

Reno City Planning Commission



MINUTES

Thursday, January 7, 2014 ~ 6:00 p.m.

Reno City Hall – Council Chambers
One East First Street, Reno, Nevada

MEMBERS

Doug Coffman, Chair
Dagny Stapleton
Paul Olivas
Charles Reno
Kathleen Taylor
Kevin Weiske
Jason Woosley

I. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chairperson Coffman led the Pledge of Allegiance.

II. ROLL CALL

Chairperson Coffman called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m. A quorum was established.

PRESENT: Doug Coffman, Paul Olivas, Charles Reno, Dagny Stapleton, Kevin Weiske and Jason Woosley

ABSENT: Kathleen Taylor

Jonathan Shipman – Deputy City Attorney, was also present.

III. PUBLIC COMMENT - This item is for either general public comment or for public comment on an action item. If commenting on an action item, please place the Agenda Item number on the Request to Speak form.

None

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF DECEMBER 5, 2013 REGULAR MEETING (For Possible Action)

It was moved by Commissioner Weiske, seconded by Commissioner Reno, to approve the December 5, 2013 regular meeting minutes. The motion carried by a vote of 5-0 with an abstention from Commissioner Olivas.

V. CITY COUNCIL LIAISON REPORTS *

There was no City Council Liaison report.

VI. APPROVAL OF THE 2014 PLANNING COMMISSION SCHEDULE (For Possible Action)

It was moved by Commissioner Weiske, seconded by Commissioner Stapleton, to approve the 2014 Planning Commission schedule. The motion carried by a vote of 6-0.

Reno City Planning Commission Meeting—Minutes

January 7, 2014

Page 2 of 20

VII. UPDATE ON CURRENT PROJECTS FROM THE OFFICE OF COMMUNICATIONS AND COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT DEPARTMENT

Deanna Gescheider, Director of Communications and Community Engagement, reviewed the new City of Reno mobile app. She stated the app was another way for residents to engage with the City to receive information or express concerns. Ms. Gescheider provided a live demonstration of the app. She stated the app has the following six key features: 1) report an issue; 2) receive current news and blog posts; 3) share and follow ideas; 4) watch live meetings; 5) sign up for alerts; and, 6) receive live bus route information. A tutorial is also available that explains the functions of the icons. There is a one-time sign-up membership. Residents can also request a follow-up to an issue via email or by phone. It is also possible to upload issues to social media sites for sharing. Residents can view their current location with the app. Since December 15, 2013 there have been 151 downloads.

Commissioner Stapleton commented that most of her neighbors like to remain anonymous when reporting issues, especially graffiti. She noted the app does not allow for anonymous reporting as residents need to log in to use the app.

Chairperson Coffman asked how residents were being informed of the app.

Ms. Gescheider replied through the media and the new City of Reno website.

Chairperson Coffman asked if the app will replace Reno Direct.

Ms. Gescheider clarified it was another outlet for Reno Direct.

Chairperson Coffman requested to know if the system will be monitored 24/7.

Ms. Gescheider stated the system is not monitored twenty-four hours, but issues can be reported instantaneously to begin the process. She noted the app should not be used for emergencies.

Commissioner Olivas commented that it was a great app for providing information to residents, such as Ward information.

Ms. Gescheider suggested including Planning Commissioner information and their wards to the app.

Commissioner Stapleton suggested using the app as an engagement tool for the NABs.

Ms. Gescheider stated a follow-up to the six-month pilot program would be presented to the City Council on January 15, 2014 and will include feedback from the NABs.

VIII. 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 III, Public Comment, is heard at the beginning of this meeting.

Reno City Planning Commission Meeting—Minutes

January 7, 2014

Page 3 of 20

1. LDC14-00020 (Waste Management/Transfer Station Redevelopment) – This is a request for: 1) special use permits to: a) add an indoor salvage and materials reclamation facility and support services containing +/-60,933 square feet of building area to the existing +/-124,843 square foot Waste Management Facility; b) to allow the facility to operate between the hours of 11:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m. (24 hours a day); and c) to reduce the requirement that at least 75% of the total street frontage be comprised of building; and 2) variances to: a) modify the landscape parking lot edge requirements; and b) modify the tree requirements within the garbage truck fleet parking lot. The +/-21.76 acre site is located on both the north and south sides of Commercial Row adjacent to the Truckee River beginning +/-425 feet east of the Sage Street/Commercial Row intersection and extending west to +/-520 feet west of the Sutro Street/Commercial Row intersection in the MU/E4TC (Mixed Use/East 4th Street Transit Corridor Overlay District) zone. The site has a Master Plan land use designation of Special Planning Area/East 4th Street Transit Oriented Development Corridor. vak [Ward 5] **(For Possible Action)**

Commissioner Weiske disclosed his employer has a current contract with Waste Management; therefore, he would be recusing himself from this item, on the advice of legal counsel.

Commissioner Olivas, Commissioner Stapleton, and Chairperson Coffman disclosed they visited the site and talked to the applicant's representative.

Commissioner Reno and Commissioner Woosley disclosed they visited the site.

