AGENDA

Regular Meeting

Reno City Planning Commission

Wednesday, January 15, 2020 ● 6:00 PM

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

Commissioners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commissioner</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark Johnson</td>
<td>326-8864</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Taylor</td>
<td>326-8859</td>
<td>John Marshall</td>
<td>326-8863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Gower</td>
<td>326-8860</td>
<td>Paul Olivas</td>
<td>326-8861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Hawkins</td>
<td>326-8862</td>
<td>Alex Velto</td>
<td>326-8858</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Posting: This agenda has been physically posted in compliance with NRS 241.020(3)(notice of meetings) at Reno City Hall – One East First Street, Washoe County Downtown Reno Library – 301 South Center Street, Evelyn Mount Northeast Community Center – 1301 Valley Road, McKinley Arts and Culture Center – 925 Riverside Drive, Reno Municipal Court – One South Sierra Street, Washoe County Administration Building – 1001 East 9th Street and Reno-Sparks Convention and Visitors Authority – 4001 South Virginia Street, Suite G. In addition, this agenda has been electronically posted in compliance with NRS 241.020(3) at http://www.reno.gov, and NRS 232.2175 at https://notice.nv.gov/.

Accommodation: Reasonable efforts will be made to assist and accommodate physically disabled persons attending the meeting. Please contact the Community Development Department at (775) 334-2576 in advance so that arrangements can be made.

Support Materials: Staff reports and supporting material for the meeting are available at the City Clerk's Office. Please contact Ashley D. Turney, City Clerk, 1 East 1st Street, Reno, NV 89505, (775) 334-2030; turneya@reno.gov. Staff reports and supporting materials are also available on the City's website at http://www.reno.gov/meetings. Pursuant to NRS 241.020(6), supporting material is made available to the general public at the same time it is provided to the Planning Commission.

Order of Agenda: A time listed next to a specific agenda item indicates that the specific item will not be heard before that time – it does not indicate the time schedule of any other items. Items on the agenda may be taken out of order and the public body may combine two or more agenda items for consideration. The Planning Commission may remove an item from the agenda or delay discussion relating to an item on the agenda at any time.

Public Comment: A person wishing to address the Reno City Planning Commission shall submit a “Request to Speak” form to the Secretary. Public comment, whether on action items or general public comment, is limited to three (3) minutes per person. Unused time may not be reserved by the speaker, nor allocated to another speaker. No action may be taken on a matter raised under general public comment until the matter is included on an agenda as an item on which action may be taken. The presiding officer may prohibit comment if the content of the comments is a topic that is not relevant to, or within the authority of, the Planning Commission, or if the content is willfully disruptive of the meeting by being irrelevant, repetitious, slanderous, offensive, inflammatory, irrational or amounting to personal attacks or interfering with the rights of other speakers. Any person making willfully disruptive remarks while addressing the Reno City Planning Commission or while attending the Reno City Planning Commission meeting may be removed from the room by the presiding officer, and the person may be barred from further audience before the Reno City Planning Commission during that session of the Reno City Planning Commission.
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Commission. See, Nevada Attorney General Opinion No. 00-047 (April 27, 2001); Nevada Open Meeting Law Manual, § 8.05.

Appeal Process: Any final action (not including recommendations) or failure to take action by the Planning Commission may be appealed to the Reno City Council by the applicant, the Mayor or a City Council Member, or any person who is "aggrieved" by the action or inaction. An appeal (together with fees) must be filed with the City Clerk within ten calendar days starting on the day after written notice of the action is filed with the City Clerk, and if the tenth calendar day falls on a weekend or holiday when the Clerk's office is not open, the appeal may be filed on the next business day.

Watch Meetings: Planning Commission meetings are streamed online when the Commission is in session in Council Chamber at http://www.reno.gov/meetings and broadcast on Charter Channel 194.

1 Pledge of Allegiance

2 Roll Call

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

4 Approval of Minutes (For Possible Action)

4.1 Reno City Planning Commission - Regular - Dec 18, 2019 6:00 PM (For Possible Action)

5 Presentation by Washoe County Health on Air Quality Regulations and Management

6 Public Hearings - (Items scheduled to be heard at a specific time will be heard no earlier than the stated time, but may be heard later.) 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.

6.1 Staff Report (For Possible Action): Case No. LDC20-00002 (Verdi Boat and RV Storage) - A request has been made for special use permits to allow: 1) recreational vehicle storage (mini-warehouse) to be constructed in Community Commercial zoning and; 2) nonresidential development adjacent to residential zoned property; 3) extended hours of operation between 11:00 pm and 6:00 am. The ±3.9 acre site is located ±25 feet northeast of the intersection of Interstate 80-Exit 2 and Orange Post Road. The site is zoned Community Commercial (CC) and has a Master Plan land use designation of Suburban Mixed-Use (SMU). The project is located within the Cooperative Planning Area (CPA) overlay zoning district. bjo [Ward 5]
7 Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Liaison Report

8 Staff Announcements

8.1 Report on status of Planning Division projects.
8.2 Announcement of upcoming training opportunities.
8.3 Report on status of responses to staff direction received at previous meetings.
8.4 Report on actions taken by City Council on previous Planning Commission items.

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

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

11 Adjournment (For Possible Action)

IF THE MEETING GOES BEYOND 11:00 PM, THE PLANNING COMMISSION MAY POSTPONE REMAINING ITEMS.
MINUTES
Regular Meeting
Reno City Planning Commission
Wednesday, December 18, 2019 ● 6:00 PM
Reno City Council Chamber, One East First St, Reno, NV 89501

Commissioners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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>326-8864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Taylor</td>
<td>Vice Chair</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>326-8859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Gower</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>326-8860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Hawkins</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>326-8862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Marshall</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>326-8863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Olivas</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>326-8861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Velto</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>326-8858</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Pledge of Allegiance
Commissioner Taylor led the Pledge of Allegiance.

2 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 6:14 PM.

3 Public Comment
None

4 Approval of Minutes (For Possible Action)

4.1 Reno City Planning Commission - Regular - Nov 7, 2019 6:00 PM (For Possible Action)

It was moved by Commissioner Gower, seconded by Commissioner Taylor, to approve the meeting minutes. The motion carried with six (6) in favor and one (1) abstention by Commissioner Marshall.
RESULT: ACCEPTED [6 TO 0]
MOVER: Peter Gower, Commissioner
SECONDER: Kathleen Taylor, Vice Chair
AYES: Johnson, Taylor, Gower, Hawkins, Olivas, Velto
ABSTAIN: John Marshall

5 Public Hearings - (Items scheduled to be heard at a specific time will be heard no earlier than the stated time, but may be heard later.)

5.1 Staff Report (For Possible Action - Recommendation to City Council): Case No. LDC20-00020 (Double Diamond U-Haul Moving and Storage) - A request has been made for a special use permit to allow for the construction of a three story ±62,017 square foot building for the establishment of a mini-warehouse and automobile/truck/equipment rental use. The ±2.51 acre site is located on the east side of South Virginia Street, ±650 feet south of its intersection with South Meadows Parkway. The site is zoned Mixed Use/South Virginia Street Transit Corridor (MU/SVTC) and has a Master Plan land use designation of Suburban Mixed-Use (SMU). [Ward 2] 6:16 PM

Christopher Piedra, applicant, gave an overview of the project.

Brook Oswald, Associate Planner, presented the staff report.

The commissioners present disclosed that they visited or are familiar with the site.

Public Comment: There were no requests to speak.

Mr. Oswald answered questions from Commissioner Marshall regarding access on Old Virginia.

Mr. Oswald explained for Commissioner Marshall staff feels the secondary access is appropriate and did not push the applicant to consolidate on N. Virginia.

It was moved by Commissioner Hawkins, seconded by Commissioner Gower, in the case of LDC20-00020 (Double Diamond U-Haul Moving and Storage), based upon compliance with the applicable findings, to approve the special use permits, subject to conditions. The motion carried unanimously with seven (7) commissioners present.

RESULT: APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER: Ed Hawkins, Commissioner
SECONDER: Peter Gower, Commissioner
AYES: Johnson, Taylor, Gower, Hawkins, Marshall, Olivas, Velto
5.2 Staff Report (For Possible Action): Case No. LDC20-00003 (Stan Lucas' Mortensen Ranch) – A request has been made for: 1) a tentative map for a 676 lot single family residential subdivision; and 2) special use permits for: a) grading that results in cuts greater than 20 feet in depth and fills greater than ten feet in height; b) hillside development; and c) disturbance of major drainageways. The ±955 acre site is located north of Highway 40 West and to the west of Del Webb Parkway and has base zoning designations of Single Family Residential – 6,000 Square Feet (SF6) and Open Space (OS) within the Mortensen Garson Overlay District (MGOD). The site has Master Plan land use designations of Single Family Neighborhood (SF) and Parks, Greenways, and Open Space (PGOS) and is within the Mortensen-Garson Neighborhood Plan. 

