



# MINUTES

## Regular Meeting

### Reno City Planning Commission

Wednesday, April 02, 2025 • 6:00 PM

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

Commissioners			
Kerry Rohrmeier, Chair 326-8864			
Silvia Villanueva, Vice Chair	326-8863	Jacob Williams	326-8861
Manny Becerra	326-8860	David Giacomini	326-8859
Christina Del Villar	326-8862	Alex Velto	326-8858

#### 1 Pledge of Allegiance

Commissioner Giacomini led the Pledge of Allegiance.

#### 2 Roll Call

*Commissioner Villanueva was absent at roll call.*

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

Emily Allen  
Mike Mellow  
Lynne Llewellyn  
Art Rangel  
Catherine Schmidt

#### 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. **LDC25-00009 (Need 2 Speed)** - A request has been made to amend Condition No. 1 of a previously approved conditional use permit (LDC25-00009) to allow for extended business hours (12:00 am) on Friday and Saturday nights for a bar, lounge, or tavern with recreation or amusement, outside in

an existing commercial center. The ±18.1 acre subject site is located east of US Highway 395 North, approximately ±130 feet south of its intersection with North McCarran Blvd. The subject site has a zoning designation of General Commercial (GC) and a Master Plan land use designation of Suburban Mixed-Use (SMU). **[Ward 3]**

The Commission decided to expedite this item and did not hear the staff presentation.

Public Comment:

Comments on this item were made under general public comment, Agenda Item 3.

Chris Utgaard, President of Need 2 Speed, responded to the public comment concern regarding noise levels. He explained they want it to be a conversational space and they will only have music on the patio to basically drown out the noise from the highway. He does not think anyone on the west side of 395 will hear the music.

Commissioner Becerra stated the reason they are expediting this item is because it is a clerical matter and all the findings have been addressed previously.

AGENDA ITEM 4.3 WAS HEARD AFTER THIS ITEM.

*It was moved by David Giacomini, seconded by Manny Becerra, to approve the amendment to the conditional use permit, subject to the conditions listed in the staff report. Motion Pass.*

<b>RESULT:</b>	Approve [6 TO 0]
<b>MOVER:</b>	David Giacomini, Commissioner
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Manny Becerra, Commissioner
<b>AYES:</b>	Becerra, Del Villar, Giacomini, Rohrmeier, Velto, Williams
<b>NAYS:</b>	
<b>ABSENT:</b>	Silvia Villanueva
<b>ABSTAIN:</b>	
<b>RECUSED:</b>	

- 4.2 Staff Report (For Possible Action): Case No. **LDC25-00042 (Starbucks Booth Street)** - A request has been made for a conditional use permit to: a) construct an accessory drive-through facility associated with a ±1,662 square foot coffee shop; b) allow commercial development adjacent to residentially zoned property; and c) allow commercial development within 300 feet of a public school. The ±0.47 acre site is located on the northeast corner of Booth Street and Keystone Avenue. The site is within the Neighborhood Commercial (NC) zoning district and has a Master Plan land use designation of Suburban Mixed-Use (SMU). **[Ward 2]**

Carter Williams, Associate Planner, gave the staff presentation.

Brook Oswald, applicant's representative, gave a presentation. The applicant requested a change in the language of Condition 8 to read "Prior to the issuance of a business license, the applicant shall provide Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) for queue management, drive through operations and circulation control for the peak hours of operations. Management shall insure that staff is trained and proficient in these specific procedures and processes." The applicant also requested that Condition 9 be removed as there is already a process in place to address it. The condition as written could possibly remove due process and create an arbitrary and capricious enforcement risk.

Disclosures:

Familiar with the site, read emails

Public Comment:

None

Questions:

Commissioner Giacomini stated his questions are targeted at objectively identifying the need for Condition 9.

Mr. Williams confirmed for Commissioner Giacomini that the applicant is providing more stacking area than what is required in code. He explained that conditional use permits run with the land so if a new operator were to take over the site, the same conditions would apply and it would not come before this body again.

Commissioner Williams expressed concern regarding safety and congestion issues with this being located within 300 feet of Reno High School. This issue is only partially addressed by sidewalk improvements and the school district's recommendation for a crossing guard is not included in the conditions.

Mr. Williams explained that installing a crossing requires a more robust study into the safety of the crossing as they are not all inherently safe.

