



## MINUTES

### Regular Meeting

### Reno City Planning Commission

**Thursday, November 17, 2022 • 6:00 PM**

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

Commissioners			
Alex Velto, Chair 326-8858			
J.D. Drakulich, Vice Chair	326-8861	Mark Johnson	326-8864
Harris Armstrong	326-8859	Arthur Munoz	326-8862
Peter Gower	326-8860	Silvia Villanueva	326-8863

#### 1 Pledge of Allegiance

Commissioner Armstrong led the Pledge of Allegiance.

#### 2 Roll Call

##### **Members Present**

Chair Alex Velto, Commissioner Mark Johnson, Vice Chair J.D. Drakulich, Commissioner Peter Gower, Commissioner Arthur Munoz, Commissioner Silvia Villanueva, Commissioner Harris Armstrong

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

Correspondence received was forwarded to the Planning Commissioners and is part of the record.

#### 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 ***PULLED ITEM*** - Staff Report (For Possible Action): Case No. **LDC23-00018 (Aspire at North Hills)** - A request has been made for a conditional use permit to allow a 204 unit multi-family development. The ±8.64 acre subject site consists of four parcels with ±308.63 feet of

frontage on North Hills Boulevard and ±179 feet of frontage on East Golden Valley Road. The subject site is located within the General Commercial (GC) zoning district and has a Master Plan land use designation of Suburban Mixed-Use (SMU). **[Ward 4]**

This item was pulled from the agenda. Correspondence and voicemails were received.

Voicemails from the following people were played during the meeting:

Luis Midianda  
Veronica Rivera  
Susan Holt  
Jody Pool  
Richard Williams

Commissioner Munoz asked if these messages will be played again when this item is presented at a future meeting.

Jason Garcia-LoBue, Planning Manager, stated the voicemails will be included as part of the record

- 4.2 Staff Report (For Possible Action): Case No. **LDC23-00019 (Mount Bismark Single-Family)** - A request has been made for: 1) a tentative map for 74 attached single-family residential lots and; 2) a conditional use permit for more than 50 residential units in the Neighborhood Commercial (NC) zoning district. The ±8.10 acre site is located just north of the intersection of Mount Babcock Street and Mount Anderson Street. The site is zoned NC with a Master Plan land use designation of Suburban Mixed-Use (SMU). **[Ward 4]**

John Krmpotic, representing the applicant, gave an overview of the project.

Grace Mackedon, Associate Planner, presented the staff analysis and recommendation. The presentation included an additional condition of approval proposed by the applicant regarding the inclusion of a sidewalk.

Disclosures: familiar with the site, met with the applicant and/or applicant's representative, no disclosures

Public Comment: None

Questions:

Commissioner Munoz asked about traffic impacts.

Mike Mischel, Engineering Manager, stated it is not going to have a significant impact. The proposed project does not even require a traffic impact study. It will increase traffic but it is expected to be nominal.

Commissioner Johnson noted this is a residential plan in a neighborhood commercial zone as opposed to being in a residentially zoned area. He asked if there are any differences with respect to residential adjacency standards if this was a multi-family zoned site, would there be any difference with respect to the setbacks from the industrial zoning across the street.

Ms. Mackedon stated the way it is referenced in code is non-residential development adjacent to residentially zoned development typically. Since the industrial is existing, staff took a look at how they can do things above and beyond since it is not really built into code.

Ms. Mackedon clarified for Commissioner Gower that the proposed parking is two spaces per unit. Code typically requires one per unit. She also clarified where the sidewalk would be that is proposed by the applicant as an additional condition of approval.

Mr. Mischel answered a question from Commissioner Villanueva regarding potential flooding. He explained this is a closed basin and code requires the applicant to mitigate 1:3 so there is no risk of downstream flooding as a result of this project. He further explained for Commissioner Villanueva that the proposed retention basin is sized to accommodate 30% more volume than was previously generated on the site before it is developed. He confirmed that would address 5 year and 100 year flood concerns.