Derek Wilson, Rubicon Design Group, gave an overview of the project and proposed changes to Condition No. 8 to remove only some of the lots listed in that condition.

Angela Fuss, Planning Manager, presented the staff report including a history of the Mortensen-Garson Overlay District (MGOD). The project location is bound by Somersett on the east and by West Meadows on the south so it is surrounded by city development and services. She also reviewed the conceptual zoning boundaries. The applicant feels the proposed zoning meets the design criteria. The staff presentation includes information on discussion items brought up as areas of concern by the public.

Disclosures:
The commissioners present disclosed that they visited the site, met with adjacent homeowners, received and read emails, spoke with the applicant’s representative, and/or are familiar with the site.

Public Comment:
The following people expressed concerns and spoke in opposition of the project: Parry Theriot; Pam McNeil; Dennis Kuhns; Colleen Cassidy; Ken McNeil; Jeanette Lynn; Charles Fasso; Frank Leto; Martin Markee; Jean Graham; Heidi Evans; Dennis Grabb; Gideon Caplovitz; Emanuela Heller-MacNeilage; Susan Alesevich; Addie Argyris; Joan Hjerpe; Joseph Callahan; Vernon Anderson; Carly Borchard; Chance Reading; Alice House; Erika White. Dee Ann Radcliff submitted a comment card in opposition but was not present to speak.

Comment cards in opposition were submitted by 37 people who did not wish to speak.

(Chair Johnson called a recess at 8:09 p.m. The meeting was called back to order at 8:21 p.m.)

Chair Johnson stated two more comment cards in opposition were received during the
recess. All comment cards will be scanned and will be available for public record.

Commissioner Velto stated he understands the explanation of going to the expired handbook when there is ambiguity in code, but requested clarification regarding what part of code staff feels is ambiguous.

Ms. Fuss explained the zoning boundary is not clearly defined. Going back to the history and intent of the handbook, staff found the boundaries were supposed to be delineate and defined at the time of tentative map.

Commissioner Marshall asked if there was anything in the record when the master plan was adopted indicating the zoning boundaries were just conceptual.

Ms. Fuss responded no, and explained the MGOD is the guiding zoning document while the master plan is the policy level document. At a policy level we do not get into discussion regarding boundaries, it is more of a big picture policy document and the detail is in the MGOD.

Commissioner Marshall stated the zoning boundary map is attached to the neighborhood plan supplement of the master plan. The city adopted that without any distinction that this was anything but straight up zoning. He asked if there was any distinction made at the time of adoption that these zones could be changed without going through the zoning map or land use designation process.

Ms. Fuss responded that goes back to the history of this project. When the zoning boundaries were identified in the MGOD, they referenced the handbook.

Commissioner Marshall summarized the answer is no, there was nothing to indicate that this was anything but standard zoning. He also asked where the ambiguity is that would cause staff to treat this differently than any other map or zone change.

Arlo Stockham, Community Development Director, explained the ambiguity is specifically the section that talks about the “maximum density for each property may only exceed or change from those shown consistent with the following”. It doesn't call out the edge of the zoning map like the handbook does but at the same time the MGOD references the handbook, which was clear in its intent that the changes should be done through the tentative map process.

Commissioner Marshall state if there was a change in density proposed then he could see maybe there is some ambiguity about densities, but they are not proposing a change in density. There is nothing that would trigger an amendment based on wanting to change
the density within the MGOD, that's not what's happening. He expressed concern regarding setting a precedent. What's happening here is we are being asked to allow a change in zoning to a tentative map not because of anything actually in the assigned zone but because of some prior document that wasn't adopted.

Mr. Stockham clarified this is an interpretation of existing code and the MGOD.

Derek Wilson, Rubicon Design Group, stated they designed their plan to use the accessible areas of the property.

Commissioner Taylor asked legal counsel what their intent was in providing direction on this instead of going to a master plan amendment.

Mr. McKean, Deputy City Attorney, explained staff was looking to resolve the question of are these boundaries in the MGOD exact locations or are they intended to be changed. One interpretation is the yellow area actually is the zoning; another interpretation is it really isn't telling you lots so it is not final zoning. When you look at the handbook you see that it was expressly contemplated that the locations will be made exact at the time of tentative map.

Commissioner Gower explained the concern of the Planning Commission is not that the development needs to be constrained to the yellow areas, the concern is that we are missing a piece of the puzzle in a process we normally go through. He asked staff if they considered an option that included going through a zoning map amendment and if that was considered, why did they decide not to go through that process.

Mr. Stockham confirmed staff did consider it. It was a difficult issue, there was confusion on the language and it could be easily interpreted in different ways so staff talked it over and part of that research was looking at the legislative history that Mr. McKean mentioned. That history was clear on the intent being for these to be refined, and that really is consistent with sound master planning on large projects like this. Because of the grey area in the current language, the legislative history, and to some extent that this is a preferable plan compared to where the land use bubbles are now, that is where the team collectively interpreted that it would appropriately be addressed through the tentative map process and public hearing we are having now.

Commissioner Gower expressed concern that when we typically see developments like this, we want to be transparent in our process, and when we look at these sizes of developments we look at if there is going to be a change. He asked why we did not take the transparent, public facing route and go through the zone change request process in addition to what we are looking at tonight.
Mr. Stockham responded either option is for the decision to be made at a public hearing through a public process like we are having today. Staff has a range of discretion as planners. What the documents say and what is required is what establishes our range of discretion. It became clear upon review the intent was to refine it through the tentative map or special use process and we had to pick one or the other and this is what the team decided the documents called for.

Commissioner Gower asked if it has to be one or the other or if it can be zoning map plus tentative map.

Mr. Stockham explained if the city decides differently, that this language does not allow the adjustment through the tentative map process, it would be both a master plan amendment process and zoning map amendment process; and a secondary process for the tentative map like we are doing right now. It would necessarily be both if the city ends up interpreting it the other way.

Commissioner Velto asked if it is possible for the allotment in this area to fit within the yellow area.

Mr. Wilson stated they have not done that study. He also stated they felt their mandate was to design to the code and use the most accessible, developable area of the property.

Commissioner Velto explained he is trying to see if there is another reason it was ambiguous and if it is impossible to fit the maximum allotment within that area.

Tom Gallagher, Summit Engineering, stated the simple answer is yes. This area did not have legal descriptions around the zoning bubbles. With the flexibility built into the handbook we knew we could adjust the zoning bubbles.

Commissioner Velto stated it is clear in the MGOD handbook that locations of the zoning boundaries will be defined in subsequent tentative maps so why did that not follow through to code.

Mr. Stockham explained this was at the depth of the recession and Reno had just laid off a third of its staff. It may have been an over site and more clear language probably should have been put in the code. It is no fault of the applicant.

Stephen Mollath, attorney for the developer, responded to Commissioner Velto's question providing a history of the settlement agreement and the MGOD.
Commissioner Taylor asked how so many people have 470 lots in their mind.

Mr. Mollath explained 470 was not part of what was going on in 2004. The first time he heard about it was a week ago.

Mr. Gallagher explained 470 came from a conceptual layout that was done during the whole process but he does not know how it got to be the number everyone has in their head. A former planner on the project and one of my staff members and the current owner went through numerous iterations on this property because it is a very difficult site and that was probably one of them. The actual density for the MGOD has always been the number that is in the design standards.

Paul Solaegui explained for Commissioner Marshall the calculations for the two access roads through West Meadows.

Mike Mischel, Engineering Manager, explained for Commissioner Marshall the reason for Condition No. 16. He confirmed if the flow gauges hit a certain percent they are obligated to upsize the interceptors.

Ms. Fuss explained for Commissioner Velto how the fire services fee was calculated. The fee is not to be used for manpower but to build a fire station. She also confirmed that the fee can be recalculated if needed. If development does not come to full fruition within ten years and the fire station does not get built, the money can go back to the developer.

Mr. Stockham confirmed for Commissioner Velto from staff's perspective it is workable to include some sort of periodic check-in to monitor how the area is building out and if we are not getting the full amount of development to raise funds for a fire station, the fee can be adjusted.

Ms. Fuss confirmed the applicant is agreeable to that.

Tray Palmer, Fire Marshal, explained for Commissioner Hawkins in the case of a fire people would use one of three access points to get out. He also explained the slopes of the roads have to fall in line with the International Fire Code or we would not approve it during the building phase.

Mr. Palmer demonstrated for Chair Johnson the access routes from the proposed fire station location to this development. He explained the response time from that site has not been calculated. It would most likely be over six minutes and that is why we are requiring fire sprinklers in the development.
Mr. Palmer explained for Commissioner Gower the city will pay for infrastructure and staffing of a fire station through the normal budget cycle with funds from tax revenue. He also explained Station 19 in Somersett is a first response for medical not fire. He confirmed the minimum staffing there is due to a funding issue. The Somersett station currently has wild land fire infrastructure and the proposed new station would have similar equipment.