Mr. Williams explained for Commissioner Becerra how the project mitigates pedestrian safety concerns. Widening the sidewalk and including a five-foot landscape strip moves pedestrians away from the street increasing safety.

Commissioner Becerra asked staff to comment on the applicant's proposed changes to the conditions.

Mr. Williams stated his only concern is that the proposed change to

Condition 8 removes language in the last sentence intended to comply with requirements to reduce backup inside the parking area.

Mr. Oswald confirmed the applicant is okay with adding that part of the language back into the end of their suggested amended Condition 8.

Mike Railey, Planning Manager, stated Condition 9 mimics a section in code and eliminating that condition would not remove the City's ability to bring this back if issues arise.

Discussion:

Commissioner Velto stated he is content with the condition changes that have been proposed by the applicant.

Commissioner Williams stated the Master Plan discourages auto-oriented uses in neighborhood centers. He asked for help understanding how they can make findings that go against the Master Plan.

Chair Rohrmeier discussed the history of the City's stand regarding drive throughs. She generally agrees that drive throughs are bad practice. In this particular location, she is supportive of the project because there is another drive through coffee shop across the street.

Commissioner Becerra agreed with Chair Rohrmeier's comments and stated that when he first started, he was very focused on setting precedence. He has been reminded there is no precedence and decisions are based on this body's discretion reviewing projects on their merit.

Commissioner Del Villar stated she has concerns with traffic and drive throughs and is hoping the walk-up window will be utilized, especially by students.

AGENDA ITEM 4.4 WAS HEARD AFTER THIS ITEM.

*It was moved by Manny Becerra, seconded by David Giacomini, to approve the conditional use permit, subject to conditions listed in the staff report, with Condition 8 modified as discussed and Condition 9 removed. Motion Pass.*

<b>RESULT:</b>	Approve [6 TO 0]
<b>MOVER:</b>	Manny Becerra, Commissioner
<b>SECONDER:</b>	David Giacomini, Commissioner
<b>AYES:</b>	Becerra, Del Villar, Giacomini, Rohrmeier, Velto, Williams
<b>NAYS:</b>	
<b>ABSENT:</b>	Silvia Villanueva
<b>ABSTAIN:</b>	
<b>RECUSED:</b>	

4.3 Staff Report (For Possible Action): Case No. **LDC25-00008 (Grand**

**Sierra Resort Arena)** - A request has been made for a conditional use permit to allow for the expansion of the Grand Sierra Resort to include construction and operation of: 1) a multi-purpose sports arena, 2) building height greater than 85 feet, and 3) public plaza space for events (amusement or recreation, outside). The development is proposed on a ±27.9 acre portion of a ±138.61 acre site located at the southeast corner of the intersection of the Interstate 580 exit and East Second Street. The site is zoned Mixed-Use Urban/Gaming Overlay (MU/G) and General Commercial (GC) and has a Master Plan designation of Urban Mixed-Use (UMU) and Suburban Mixed-Use (SMU). **[Ward 3]**

Nathan Gilbert, Principal Planner, gave the staff presentation.

Andrew Diss, GSR Representative, gave a presentation.

Disclosures:

Spoke with the applicant, read material, familiar with the site, spoke with RSIC

Public Comment:

Cathy Martson  
Rebecca Flannery

Questions:

Mike Railey, Planning Manager, confirmed for Commissioner Becerra in response to public comment that funding for this project is outside the purview of the Planning Commission and is not associated with this request.

Mr. Diss explained for Commissioner Becerra that the shuttle service will be for game days. If the need arises, they would be willing to see if it make sense to provide that service outside of game days. He also confirmed that the ice rink will be available to the public.

Commissioner Giacomini asked the applicant if they are comfortable with Condition 7 stating that additional traffic mitigations may be required prior to acceptance.

Loren Chilson, Traffic Engineer, confirmed they understand and accept the terms of the condition.

Mr. Gilbert explained for Commissioner Del Villar that the increase in sewer flow noted is an average flow rate. He also explained that places where pedestrian amenity funds are used have to be available to the public.

Mr. Chilson explained for Commissioner Del Villar the proposed road improvements to mitigate in-bound traffic.

Mr. Diss further explained that most events will be around 7 or 8 o'clock at night and they are fairly confident events will miss peak traffic times.