Greg Martinelli stated this issue is the culmination of work over the last six years to improve the recycling program in the Truckee Meadows area. Last year, the City Council approved a new franchise agreement with Reno Disposal, which is a subsidiary of Waste Management. As a result, certain conditions need to be met, including establishing an Eco Center. In 2011, the property across the street from the transfer station was acquired. The Eco Center will allow for disposal of solid waste, "green" waste, e-waste, and recycling in one location. The coverage area will be enhanced so it is screened from the river and the street and the railroad tracks. Fleets will be converted to compressed natural gas. Construction on the corner of Sage and Commercial Row is not a part of this request, but was included in the original special use permit and will be in operation later this month. The single-stream recycling program will begin with the new compressed natural gas trucks in February 2014. Retrofits to the existing shop have been completed in order to provide maintenance for the compressed natural gas trucks. All trucks should be converted to compressed natural gas by 2020, including the third-party fleets that move the material from Commercial Row to Lockwood.

Vern Kloos, Senior Planner, stated, in 1994, the facility was approved to allow approximately 185,000 square feet, most of which was never constructed. This project equals the square footage approved in 1994 and includes the recycling facility. It will also upgrade the facility with regards to parking, paving, landscaping, screening and architectural elements, which will improve the site. He reviewed the variance requests. Staff received one call related to the installation of landscaping and if it would be maintained and the appearance of the facility. Mr. Kloos stated landscaping will need to be maintained and would be a Code Enforcement issue if it was not. Staff is recommending approval, subject to the conditions in the staff report.

Reno City Planning Commission Meeting—Minutes

January 7, 2014

Page 4 of 20

At this time, Chairperson Coffman opened discussion to public comment.

Mike Steedman stated he was concerned with Waste Management trucks using Fourth Street, since Redevelopment was working with the RTC on making the Fourth Street and Prater Way Corridor more bicycle-friendly. He was also concerned with accessibility to the river relating to the proposed landscaping. He suggested using deciduous trees instead of Evergreens. He commented that the facility should be relocated as they were trying to revitalize the river.

Seeing and hearing no further public comment requests, Chairperson Coffman closed public comment.

Commissioner Reno commented that there is a berm near the river. He asked if this area has flooded in the past.

Vern Kloos, Senior Planner, replied not that he was aware of. He noted that the project is located on the north side of the river which is ten feet higher than the south side.

Commissioner Reno asked if there were monitoring wells to prevent leakage into the river, as the facility was almost doubling in size and appears to be a permanent fixture in the area.

Vern Kloos, Senior Planner, stated he did not know. Staff did not receive any comment from the Health Department that indicated there was an issue. It was his understanding the transfer station would be constructed of concrete, several feet thick. Parking lot improvements must also meet current code, with regards to drainage.

Commissioner Stapleton noted the transfer station was a part of this request; therefore, the location and adjacent uses should be reviewed. She asked if there were any concerns raised, with regards to flooding or on the ecological impact to the river.

Vern Kloos, Senior Planner, stated this project was referred to the Corp of Engineers. No comments were received. The Health Department is required to approve the operations plan. As far as staff knows, the facility is operating properly and will be upgraded with this project. Mr. Kloos noted he was part of the team which reviewed the special use permit in 1994 and that this project was better than the 1994 project.

Commissioner Stapleton asked if certain trees were better, ecologically, along a river, and if the proposed trees were reviewed, in terms of species and water use or just in terms of screening.

Vern Kloos, Senior Planner, stated the primary purpose was to add to the screening value along the river and around the facility. The Planning Commission could condition the landscaping requirement to include a review of the trees being used by the Urban Forester.

Commissioner Stapleton suggested the landscaping requirement be amended to include this condition.

Reno City Planning Commission Meeting—Minutes

January 7, 2014

Page 5 of 20

In response to Commissioner Olivas' question, Vern Kloos, Senior Planner, reviewed how the growth of the facility by 50% was determined, given the current buildings in the area. He stated the transfer station and the amount of solid waste processed would not be increased from the existing limit.

Chairperson Coffman stated it was his understanding that this facility is currently operating twenty-four hours of the day and that the request was to bring them into compliance.

Greg Martinelli replied that is correct because they service certain facilities at night that cannot be serviced during the day, including the casinos. Mr. Martinelli stated several monitoring wells are in place and there has never been a detectable amount of any substance. The flood of 1996 came up the embankment, but never breached the berm. A concrete wall was added to the loading tunnel where the berm was weakened. In response to Commissioner Stapleton's suggestion, Mr. Martinelli added they were in agreement with the Urban Forester reviewing the trees being proposed.

Chairperson Coffman asked if Evergreen trees were not the right type of trees to be used during the winter because of the snow buildup.

Greg Martinelli stated that would be a question for the Urban Forester. He clarified solid waste tonnage per day was at approximately 1,200 tons. The tonnage that goes through the facility will not change. The mix will change due to the single-stream recycling program being implemented. Traffic will also improve in the area because City of Reno residents will be allowed to dispose of four loads per year at the transfer station, whenever they want, instead of having to wait for "residential dump day" weekends. In response to questions regarding the location, Mr. Martinelli stated it would cost approximately \$50 million to relocate the facility; therefore, their intention was to improve what they have and make it work, because their contract with the City of Reno requires a transfer station.

Commissioner Reno asked if the transfer station was exclusive to the City of Reno or will it grow in capacity as time goes on.

Greg Martinelli stated there will be reasonable and steady growth, but overall, it will never be more than capacity. The transfer station will service the entire Truckee Meadows area, which is the Reno, Sparks, and Washoe County areas.