Ms. Fuss confirmed for Commissioner Hawkins there is an existing pipeline and an easement for that pipeline extending into the Somersett property.

Mr. Mischel explained for Commissioner Hawkins the condition for a developer to have a sewer flow test done to determine what upgrades need to take place. He confirmed the same condition would apply for any development to the west.

Ms. Fuss explained for Commissioner Taylor the MGOD is unique in that it came to be through a court settlement agreement. Typically a big development is done through a Planned Unit Development (PUD).

Ms. Fuss explained code for the drainageways and crossings for Commissioner Taylor. She confirmed that the applicant let staff know yesterday about their request to modify Condition No. 8 hoping to keep the lots on the west side of the ridgeline. Staff is still recommending the current condition language.

Ms. Fuss explained for Commissioner Taylor the ridgeline map was part of the handbook and identifies two ridgelines as being significant in planning area one.

Ms. Fuss confirmed for Commissioner Taylor that if the handbook identified a different definition of ridgelines or identified them on a different map, that would give us the ability to go back and look at intent. The MGOD specifically identifies this map and it identifies standards that have to be maintained if developing on a significant ridgeline. Staff came up with conditions that we feel meets the intent of the code and that would protect the neighbors to the adjacent east. She also confirmed we have a clear map that identifies significant ridgelines.

Ms. Angela explained for Commissioner Gower that staff has a map that was developed in 2005 that identifies city-wide ridgelines.

Mr. Stockham explained for Commissioner Gower the multilevel analysis that was used in identifying which ridgelines are considered significant. Ultimately, what is adopted in code city-wide is a specific map and standard talking about ridgeline protection referencing this map. It does not strictly prohibit development on ridgelines. Due to the
combination of factors of site analysis and sensitivity to neighbors, staff felt it was appropriate in this tentative map to recommend protection of ridgelines a little above and beyond what is strictly required by code.

Robert Gelu, Summit Engineering, demonstrated for Commissioner Taylor the areas with slopes over 30% on the site. There are only around 20 lots planned in those areas.

Mr. Wilson answered questions from Chair Johnson regarding emergency access points.

Mr. Gelu confirmed for Chair Johnson the grades are per City Design Manual.

John Enloe, Truckee Meadows Water Authority (TMWA), explained for Chair Johnson the applicant requested a discovery process where we identify what facilities are required and the estimated cost. The infrastructure required to extend water service to this development is significant. There is not capacity available today to serve this project. If we started today it would be 2-3 years to get any water service to this area. He also answered questions regarding a future line route.

Mr. Enloe confirmed for Commissioner Gower there is a small waterline improvement that comes in from Somersett but the majority of the capacity is coming out US40.

Mr. Enloe explained for Chair Johnson they provide as much connectivity as they can to the existing system for redundancy. He also clarified it is surface water the applicant is proposing to dedicate for service.

Ms. Fuss explained for Commissioner Hawkins the applicant cannot get a final map unless they have a will serve letter from TMWA. She confirmed construction cannot begin unless they have the ability to provide water.

Ms. Fuss confirmed for Commissioner Taylor the applicant is conditioned to submit and get approval on a wildlife mitigation plan through NDOW.

Tara Smaltz, NDOT, confirmed for Chair Johnson that a traffic impact study was provided to NDOT by Paul Solaegui. The study did include analysis of the existing roundabout and in the year 2039 it is projected to meet adequate level of service.

Ms. Smaltz confirmed for Chair Johnson NDOT recognizes the bike path as being a well-used bike path. She believes there were accommodations made for bicyclists but they would have to look back at the existing permit for the roundabout. NDOT is expecting that the proposed developer would mitigate any impacts to the NDOT road network.
Ms. Fuss explained for Chair Johnson the traffic report does recommend changes to the intersection to add left turn lanes.

Commissioner Taylor asked about a Summit Engineering map referencing 470 lots that was submitted with Ward 5 NAB comments.

Ms. Fuss noted that map was not submitted to the City and no application was made for 470 lots.

Mr. Gallagher explained the map was probably one of the original iterations between when the zoning bubbles were drawn and the map we have submitted for approval.

Commissioner Taylor asked how the number of lots went from 470 to 676.

Fred Altmann, representing Mr. Lucas, explained the preliminary process and explained there have been several different maps and the one referencing 470 lots happened to be the one used as a starting point at that particular NAB meeting. When Mr. Lucas had the property he eventually decided he wanted to have the maximum amount of lots allowed at the time of the settlement agreement.

Ms. Fuss explained for Commissioner Gower which lots are referenced in Condition No. 13 requiring a minimum of 50 trees to be planted in a buffer area.

(Commissioner Marshall absent at 10:03 p.m. Commissioner Marshall present at 10:04 p.m.)

Commissioner Velto expressed concern regarding an appearance of dishonesty when the applicant's team acted like they had no idea about where the number of 470 lots came from.

Mr. Wilson explained it would have been more advantageous if Mr. Altmann spoke first as he did work on the map referencing the 470 lots and others on the team who spoke first did not.

Commissioner Gower expressed appreciation for the work done by city staff. He expressed concern that we have a zoning map that is part of our master plan that was adopted and there was no disclaimer associated with it. He was also concerned we didn't take the extra step to go through the process of a master plan and zoning map amendment. The findings are different for a zoning map and a master plan amendment than they are for a tentative map and an SUP so they have different considerations.
Commissioner Taylor stated she respects the City of Reno and staff but she cannot make some of the findings for the tentative map and SUP. A lot more time needs to go into this.

Commissioner Olivas stated the applicant is trying to stick with 676 lots and flexing the bubbles and it is too much to reconcile. He cannot make the finding e.

Commissioner Marshall stated we can't sidestep the standard zone change process. If we accept the staff recommendation, that means the entire MGOD can be rezoned via tentative map and that is a significant deviation from standard practice.

Commissioner Velto stated he struggles to get to ambiguity which means it's difficult to look to any other documents.

Commissioner Hawkins stated he agrees with fellow commissioners. He cannot make tentative map findings b, c, d, and j; special use permit finding c; and special use permit for hillside development findings a and c.

Chair Johnson stated he cannot make findings c, h and j.

It was moved by Commissioner Hawkins, seconded by Commissioner Marshall, in the case of LDC20-00003 (Stan Lucas' Mortensen Ranch), based upon non-compliance with the applicable findings, to deny the tentative map and special use permits. The motion carried unanimously with seven (7) commissioners present.

Chair Johnson read the appeal process into the record.

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

6 Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Liaison Report
Commissioner Gower reported the Silver Hills project was heard at a meeting last week and was found not in conformance with the Regional Plan. The next meeting will be held on January 24, 2020.

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.
10:37 PM

Arlo Stockham, Community Development Director, reported the following City Council actions: approved an annexation request uphill of a proposed Westview subdivision; approved abandonment of a small segment of Lake Street south of UNR; first tentative map for StoneGate was approved.

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

None

9 Public Comment

Pam McNeil thanked the commissioners for listening.

10 Adjournment (For Possible Action)

The meeting was adjourned at 10:40 p.m.
6.1. Staff Report (For Possible Action): Case No. LDC20-00002 (Verdi Boat and RV Storage) - A request has been made for special use permits to allow: 1) recreational vehicle storage (mini-warehouse) to be constructed in Community Commercial zoning and; 2) nonresidential development adjacent to residential zoned property; 3) extended hours of operation between 11:00 pm and 6:00 am. The ±3.9 acre site is located ±25 feet northeast of the intersection of Interstate 80- Exit 2 and Orange Post Road. The site is zoned Community Commercial (CC) and has a Master Plan land use designation of Suburban Mixed-Use (SMU). The project is located within the Cooperative Planning Area (CPA) overlay zoning district.

From: Brook Oswald, Associate Planner

Ward #: 5
Case No.: LDC20-00002
Applicant: Verdi Boat and RV Storage
APN Number: 038-230-15
Request: A request has been made for special use permits to allow: 1) recreational vehicle storage (mini-warehouse) to be constructed in Community Commercial zoning; 2) nonresidential development adjacent to residential zoned property and; 3) extended hours of operation between 11:00 pm and 6:00 am.

Location: The ±3.9 acre site is located ±25 feet northeast of the intersection of Interstate 80- Exit 2 and Orange Post Road. The site is zoned Community Commercial (CC) and has a Master Plan land use designation of Suburban Mixed-Use (SMU). The project is located within the Cooperative Planning Area (CPA) overlay zoning district.

Proposed Motion: Based upon compliance with the applicable findings, I move to approve the special use permit subject to conditions.
**Recommended Conditions of Approval:**

All conditions shall be met to the satisfaction of Community Development Department staff, unless otherwise noted.