Discussion:

Commissioner Munoz stated we tend to have to put the cart before the horse and we really need the housing to come in before everything else catches up. Unfortunately, we have gotten so far ahead of ourselves in the North Valleys with building and adding more people and traffic that the area can no longer handle any more of these projects until everything else catches up. Although this is a great project and product, I cannot burden the North Valleys with more congestion. For that reason I will be voting no.

***It was moved by Peter Gower, seconded by J.D. Drakulich, to approve the tentative map and conditional use permit, subject to conditions listed in the staff report with the addition of a condition that requires pedestrian connectivity from the site to Mount Bismark Street. Motion***

*Pass.*

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>Approved [6 TO 1]</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Peter Gower, Commissioner
<b>SECONDER:</b>	J.D. Drakulich, Vice Chair
<b>AYES:</b>	Velto, Johnson, Drakulich, Gower, Villanueva, Armstrong
<b>NAYS:</b>	Arthur Munoz
<b>ABSENT:</b>	

- 4.3 Staff Report (For Possible Action - Recommendation to City Council):  
Resolution No. 06-22 Case No. **LDC23-00002 (1045 Hoge Road Master Plan and Zoning Map Amendments)** – A request has been made for: 1) a Master Plan amendment from Unincorporated Transition (UT) to Single-Family Neighborhood (SF), and; 2) a zoning map amendment from Unincorporated Transition – 5 acres (UT-5) to Single-Family Residential – 3 units per acre (SF-3). The ±3 acre site is located northwest of Hoge Road ±670 feet west of its intersection with Mason Road; together with matters which pertain to or are necessarily connected therewith. **[Ward 4 (Upon Annexation)]**

Eric Hasty, Wood Rodgers, gave an overview of the project.

Grace Mackedon, Associate Planner, presented the staff analysis and recommendation.

Disclosures: received and read emails, spoke with the applicant's representative, no disclosures, familiar with the area, visited the site

Public Comment:

Correspondence received was forwarded to the Planning Commission and is part of the record.

Gabriel Burke  
Steven Mathers  
Randi Mendez Parra  
Loyd Crites  
Richard Wharton  
Tracy Candela  
Cynthia Fedinic  
Vince Wittowsky

Questions:

Mr. Hasty confirmed for Commissioner Drakulich that they did hold a neighborhood meeting after giving public comment at the Ward 4 NAB

meeting. Notices were mailed out to the surrounding neighbors and four members of the public showed up. The concerns we heard were all regarding infrastructure and the existing conditions.

Mr. Hasty answered questions from Chair Velto regarding the process for a potential future project. If a tentative map is required for a future project, all of the infrastructure concerns would be addressed during that tentative map process.

Ms. Mackedon explained for Commissioner Villanueva that the City limits are directly east of this site and the SOI extends west. She clarified that the SOI is outside City limits but is identified as intended to be annexed within the next 20 years. She confirmed that this site does have slopes and there is a significant rock outcropping on the southeast portion.

Commissioner Villanueva asked what the cuts and fills might look like if this were to be approved and it was developed.

Ms. Mackedon explained that is something we would see at time of development depending on what they would be proposing.

Jason Garcia-LoBue, Planning Manager, clarified that this item is a Master Plan and Zoning Map Amendment proposal. If a project is proposed in the future, it would need to be done in accordance with Reno Municipal Code. If a future project were to fall outside of certain parameters, it would trigger a site plan review or a tentative parcel map that would come back to this Planning Commission.

Ms. Mackedon confirmed for Commissioner Armstrong that Reno PD reviewed this and no comments were received. She also explained that the potential development for this site does not trigger a traffic study.

Commissioner Gower referred to Finding H under the zoning regulations and asked staff to walk through the access in more detail and the potential requirements for roadway upgrade.

Ms. Mackedon answered questions from Commissioner Gower regarding access and what part of the roadway the City is responsible for maintaining currently. Whether it is a shared driveway or a private access easement depends on how many units it would be serving. It would be improved either way.

Commissioner Munoz referred to Finding M and asked staff how they can make that finding when there is nothing within a mile or two that is close to this

type of cluster development.

Ms. Mackedon stated cluster development is not being proposed tonight. There are some significant rock outcroppings on the site that we would like to see preserved. If the existing right-of-way were used in a future development where they had to take out the rock outcropping, it would more than likely trigger a cuts and fills major site plan review. We would encourage the preservation of the rock outcropping.