Mr. Gilbert explained for Commissioner Becerra that whether or not phase two comes before this body depends on whether the proposed use is allowed by-right or requires a permit or entitlement.

Mr. Diss confirmed for Commissioner Becerra that they are considering using intelligent transportation systems. They want to make it as easy as possible for visitors to enter and exit the property.

Discussion:

Commissioner Velto stated the applicant has met all the findings. There are a lot of benefits from this project. The answers to Commissioner Giacomini's questions about traffic were helpful.

Commissioner Becerra stated he and Chair Rohrmeier met with the applicant months ago when this initially came in and shared their feedback. Since then it has strengthened. The applicant made sure to meet with the Reno-Sparks Indian Colony and satisfied their input and concerns. This is a project I can get fully behind.

Commissioner Del Villar stated she had concerns about traffic and modes of transportation and all of her questions have been answered.

Chair Rohrmeier stated this is an exemplary project.

Commissioner Williams agreed this project is fantastic and he appreciates the work that has gone into it. He expressed concern about traffic, particularly the off-ramps, and he hopes the plan to mitigate traffic issues works well.

Commissioner Giacomini stated that as a traffic engineer, he is acutely aware of the delays and schedule problems that can occur when having to deal with numerous agencies. This project has substantial compliance with general policy 1.2a that pertains to tourism. He is comfortable with this applicant moving forward on the basis of making findings with regard to traffic, particularly with what the applicant presented and knowing that many of these items are not in Reno right-of-way, which makes it important that we don't overstep our bounds with regard to what conditions we would want to see.

AGENDA ITEM 4.2 WAS HEARD AFTER THIS ITEM.

*It was moved by Manny Becerra, seconded by Christina Del Villar, to approve the conditional use permit, subject to conditions listed in the staff report. Motion Pass.*

<b>RESULT:</b>	Approve [6 TO 0]
<b>MOVER:</b>	Manny Becerra, Commissioner
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Christina Del Villar, Commissioner
<b>AYES:</b>	Becerra, Del Villar, Giacomini, Rohrmeier, Velto, Williams
<b>NAYS:</b>	
<b>ABSENT:</b>	Silvia Villanueva
<b>ABSTAIN:</b>	
<b>RECUSED:</b>	

- 4.4 Staff Report (For Possible Action – Recommendation to City Council): Case No. **LDC24-00051 (StoneGate Heinz Ranch MPA and ZMA)** - A request has been made for: 1) a Master Plan amendment on ±1,363.33 acres from a mix of Industrial (I), Suburban Mixed-Use (SMU), Mixed Neighborhood (MX), Single-Family Neighborhood (SF), Multi-Family Neighborhood (MF), Large-Lot Neighborhood (LL), Parks, Greenways, and Open Space (PGOS), and No Land Use (NOLU) to a mix of I, SMU, and SF; and 2) a zoning map amendment from ±1,767.3 acres of StoneGate Planned Unit Development (PUD) to ±923.3 acres of Industrial (I), ±385.7 acres of Single-Family Residential 5 units per acre (SF-5), ±54.6 acres of General Commercial (GC), and ±403.7 acres of Parks, Greenways, and Open Space (PGOS). The ±1,767.3 acre site is generally located partly north of U.S. Highway 395 and west of White Lake Parkway and partially south of White Lake and U.S. Highway 395 in Cold Springs. The request seeks to amend an existing Project of Regional Significance (PRS) designation. The proposal is a PRS based on anticipated employment, housing, sewage, water usage, traffic, and student population thresholds being met, thereby requiring additional review at a regional level. **[Ward 4]**

THE MEETING RECONVENED AFTER A 13-MINUTE RECESS.

Jeff Foster, Associate Planner, gave the staff presentation.

Andrew Durling, Wood Rodgers, gave a presentation.

Disclosures:

Met with the applicant, familiar with the site, live in Ward 4 (Del Villar), met with the developer, read material and public comment, spoke with Cold Springs residents

Public Comment:

Liliana Ochoa

Bill Hedley

Olivia Tanager

Brian Armon

Mason La Fond (did not wish to speak)

Derek Carroll (did not wish to speak)

Rebecca Flannery (via Zoom)

Emily Ochoa (via Zoom)

Cathy Martson (via Zoom)

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

Questions:

Commissioner Giacomini asked if data centers under this PUD would still go through the conditional use permit process.

