtual meeting scheduled for 2/6/25 with CM Duerr, Applicant, Appellant, neighbors, and Project Architect

Chronology of Applicant's Outreach (cont.)

Date	Event	Result	Next Steps
1/31/25	Applicant emailed grading plan to Appellant	Request satisfied.	Virtual meeting 2/6/25
2/3/25	Appellant emailed two documents (written comments and architectural examples)	Applicant team reviewed documents and considered revisions to building elevations	Virtual meeting 2/6/25
2/6/25	Virtual Meeting #1	Applicant agreed to revise building elevations and provide N/S and E/W cross sections to demonstrate building height	Virtual Meeting #2 scheduled for 2/13/25

Chronology of Applicant's Outreach (cont.)

Date	Event	Result	Next Steps
2/13/25	Virtual Meeting #2	Applicant shared revised building renderings and site cross sections. Revised building plans developed in 1 week, resulting in \$60K of additional design and construction costs	Virtual Meeting #3 scheduled for 2/18/25
2/18/25	Virtual Meeting #3	Appellant provided new and additional revision requests that were deemed excessive by Applicant	Applicant will resubmit revised materials for City Council Hearing

NEIGHBORS' REQUESTS & RESPONSES

ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN MODIFICATIONS

- Numerous modifications have been made:
 - Roofline – more articulation; opened balconies; added roof/parapet projections
 - Massing – opened balconies limits bulkiness at building corners
 - Colors – Lighter colors proposed
 - Balconies – opened up, primarily at building corners; added faux wood siding material and wood tone colors to balcony areas

BEFORE



REVISED



BEFORE



REVISED



BEFORE



REVISED



NEIGHBORS' REQUESTS & RESPONSES

DECREASE DENSITY

- Considered by Applicant, but not included
- Project proposes a reduction from 314 approved units to 273 proposed units
- Zoning allows up to 419 units
- Any further reduction renders the project economically infeasible

NEIGHBORS' REQUESTS & RESPONSES

DECREASE BUILDING HEIGHT

- Considered by Applicant, but not included
- Project proposes building heights less than zoning code allowance (65-feet/5-stories)
- Comparable building height to former use, approved project, and adjacent commercial buildings
- Ample setbacks provided and mature trees preserved



NEIGHBORS' REQUESTS & RESPONSES

ACCESS TO MCCARRAN BOULEVARD

- Considered by Applicant, but not included
- Access to McCarran would not meet NDOT design standards for driveway spacing
- Not supported by City/RTC/NDOT requirements



Table 4-1: Access Spacing Standards

Roadway Class	Location/ Posted Speed Limit	Full Access		Limited Access	
		Signalized Intersection Uniform ¹ Spacing	Unsignalized Intersection/Roundabout Minimum ² Spacing	Left-in/Right-in/ Right-out only Minimum ² Spacing	Right-in/Right-out only ³ Minimum ² Spacing
1: Interstate Freeways	Urban/ Suburban/ Rural	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Full control of accessAccess is available only via grade-separated interchangesAll interchanges must meet public road spacing (1 mile in urban, 2 miles in suburban, and 3 miles in rural areas) and comply with FHWA Policy			
2: Other Freeways	Urban/ Suburban/ Rural	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Full control of accessAccess is available only via grade-separated interchangesAll interchanges must meet public road spacing (1 mile in urban, 2 miles in suburban, and 3 miles in rural areas)Access to federal aid freeways must comply with federal regulations			
2: Expressways	≤ 55 mph	5,280'		5,280'	1,320'
	≥ 60 mph	10,560'			
3: Other Principal Arterials 45 MPH	≤ 35 mph	1,320'		660'	350'
	40-55 mph	2,640'	1,320'	990'	660'
	≥ 60 mph	5,280'	2,640'	1,320'	800'
4: Minor Arterials	≤ 35 mph	1,320'		660'	300'
	≥ 40 mph	2,640'	1,320'		350' – 600'
5: Major Collectors	≤ 35 mph	1,320'		440'	250'
	≥ 40 mph	2,640'	1,320'	660'	300' – 500'

NEIGHBORS' REQUESTS & RESPONSES

ACCESS TO MCCARRAN BOULEVARD

- Considered by Applicant, but not included
- Access to McCarran would not meet NDOT design standards for driveway spacing
- Not supported by City/RTC/NDOT requirements



NEIGHBORS' REQUESTS & RESPONSES

RESTRICT ACCESS ONTO LAKESIDE

- Considered by Applicant, but not included
- Existing driveway is owned by adjacent multifamily development to the south with access easement for project
- City Staff is not requiring any restrictions

NEIGHBORS' REQUESTS & RESPONSES

REQUEST GRADING PLAN, ELEVATIONS, RENDERINGS & CROSS SECTIONS

- Completed and provided by Applicant

REGRADE SITE TO LOWER BUILDING ELEVATIONS

- Not possible.
- Existing grade (30+ feet of fall from west to east) not conducive for additional cut
- Stepped building pad being used to make up grade

NEIGHBORS' REQUESTS & RESPONSES

DESIGN FOR FUTURE MCCARRAN WIDENING

- RTC improvement plans at 15% design stage and plan to have 30% plans Summer 2025
- Applicant will revise plans prior to building permit, as applicable

TRAFFIC IMPACT FEES EARMARKED FOR MCCARRAN IMPROVEMENTS

- Applicant requested this from RTC
- No way for RTC to earmark \$900K RRIF



Less intense than currently approved project



Conforms with codes and standards



Staff recommended approval



Planning Commission unanimous approval



Considered Appellant concerns and made changes where feasible





WOOD RODGERS

Andy Durling, AICP

adurling@woodrogers.com