Commissioner Stapleton commented that Conditions 5 through 16 have not yet been met, but would be met before the project can be constructed. She stated she was uncomfortable that these conditions have not been met before this project was presented to the Planning Commission, because these conditions are important elements.

Vern Kloos, Senior Planner, explained conditions were included as a "heads up" that these Code requirements will need to be met, before the building permits can be approved.

Commissioner Olivas asked if conditions were needed in order to approve the special use permit.

Vern Kloos, Senior Planner, replied some conditions were added like the noise study to highlight these requirements and that they will be verified during review of the project building permits.

Reno City Planning Commission Meeting—Minutes

January 7, 2014

Page 6 of 20

Commissioner Woosley stated he was in support of the project, because it is an extension of an existing use and will improve the area.

Commissioner Olivas agreed with Commissioner Woosley's comments. He noted the facility takes the necessary steps to prevent harmful toxins from being dumped. He commented that the parking requirement and having trees in the middle of the parking lot did not make sense. In his opinion, it is more equipment storage than parking. But, it is a good, positive project because they have improved the current standards.

Commissioner Stapleton commented that she was comfortable with the general discussion of the project and the hardships for the variances. She requested a condition be added to require the Urban Forester to review the trees being proposed for the project, in terms of screening and species.

Commissioner Reno stated he could make the findings, after hearing the discussion.

Chairperson Coffman asked if the City Council will make the decision on what trees will be used for the project.

Vern Kloos, Senior Planner, replied the plans will be reviewed by staff. In his opinion, some evergreen trees should be used for screening. Having the Urban Forester review the landscaping and trees being proposed could be a separate condition.

It was moved by Commissioner Stapleton, seconded by Commissioner Reno, to recommend approval of the special use permit for LDC14-00020 (Waste Management/Transfer Station Redevelopment) based upon compliance with the applicable findings with the addition of Condition 16 that, prior to review of the landscaping plan during the building permit process, the applicant should work with the Urban Forester and their landscape architect to ensure that the trees and landscaping that will be adjacent to the river are environmentally and ecologically appropriate. Commissioner Stapleton stated she could make all of the findings. Commissioner Reno stated he could make all of the findings. The motion carried by a vote of 5-0.

It was moved by Commissioner Olivas, seconded by Commissioner Woosley, to recommend approval of the variances for LDC14-00020 (Waste Management/Transfer Station Redevelopment) subject to conditions and based upon compliance with the applicable findings. The motion carried by a vote of 5-0.

2. TXT13-00005 (Amendment of TOD Standards) – This is a request to amend Reno Municipal Code Title 18, “Annexation and Land Development”, Chapter 18.08, “Zoning”, Section 18.08.101, entitled “Establishment and Purpose of Base and Overlay Zoning Districts”, Section 18.08.201, entitled “Permitted Uses by Base Zone District”, Section 18.08.301, entitled “Nonresidential and Mixed Use Base Zoning Districts”, and Section 18.08.405, entitled “Regional Center and Transit Corridor Overlay Districts”, together with other matters properly relating thereto. cch [All Wards] **(For Possible Action – Recommendation to City Council)**

At this time, Commissioner Weiske rejoined the meeting.

Reno City Planning Commission Meeting—Minutes

January 7, 2014

Page 7 of 20

Claudia Hanson, Planning and Engineering Manager, provided a brief review of changes made since the last workshop. On page seven, a definition has been added of the Western Gateway Regional Center Planning Area Overlay District, which includes some of the Gold Ranch area. No specific code standards except for MU standards for the Western Gateway Regional Center have been added, because most of it was regulated by the Mortensen-Garson agreement from ten years ago. On page 56, specific land uses for the Gold Ranch area added to the Western Gateway Regional Center have been added to the land use table. On page 73, land uses for the TODs have been added, mostly in the North Virginia Transit Corridor. On page 86, changes were made to the Mixed Use Base Zoning District, with regards to eliminating the Floor Area Ratio (FAR) and density requirement for secondary corridors. Some minimum density requirements were increased from 14 to 18 to reflect the recent changes to the Regional Plan. Midtown was not included. On page 116, changes were made to parking and to the FAR to .75 in the northern portion outside of a transit stop in the South Virginia Transit Corridor. In the Mill Street Transit Corridor, a number of parking requirements were removed, as well as architectural and site layout, with reference back to standard code, which may reduce the size of the Mixed Use area, much of which is not covered under base zoning and is consistent throughout the Transit Corridors. On page 122, wording was added to increase street frontage on East 4th Street. Secondary Corridors have also been identified. On page 123, regarding the North Virginia Transit Corridor, the area has been changed to a secondary corridor and industrial uses have been added back in with a special use permit. Regarding West Fourth Street, primary and secondary corridors have been identified. Parking was removed with a reference to standard code for parking. Density was also increased from 14 to 18.

At this time, Chairperson Coffman opened discussion to public comment.

Ken Krater commented that these changes will help with development of the Reno area. He stated there was a lot of discussion about providing flexibility to move forward with the site plan review, if the strict interpretation of code standards is not met. He provided some examples. He suggested this flexibility be allowed under special circumstances. He also noted there had been discussion to allow flashing and animated signs in the South Virginia Street Corridor, but that this item was stricken on page 117.

Claudia Hanson, Planning and Engineering Manager, noted flashing and animated signs are covered under the sign code and was removed from page 117 for consistency.