Mr. Foster confirmed that is correct. If a future data center use were to be proposed, it would be brought before the Planning Commission for a conditional use permit.

Commissioner Del Villar asked for an explanation of the term generally compatible.

Mr. Foster explained generally projects are not entirely compatible in all areas. For example, in an ideal world industrial zoning would not be directly adjacent to residential. On balance we find that this proposed request is generally compatible.

Commissioner Del Villar asked how this project fits in with quality of life, as per the Master Plan.

Mr. Foster explained there would be a positive impact to quality of life by reducing the amount of time people spend driving into the urban core of Reno for employment opportunities and other services. There are also trails proposed that would add to quality of life.

Mr. Foster explained for Commissioner Del Villar that this body is considering a Master Plan amendment and zone change that would allow or facilitate future uses like retail, commercial, medical office space and other services. The existing PUD is almost exclusively residential.

Commissioner Becerra asked when Cold Springs residents would be able to reap or experience those quality of life benefits.

Mr. Durling explained that the benefits to quality of life come as employment grows in the area over time. One thing that comes more immediately is sewer service. Another added benefit for the community at large is the White Lake trail. This project will also open up access to some public lands over time.

Eugenia Larmore, EKAY Economic Consultants, explained for

Commissioner Becerra how the annual revenue was determined using the uniform standard adopted and provided by Reno.

Mr. Durling explained for Commissioner Giacomini that infrastructure has to come first before they break ground on any projects. Generally speaking, access is key and that will come from White Lake Boulevard so that roadway extension would happen first. With that you would have water and sewer infrastructure.

Mr. Durling explained for Commissioner Del Villar the types of industrial uses they are anticipating.

Commissioner Del Villar asked if there is a bond on the record for the previous PUD.

Chair Rohrmeier asked if that was related to a development agreement.

Mr. Durling explained a special assessment district was approved as part of the StoneGate PUD. That isn't necessarily a bond but is a self-imposed tax on the property itself. There were also development agreements that wouldn't necessarily be nullified with this change but would be hard to enforce with reduced residential development tied to them.

Mr. Foster explained for Commissioner Del Villar the general theory is that residential changing to commercial or industrial reduces the need for services in terms of fire and police.

Mike Railey, Planning Manager, stated this change would not nullify the development agreements established under the StoneGate PUD, however they would not necessarily reflect the updated plan and would need to be amended through City Council action.

Commissioner Williams expressed concern that the report defers pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure details to future entitlements.

Mr. Durling explained that the development going forward will be regulated in its entirety by Reno Municipal Code and the Public Works Design Manual, both of which require things like sidewalks and bike lanes. In addition to that, they will be looking to include a trail system throughout the industrial area.

Mr. Durling answered questions from Commissioner Becerra regarding impacts to existing well users. He explained the plans to develop additional water resources on the south side of White Lake using Great Basin as the primary water source. He pointed out the benefits of using Great Basin compared to the previous plan that required using TMWA as the primary source.

Discussion:

Commissioner Del Villar stated the big concern for her is related to quality of life issues if this is changed to industrial.

Chair Rohrmeier stated she is torn on this decision. I appreciate straight zoning as opposed to a PUD for 1,700 acres. It can change more fluidly with the city code updates and that is a good thing for planning as our city continues to change. I don't love this jump from 950,000 square feet of industrial to 11.75 million square feet. The zoning isn't industrial commercial or mixed employment, it's industrial which is the most permissive use. It doesn't seem to follow a density transition and creates incompatibilities. Right now we seem to have a surplus of distribution and warehouse facilities that are unoccupied. Is this the vision of North Valleys? We've heard tonight and for years prior from residents that this is not what is wanted in Ward 4.

Commissioner Giacomini discussed the challenges experienced with trying to bring commercial uses to North Valleys. This would go from housing to industrial, not necessarily a use type that residents would like to see out there. My reason in asking about an overall mix is because that is an area specific policy that is of utmost importance to the people in Ward 4. I asked about the infrastructure to see if some of those components are going to be in place to make it more conducive for other uses like restaurants to come up in the future. What I heard was today if we were to try and put a restaurant in those general commercial zones, it would be too expensive. If we get water and traffic infrastructure there, it is easier for me to make the findings with regard to overall mix.