1. The project shall comply with all applicable City codes, plans, reports, materials, etc., as submitted. In the event of a conflict between said plans, reports, materials and City codes, City codes in effect at the time the application is submitted, shall prevail.

2. The applicant shall apply for all building permits for the project within 18 months from the date of final approval, and continuously maintain the validity of those permits, or this approval shall be null and void.

3. The applicant, developer, builder, property owner, or business proprietor, as applicable, shall continuously maintain a copy of this approval letter on the project site during the construction and operation of the project/business. The project approval letter shall be posted or made readily available upon demand by City staff.

4. Prior to the issuance of any building permit and/or business license, the applicant shall attach a copy of the final approval letter. The approval letter shall accompany a narrative provided by the applicant that describes how the requested permit addresses each of the approved conditions of approval.

5. Prior to the issuance of any permit, excluding grading, the applicant shall have plans approved that include adequate emergency access to the site and adjacent sites including, but not limited to, the installation of an emergency access gate with a Knox Key Switch, Knox Vault, or other approved method of emergency access, to the approval of the Fire Department and Community Development Department.

6. Prior to any permit for Site Improvements, excluding grading, the applicant shall provide, for review and approval, an operations and maintenance manual for all onsite Private Storm Drain Infrastructure. The manual must provide details needed to conduct ongoing inspection and maintenance to the facilities after project completion. The manual, along with ongoing maintenance and inspection reports shall be kept up to date and available for City review and inspection.

7. Prior to a permit for Site Improvements, the applicant shall obtain all necessary permits and approvals from the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT). Plans shall illustrate, using turning templates, that recreational vehicles, including
trailered vehicles can safely access frontage roads and Interstate 80 on and off ramps in the immediate vicinity of the project site.

8. Construction hours shall be limited to between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m., Monday through Friday and between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on Saturday. There shall be no construction on Sundays, excluding dust control and Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan measures. Large concrete pours may be allowed outside of standard construction hours with a plan to minimize impacts on existing residences, subject to the Administrator approval.

9. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall have plans approved demonstrating that all exterior site lighting will utilize state of the art certified dark skies lighting techniques; and will comply with the lighting standards in the residential adjacency portion of code [Reno Municipal Code (RMC) 18.12.304(e)] regarding pole height, fixture shielding, directing light downward, light spill containment and provision of a site lighting photometric plan.

10. Prior to the issuance of any permit, excluding grading, the applicant shall have plans approved demonstrating all metal and roof materials have a non-reflective finish.

Summary: This is a request to construct a mini-warehouse/boat and recreational vehicle (RV) storage facility consisting of ±77 storage areas under canopies located on ±2.6 acre portion of a ±3.9 acre vacant site (Exhibit A). The proposed project is not anticipated to have a negative impact on existing adjacent residential uses due to the low-intensity nature of the mini-warehouse use. The site has been designed and conditioned to mitigate impacts by limiting building height to 17 feet, reducing signage height, and incorporating solid screening around the entire project consisting of a combination of walls and landscape buffers.

Per Reno Municipal Code (RMC) 18.08.201 (Permitted Uses by Base Zone District), the establishment of a mini-warehouse facility within the Community Commercial (CC) zoning district requires approval of a special use permit. A special use permit is required for nonresidential development located adjacent to residentially zoned property per RMC 18.06.405 (Special Use Permit). The facility proposes to allow 24 hour a day access and requires a special use permit for hours of operation between the hours of 11:00 pm and 6:00 am.

Analysis: Reno Municipal Code requires that SUP findings a through h must be made in order to approve this request. The following is an analysis of each of the required SUP findings as they relate to the proposal:
a. The proposed use is compatible with existing surrounding land uses and development.

Land uses, Master Plan designations, and zoning districts surrounding the site are shown in the table below. Surrounding uses include: Interstate 80/exit ramp 2 and a casino to the west; a detached single-family residence (30 feet from the project site) to the north; the Truckee River and detached single-family residences (500 feet from the project site) to the east; and a vacant commercial building and detached single-family residences (625 feet from project site) to the south.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LAND USE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mini-warehouses are relatively low intensity uses that are generally compatible with various other uses. The proposed storage facility will be gate restricted and is proposed to be accessible to renters 24 hours a day. Security of the site will be provided through a video monitoring system with cameras placed throughout the site. Mini-warehouses are also further regulated by RMC 18.08.202(f)(13) (Additional Regulations for Mini-Warehouse) that prohibit activities including, but not limited to, operating additional businesses within the storage units, using power tools or similar equipment, and conducting auction sales. As proposed, the use is consistent with the surrounding area. The proposed site and building design in relation to adjacent uses and the surrounding area is further discussed under finding e.

The Cooperative Planning Area Overlay District (CPA) provides consistent development standards in areas subject to cooperative planning, as identified in the City of Reno Master Plan. The applicant will be required to meet applicable standards per RMC Section 18.08.404. (CPA Cooperative Planning Area Overlay District). As proposed and with conditions, the project conforms to the requirements.
b. The project is in substantial conformance with the Master Plan.

The subject site has a Suburban Mixed-Use Master Plan land use designation. As proposed and with recommended conditions, the project appears to be in conformance with the following applicable Master Plan goals and policies:

- City Wide Policy 2.1C: Level of Service Targets – Varies for different services and facilities (Growth Tier Priority 4)
- City Wide Policy 6.1A: Fire and Medical Emergency Response – Utilize private fire protection measures.
- Area Specific Policy C-SC.2: Relationship of Uses – Support a combination of horizontally mixed uses and vertically mixed uses based on market demand…recognizing in many locations single-use developments will continue to function independently;
- Area Specific Policy C-SC.14: Relationship to Adjacent Neighborhoods – Provide a gradual transition in building height and mass along the edge that is shared with adjacent neighborhoods;
- Area Specific Policy C-GC.1: Relationship to Truckee River – Retain a 50 foot buffer along the river.
- Area Specific Policy SD.19: Light Pollution – Employ the use of shielded light fixtures and other techniques for reducing light trespass, sky-glow, and other forms of light pollution generated on a site.

c. There are or will be adequate services and infrastructure to support the proposed development.

Public Safety: The Reno Police Department (RPD) provided a Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) report (Exhibit B) noting that the proposed site design implements standard CPTED recommendations related to natural surveillance and access control through the use of a single point of entry. RPD recommended that site lighting should be designed in a manner that is sufficient to provide natural surveillance of the property. At the time of permit, the applicant will provide a site lighting plan that demonstrates lighting is provided that is in conformance with RMC standards.

Reno Fire Department (RFD) noted that the closest fire station to the project is Station 11 (Single Engine Company) located at 7105 Mae Anne Avenue with a response time of approximately 10 minutes. The second closest fire station is Station 19 (Medical Response Unit) located at 2015 Hawk Meadow Trail, with a response time of approximately 11 minutes.

The proposed project is in an area where adequate and reliable water supply systems are not currently available. Section B103.3 of the adopted 2018 International Fire Code allows for the
utilization of National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) 1142 (Standard on Water Supplies for Suburban and Rural Fire Fighting) to determine water supply needs for fire-fighting purposes when adequate water services do not exist. The applicant has proposed a water tank, pumps and required hydrants that have been reviewed by RFD and meet the NFPA 1142 standards and requirements. Access to the tanks and associated hydrant will be available to RFD, as needed, to supply additional emergency services in the surrounding area.

The applicant has proposed a controlled access gate to the storage area. The installation of a Knox Key Switch, Knox Vault, or other approved method of emergency access should be provided, to the approval of the Fire Department and Community Development Department (Condition 5). All other requirements must meet the 2018 International Fire and Building Codes as adopted.

Public Improvements: A public sewer line is not currently in close proximity to the project site. The proposed use does not require a restroom, per building code, and no sewer connection or alternative sewage system is proposed with the project. The site is not currently served by a public or private water purveyor. The application proposes that on-site wells and holding tanks will be provided for landscape irrigation and fire suppression needs. Prior to any permit for site improvements, the applicant will be required to provide documentation indicating appropriate water rights for the project.

A Preliminary Drainage Report was provided with the application materials. Analysis for retention of the five year and 100 year storms was provided (Exhibit C) in accordance with the Public Works Design Manual (PWDM). A final hydrology report will be required with a site improvement permit. An operations and maintenance manual for all on-site private storm drain infrastructure should be provided. The manual will provide details needed for ongoing inspection and maintenance of the facilities after project completion. The manual, along with ongoing maintenance and inspection reports shall be kept up to date and available for City review and inspection (Condition 6).

d. The proposal adequately mitigates traffic impacts of the project and provides a safe pedestrian environment.