Angela Fuss, CFA, commented that sidewalk requirements beginning on page 86 requires an area of 18 feet 6 inches of sidewalk, when discussion was to keep the requirement under 18 feet. On page 116, parking requirements for restaurant and retail use in the north section of the South Virginia Street Corridor reverts to the Downtown Regional Center Plan, which is zero. She suggested a maximum parking requirement be included for those tenants that may want to include parking. On page 117, the ten-foot pedestrian pathway requirement for residential and non-residential parcels that are 300 feet in width or more should be changed to non-residential development only. Ms. Fuss noted all landscaping requirements for the South Virginia Corridor were removed. She suggested requirements revert back to Mixed Use zoning requirements. On page 118, regarding density and intensity, FARs are not specified for areas that do not have adjacent bus transit. She suggested an FAR of .25 from the Master Plan be added for those areas not adjacent to bus transit. On page 120,

Reno City Planning Commission Meeting—Minutes

January 7, 2014

Page 8 of 20

there is a specific landscape requirement for Mixed Use and with an FAR between 1 and 1.5. She suggested adding requirements for parcels above or below that FAR requirement, which can be universal landscaping requirements.

Claudia Hanson, Planning and Engineering, stated the landscaping requirement on page 120 should have been stricken and reverted back to Mixed Use requirements.

Angela Fuss, CFA, suggested the landscaping requirement on page 121 also be stricken and reverted back to Mixed Use requirements. She commented that she agreed with Mr. Krater's comments about allowing more flexibility so that, under certain circumstances, a special use permit should be required.

Seeing and hearing no further public comment requests, Chairperson Coffman closed public comment.

Commissioner Stapleton commented that Ms. Fuss suggestions of having minimum/maximum parking requirements for the northern portion of the South Virginia Street Corridor and to restrict the ten foot wide pedestrian walkway requirement to non-residential parcels only are policy requirements. Commissioner Stapleton stated she did not agree with these policy requirements, and that they should not be changed based on the interest of one developer.

Commissioner Weiske asked if staff prevents projects with special use permit or variance requests from being presented to the Planning Commission.

Claudia Hanson, Planning and Engineering Manager, replied no.

Commissioner Weiske asked if an applicant still has the opportunity to present their variance or special use permit request to the Planning Commission, with an appeal to City Council, if the applicant does not agree with staff.

Claudia Hanson, Planning and Engineering Manager, replied yes.

Ken Krater explained a developer cannot select for themselves which application to present to the Planning Commission and that there may be projects which, under special circumstances, should be based on the eight or ten findings for a special use permit rather than having to meet the four specific findings for a variance.

Commissioner Stapleton commented that the language on page 92 should provide the flexibility requested by Mr. Krater. She noted the language eliminates the standards for density and building orientation with a site plan review. She expressed concern about this and asked when it went from special use permit to site plan review.

Claudia Hanson, Planning and Engineering Manager, stated that was discussed at the last workshop and that it had also been explained at that time that a site plan review is an administrative decision; therefore, would not be presented to the Planning Commission. If appealed, it can be presented to the Hearing Officer and the City Council.

Reno City Planning Commission Meeting—Minutes

January 7, 2014

Page 9 of 20

Commissioner Stapleton stated she was not comfortable with this change because building orientation is essential to the TODs and should not be varied, even with a special use.

Chairperson Coffman asked if site plan reviews had been discussed and added to speed up the process.

Claudia Hanson, Planning and Engineering Manager, replied yes. Fees will be similar for a site plan review and a special use permit. The difference between the two would be the 30 versus 65 days for an appeal hearing.

Commissioner Weiske commented he recalled discussing this issue with regards to the cost with the time process for appeals and to allow staff to handle building orientation for areas, sans East Fourth Street and North Virginia Street Corridors for more efficiency. He noted the Planning Commission would maintain control of the building orientation for East Fourth Street and North Virginia Street Corridors.

Claudia Hanson, Planning and Engineering Manager, noted, for a site plan review, the Hearing Officer will review a project, if staff makes an error during their review.

Commissioner Weiske clarified the project discussed at last month's meeting regarding the ten foot pedestrian walkway requirement was for a multi-residential property and that, in his opinion, a single-family residential property more than 300 feet should not be required to put in a ten foot pedestrian walkway.

Discussion was heard changing sidewalk width in the standards to four feet/ eight feet/and six feet for a total of 18 feet.

Claudia Hanson, Planning and Engineering Manager, stated she agreed the Regional Center should stay at a special use permit on page 92. On page 116, there are no parking requirements for restaurants, bars, and retail in the northern section of the South Virginia Street Corridor. She agreed a maximum parking requirement should be established to be capped at standard code.

Commissioner Weiske asked why there should be a parking restriction, if a national business requires more parking spaces than the restriction allows.

Claudia Hanson, Planning and Engineering Manager, replied there are parking restrictions because it is a TOD Corridor which requires certain policies and best practices to encourage a certain type of development to support the City's infrastructure and goals for development.

Commissioner Reno suggested the parking requirement be half of standard code, because there is reduced parking in the TOD Corridors.

Commissioner Woosley suggested parking be required to standard code for the area between the Midtown District and north of Moana Lane.