Commissioner Becerra stated this is not 2006 even though the rezoning reflects what the land may have looked like back then. The needs of Reno and its residents, those in Cold Springs and as a whole, in 2025 demand some work from the start in terms of planning. I am semi-comforted with the fact that prior community benefit agreements like emergency services, water services, and other infrastructure the community needs can still be renegotiated at the City Council level. I wish I could say I'm 100% confident but I've seen that our advice and suggestions and our decisions as a commission have not been heeded before when arriving at Council, and often without explanation as to why. So, any potential support of this project would be given with serious pause. He asked if staff or the applicant wanted to add any last thoughts for consideration.

Mr. Durling addressed the concerns about the size of proposed industrial and stated they feel when you look at it in the broader economic standpoint of the City of Reno, a project like this is needed. He discussed the industrial lands needs assessment done by the Regional Planning Agency around 15 years ago. At that time the assessment was that our region does not have an adequate supply of larger industrial parcels.

From our perspective the city needs a viable source of industrial land to be able to attract employment to the city.

Mr. Foster pointed out that the application was submitted a year ago and that staff has been working with the applicant on the appropriate zoning, updating the development agreements, etc. In response to staff comments, the applicant changed one zoning request from SF-11 to SF-5, which dramatically reduces the potential residential unit yield. The applicant has been flexible in addressing staff concerns. Everything has been thought out and analyzed over time, and staff concurs with the current request. In terms of quality of life and lighting, overall potential additional light from industrial use may be less than from residential under the PUD.

Commissioner Del Villar asked about other possible designations that might ease people's concerns.

Mr. Durling confirmed they have considered other designations and explained their reasons for requesting industrial.

Chair Rohrmeier asked about using mixed-use zoning.

Mr. Durling expressed concern with the limitations that would put on industrial uses.

Commissioner Velto stated he feels a little more comfortable with what is being proposed. I tend to assume that when an applicant comes forward seeking an MPA or a zoning map amendment, they have done their due diligence and have evaluated the need for the project in a manner that is more sophisticated than we can do as a Planning Commission. So, I don't like the idea of trying to push the applicant into a different type of zoning. He discussed how this proposal could be beneficial for the city and consistent with how the Master Plan expects them to evaluate projects.

Commissioner Giacomini discussed the quality of life component and stated regardless of the use type if it is an employment center of any kind, the trips would be going toward that facility in the AM peak hours helping the commute for people in Ward 4. If this was residential as currently entitled, that would not be the case.

Commissioner Becerra stated it is our job to try to find what is business friendly yet resident responsible.

Commissioner Williams stated he looks at the positives of this to be the reduction in water, the reduction in average daily trips, and the relation to the Master Plan as far as economic and industrial growth goes.

Chair Rohrmeier stated I am not as convinced on the due diligence here. I

think maybe the big driver was here is a land use that doesn't require a lot of up front infrastructure costs and thereby that will be the direction we move forward. There are not a lot of spaces left like this for growth so this is an important decision. I don't see the compatibility the way the zoning map is designed today.

Commissioner Del Villar voted no on the motion based on quality of life and incompatibility.

Chair Rohrmeier voted no on the motion based on the issue of incompatibility.

Commissioner Becerra voted no on the motion for the same reasons stated by his fellow commissioners.

Chair Rohrmeier read the appeal process into the record.

*It was moved by David Giacomini, seconded by Alex Velto, to adopt the Master Plan amendment by resolution and recommend that City Council adopt the Master Plan and zoning map amendments by ordinance, subject to conformance review by the Regional Planning Commission. Motion Fail.*

<b>RESULT:</b>	Approve [3 TO 3]
<b>MOVER:</b>	David Giacomini, Commissioner
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Alex Velto, Commissioner
<b>AYES:</b>	Giacomini, Velto, Williams
<b>NAYS:</b>	Manny Becerra, Christina Del Villar, Kerry Rohrmeier
<b>ABSENT:</b>	Silvia Villanueva
<b>ABSTAIN:</b>	
<b>RECUSED:</b>	