The site frontage abuts a Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) frontage road. This roadway is directly connected to the east bound Interstate 80/ Exit 2 westbound lane which abruptly ends, to the west, causing a safety concern for left turn movements out of the proposed project. Preliminary site plans demonstrate that site access will be limited to right turn only and will meet NDOT standards and requirements (Exhibit B). Email correspondence with NDOT representatives requested that plans be provided that illustrate that turning radiuses are sufficient to accommodate RV traffic on the surrounding road network. Prior to a site improvement
permit, the applicant should obtain all necessary permits and approvals from NDOT (Condition 7).

The proposed RV storage use generates minimal traffic. Trip Generation can be expected to reach 14 Average Daily Trips (ADT), and 3 Peak Hour Trips (PHT) in the am and pm. A traffic study is required for projects generating 100 PHT or more and as such, further traffic analysis is not required for the project. Site circulation design, traffic control devices, and operational characteristics of the common use driveways, on-site drive aisles, emergency accesses, fire access lanes, and parking areas are designed in accordance with the PWDM and the parking layout is consistent with RMC 18.12.1104 (Parking Lot Design and Construction).

In accordance with the PWDM, prior to any permit for Site Improvements, the applicant shall grant all necessary access easements along Orange Post Road and other adjacent properties. Plans indicate that access has been provided to surrounding properties. The applicant has proposed easements that conform to PWDM requirements (Exhibit D).

e. The proposed site location and scale, intensity, density, height, layout, setbacks, and architectural and overall design of the development and the uses proposed, is appropriate to the area in which it is located.

Site and Building Design: The applicant has submitted site improvements (Exhibit A) and conceptual structure elevations (Exhibit E) that illustrate the use of a solid concrete masonry unit wall and steel sheeting to provide screening to the storage area. The storage shelters are approximately 17 feet tall. The allowed building height in the CC zoning is 65 feet.

RMC 18.12.1207 (Screening Between Land Uses) requires screening in the form of a wall between the mini-warehouse and residential zoning to the east. Screening is not required between the CC zoned properties to the north. The landscape plan (Exhibit E) illustrates a six-foot concrete masonry unit (CMU) wall and 10 foot wide strip of landscaping extending along a portion the northern property line that is adjacent to the private residence. Existing trees and landscape are preserved to the east of the project access that buffer the adjacent property from impacts. Adverse impacts to the privacy of adjacent residences are not anticipated due to the low-intensity nature of the mini-warehouse use; proposed building heights; and solid screening consisting of a combination of buildings, walls, and landscape buffers. Exterior facing facades will be required to meet building and articulation standards per RMC 18.12.301 (General Applicable Site and Building Standards).

RMC 18.12.304 (Residential Adjacency Standards) limit noise at residential property lines to 65 decibels during the daytime and 49 decibels during the night between 10:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m., and also limit spillover lighting such that lighting at single-family zoned property lines cannot exceed 0.05 foot candles. The applicant has submitted a preliminary photometric plan (Exhibit
In order to protect views of the night sky, state of the art dark skies lighting techniques are recommended (Condition 9).

The application indicates that approximately one acre of the steep eastern portion of the site will not be disturbed and the natural areas will be preserved along the Truckee River. Existing pine trees are proposed to be preserved along the southeastern portion of the site and will provide additional screening and buffering to the adjacent residence. The proposed landscape plan (Exhibit E) identifies ±16,822 square feet (±15.1% of the site) of formal landscape area that meets the CC zoning district requirement of 15% of the developed site area.

Application materials indicate the total number of RV storage units will be approximately 77 with no on-site office proposed and per RMC 18.12.1102 (Off-Street Parking requirements) would require two parking spaces. The applicant has provided four parking spaces in front of the primary access gate, one of which will meet ADA standards. All proposed parking spaces, driveways, and drive aisles meet minimum dimensions. Pedestrian access will be provided between the parking area and a secured man-gate to access the storage facility.

No sidewalk currently exists along the frontage road. RMC Section 18.12.1001 (Pedestrian Access Requirements) requires pedestrian access be provided between rights-of-way and buildings and the applicant will need to demonstrate compliance at the time of application for a building permit. The applicant may apply for a sidewalk waiver with the Department of Public Works. If granted, the applicant will not be required to provide pedestrian access from the right-of-way.

f. The project does not create adverse environmental impacts such as smoke, noise, glare, dust, vibrations, fumes, pollution or odor which would be detrimental to, or constitute a nuisance to area properties.

As proposed and conditioned, adverse impacts such as smoke, glare, dust, vibrations, fumes, pollution, or odor are not anticipated with ongoing operation of the proposed use.

Hours of construction are limited to 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., Monday through Friday and 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on Saturday (Condition 8).

Use of the facility during the extended operation hours of 11:00 pm and 6:00 am is anticipated to be minimal, as shown by the peak traffic hour trips in finding d. Surrounding properties will be buffered or screened from headlight glare and noise volumes are not anticipated to exceed Reno City standards and/or the ambient noise levels of Interstate 80.
All exterior site lighting is required by code to be directed downward and shielded. Residential adjacency standards limit the spillover of light at residential property lines to no greater 0.05 foot candle. In addition, residential adjacency standards limit light fixtures within 100 feet of single-family zoning to 20 feet in height. The applicant will need to demonstrate compliance with these standards at the time of building permit (Condition 9).

Based on application materials and conceptual building elevations (Exhibit E), portions of the project buildings and water tank will be metal. To limit potential metal and roof glare, it is recommended that roof and metal materials have a non-reflective finish (Condition 11).

g. Project signage is in character with project architecture and is compatible with or complementary to surrounding uses.

Per RMC 18.16 (Signs), the CC zoning district, allows one freestanding sign with a maximum sign area of 120 square feet and up to 35 feet in height. Wall signs are allowed at a rate of one square foot per lineal foot of business frontage. The CC zoning district generally allows for all types of illumination and flashing/animated signs, except within provided 750 feet of residential zoning where a special use permit is required.

The applicant has provided conceptual sign graphics (Exhibit E) that proposes one sign at the entrance and a wall sign. To ensure signage that is compatible with surrounding uses it is recommended to require that the sign standards and requirements of the Neighborhood Commercial (NC) zoning sign (Condition 10). The NC zoning would allow for a maximum 12 foot monument sign and 400 square feet of wall signs. Sign lighting will be required to be indirect and no digital signs are allowed. The applicant may use the allowed wall sign square footage on the water tank, if desired.

h. The structure has been designed such that the window placement and height do not adversely affect the privacy of existing residential uses.

The proposed project is not anticipated to have a negative impact on existing residential uses. As discussed under finding e, the low-intensity nature of the mini-warehouse use, proposed building heights, and solid screening consisting of walls or a combination of buildings, walls, and landscape buffers and will limit privacy, noise and lighting impacts to residential uses.

General Code Compliance: As proposed and with the recommended conditions of approval, the project is consistent with RMC requirements.
Agency Comments (Exhibit B): In addition to the reviewing agencies already discussed in this staff report, the project application was provided to the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT), and Washoe County Health District (WCHD) for review and comment.

Neighborhood Advisory Board (NAB): This project was reviewed by the Ward 5 Neighborhood Advisory Board (NAB) on August 13, 2019. NAB members did not have a quorum and did not provide official comments. The applicant is scheduled to attend a second meeting with the NAB on January 14, 2020 to discuss project modifications. Additional comments received from Ward 5 NAB members will be forward to the Planning Commission upon receipt.

Legal Requirements:

RMC 18.06.405(e)(1) Special Use Permit

Findings:

Special Use Permit: General special use permit findings. Except where specifically noted, all special use permit applications shall require that all of the following general findings be met, as applicable.

a. The proposed use is compatible with existing surrounding land uses and development.

b. The project is in substantial conformance with the master plan.

c. There are or will be adequate services and infrastructure to support the proposed development.

d. The proposal adequately mitigates traffic impacts of the project and provides a safe pedestrian environment.

e. The proposed site location and scale, intensity, density, height, layout, setbacks, and architectural and overall design of the development and the uses proposed, is appropriate to the area in which it is located.

f. The project does not create adverse environmental impacts such as smoke, noise, glare, dust, vibrations, fumes, pollution or odor which would be detrimental to, or constitute a nuisance to area properties.
g. Project signage is in character with project architecture and is compatible with or complementary to surrounding uses.

h. The structure has been designed such that the window placement and height do not adversely affect the privacy of existing residential uses.

Attachments:

- Display Maps (PDF)
- Exhibit A-Site Plan, Utilities and Grading (PDF)
- Exhibit B- Department and Agency Comments (PDF)
- Exhibit C- Storm Water (PDF)
- Exhibit D- Conceptual Easements (PDF)
- Exhibit E- Landscape, Lighting and Elevations plans (PDF)
The information herein is approximate and is intended for display purposes only.