Reno City Planning Commission Meeting—Minutes

January 7, 2014

Page 10 of 20

Commissioner Stapleton stated she agreed with Commissioner Reno's suggestion and Ms. Hanson's comments regarding the TOD and that it should also be applied to building orientation.

Claudia Hanson, Planning and Engineering Manager, stated, on page 117, the ten-foot wide pedestrian walkway requirement was focused towards hotel/casino establishments and larger Mixed Use and Commercial developments. She clarified single-family residential was added back in to the East Fourth Street Corridor.

Ken Krater suggested code standard of six feet for a sidewalk be used for the pedestrian walkway requirement, because six feet was sufficient.

Commissioner Weiske noted the ten-foot pedestrian walkway discussed during the project presented at last month's meeting could be a combination of two walkways that total ten feet and not necessarily one ten-foot pedestrian walkway. He stated he was in support of a ten-foot walkway because it can be varied.

Discussion was heard to include language that the ten-foot walkway can be a combination of walkways that total ten feet with a minimum requirement of four feet.

Ken Krater suggested having two six-foot sidewalks with a minimum requirement of six feet.

Commissioner Reno suggested including a minimum distance requirement between the two walkways, with no construction in-between.

Commissioner Woosley questioned why there needs to be a minimum distance requirement between the two walkways if a six-foot sidewalk is sufficient for safety.

Claudia Hanson, Planning and Engineering Manager, explained Commissioner Woosley's question was plausible because the intent is to have more pedestrian circulation within a 300-foot parcel. She noted tonight's discussion suggested one ten-foot pedestrian walkway or two six-foot sidewalks. District landscaping requirements stated on page 120, 121 and 124 would be removed and reverted to MU base zoning as listed on page 91. On page 92, special use permits (SUP) will remain for regional centers. She asked if there should be an extension beyond land use intensities and building orientation and if there should be a change of a special use permit or a site plan review. She noted a site plan review is administrative with 30 days to begin the appeal process, if needed, and not presented to the Planning Commission. If appealed, it would be presented to the Hearing Officer and the City Council. A special use permit is 65 days to begin the appeal process, similar in price, and would be presented to the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Stapleton stated it should be a special use permit because building orientation is one of the key elements for the TOD and should not be varied.

Commissioner Weiske asked why building orientation and why Commissioner Stapleton thinks staff will not push standards as hard as the Planning Commission.

Reno City Planning Commission Meeting—Minutes

January 7, 2014

Page 11 of 20

Commissioner Stapleton stated staff does not have code policy to back up their determinations and, with a special use permit, they would. Building orientation takes away the pedestrian orientation or the walkability if not facing the street.

Commissioner Weiske commented that staff has promoted walkability in the TODs and that, if an applicant disagrees with staff on building orientation, the appeal process is the same for a special use permit or a site plan review, but the site plan review is a shorter process therefore less expensive for the City and the applicant.

Commissioner Stapleton stated they were discussing how to make the decision to vary building orientation and the correct mechanism or process for varying building orientation. In a site plan review, staff can vary building orientation at their discretion, but, in her opinion, building orientation should only be varied if a hardship can be proven.

Commissioner Weiske asked about the process if a project was brought forward with a change to the building orientation.

Claudia Hanson, Planning and Engineering Manager, stated currently the special use permit process would be used because it is listed in code. A site plan review is almost the same review that staff completes for a special use permit. The findings are slightly different. A letter would then be generated and posted on the website, as well as sent to the applicant, who will have a ten-day appeal period to the Hearing Officer.

Commissioner Weiske asked if the findings of the Planning Commission are more stringent than staff findings.

Claudia Hanson, Planning and Engineering Manager, replied they are different. She reviewed the findings for a site plan review and noted, from the last workshop, the North Virginia Street TOD, Mill Street, TOD, West Fourth Street TOD, the southern section of the South Virginia Street TOD, and the Regional Centers have been narrowed.

Commissioner Weiske suggested a special use permit process be in place for some of the TODs, after hearing the findings for a site plan review.

Commissioner Woosley stated he liked the idea of site plan reviews, but not the way they are at this time because of the “wobble room” it may provide for some areas. He suggested narrowing the areas where site plan reviews could be put in place in the future instead of special use permits.

Claudia Hanson, Planning and Engineering Manager, added, in the future, staff will bring forth an amendment to the findings of a site plan review. She suggested leaving it as a special use permit, with the recommendation of an amendment and update to the site plan review process.

Chairperson Coffman stated he did not like that the site plan review goes directly to the City Council and bypasses the Planning Commission.

Reno City Planning Commission Meeting—Minutes

January 7, 2014

Page 12 of 20

Commissioner Stapleton asked for clarification that a site plan review only goes to staff for approval and the Hearing Officer and City Council, if appealed.

Claudia Hanson, Planning and Engineering Manager, clarified that is correct. She noted a site plan review is still noticed the same way as a special use permit. Administrative appeals have to be appealed through the Hearing Officer, per state law.

At this time, Chairperson Coffman called for a short break.

Commissioner Weiske asked, for the record, if it takes longer to complete the SUP process through the Planning Commission with an appeal to City Council than it does on a site plan review with an appeal to an Administrative Hearing Officer and City Council.

Claudia Hanson, Planning and Engineering Manager, stated it is probably faster through the Planning Commission, but the appeal process schedule is about the same for an SUP or a site plan review.

Commissioner Weiske commented that he would be in support of the special use permit process, because of the timing issue.