- 4.5 Staff Report (For Possible Action - Recommendation to City Council) - Case No. **LDC25-00037 (Rancharrah Planned Unit Development Master Plan Amendment & Handbook Amendment)**: A request has been made for: 1) a Master Plan amendment from Parks, Greenways, and Open Space (PGOS) to Single-Family Neighborhood (SF); and, 2) an amendment to the Rancharrah Planned Unit Development (PUD) Handbook to: a) change a ±7.2 acre portion of the land use plan from Equestrian Center to Single-Family in order to create Village 8; b) reduce the total number of units from 722 to 469 units; c) modify the objectives of the PUD by removing all references to “equestrian” and “riding facilities”; and d) update the Flexibility section to reflect current RMC processes and other miscellaneous updates to reflect current RMC references. The ±6.0 acre Master Plan Amendment site is located west of the intersection of Falabella Way and Silver Charm Way, east of Bartley Ranch Regional Park. The ±140 acre PUD is generally located on the northwest corner of Kietzke Lane and Del Monte Lane. The PUD has Master Plan land use designations of PGOS, Single-Family

Neighborhood (SF), Large-Lot Neighborhood (LL), and Suburban Mixed-Use (SMU). [Ward 2]

THE MEETING RECONVENED AFTER A 6-MINUTE RECESS.

Leah Piccotti, Associate Planner, gave the staff presentation.

Andy Durling, Wood Rodgers, gave a presentation.

Disclosures:

Met with the applicant's representative, met with residents, read material and public comment, sought guidance from the City Attorney's Office

Public Comment:

David Wong  
Christine Speed  
Glenn Gray  
Werner Keller  
Audrey Keller  
Kyle Forsyth (did not wish to speak)  
Mike Mellow  
Amy Horvath  
George Phirippidis (via Zoom)  
Teri Iaconis (via Zoom)

Questions:

Ms. Piccotti confirmed for Commissioner Williams that City Council did restrict a tentative map to 59 homes. She explained that because that was a tentative map and not an amendment to the handbook, it can still be modified or a new tentative map could come forward. That condition by Council was specific to the tentative map.

Mike Railey, Planning Manager, also confirmed that condition was project specific, it was specific to that tentative map reviewed by Council through an appeal. If the developer decided not to move forward with recording a final map, a new project could come in and not be subject to that cap of 59 homes.

Ms. Piccotti explained for Commissioner Del Villar that this conversation is for an amendment to the handbook. The Commission will look at this as an amendment to the overall zoning in Rancharrah. The master plan amendment is specific to the six acre equestrian center Village 8 site.

Ms. Piccotti explained for Commissioner Del Villar that she searched all other stables in the City of Reno and none of them have a PGOS designation.

Ms. Piccotti explained for Commissioner Del Villar that as a planner, she would look at traffic analysis when a development comes forward, not necessarily when a zoning change comes forward.

Mr. Durling answered questions from Chair Rohrmeier explaining the open space calculation.

Commissioner Giacomini asked staff how the equestrian center ended up with PGOS zoning.

Mr. Railey explained that it is not uncommon that they find glitches that occurred when the new land use was applied, especially within PUDs which had a blanket designation of special planning area. That land use was applied potentially without reading through the entire PUD to see the equestrian center was a recreational amenity, however there was underlying density assigned to it. So that level of detail may have been missed.

Ms. Piccotti clarified for Commissioner Giacomini that this would be a decrease in the total number of units and a reallocation of the allowed units within the SF designation over to the Village 8 site.

Commissioner Becerra asked if the applicant would be amenable to some of the residents' requests, including extending some PGOS for usable open space, access to Sierra Rose from Village 7, removing a white fence, preserving the mature trees along Village 8, and preserving the original ranch buildings.

Mr. Durling explained the idea behind the potential planned access to Sierra Rose and why that was not pursued. He also explained why it is not possible to add a pathway along Evans Creek. If the white fence mentioned is in Village 8 and was damaged, yes that would be redone. Regarding preserving mature trees, it is anticipated they would have a tree preservation plan as part of the Village 8 tentative map.

Commissioner Becerra mentioned the community's desire for usable open space and asked about the condition of Bartley Ranch.

Mr. Railey explained that Bartley Ranch is a Washoe County Regional Park, not a City of Reno park. Wheatland Park to the north of Rancharrah is a maintained city park.

Ms. Piccotti confirmed for Commissioner Giacomini that access to Bartley Ranch is guaranteed and is written into the handbook.

Mr. Durling explained for Chair Rohrmeier the history of previous amendments to the PUD.

Mr. Durling explained for Commissioner Del Villar how they got to the proposed number of units and reconfirmed that the event center area is not open space.

