Pledge of Allegiance

Chair Johnson led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Roll Call

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendee Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Arrived</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark Johnson</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Taylor</td>
<td>Vice Chair</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Gower</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Hawkins</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Marshall</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Olivas</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Velto</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The meeting was called to order at 6:04 PM.

Public Comment

None

Approval of Minutes  (For Possible Action)

4.1 Reno City Planning Commission - Regular - Apr 15, 2020 6:00 PM  (For Possible Action)  6:06 PM

Commissioner Gower requested a correction to Item 5.1. Kerry Rohmeier presented on behalf of the Washoe County Parks and Open Space Department but she is from the Tectonics Design Group.
It was moved by Commissioner Hawkins, seconded by Commissioner Gower, to approve the meeting minutes as amended. The motion carried unanimously with seven (7) commissioners present.

RESULT: ACCEPTED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER: Ed Hawkins, Commissioner
SECONDER: Peter Gower, Commissioner
AYES: Johnson, Taylor, Gower, Hawkins, Marshall, Olivas, Velto

5 Public Hearings

5.1 Staff Report (For Possible Action - Recommendation to City Council): Case No. TXT20-00005 (Skyway Design Guidelines Text Amendment) - A request has been made to amend the Reno Municipal Code Title 18, “Annexation and Land Development”, “Appendix B - Skyway Design Guidelines”. This amendment will specifically remove the Skyway Design Review Committee regulations, together with matters which pertain to or are necessarily connected therewith.

6:07 PM

Angela Fuss, Acting Community Development Director, presented information included in the staff report explaining why this text amendment was initiated.

Disclosures:

Commissioners Taylor, Gower and Marshall had no disclosures. Commissioner Hawkins spoke with Heidi Gansert. Commissioner Olivas received emails and corresponded with Heidi Gansert. Commissioner Velto spoke with people for and against this item. Chair Johnson received email and spoke with members of the public about this item.

Public Comment:

Lori Wray, Scenic Nevada, spoke in opposition of this item and expressed concern that eliminating the Skyway Committee would eliminate expert opinions and recommendations.

Mercedes del la Garza spoke in opposition of this item and discussed the need for the Design Review Committee.

Questions:

Commissioner Velto asked what it would take to create the Design Review Committee (DRC).
Ms. Fuss explained the process. There would be an application opening on our website and those applications would be provided to the Planners, Architects, Landscape Architects, Reno Planning Commission, and the Citizen Advisory Committee to the Redevelopment Group. Each of those groups would then submit a principle member and an alternate and City Council will chose who they want on the DRC.

Commissioner Velto asked how often the DRC would meet.

Ms. Fuss stated the DRC would only meet if there is a skyway project for them to review.

Commissioner Olivas asked what input the DRC has and how it impacts things upstream.

Ms. Fuss explained the DRC would review the application and forward comments to the Planning Commission. The DRC is not a voting committee.

Commissioner Olivas asked how the process would differ without comments from the DRC.

Ms. Fuss stated there is a public comment process so anyone can provide public comment on any of our projects.

Commissioner Taylor discussed the potential for DRC members to leave or move on during the years they have nothing to review and asked if the process to establish a DRC would need to be started all over.

Ms. Fuss stated most of our committees have term limits. In this case there is nothing in the code that specifies term limits. If we had formed this committee 20 years ago we would have to go back to that committee, see who was still around, and go through the process to replace any missing members.

Commissioner Taylor asked about a formal process for comments on any project.

Ms. Fuss confirmed that all public comment is recorded and passed on to the Planning Commission and City Council before their meetings.

Commissioner Gower asked why this was not filtered during the recent Title 18 update process.

Ms. Fuss discussed why certain sections of the code were not touched at all during that update.
Commissioner Gower asked if the DRC could be formed to review skyway projects as they come up and be disbanded between projects.

Ms. Fuss confirmed there is nothing in code on how the DRC is structured other than the makeup of who gets to recommend DRC members.

Commissioner Gower asked if it is staff's opinion that there is a level of expertise between staff, the Planning Commission, and City Council that would replace the intent for the expertise of the DRC.

Ms. Fuss explained that staff bases our review on the guidelines that have been established. Back in the 1990's when this was established they were looking for something that wasn't strict regulation or guidelines but had more of a design input. We do have planning commissioners and staff with design backgrounds.

Commissioner Gower stated we are assuming we will have the level of expertise going forward if we remove the DRC.