Subject Site

GOLD RANCH CASINO AND RV RESORT

Attachment: Display Maps (11425 : LDC20-00002 (Verdi Boat and RV Storage))
The information herein is approximate and is intended for display purposes only.

Date: December 2019

Scale: 1 inch = 670 feet

Zoning Districts:
- CC
- MU
- LLR-1

Attachment: Display Maps (LDC20-00002 (Verdi Boat and RV Storage))
VERDI BOAT & RV STORAGE
PRELIMINARY CROSS SECTIONS (AMENDED)

SECTION A-A'

SECTION B-B'

VERDI BOAT & RV STORAGE
PRELIMINARY CROSS SECTIONS (AMENDED)
SPECIAL USE PERMIT
RENO NEVADA

Attachment: Exhibit A Site Plan, Utilities and Grading (1/25; LDC20-00002 (Verdi Boat and RV Storage))
To: City of Reno, Business License Division

Business Name: Verdi Boat & RV Storage  Case#: LDC20-00002

Address: 345 Interstate 80 W

Completed by: Burow, C 13298

The following document is submitted for your consideration. The ideas, contents herein are the opinions of the listed, qualified Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) Police Officer, and are based on CPTED Principles and Factors. Implementation of the recommendations in no way guarantees a crime-free project. Recommendations listed are designed to make the applicant aware of certain issues which may arise and present possible solutions.

Natural Surveillance (Concept focuses on increased visibility):
Noted Concerns: Upon development, steps should be taken to incorporate natural surveillance elements that increase the threat of apprehension by taking steps to increase the perception that people can be seen. Open view CPTED fencing throughout property promotes natural surveillance of passing observers. Single point of entry for users to allow staff to passively monitor as people enter and exit should be utilized. Proposed LED lighting with 90 degree cutoff and uniformity of spread in accordance with IES standards (proper color temperature to illuminate true to color) promotes a decreased perception of crime and increases natural surveillance of normal users and observers.

Possible Solution / Resolution:

Natural Access Control (Concept that focuses on entry & exit points):
Noted Concerns: Natural access control concepts of physically guiding people through the space by strategic design of streets, building entrances, building layout and landscape appear to be in place based on preliminary site plans. One of the entrances should be reserved as an emergency exit only so the monitoring of tenants coming and going is possible through a single point of entry. Individualized pin codes for both entry and exit are encouraged to monitor and prevent storage unit related calls for service and allowing the identification of tenants actively inside the complex.

Possible Solution / Resolution:

Territorial Reinforcement (Concept of clearly defining ownership over space):
Noted Concerns: The use of pavement treatments in semi-public and private space, landscaping, signage, and CPTED fencing all help define ownership of a property which contributes to a reduction in criminal activity and perceived safety. Controlled access gate with surveillance of incoming and outgoing tenants helps deter criminal activity and allows for case follow up regarding calls for service.

Possible Solution / Resolution:
**Maintenance and Management** (Concept focuses on how Mgmt. runs/maintains property):

Noted Concerns:  Upon development, maintenance and management techniques should be implemented. Proper maintenance plans define territory, controls access, and creates ownership over space which all contribute to the reduction in criminal activity. Landscape should be maintained to CPTED standards with lower tree canopy trimmed up at least 6’ and bushes/shrubs trimmed down to 2’ to keep open visibility in this desired range.

Possible Solution / Resolution:

---

**Design guide for reviewing project – CHECKLIST**

The design guide is summarized in the form of a checklist. The questions help you to go through the security aspects of a project. The checklist will provide an initial crime prevention through environmental design review for the project.

1. Sightlines
2. Lighting
3. Concealed or Isolated Routes
4. Entrapment Areas
5. Isolation
6. Land Use Mix
7. Activity Generators
8. Ownership, Maintenance, and Management
9. Signs and Information
10. Overall Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Sightlines</strong></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Can sharp corners or sudden changes in grades that reduce sight lines be avoided or modified?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Does design allow clear sight lines and visibility at those areas where they are desired?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do areas of concerns such as stairwells, lobbies of high-rise building have clear sight lines?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. If sight lines are blocked, can it be made visible by using glass or can other enhancements such as mirrors or security cameras be provided?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Does design allow for future sight line impediments such as landscaping in maturity?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Does access to hidden areas such as underpasses or parking areas have clear sight lines?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lighting</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Is there a need for lighting to be provided if the paths or spaces are not used at night?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is lighting adequately provided such that a person can recognize a face from about 10 metres?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Does lighting provide uniform spread and reduce contrast between shadow and illuminated areas?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Is lighting provided too glaring?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Are light fixtures provided for areas that require good visibility such as pedestrian routes and entrapment areas?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Are light fixtures protected against vandalism or made of vandal resistant materials?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Is lighting at areas used during night time e.g. parking lots, space around buildings adequately provided?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Is back lane lighting required?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concealed or Isolated Routes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Can concealed and isolated routes such as staircases, passageways or tunnels be eliminated?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Are there entrapment areas within 50 - 100 meters at the end of a concealed or isolated route?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Is there an alternate route?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. If a pedestrian cannot see the end of a concealed or isolated route, can visibility be enhanced by lighting or improving natural surveillance? X

5. Are concealed or isolated routes uniformly lit? NA

6. Is there natural surveillance by people or activities through various land uses? X

7. Is there formal surveillance? UNKNOWN

8. Is access to help e.g. security alarm, emergency telephones, signage and information available? UNKNOWN

### Entrapment Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Is there an entrapment area and can it be eliminated?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Can it be closed during off hours?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Is the entrapment area visible through natural or formal surveillance?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Does design provide for escape routes?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Isolation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Does design incorporate natural surveillance?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Do areas of concerns such as isolated routes and parking areas provide natural surveillance?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. If providing natural surveillance is not possible, are emergency telephones, panic alarm and attendants provided? UNKNOWN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Can compatible land uses be provided to increase activity? □ X

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Mix</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Are different land uses compatible?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Can land uses that raise security concerns e.g. bars and pubs, be located where their impact is minimized?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Generators</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Can complementary uses that promote natural surveillance be provided?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Does design provide for complementary users?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Does design reinforce activity?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Is the area programmed for various events or activities?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Can a clustering of uses be used to support the intended activity?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Are ground level activities incorporated in design?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Can areas be programmed to facilitate increased activity?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership, Maintenance, and Management</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Does the design provide territorial reinforcement through design features?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Does the design allow for easy maintenance?  **X**  

3. Are there signs and information to guide people on how to report maintenance concerns? **UNKNOWN**  

4. Does the management of space provide maintenance priorities e.g. removal of offensive graffiti? **UNKNOWN**  

### Signs and Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Are signs visible and legible?</td>
<td><strong>UNKNOWN</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Are signs conveying messages clearly?</td>
<td><strong>UNKNOWN</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Is information adequate?</td>
<td><strong>UNKNOWN</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Are sign strategically located to allow for maximum visibility?</td>
<td><strong>UNKNOWN</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Are signs well maintained?</td>
<td><strong>UNKNOWN</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Are maps provided in large areas such as underpasses, parks, etc.?</td>
<td><strong>UNKNOWN</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Are signs displaying hours of operation?</td>
<td><strong>UNKNOWN</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Overall Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Do quality and aesthetically pleasing built environments compromise security concerns?</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is the scale of development consistent with neighbors to avoid large gaps on streets?</td>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Is design of the built environment simple and easy to understand?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Is there space that can become dead space?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How is the built environment used at night time? <strong>UNKNOWN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Are construction materials used to enhance safety and security?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Comments / Concerns:**
Hello Brook,
Here are my comments:

- Page 15 states all proposed lighting is to be wall mounted but the photometric plan shows a 25' twin head pole light. The location and height of this fixture will possible cause glare to the adjoining residential units directly to the east. Has this been taken into consideration?

- Code enforcement suggests only the following condition for noise associated with construction activity: Construction hours shall be limited to between the hours of 6:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m., excluding dust control and Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan measures. Large concrete pours may be allowed outside of the standard construction hours with a plan to minimize impact on existing residences. Such plan must be submitted no later than 30 days prior to any pour and is subject to the Administrator approval.

This condition is consistent with Reno Municipal Code Section 18.12.304 (g) Permissible Noise Level.

Joseph Henry, CCEA
Senior Code Enforcement Officer
City of Reno
775 334-2360
775 221-9821 cell
Ms. Brook Oswald  
Associate Planner  
City of Reno  
Community Development Department  
1 East First Street  
Reno NV 89501

Reference: LDC20-00002 (Verdi Boat and RV Storage)

Dear Ms. Oswald:

The Nevada Department of Transportation District II (NDOT) has reviewed the request for a special use permit to allow: 1) ±49,500 square feet of mini-warehouse to be constructed in the Community Commercial (CC) zoning district and; 2) nonresidential development adjacent to residentially zoned property. The ±3.9 acre site is located on the northeast corner of the intersection of Orange Post Road and Frontage Road – WA01 (I-80 Frontage). The site is zoned Community Commercial (CC) and has a Master Plan land use designation of Suburban Mixed-Use (SMU). The project is located within the Cooperative Planning Area (CPA) overlay district. 