Commissioner Becerra asked if there is anything else the applicant can offer as an olive branch to the residents.

Mr. Durling stated he is the applicant's representative and can't make any further concessions at this time. They feel the proposal is reasonable and staff's presentation stated the proposed densities on Village 8 are not out of line with what is adjacent to it.

Commissioner Becerra stated there could perhaps be more density in Village 8 but also with a little give of more PGOS for usable open space, or a commitment to some sort of access.

Mr. Durling stated there is no proposed change to the access of Rancharrah. It is a gated residential community with access control. There is a lot of pedestrian connectivity throughout and there is access to ample parkland at Bartley Ranch and Wheatland Park.

Discussion:

Commissioner Williams stated a lot of the things that were asked for during public comment are easily accomplished under HOA control. They are asking the developer to do certain things with trees and fences and converting open space, and when the development gets turned over to the HOA that is under their purview to change. The community entrusts an HOA to improve common area spaces.

Commissioner Velto stated the reduction in the total number of allowed units is a benefit potentially for what the homeowners are looking for. Given that there is a reallocation of density and not an increase in the total density, this fits within the broader PUD framework and is compatible with what is adjacent to the area. With this amendment it could potentially empower the homeowners to take control over the HOA and that could be a way of addressing some of their concerns. I can make the findings and think the applicant has done some work to address concerns of the neighbors.

Commissioner Giacomini stated the open space that has been referenced in Village 8 is right next to Bartley Regional Park. The applicant is clearly making an effort for access to be preserved. At this point I feel comfortable making the findings for what is before us.

Commissioner Becerra stated part of the concern he is hearing from residents is that by the time they might get control of the HOA a lot of the key amenities they seek to preserve or enhance may be gone. I am trying

to strike a balance here where it is a win win for all parties involved.

Commissioner Del Villar stated she thinks the density is the question. Could there be fewer homes and could one of the lots be turned into a dog park are some of the things she is thinking about. As it is presented, I can make most of the findings. I am just still trying to figure out if there is some balance that can be found somewhere.

Commissioner Becerra stated that ideally he would have wanted the residents and applicant to find some middle ground themselves. That may not happen but I would implore the applicant to continue the conversation with the residents and find some more middle ground based on what has been discussed tonight because I think there is some room for a bit more give. If I support this tonight it will be with that recommendation to continue to find some solutions together.

Chair Rohrmeier stated this is another difficult one. I can support a change from PGOS to single family. I am really challenged by a community that feels they are being intimidated and that they moved to a place where they don't have a voice or that they aren't able to get the things they need to feel that what they bought is what they're actually having. Unfortunately, we don't get to make those choices here. I will say when you show something like access granted and that's not followed through, or something is labeled as community space and then it's not, that is an area where if those kinds of tensions arise, there should be concessions made in good faith. I too would like to see the developer continue those conversations and really hear out what the residents are feeling. They clearly outlined four conditions they want some response on and so far it sounds like it's just no. I hope there is resolution that doesn't end up in a courtroom some day.

Chair Rohrmeier read the appeal process into the record.

***It was moved by David Giacomini, seconded by Alex Velto, to adopt the Master Plan amendment by resolution and recommend that City Council approve the Master Plan and PUD amendments, subject to conformance review by the Regional Planning Commission. Motion Pass.***

<b>RESULT:</b>	Approve [5 TO 1]
<b>MOVER:</b>	David Giacomini, Commissioner
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Alex Velto, Commissioner
<b>AYES:</b>	Becerra, Giacomini, Rohrmeier, Velto, Williams
<b>NAYS:</b>	Christina Del Villar
<b>ABSENT:</b>	Silvia Villanueva
<b>ABSTAIN:</b>	
<b>RECUSED:</b>	

Chair Rohrmeier reported there was a presentation on data centers and that will also be presented at the Joint City Council/Planning Commission workshop.

**6 Staff Announcements**

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

Mike Railey, Planning Manager, provided an update on City Council actions and upcoming agenda items.

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

Chair Rohrmeier requested a future agenda item on alternative housing approaches.

Commissioner Becerra requested a presentation on noticing requirements.

Commissioner Giacomini discussed the need for an established method of identifying alternates to attend Regional Planning Commission meetings.

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

None

**9 Adjournment (For Possible Action)**

The meeting was adjourned at 11:56 p.m.