Commissioner Munoz stated it seems like this site is kind of an island out on its own and asked if staff had any concerns that this does not fit the area.

Ms. Mackedon staff was able to make the finding regarding not creating an island because the site is abutting City limits. This is close to the downtown core so it does make sense to eventually annex it into the City. There is not a large area of County land close to this, it is within the SOI, and it is anticipated to be annexed. That is how staff was able to make the finding.

Commissioner Johnson asked staff why the Planning Commission is getting this before City Council gets an annexation.

Ms. Mackedon explained City Council's direction is to have these seen together so staff has to take it to the Planning Commission prior to the annexation being heard so that they can be heard concurrently at City Council.

Discussion:

Commissioner Johnson stated his concern is that a lot of what is being heard tonight with respect to traffic, utilities, and access are issues that are not looked at in our findings but in the annexation findings. On the surface, this is adjacent to City property and existing infrastructure and it makes sense to annex. After looking into it further and hearing tonight's discussions, we are hamstrung by the process that the City has laid out by not letting the Planning Commission be involved in annexations. There are questions and concerns tonight that we cannot address because they will be fleshed out in the annexation process.

There was discussion between Chair Velto and Commissioner Johnson regarding their perspectives of the process.

Mr. Garcia-LoBue confirmed for Commissioner Drakulich that tonight's action is a recommendation to City Council. City Council will have this item and a separate item for annexation before them in December.

Commissioner Gower stated that in his opinion the annexation decision should

come before a decision we are asked to make. This commission is not ready to vote yes or no on this, it should wait until the annexation decision. I have questions that relate directly to the findings for zoning regulations that I cannot make because I don't know the City's commitment to provide services. If we postpone this until after the December City Council meeting, then we will have the information we need.

Commissioner Villanueva agreed with the statements made by Commissioners Gower and Johnson.

Chair Velto stated he understands the concern being expressed regarding not knowing yet if the City will annex the property. I can make the findings understanding that the City needs to annex the property and our decision doesn't have an effect unless that happens.

Commissioner Munoz made a motion at this time to deny the master plan amendment. The following discussion took place before a vote was taken.

Commissioner Gower stated he is not in favor of the motion as stated. There is an option to postpone the decision until after the City Council meeting to take action on annexation.

Commissioner Drakulich stated he would support a postponement.

Commissioner Armstrong stated he would also support a postponement.

Ms. Mackedon stated they can postpone the item until after City Council hears the annexation.

Mr. Hasty requested clarification on what the change in process would mean.

Ms. Mackedon stated this is why staff was directed to have the annexation and the zone change and master plan amendment for Council to hear all at the same time.

Commissioner Gower stated this is why the Planning Commission needs to review annexation decisions. This applies directly to our decision-making process. He asked what difference it makes to City Council how this property is zoned or what the master plan land use designation is for an annexation decision. The City has been annexing property for a long time and we don't always follow this process. The City annexes property with existing land use designation and zoning without changing it first so why does it matter than we go through this process first?

Ms. Mackedon stated City Council can hear the annexation separately. Staff has heard direction to try to make them concurrent so they can look at the project more as a whole.

Commissioner Munoz agreed that this process does hamstringing the Planning Commission but at the same time it does reduce the number of meetings required in the process. He agreed it is a frustrating situation.

Karl Hall, City Attorney, stated Code requires that applications for annexation be reviewed by City Council concurrently with the application for a ZMA and MPA. Code requires that you make a recommendation tonight.

Commissioner Drakulich stated that since a decision on a recommendation has to be made tonight rather than postponing a decision, he will not support the motion to deny.

Commissioners Gower and Johnson stated that for the master plan amendment they cannot make Finding C.

A motion was made to deny the zoning map amendment.

Commissioner Gower stated that he cannot make Findings H, J, and M.

