

# Exhibit B - PC Minutes

*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

**Attachment: November 17th Draft PC Minutes**

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**