Chair Johnson stated the City Council agenda item for this was to review the requirements for establishing a DRC. There was no discussion at that City Council meeting about how to put the DRC together. He asked how it went from considering different ways to put this together to just eliminating it.

Ms. Fuss explained that when staff first caught this section of code we met with legal staff and the City Clerk and had a conversation about how committees are formed in the City of Reno and we put together a game plan. When we took it City Council we provided a possible resolution outlining the process if they decided to move forward with providing a DRC. The City Council decided not to move forward with that resolution and instead directed staff to move forward with this text amendment removing the DRC.

Chair Johnson stated there was an item on our Planning Commission agenda in March to put forth somebody for this DRC so at some point in time discussion was going on that was pulled without any reference to us.

Discussion:

Commissioner Hawkins discussed the issue of past assumptions by casinos that they own the street underneath their skyways. We need to stick with what was already laid down in 2000 and that is with the DRC because they would be the experts.

Commissioner Gower stated that City Council’s direction to staff to put something before
us to remove the DRC language is a little bit rushed. There needs to be a more comprehensive conversation in terms of whether there are other changes that need to be made to the code to give staff and the Planning Commission the tools to be able to evaluate skyways in the future. That's the kind of conversation there needs to be instead of just reacting to an application and coming up with a solution to remove the barrier to that application.

Commissioner Hawkins stated when the skyways first started going in they were to stay within the core of the downtown area and we're talking about going up to UNR. We need to look at what the code says now about where skyways are allowed.

Ms. Fuss explained there is a section of code that provides a map of where skyways are permitted and the location for the next agenda item is shown as an allowed location for a skyway.

Chair Johnson asked if there is a distinction in code between skyways and sky bridges in terms of where they are allowed.

Ms. Fuss stated she can go back and check but she believes they are all lumped into one category.

Commissioner Taylor asked about DRC recommendations and if they have any more weight than a regular public comment.

Ms. Fuss stated the intent was that a group of design professionals would review an application and provide comments. Those comments would be forwarded to the Planning Commission and City Council for their input. The DRC is not a voting committee. The idea is that they are a group of design professionals so they would be coming from a different perspective than somebody that doesn't have that accredited professional background. Their comments are forwarded and it is not a binding requirement that the Planning Commission move forward with those comments.

Commissioner Taylor asked if there are design standards for skyway bridges.

Ms. Fuss confirmed there are design guidelines.

Commissioner Velto stated it seems like it is a big hassle to put this DRC in place if it only meets once every 20 years. It seems like it might be difficult to maintain the DRC if they are not being used often. He also pointed out that if we were just to remove the language suggested in the text amendment, we would still be leaving the DRC duties in the code. If this is passed tonight, we would need to look at the other portions of the code
that mention the DRC and that makes me think we probably shouldn't do this yet until we ensure other portions of code don't conflict.

Commissioner Marshall stated this item brings to a point a number of different planning considerations. It really is a danger to make general policy on the back of a single project. We are basing a policy change on the demands of a single project and that policy has substantial effects in other areas of the city. The DRC is to provide input different than what you get from public comment. Skyways have a significant impact on the public and the DRC is designed to provide input on an incredibly design heavy section of code. The DRC is to provide recommendation, not just comments, to the Planning Commission and City Council. What is the basis upon which we are to make our decision in applying these particular provisions of the fairly technical design elements? He stated he would like to see the recommendation of a group of experts. Without it what are we to rely on? There is a reason why there is a recommendation from design professionals and if you deviate from those experts you need to have a basis for it, not just an arbitrary thing or because the process is inconvenient. I don't think we should deviate from the good policy that was adopted.

Commissioner Olivas stated he does not know that this is necessarily on the back of the project under the next agenda item. That project shined a light on this and it needs to be dealt with. He does not agree that the COVID crisis should be used as a reason to do this. That said, he thinks that a committee that hasn't met in 20 years and was never formed is pretty much irrelevant. We do need public input and expert input but to have a whole committee for something that happens once in 20 years, how many other committees are we going to have to have out there for everything else that happens only once every 20 years. We do need a process and I think this needs to fit into the existing general processes of the Planning Commission and City Council.