Comments specific to the referenced request:

1. NDOT has reviewed the traffic information submitted by the applicant’s consultant. Based on ITE Trip Generation (10th Edit.), it is estimated the site will generate 75 daily, 5 am peak and 8 pm peak hour trips.

2. NDOT has been in contact with the applicant’s consultant and discussions have indicated that they will construct a Type 4/5 (compatible) approach driveway and will provide additional signage as determined during the permit process to indicate speed limit and driveways ahead considering the proximity to the I-80 off ramp that begins Frontage Road WA01.

Other comments specific to the future development/ permitting process:

3. Existing occupancy permits are personal; however, the upkeep and repair responsibilities shall transfer to the property owner’s successor. Actual work being performed in the right-of-way is cannot be transferred without prior written approval from the Department. If the
property changes use, the new property owner will need to apply for a new occupancy permit for access to the state highway.

4. An occupancy permit is required for facilities within the Department right-of-way. Please see the *Terms and Conditions Relating to Right of Way Occupancy Permits* (2018 edition) booklet available online at nevadadot.com. Contact the Permit Office at (775) 834-8330 or by electronic mail at dist2permits@dot.nv.gov for more information regarding the permit process.

5. For any non-permanent activities or temporary traffic control such as placement of cones, static signs, and portable electronic signs within the Department right-of-way will require a temporary occupancy permit. Please submit temporary permit applications at least 4 weeks prior to the scheduled activity or work. Contact the Permit Office for more information.

6. The applicant is encouraged to coordinate with the Permit Office early for any required occupancy permit (access management, hydraulic design and drainage facilities, maintenance memo of understanding (MOU), roadway abandonment, intersection control evaluation, leases, etc.). NDOT’s permit processing time may vary based on project complexity; however, the processing time is approximately forty-five (45) working days. This does not include any revision time needed to make necessary changes in the design. Significant design applications may take more than one revision, please allow adequate planning and schedule ahead.

7. An effective strategy to minimize delay is taking advantage of the Permit Office’s Pre-Permit process. Preliminary plans and associated engineering documents may be submitted in advance for NDOT review and comment. This service does not require a processing fee. Please contact the Permit Coordinator, Paula Diem, at (775) 834-8330 for any questions or comments regarding the pre-permit process.

8. Prior to any grading adjacent to the Department right-of-way, a drainage report, including a grading plan, and a Drainage Form must be submitted to the Permit Office. Please contact the Permit Office at (775) 834-8330 for more information.

9. Prior to any grading adjacent to the Department right-of-way, a Drainage Information Form, including a grading plan, must be submitted to the Permit Office.
   
   a. A drainage report shall be submitted for any development or construction that impacts flow to or within the right-of-way.
   
   b. Please contact the Permit Office to coordinate with Department’s Hydraulic Design Division. It is beneficial to the developer to work with the Hydraulic Design Division early in the design process to answer questions and give guidance.
   
   c. The Drainage Information Form shall be stamped by a professional engineer, unless waived at the discretion of the District Engineer. To request for a waiver, please submit the following:
      
      ➢ Submit a signed letter addressed to the District Engineer on official letterhead describing the development or construction activities and provide supporting reasons to approve the waiver.
      
      ➢ Include FEMA flood maps pertaining to the proposed project location.
      
      ➢ Include construction plans or any other supporting documentation.
The project site and activities are adjacent to Interstate 80 Control-of-Access. Drainage Report including a grading plan, and a Drainage Form must be submitted to the Permit Office. The drainage report must be signed and sealed by a Nevada registered professional engineer. Report should address the detention facilities proposed adjacent to NDOT’s right-of-way for Interstate 80 and the existing drainage canal running along the eastern subdivision boundary. Site development activities may require coverage under the State or Federal issued National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Construction General Permit (CGP). In such cases, the applicant will be required to develop and implement a stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) and perform documented construction site stormwater inspection in accordance with CGP guidelines. For more information, contact the Permit Office.

Applicant is responsible for mitigating any project site drainage within the property. Drainage facilities within Department right-of-way is not recommended. Any proposal with facilities within the right-of-way will require a license or lease.

It is the permit applicant’s responsibility to perform title research and identify if the state has purchased access and abutters rights for the parcel where an access is proposed. Any break in the access control will need to be processed through the state surplus property committee. This process can be quite lengthy, and success is not guaranteed.

Any truck haul operations that access the state highway system will require a temporary permit and coordination with Permit Office at (775)834-8330.

The Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) prohibits advertising within the Department right-of-way. Please refer to NRS 405.110 Unlawful advertising on or near highway or on bridge.

Applicant shall be responsible into perpetuity for all maintenance of plants, shrubs and trees and related irrigation systems installed on the Department right-of-way. All shrubs and plant material placed within the right-of-way must be low profile. The shrub and plant height shall be two feet or lower from existing ground and shall be maintained to ensure adequate sight distance for the traveling public. All trees must have a four (4) inch caliper or less at maturity.

The state defers to municipal government for land use development decisions. Public involvement for community development related improvements within the Department right-of-way should be considered during the municipal land use development public involvement process. Significant public improvements within the right-of-way developed after the municipal land use development public involvement process may require additional public involvement. It is the responsibility of the permit applicant to perform such additional public involvement. We would encourage such public involvement to be part of a municipal land use development process.

No Billboards or similar type advertising maybe utilized on the property without contacting NDOT District II Utility Coordinator at 775-834-8308.

No other comments at this time.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this community development proposal. The Department reserves the right to incorporate further changes and/or comments as the design review advances. I look forward to working with you and your team, and completing a successful project. Please...
feel free to contact me at (775)834-8300, if you have any further questions or comments.

Sincerely,

Tara Smaltz, PE
Engineering Services Manager

JEP:rmo

cc: Mike Fuess, NDOT District Engineer
    Richard “O.J.” Oujevolk, NDOT Traffic
    Arlo Stockham, Director of Community Development, City of Reno
    File
July 24, 2019

Arlo Stockham, AICP, Community Development Director
Community Development Department
City of Reno
P.O. Box 1900
Reno, Nevada 89505

Subject: City of Reno July 2019 Intake

Dear Mr. Stockham:

The Washoe County Health District, Air Quality Management Division (AQMD) respectfully submits comments on the projects listed below.

1. LDC20-00003 (Stan Lucas’ Mortensen Ranch)
2. LDC20-00002 (Verdi Boat and RV Storage)
3. LDC20-00005 (Grey Goose Self Storage)
4. LDC20-00004 (Damonte Ranch Village 26)
5. LDC20-00001 (Reno Logistics Center Zoning Map Amendment)

The following comments support the goals in the City of Reno’s Resolution 8189 (Adopted April 13, 2016). The resolution recognizes the collaborative effort needed by regional partners, such as the City of Reno and Health District, to meet federal air quality standards.

These comments also align with the Ozone Advance Path Forward,\(^1\) ReImagine Reno Master Plan, and the AQMD’s Ozone Advance presentation at the March 6, 2019 Reno Planning Commission meeting.

1. National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS): The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) establishes health-based NAAQS for six pollutants including ozone. The ozone NAAQS is 0.070 ppm and Washoe County’s most recent design value for 2016-18 is 0.071 ppm. Our ozone levels are directly related to our community’s vehicle trips, vehicle miles traveled (VMT), motor vehicle fleet mix, industrial activity, and energy usage. Not meeting the NAAQS can have long-term negative public health and economic impacts.