*Recess*

***It was moved by Arthur Munoz, seconded by Silvia Villanueva, to deny the Master Plan Amendment. Motion Pass.***

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>Denied [4 TO 3]</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Arthur Munoz, Commissioner
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Silvia Villanueva, Commissioner
<b>AYES:</b>	Johnson, Gower, Munoz, Villanueva
<b>NAYS:</b>	Alex Velto, J.D. Drakulich, Harris Armstrong
<b>ABSENT:</b>	

***It was moved by Arthur Munoz, seconded by Silvia Villanueva, to deny the zoning map amendment. Motion Pass.***

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>Denied [4 TO 3]</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Arthur Munoz, Commissioner
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Silvia Villanueva, Commissioner
<b>AYES:</b>	Johnson, Gower, Munoz, Villanueva
<b>NAYS:</b>	Alex Velto, J.D. Drakulich, Harris Armstrong
<b>ABSENT:</b>	

- 4.4 Staff Report (For Possible Action - Recommendation to City Council):  
Case No. **LDC22-00050 (Sierra Senior Care PUD Amendment) - A**



request has been made for an amendment to the Sierra Senior Care Planned Unit Development (PUD) zoning district design standards handbook to allow for 96 multi-family dwelling units on the vacant northern ±3.26 acre portion of the PUD. Also, in order to accommodate the proposed use, various additions to design standards are proposed including: building architecture, setbacks, lighting, landscaping, parking, etc. The ±5.09 acre PUD is generally located north of the terminus of Beck Street and south of Mountain View Drive. The site has a Master Plan land use designation of Multi-Family Neighborhood (MF). **[Ward 1]**

*Meeting resumed at 8:11 p.m.*

Garrett Gordon, representing the applicant, gave an overview of the project.

Grace Mackedon, Associate Planner, presented the staff analysis and recommendation.

Disclosures: met with the applicant's representative, received and read emails, visited and/or are familiar with the site, Commissioners Armstrong and Villanueva live in the area, Commissioner Johnson received a yellow notice card

Public Comment: Correspondence received was forwarded to the Planning Commission and is part of the record.

Voicemails played first from the following:

Russell Gordon  
William Scott Kellison  
Michael Coffee  
Matthew Chisholm  
Marissa McClish  
Joanne Bravo  
Carmen Gage  
Alicia Powers  
No name provided

William Scott Kellison made public comment via zoom.  
Curtis Whittaker made public comment via zoom.

Request to speak forms received from the following:

Debra Gamino  
Bruce Gamino  
Nicholaus Schuhl  
Melinda Gadda

Alicia Powers

Michael Arrington did not wish to speak. Chair Velto read comments into the record.

Kara VanValkenburg

Donna Keats

Gregory Glowdowski

Carmen Gage

Dan Beeler

Questions:

Ms. Mackedon explained for Commissioner Drakulich that staff would not normally look at market demand for senior housing. Staff reviews requests in comparison to our Master Plan policies and the findings that need to be made. Staff also looks at the surrounding development for compatibility standards. The fact that there is another assisted living facility nearby does come into consideration in part, but really staff is looking at the proposed request and how that fits in to the particular site.

Commissioner Drakulich asked for more information on the applicant's decision-making process to change from senior care to multi-family.

Mr. Gordon reviewed some of the history of this process and factors that were considered in making the decision to request this amendment.

Loren Chilson, Headway Transportation, explained for Commissioner Gower how they determined the Level of Service (LOS) would be maintained with this proposal. There is a wide variety of traffic volumes that can fit within each LOS. The traffic volume in this area is extremely low with a LOS in the A/B range.

Commissioner Gower brought up the baseline situation that was in Donna Keats' presentation during public comment and asked how that was incorporated into the traffic analysis.

Mr. Chilson stated that traffic volumes fluctuate. They were higher pre-COVID and have now come back. Traffic was counted for the analysis in February 2022. The fluctuations in this case mean nothing in the grand scale of the analysis because we are talking about very low traffic volume.

Mr. Chilson confirmed for Commissioner Gower that they did look at trip distribution. The traffic analysis looks at how traffic will use the various roadways that we connect to. The site plan was done to disperse the traffic.

Mike Mischel, Engineering Manager, answered questions from Commissioner Johnson regarding standard street development requirements and noted some sidewalk has been put in. He will need to look into whether or not parking will be allowed on both sides of Mountain View Drive.