Commissioner Gower stated committees form subcommittees all the time to address specific topics. They can be formed and disbanded pretty quickly. He referred to Commissioner Velto’s comments and noted the DRC shows up in other places in the code and that is the perfect example of why we shouldn't be rushing this and we need to take a more comprehensive look at it. Maybe getting rid of the DRC is the right approach but just throwing it in as an amendment and saying yes or no is not only bad policy but bad planning and is doing a disservice to our community.

Chair Johnson stated that he almost feels personally slighted by the idea that this isn't seen as something that is important or that any public comment should be considered as having just as much weight as the recommendations of someone with professional qualifications. There is a lot of education and background and knowledge that goes into understanding the concepts that this code requires skyways to follow. It is a gross
injustice to the entire design community to say that anybody is able to make public comment and it's all incorporated into what's being done. There is a heavier weight whether it's a voting member or not to having that DRC review. The public should be better served by having as much expertise advice as possible. We should be looking at a more comprehensive review of this to integrate this appendix into the code clarifying what the DRC needs to be. To say we don't need professional expertise on this is the wrong way to go.

*It was moved by Commissioner Marshall, seconded by Commissioner Hawkins, in the case of TXT20-00005 (Skyway Design Guidelines Text Amendment) to recommend the City Council deny the text amendment. Motion carried with five (5) in favor and two (2) oppositions by Commissioners Taylor and Olivas.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULT:</th>
<th>APPROVED [5 TO 2]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOVER:</td>
<td>John Marshall, Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECONDER:</td>
<td>Ed Hawkins, Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYES:</td>
<td>Johnson, Gower, Hawkins, Marshall, Velto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAYS:</td>
<td>Kathleen Taylor, Paul Olivas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 Staff Report (For Possible Action - Recommendation to City Council): Case No. LDC20-00047 (Gateway Parking Complex – Skyway) - This is a request for a special use permit to construct a covered open air Skyway (pedestrian bridge) over 9th Street, connecting the UNR Gateway Parking Garage to the UNR Campus. The skyway crosses East 9th Street and spans between two parcels located to the west of Lake Street and east of North Center Street. The site is located within the Mixed Use/University of Nevada Regional Center/Academic and Research (MU/UNRC/AR), Mixed Use/University of Nevada Regional Center/Open Space and Mixed Use/University of Nevada Regional Center/Commercial (MU/UNRC/C) zoning districts. The site has a Master Plan land use designation of Public Quasi-Public (PQP). [Ward 5] 6:52 PM

Chair Johnson recused himself from this item.

**CHAIR JOHNSON ABSENT AT 7:17 PM.**

Francisco Navarro, WD Architecture & Engineering Project Manager, gave an overview of the project. Heidi Gansert, UNR Executive Director, External Relations, also gave an overview.

AnnMarie Lain, Assistant Planner, presented the staff report. Staff received one comment in favor and 11 comments in opposition. All comments received are included in the record.
Disclosures:

Commissioners Olivas, Hawkins, Velto, and Taylor disclosed that they visited the site, received emails, and spoke with the applicant's representative. Commissioners Gower and Marshall disclosed that they visited the site and received emails.

Public Comment:

Lori Wray, Scenic Nevada, spoke in opposition of the project.

_It was moved by Commissioner Marshall, seconded by Commissioner Gower, to continue this item until after City Council hears the text amendment question on the Skyway Design Guidelines. Motion carried with five (5) commissioners in favor and one (1) opposition by Commissioner Olivas._

RESULT: CONTINUED [5 TO 1]
MOVER: John Marshall, Commissioner
SECONDER: Peter Gower, Commissioner
AYES: Taylor, Gower, Hawkins, Marshall, Velto
NAYS: Paul Olivas
RECUSED: Mark Johnson

5.3 Staff Report (For Possible Action): Case No. LDC20-00053 (Golden Valley Commercial) - A request has been made for a special use permit for a commercial development that will include: 1) a mini-warehouse and a car wash; and 2) uses that operate between the hours of 11:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m. The ±9.62 acre site is located on the west side of East Golden Valley Road, and north of US Highway 395. The subject site is zoned Arterial Commercial (AC) and has a Master Plan land use designation of Suburban Mixed Use (SMU). [Ward 4] 7:46 PM

CHAIR JOHNSON PRESENT AT 7:45 PM.

Mike Railey, Christy Corporation, gave an overview of the project.

Heather Manzo, Associate Planner, presented the staff report. Staff received two comments. One was a general request for information on the project and the other expressing concern regarding 24-hour operation.