Claudia Hanson, Planning and Engineering Manager, stated, in terms of the full appeal process to City Council, it would be faster through a special use permit.

Commissioner Woosley stated he agreed with Commissioner Weiske and was in support of the special use permit process, but that in the future site plan reviews should be put in place for small changes to a project that do not need to go through the special use permit process.

Commissioner Stapleton added that another part of this discussion was removing building orientation because it should not be varied unless there is a hardship.

Commissioner Woosley asked if there had been previous discussion and examples regarding building orientation being put to the side or facing away from the street.

Claudia Hanson, Planning and Engineering Manager, stated there was information about side frontage on page 90.

Commissioner Weiske commented that they may be getting the TODs confused with the Midtown District.

Angela Fuss, CFA, noted the shopping center on South Virginia Street was an example of building orientation facing away from the street.

Claudia Hanson, Planning and Engineering Manager, noted that shopping center was built under the General Transit Corridor (GTC), which was the predecessor to all TODs.

Ken Krater stated the example that generated this text amendment was the commercial retail project on South Virginia Street, just south of California Avenue. The developer had to orient his building

Reno City Planning Commission Meeting—Minutes

January 7, 2014

Page 13 of 20

towards the side lot line to fit his retail project, because of the orientation of the lot. The developer was in favor of allowing that option of having buildings oriented to side lot lines, as long as there was pedestrian access to the main street.

Commissioner Stapleton stated, in her opinion, this development should never have been allowed to be oriented to the side, because its parking lot is facing towards the street, and breaks up the character of the Midtown District. She noted it could be an example of why building orientation needs to be a variance, because the narrowness of the building could be seen as a hardship.

Discussion was heard to change the language from site plan review to special use permit and to remove building orientation so it always defaults to a variance.

Commissioner Woosley stated he agreed with those changes because there have been no good examples in support of current language.

Commissioner Reno suggested language be changed to state street frontage may be to the side property line.

Commissioner Woosley questioned if this change would keep developers from creative ways for using small lots in TODs and keep them from applying for a variance.

Commissioner Weiske commented on the difference in lot size and traffic lane size in the TODs versus the Midtown District. He stated he could not support the change because of these differences.

Commissioner Stapleton stated she was only concerned with building orientation.

Commissioner Olivas stated he agreed with Commissioner Weiske, because these areas are not walkable areas, but transit-oriented. He was in support of allowing side frontage and keeping the language as is.

Commissioner Woosley commented that he was in support of keeping the language as is, because it is better suited for TODs.

Commissioner Reno agreed because these areas are outside the Midtown District, yet still have pedestrian access.

Commissioner Stapleton stated she was fine with that, if that is the consensus of the Commission, but if buildings are not oriented towards the street, the area is not walkable and not pedestrian-friendly and should not be considered a TOD.

Claudia Hanson, Planning and Engineering Manager, clarified there would be no change to the language on page 90 and language on page 92 would be changed from site plan review to special use permit.

Commissioner Weiske stated, for the record, that he was in favor of Ms. Hanson's clarification.

Reno City Planning Commission Meeting—Minutes

January 7, 2014

Page 14 of 20

Commissioner Woosley agreed.

Commissioner Reno agreed with Commissioner Stapleton on building orientation; however, whether it should apply to TODs further from the Midtown District should be for a future discussion. He also agreed that a special use permit would be the better choice for building orientation, so it could be presented to the Planning Commission for changes.

Claudia Hanson, Planning and Engineering Manager, asked for Commission direction on page 116 regarding parking for restaurants, bars, and retail in the northern section of the South Virginia Transit Corridor. Currently, parking standard is zero, but there was a suggestion on setting a maximum amount of parking from 50% to standard code.

Commissioner Reno stated he made this suggestion in order to promote walkability and pedestrian-friendly areas.

Commissioner Woosley commented that it would seem appropriate to have parking up to standard code further towards Moana Lane.

Ken Krater commented that parking needs to be available for businesses outside the Midtown District or the core regional centers; otherwise, there would be no development.

Claudia Hanson, Planning and Engineering Manager, added having a cap of standard parking with the minimum at zero will allow for intensification of a business.

Commissioner Weiske commented that he understands the TODs are to promote the use of other modes of transportation. He suggested developments that want to exceed standard code for parking be allowed to construct parking structures that blend into their development.

Claudia Hanson, Planning and Engineering Manager, replied placing a cap on the parking standard would ensure a development has to request a variance to exceed that cap and a special use permit for the FAR.

Commissioner Stapleton was in support of that suggestion, if the building orientation is to the street.

Commissioner Reno was in support of parking up to standard code, with structured parking to be developed, if parking is to exceed standard code.

Claudia Hanson, Planning and Engineering Manager, clarified the following changes: on page 86, a six-foot sidewalk would be required; on page 87, a four-foot sidewalk will be required from back of sidewalk to the front of the building; on page 92, change site plan review to special use permit; on page 116, standard code for parking will be added for restaurants, bars, and retail establishments; on page 117, parcels that are 300-feet in width or more shall provide a ten-foot wide pedestrian walkway or two six-foot wide pedestrian walkways; on page 118, the .25 FAR requirement from the Regional Plan and Master Plan will be added for the northern section of the South Virginia Street TOD; on page 120, the MSTC District Landscaping Table will be removed; on page 121, the RLM District

Reno City Planning Commission Meeting—Minutes

January 7, 2014

Page 15 of 20

Landscaping Standards Table will be removed; on page 124, the NVTC District Landscaping Table will be removed; and, on page 123, the E4TC District Landscaping Table will be removed.