Ms. Mackedon confirmed for Commissioner Johnson that the school district gets all of these development projects and they did not have any specific concerns. Staff asked the developer to coordinate with safe routes to school as well.

#### Discussion:

Commissioner Drakulich stated that what he sees here is a trade for infill, high density apartments that can go in that we still very much need. The Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency (TMRPA) presented information not long ago on a population increase of eight percent over the next eight years. He sees a need for this product and will support it.

Commissioner Villanueva stated it is an appropriate use of this parcel. Living in the area she will be impacted as well and still feels it is appropriate. She also stated that her concern regarding traffic safety and LOS have been addressed.

Commissioner Gower requested a change in the PUD text where two alternative options to the memory care facility are listed. The word “and” should be changed to “or”.

Mr. Gordon confirmed for Commissioner Gower that they will make the text changes suggested before moving forward to City Council.

Ms. Mackedon concurred with the suggested text changes.

Commissioner Johnson discussed the fact that he lives in this area and shares the concerns of his neighbors. He discussed the need for infill and noted this project checks all the boxes for good infill. He stated he struggles to find reasons not to make the findings and is still struggling in terms of what to do knowing the specific impacts. The parking issue is still a concern and he would have appreciated staff having information on what parking was or wasn't available on Mountain View Drive, especially in front of the dog park.

Commissioner Villanueva discussed why it is important to have this type of housing in this area.

Commissioner Johnson stated that he is voting nay because the original requirements to allow for the senior care is still an option in here. This is in

addition to an option that he was not able to support previously.

*It was moved by J.D. Drakulich, seconded by Silvia Villanueva, to recommend that City Council approve the amendments to the Sierra Senior Care Planned Unit Development design standards handbook, in addition to the suggested text change discussed tonight, subject to the conditions listed in the staff report. Motion Pass.*

<b>RESULT:</b>	Approved [5 TO 2]
<b>MOVER:</b>	J.D. Drakulich, Vice Chair
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Silvia Villanueva, Commissioner
<b>AYES:</b>	Velto, Drakulich, Gower, Villanueva, Armstrong
<b>NAYS:</b>	Mark Johnson, Arthur Munoz
<b>ABSENT:</b>	

## **5 Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Liaison Report**

Commissioner Johnson reported the next meeting will be on Monday since it will be Thanksgiving on the regular meeting date.

## **6 Recommendation to City Council for Appointment to the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Commission from the members of the Reno City Planning Commission to fill a vacant position: Harris Armstrong, J.D. Drakulich, Arthur Munoz, Alex Velto, Silvia Villanueva (For Possible Action - Recommendation to City Council)**

*It was moved by Alex Velto, seconded by J.D. Drakulich, to recommend Silvia Villanueva for appointment to the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Commission. Motion Pass.*

<b>RESULT:</b>	Approved [7 TO 0]
<b>MOVER:</b>	Alex Velto, Chair
<b>SECONDER:</b>	J.D. Drakulich, Vice Chair
<b>AYES:</b>	Velto, Johnson, Drakulich, Gower, Munoz, Villanueva, Armstrong
<b>NAYS:</b>	
<b>ABSENT:</b>	

## **7 Staff Announcements**

- 7.1 Report on status of Planning Division projects.
  - 7.2 Announcement of upcoming training opportunities.
  - 7.3 Report on status of responses to staff direction received at previous meetings.
  - 7.4 Report on actions taken by City Council on previous Planning Commission items.
- Jason Garcia-LoBue, Planning Manager, reported the next meeting will be on December 8<sup>th</sup>.

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

None

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

None

**10 Adjournment (For Possible Action)**

*It was moved by Harris Armstrong, seconded by Mark Johnson, to adjourn. Motion Pass.*

<b>RESULT:</b>	Approved [7 TO 0]
<b>MOVER:</b>	Harris Armstrong, Commissioner
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Mark Johnson, Commissioner
<b>AYES:</b>	Velto, Johnson, Drakulich, Gower, Munoz, Villanueva, Armstrong
<b>NAYS:</b>	
<b>ABSENT:</b>	