\(^1\) U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; Advance Program Participants - Washoe County, NV; https://www.epa.gov/advance/program-participants-washoe-county-nv;
2. **Ozone Advance Strategies**: The AQMD is one of 21 areas in the country accepted into EPA’s Ozone Advance program. Ozone Advance’s primary goal is to encourage local governments to take proactive steps that improve air quality and prevent a “non-attainment” designation for ozone. The most effective approach to implementing Ozone Advance is to include those strategies into each jurisdiction’s code. AQMD will participate in Reno’s Title 18 update and is committed to incorporating Ozone Advance strategies into Washoe County and Sparks’ codes. Although the following strategies are voluntary, they are not uncommon in areas that are designated as “non-attainment” for the ozone NAAQS.

   a. **Transportation**: Motor vehicles are the largest category of ozone precursors (nitrogen oxides and volatile organic compounds). As appropriate, these projects should incorporate elements that minimize: Vehicle trips, VMT, and tailpipe emissions. Examples include connected active transportation networks; employee trip reduction programs; electric vehicle charging infrastructure; park and ride areas; and Safe Routes to School programs.

   b. **Energy**: Buildings use large amounts of energy and water. Short-term investments during construction can reduce the consumption of energy and have long-term air quality benefits. As appropriate, these projects should incorporate an ENERGY STAR or LEED construction standard.

   c. **Schools**: Schools attract hundreds to thousands of students who must travel to and from school each day. Infrastructure within two miles determines students’ transportation choices. As appropriate, these projects should incorporate: Active transportation infrastructure; connectivity; and Safe Routes to School programs.

   d. **Urban Heat Island (UHI)**: Summertime temperatures in the Truckee Meadows have been increasing for several decades. Warmer temperatures increase ozone formation as well as increase the energy demand for cooling buildings and motor vehicles. As appropriate, these projects should incorporate best practices that minimize factors contributing to Washoe County’s UHI such as: Minimizing heat absorbing impervious surfaces; increasing vegetative cover; incorporating cool corridors and islands; applying cool roof technology to all buildings, Low Impact Development (LID) parking lots; and increasing tree canopies.

   e. **Construction Impacts**: Off-road motor vehicles, such as construction equipment, are the second largest category of ozone precursor emissions. Grading operations are also a large source of PM$_{10}$. As appropriate, these projects should: Incorporate contractors with technologies and policies that reduce unnecessary engine idling; discourage higher polluting construction equipment (Tier 0 or 1 diesel engines); and encourage cleaner construction equipment (Tier 3 or cleaner diesel engines). Two funding resources for contractors with older diesel construction equipment are: 1) EPA’s Diesel Emissions Reduction Act (DERA), and 2) VW Mitigation Funds.
Again, thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on these projects. Feel free to contact me at 775-784-7200 if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

Daniel Inouye, Acting Director
Air Quality Management Division
Washoe County Health District
QUITCLAIM DEED RESERVING ANY AND ALL ABUTTER'S RIGHTS INCLUDING ACCESS RIGHTS AND TO INTERSTATE ROUTE 80. ALSO RESERVING AN EASEMENT AND THE RIGHT TO MAINTAIN A DRAINAGE DITCH ALONG WESTERLY SIDE OF PARCEL PER DOC NO. 220169 (ITEM #15 OF P1R) (HATCHED)

QUITCLAIM DEED RELINQUISHES OF ANY ALL ABUTTER'S RIGHT OF ACCESS PER DOC NO. 328010 (ITEM #13 OF P1R) NOT A PART

ROW FOR A ROADWAY EASEMENT FOR INGRESS AND EGRESS FROM ST HWY U.S. 40 PER DOC NO. 272510 (ITEM #12 OF P1R)

TARGET INVESTMENTS, LLC
APN: 038-230-15
AREA: 3.91 ACRES (PER ASSESSOR)

NOTE: SAID DOC NO. 272510 GRANTS ACCESS TO HIGHWAY 40 AND THE EAST LINE OF A PRIVATE ROAD. HOWEVER, EXACT LOCATIONS ARE NOT DEFINED.

TRUCKEE RIVER RIDGE LLC SERIES 1
APN: 038-230-19

PRIVATE ROAD ROW MAINTENANCE AND ACCESS AGREEMENT FROM A U.S. HIGHWAY 80 FRONTAGE ROAD PER DOC NO. 2771639 (ITEM #18 OF P1R) (HATCHED)

EXCEPTING THEREFROM AN IRRIGATION DITCH APPROX. 125' WEST OF THE EAST PARCEL LINE (WIDTH UNKNOWN) PER DOC NO. 272510 (ITEM #12 OF P1R)

QUITCLAIM DEED RELINQUISHES OF ANY ALL ABUTTER'S RIGHT OF ACCESS PER DOC NO. 328035 (ITEM #13 OF P1R) (HATCHED)

QUITCLAIM DEED RELINQUISHES OF ANY ALL ABUTTER'S RIGHT OF ACCESS PER DOC NO. 326009 (ITEM #13 OF P1R) NOT A PART

CENTERLINE OF A 12' SPPCD ROADWAY EASEMENT PER DOC NO. 339166 (ITEM #14 OF P1R) (HATCHED)

WHITE FAMILY TRUST
APN: 038-234-29

QUITCLAIM DEED RELINQUISHES OF ANY ALL ABUTTER'S RIGHT OF ACCESS PER DOC NO. 328009 (ITEM #13 OF P1R) NOT A PART

QUITCLAIM DEED RELINQUISHES OF ANY ALL ABUTTER'S RIGHT OF ACCESS PER DOC NO. 328010 (ITEM #13 OF P1R) (HATCHED)

TRUCKEE RIVER RIDGE LLC SERIES 2
APN: 038-230-11

QUITCLAIM DEED RELINQUISHES OF ANY ALL ABUTTER'S RIGHT OF
ACCESS PER DOC NO. 328010 (ITEM #13 OF P1R) NOT A PART

PRIVATE ROAD ROW MAINTENANCE AND ACCESS AGREEMENT FROM A U.S. HIGHWAY 80 FRONTAGE ROAD PER DOC NO. 2771639 (ITEM #18 OF P1R) (HATCHED)

EXCEPTING THEREFROM AN IRRIGATION DITCH APPROX. 125' WEST OF THE EAST PARCEL LINE (WIDTH UNKNOWN) PER DOC NO. 272510 (ITEM #12 OF P1R)

QUITCLAIM DEED RELINQUISHES OF ANY ALL ABUTTER'S RIGHT OF
ACCESS PER DOC NO. 328035 (ITEM #13 OF P1R) (HATCHED)

QUITCLAIM DEED RELINQUISHES OF ANY ALL ABUTTER'S RIGHT OF ACCESS PER DOC NO. 326009 (ITEM #13 OF P1R) NOT A PART

CENTERLINE OF A 12' SPPCD ROADWAY EASEMENT PER DOC NO. 339166 (ITEM #14 OF P1R) (HATCHED)

REFERENCES
PRELIMINARY TITLE REPORT (P1R) AMENDMENT NO. 1, ORDER NO. 245947-COM. FIRST AMERICAN TITLE INSURANCE COMPANY, 1450 RIDGIEVE DR, SUITE 100, RENO, NV 89519
PLANT LIST

SYM
TREES TO BE REMOVED (APPROX. 15)

TREES TO REMAIN (APPROX. 48)

DECIDUOUS TREES

EVERGREEN TREES

PRELIMINARY LANDSCAPE REQUIREMENTS

DEVELOPED SITE AREA: 112,146 SQ FT (2.4 ACRES)

ZONING CC

REQUIRED LANDSCAPE AREA: 19% OF DEVELOPED SITE = 21,602 SQ FT

PROVIDED LANDSCAPE AREA = 18,802 SQ FT

- Includes 180 SQ FT OF PARKING AREA (4 SPACES X 25 SQ FT)

UNDENVED NATURE AREA TO REMAIN = 10,211 SQ FT

EXISTING TREES TO REMAIN = 48

REQUIRED TREES = 186 (TREE PER 300 SQ FT OF REQUIRED LANDSCAPE AREA)

PARKING TREES = 11 (TREE PER 15 SPACES, 4 SPACES PROVIDED)

- PROVIDE 18 FEET OF FRONTAGE (FRONTAGE ROAD: 60 FEET) = 11

- 1 TREE PER 15 FEET OF FRONTAGE (ORANGE POST ROAD: 321.56 FT) = 12

PROVIDED TREES = 56

- 11 + EXISTING TREES IN DEVELOPED AREA

REQUIRED SHRUBS = 336 MIN. (5 SHRUBS PER REQUIRED TREE)

GENERAL NOTES:

1. ALL PLANTING AND IRRIGATION SHALL BE INSTALLED PER LOCAL GOVERNING CODES.

2. FINAL PLANT SELECTION AND LAYOUT WILL BE BASED ON SOUND HORTICULTURAL PRACTICES RELATING TO MICROCLIMATE, SOIL, AND WATER REGIMES. DROUGHT TOLERANT/ NATIVE PLANTS AND TREES WILL BE USED WHERE PRACTICAL. ALL TREES WILL BE STAKED AND BRACED AS NECESSARY. THE QUALITY AT TIME OF PLANTING WILL BE PER CURRENT EDITION OF THE AMERICAN STANDARD FOR NURSERY STOCK (ARE 008-1).

L.A. Studio/Architect
VERDI BOAT AND RV STORAGE
Creation Funding, LLC
KEYNOTES

1. PAINTED METAL FACIA - COLOR PAINTED TO MATCH MIDNIGHT BRONZE
2. PAINTED METAL ROOF DECK - COLOR MEDIUM BRONZE BY MBCI
3. STRUCTURAL STEEL COLUMN - COLOR PAINTED MEGA GREIGE SW 7031
4. STRUCTURAL STEEL BEAMS - COLOR PAINTED MEGA GREIGE SW 7031

1" = 60'-0"

ELEVATIONS