Commissioner Weiske stated, for the record, that he was in agreement with the changes.

It was moved by Commissioner Reno, seconded by Commissioner Weiske, to recommend approval of TXT13-00005 (Amendment of TOD Standards) based upon compliance with the applicable findings and with the changes discussed. Commissioner Reno stated he could make all of the findings. Commissioner Weiske stated he could make all of the findings. The motion carried by a vote of 6-0.

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS/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 III, Public Comment, is heard at the beginning of this meeting.

1. TXT14-00002 (Time Extensions for Open Lot Parking) – This is a request to amend Reno Municipal Code Title 18, “Annexation and Land Development”, Chapter 18.08, “Zoning”, Section 18.08.202, entitled “Additional Regulations for Principal Uses,” to allow for a change to the length of time that may be granted for a time extension for open lot parking in the Downtown Reno Regional Center and the Redevelopment Districts, together with other matters properly relating thereto. kk/cch [All Wards] **(For Possible Action – Recommendation to City Council)**

This item was continued from the December 5, 2013 Public Hearing.

With a presentation slideshow, Claudia Hanson, Planning and Engineering Manager, reviewed parking lots in the downtown area with non-conforming improvements, insufficient maintenance, abandoned sites, or longevity. She stated standards for parking lots in the downtown area were being considered for the health of the Truckee River and to maintain the beauty of the downtown area for visitors and residents. Paving, without a permit, is no longer allowed. On page 14 of the ordinance, Ms. Hanson stated Commissioner Taylor had suggested at the last meeting to allow a permanent parking facility if landscaping is built to full standards. In paragraph two, five years was added with a request for an additional five years with additional landscaping requirements that may be needed, as determined by City Council. Ms. Hanson added Mr. Krater had requested that bonding for full landscaping be required during the five-year extension. At the end of the allowed time for temporary open lot parking, full landscape improvements will be required or the open lot parking site shall be removed. The site shall either be fenced or developed out.

At this time, Chairperson Coffman opened discussion to public comment.

Ken Krater commented on the importance of having parking in the downtown area for businesses. He agreed with requiring a bond for full landscaping, during the five-year extension, and the flexibility given to City Council.

Reno City Planning Commission Meeting—Minutes

January 7, 2014

Page 16 of 20

Seeing and hearing no further public comment requests, Chairperson Coffman closed public comment.

In response to Commissioner Reno's question, Claudia Hanson, Planning and Engineering Manager, reviewed how amendments would affect current open parking lot sites.

Commissioner Olivas asked what would be required that would revert the site back to vacant land.

Claudia Hanson, Planning and Engineering Manager, stated fencing would be required.

Commissioner Olivas commented that he was in support of requesting a bond at the five-year extension if no additional improvements would be required.

Commissioner Stapleton asked if the original intent was not to have open lot parking in the downtown area.

Claudia Hanson, Planning and Engineering Manager, replied not as a permanent use.

Commissioner Stapleton asked what direction was received from the City Council on this issue.

Claudia Hanson, Planning and Engineering Manager, stated it was to review the timing for temporary parking and standards for open lot parking.

Commissioner Stapleton questioned if direction was going towards having permanent open parking lots because the original intent was to allow for temporary parking lots on sites that were to be developed.

Claudia Hanson, Planning and Engineering Manager, clarified that was not the direction, but it could be direction from the Planning Commission to have structured parking or permanently landscaped, open lot parking.

Commissioner Stapleton commented she was not in favor of either suggestion, but that, if that is the direction of the Planning Commission, discussion should focus on where parking should be located so sites can be developed.

Commissioner Olivas stated he agreed with Commissioner Stapleton's comments, but that the City Council should determine policy.

Commissioner Stapleton noted one of the duties of the Planning Commission is to think about policy for the long term and not just about the criteria and details of code.

Commissioner Weiske agreed with Commissioner Stapleton's comments. He commented that a phasing plan is needed for development of temporary open parking lots, at the time of the five-year extension request, because open lot parking is not desirable for the downtown area.

Reno City Planning Commission Meeting—Minutes

January 7, 2014

Page 17 of 20

Chairperson Coffman asked for clarification that the only temporary open parking lot is at the courthouse.

Claudia Hanson, Planning and Engineering Manager, stated that parking lot is the only official site under this policy. The Siena parking lot is under a bond, but with the expansion of the Siena.

Chairperson Coffman asked about standards for temporary open parking lots.

Claudia Hanson, Planning and Engineering Manager, stated the lot must be constructed of asphalt or concrete or another approved surface by the engineer with street trees and lighting. No perimeter or interior landscaping is required.

Commissioner Weiske commented that drainage is also important to protect the Truckee River.

Claudia Hanson, Planning and Engineering Manager, added the Administrator will also send out a warning letter that a developer has nine months to pave dirt parking lots and to install landscaping and lighting, per permit requirements.

Commissioner Reno stated he agreed with Commissioner Weiske that a phasing plan should be in place at the five-year mark. The bonding should be to decommission the site and to not encourage a parking lot on the site.

Commissioner Olivas agreed.