Disclosures:

Commissioners Taylor and Gower disclosed they received email. Commissioner Hawkins disclosed he visited the site and spoke with the applicant's representative. Commissioner...
Marshall disclosed he drove by the site and received email. Commissioners Olivas, Velto, and Johnson disclosed they visited the site and received email.

Public Comment:

None

_It was moved by Commissioner Hawkins, seconded by Commissioner Marshall, in the case of LDC20-00053 (Golden Valley Commercial), based upon compliance with applicable findings, to approve the special use permit, subject to conditions. Motion carried unanimously with seven (7) commissioners present._

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULT: APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOVER: Ed Hawkins, Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECONDER: John Marshall, Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYES: Johnson, Taylor, Gower, Hawkins, Marshall, Olivas, Velto</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4 Staff Report (For Possible Action): Case No. LDC20-00054 (Logisticenter 395 Phase 2 Condition Amendment) - A request has been made to amend Condition of Approval No. 25 associated with special use permit LDC18-00084 (Logisticenter 395 - Phase 2 Amendment to Conditions) to modify the allowed hours of operation for certain construction activities. The ±57.98 acre site is located east of Tholl Drive between Military Road and Lemmon Drive within the Industrial Commercial (IC) zoning district. The site has a Master Plan land use designation of Industrial (I). [Ward 4] 8:06 PM

Ken Krater, representing the applicant, gave an overview of the project.

Kyle Chisholm, Assistant Planner, presented the staff report. Staff received one phone call and one email with concerns that a sound wall was not installed on their section of Lemmon Drive. Mr. Chisholm stated those concerns have been addressed. The proposed amended hours for concrete pours is anticipated to reduce the overall impact to the area by reducing the total amount of time of construction.

Disclosures:

Commissioners Taylor, Gower, Marshall, Velto, and Johnson disclosed they visited or are familiar with the site. Commissioner Hawkins disclosed he visited the site and spoke with the applicant's representative. Commissioner Olivas disclosed he visited the site and received email.

Public Comment:
None

Questions:

Commissioner Marshall asked about the concrete pour hours.

Mr. Krater explained the reasoning for different concrete pour hours. The largest pours are the slab on grade and they take longer. The wall panels don't have as much concrete as the slab on grade. We tried to squeeze the hours down as much as possible to be able to complete the work before evening hours.

Commissioner Marshall asked about Condition No. 28.

Mr. Chisholm confirmed the sound wall is still a condition of approval and has been completed.

Discussion:

Chair Johnson expressed concern that they are modifying this for the final phase of the project but stated he does understand there is more early morning work in order to shorten the overall duration of construction.

Commissioner Marshall noted they had previous discussion of the number of days and times for pours to limit the noise for the neighbors and would rather not have to revisit these kinds of questions for a project unless there are compelling reasons to make changes.

Mr. Krater confirmed for Commissioner Olivas that OSHA requirements allow you to turn off the backup alarms if you have flaggers. We also have white noise devices in place that the neighbors can't hear that are very effective.

*It was moved by Commissioner Hawkins, seconded by Commissioner Taylor, in the case of LDC20-00054 (Logisticenter 395 Phase 2 Condition Amendment), based upon compliance with the applicable findings, to approve the amended special use permit, subject to conditions listed in the staff report. Motion carried unanimously with seven (7) commissioners present.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULT:</th>
<th>APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOVER:</td>
<td>Ed Hawkins, Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECONDER:</td>
<td>Kathleen Taylor, Vice Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYES:</td>
<td>Johnson, Taylor, Gower, Hawkins, Marshall, Olivas, Velto</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6 Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Liaison Report
Commissioner Gower reported the last meeting was cancelled. The next meeting will be in June.

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.

8:30 PM
Angela Fuss, Acting Community Development Director, reported on the following City Council action:

WCSD zone change was approved by City Council. The Sharlands PUD Amendment was approved by City Council. The Mountain View Mixed Residential special use permit was appealed and went to Council last week. It was continued to June 3, 2020 so the applicant and adjacent property owners association could work out a pedestrian connection.

Ms. Fuss also reported the following staffing changes:

Acting City Manager - Police Chief Soto
Acting Assistant City Manager - Arlo Stockham
Acting Community Development Manager and Planning Manager - Angela Fuss

8 Commissioner's Suggestions for Future Agenda Items (For Possible Action)
None

9 Public Comment
None

10 Adjournment (For Possible Action)
The meeting was adjourned at 8:32 p.m.