Claudia Hanson, Planning and Engineering Manager, noted that, based on this direction, paragraph one would be stricken that allows parking lots to continue indefinitely and to only allow lots temporarily for five years by the Administrator, with a bond to restore the site and secure the property with a five-year extension request to City Council.

Commissioner Olivas stated, in his opinion, parking should be temporary with an upgrade to the standards at the five-year extension request for a more permanent structure with bonding to be used for decommission.

Claudia Hanson, Planning and Engineering Manager, stated street trees are a requirement for any type of development. She commented that she did not know the benefit of requiring additional landscaping at the five-year extension mark because it takes five years for plants to mature.

Ken Krater suggested the following language for the phasing plan: “Upon request for the time extension, a draft development plan shall be submitted with the application that includes a phasing plan.”

Commissioner Reno suggested a permanent parking lot may be an option for the City Council, as a phasing plan with bonding for decommission at the five-year extension mark.

Chairperson Coffman asked who sets the bond.

Reno City Planning Commission Meeting—Minutes

January 7, 2014

Page 18 of 20

Claudia Hanson, Planning and Engineering Manager, stated an estimate is required from a licensed professional.

Commissioner Weiske commented that he would not be in favor of allowing an indefinite parking lot, even if all landscaping requirements were met, as stated in paragraph one because it is a regional center. He suggested parking structures be built.

Commissioner Stapleton agreed with Commissioner Weiske. She suggested long-term planning include a review of the DRRC overall and the policy to determine if permanent or temporary parking should be included.

Claudia Hanson, Planning and Engineering Manager, clarified, removing paragraph one, would only allow the City Council to approve temporary parking for another five years and negates having a permanent parking lot in the phasing plan.

Commissioner Woosley asked for clarification that current parcels that are screened off would be required to have landscaping.

Claudia Hanson, Planning and Engineering Manager, replied not necessarily because each parcel is different. She provided some examples of parcels that are permitted, but not on the 10-year time frame for temporary parking.

Commissioner Woosley asked if paragraph one would begin the process for these parcels.

Claudia Hanson, Planning and Engineering Manager, replied no. It would be the same one way or another. Paragraph one determines the ultimate outcome in ten years.

Commissioner Stapleton stated there are two issues: 1) enforcement for some of the existing vacant lots; and 2) the lots that are being used and issued temporary permits for parking. She stated she would be in support of removing paragraph one and the changes for the bonding.

Claudia Hanson, Planning and Engineering Manager, noted there was also inclusion of an intent statement to not allow permanent parking lots in the downtown area.

Commissioner Stapleton asked if this information was currently in the DRRC.

Claudia Hanson, Planning and Engineering Manager, stated there are current policies that would support that intent.

It was moved by Commissioner Stapleton, seconded by Commissioner Weiske, to recommend approval of TXT14-00002 (Time Extensions for Open Lot Parking) based upon compliance with the applicable findings with the following changes: 1) the deletion of section one; 2) the addition of a bond for decommission at five years; 3) an intent statement preventing permanent parking; and 4) the addition of the word “applicant” before the word “developer” in paragraph three. Commissioner Stapleton stated she could make all of the findings. Commissioner Weiske stated he could make all of the findings. The motion carried by a vote of 6-0.

Reno City Planning Commission Meeting—Minutes

January 7, 2014

Page 19 of 20

X. TRUCKEE MEADOWS REGIONAL PLANNING LIAISON REPORT

Commissioner Weiske stated a meeting has not yet been held. The next meeting will be held on January 22, 2014.

XI. STAFF ANNOUNCEMENTS – 1. Report on status of Planning Division projects; 2. Announcement of upcoming training opportunities; 3. Report on status of responses to staff direction received at previous meetings; and 4. Report on actions taken by City Council on previous Planning Commission items.

Claudia Hanson, Planning and Engineering Manager, stated the TOD standards will be forwarded to the City Council. The follow-up to the Zoning Plan and Master Plan amendments will be presented to the Planning Commission in February 2014. The SouthEast Connector was approved by the City Council. The TOD Master Plan amendment was approved by the City Council and will be presented to Regional Planning later this month. She provided the following ward assignments to Planning Commissioners:

Chairperson Coffman – Ward Two
Commissioner Woosley – Ward Four
Commissioner Olivas – Ward Five
Commissioner Reno – Ward One
Commissioner Stapleton – Ward Three
Commissioner Taylor – Mayor’s Appointment
Commissioner Weiske – At Large

XII. COMMISSIONER'S SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS (For Possible Action)

Commissioner Weiske requested a discussion and debate regarding residential adjacency to 24-hour businesses or restaurants/bars. He also requested a discussion of project information that has been received in disk format or electronic format months in advance and if this information is still applicable or can be discarded.

XIII. PUBLIC COMMENT – This public comment item is to allow the public to provide general public comment and not for comment on individual action items contained on this Agenda.

None

XIV. ADJOURNMENT (For Possible Action)

There being no further business, meeting adjourned.

It was moved by Commissioner Reno, seconded by Commissioner Olivas, to adjourn the meeting. The motion carried by a vote of 6-0.

Reno City Planning Commission Meeting—Minutes

January 7, 2014

Page 20 of 20

**AS APPROVED BY THE RENO CITY PLANNING COMMISSION IN SESSION ON
FEBRUARY 5, 2014.**