AGENDA
Workshop Meeting
Reno City Council
Tuesday, February 11, 2020 • 11:00 AM
Reno City Council Chamber, One East First Street, Reno, NV 89501

Hillary Schive, Mayor

Council Members:

Ward 1 – Jenny Brekhus
Ward 2 – Naomi Duerr
Ward 3 – Oscar Delgado
Ward 4 – Bonnie Weber
Ward 5 – Neoma Jardon
At-Large – Devon Reese

Public Notice: 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 Ninth 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/. To obtain further documentation regarding posting, please contact Ashley D. Turney, City Clerk, 1 East First Street, Reno, NV 89501, (775) 334-2030; turneya@reno.gov.

Accommodations: Reasonable efforts will be made to assist and accommodate physically disabled persons attending the meeting. Please contact the City Clerk’s Office at (775) 334-2030 in advance so that arrangements can be made.

Supporting Material: Staff reports and supporting material for the meeting are available at the City Clerk’s Office, and 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 City Council.

Order of Business: The presiding officer shall determine the order of the agenda and all questions of parliamentary procedure at the meeting pursuant to the Rules of the Reno City Council (City Council Resolution No. 8478, adopted December 13, 2017). Items on the agenda may be taken out of order. The Reno City Council may combine two or more agenda items for consideration; remove an item from the agenda; or delay discussion relating to an item on the agenda at any time. See, NRS 241.020(2)(c)(6). Items scheduled to be heard at a specific time will be heard no earlier than the stated time, but may be heard later.

Council Recess: The Reno City Council may recess at any time during the meeting at the discretion of the Mayor and/or to confer with counsel per NRS 241.015(3)(b)(2) and/or its management representatives per NRS 288.220(4), as necessary. Additional short breaks may be taken throughout the meeting as needed.

Public Comment: A person wishing to address the Reno City Council shall submit a “Request to Speak” form to the City Clerk. 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.

On specific agenda items, 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 City Council, 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 Council or while attending the Reno City Council meeting may be removed from the room by the presiding officer, and the person may be barred from further audience before the Reno City Council during that session of the Reno City Council. See, Nevada Attorney General Opinion No. 00-047 (April 27, 2001); Nevada Open Meeting Law Manual, § 8.05.

In addition, any person willfully disrupting the meeting may be removed from the room by the presiding officer. See, NRS 241.030(4)(a); RMC §§ 8.12.024, 8.12.027. Examples of disruptive conduct include, without limitation, yelling, stamping of feet, whistles, applause, heckling, name calling, use of profanity, personal attacks, physical intimidation, threatening use of physical force, assault, battery, or any other acts intended to impede the meeting or infringe on the rights of the Reno City Council, city staff, or meeting participants.

Watch Meetings: Certain Reno City Council meetings are streamed online when Reno City Council is in session in Council Chamber at www.reno.gov/meetings and broadcast on Charter Channel 194.
A  Introductory Items
   A.1 Pledge of Allegiance
   A.2 Roll Call
   A.3 Public Comment  (This item is for either public comment on any action item or for any general public comment.)
   A.4 Approval of the Agenda  (For Possible Action) - February 11, 2020.

B  Development Code Update
   B.1 Staff Report (For Possible Action): Workshop for review of preliminary draft ordinances for the RENOvation Development Code Update, including direction to staff.

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

D  Adjournment (For Possible Action)
Date: February 11, 2020

To: Mayor and City Council

Thru: Sabra Newby, City Manager

Subject: B.1. Staff Report (For Possible Action): Workshop for review of preliminary draft ordinances for the RENOvation Development Code Update, including direction to staff.

From: Arlo Stockham, Community Development Director

Summary: The February 11, 2020 workshop is for Council review of the draft RENOvation Development Code Update and direction to staff. The Planning Commission held a similar workshop on January 21, 2020 and provided recommendations for Council consideration.

This is the first round of review for the draft ordinance language. Draft ordinances were prepared in accordance with the general direction received during Planning Commission and Council review of a Targeted Code Assessment Report and a series of “Issue Sheets”.

Public feedback on the draft ordinances was solicited through mailed notifications to all property owners in the City, periodic email outreach to a ±770 member stakeholder list, presentations at Neighborhood Advisory Boards, numerous stakeholder meetings, a project website with review and commenting tools (www.Reno.gov/Zoning), and regular meetings of a Technical Working Group. The recommendations outlined in this staff report address input received through the public review process and general direction received during the Issue Sheet review process.

This staff report mirrors the Planning Commission staff report, with input from the Planning Commission noted in each section in blue text. Further review of the major discussion topics is scheduled with the Technical Working Group and the Planning Commission between publication of this staff report and the February 11 Council workshop.

At the Planning Commission workshop, key topics of discussion included:

- Development review process options, including land use and site plan review processes and thresholds for public hearings;
- Parking standards; and
- Site and building design standards.
The Planning Commission recommended a number of targeted refinements and expressed support for the general direction and approach of the draft ordinances. The overall emphasis is to have more comprehensive development standards with a more predictable and efficient development review process. Ordinance changes address master plan implementation priorities, including housing affordability and sustainable design principles.

The staff report focuses on the major amendments and significant discussion topics that have emerged, including:

- The Code Update Process and Scope of Amendments
- Land Use Table (Housing)
- Grading and Hillside Development
- Parking
- Landscaping
- Site and Building Design Standards
- Residential Adjacency Standards
- Historic Preservation
- Application Review Processes and Decision Making Bodies
- Processes for Flexibility and Relief
- Application Review Findings

An assortment of less controversial topics have been discussed and addressed during the drafting and community outreach processes. More detailed information is provided in the digital attachments.

- **Attachment A** is an updated list of potential amendment topics that are outside the scope of the draft code amendments and may be considered through separate processes.
- **Digital Attachments B1-B3** include the preliminary draft ordinances (Modules 1, 2 and 3).
- **Attachment C** is a ±45 page working document of the Technical Working Group that lists each substantive amendment topic, along with suggested modifications based on public input and/or Technical Working Group review.
- **Digital Attachment D** is a compilation of input received during the public review process. The substantive topics raised are addressed in this staff report and/or Attachment C.
- **Attachment E**: Planning Commission meeting minutes.

**Previous Council Action:**

- December 11, 2019 - Council received a summary of the draft code modules.
- October 23, 2019 - Council provided direction on Issue Sheet 3A related to administration and procedures. Council also approved an amendment to the consulting agreement.
August 14, 2019 - Council provided direction on Issue Sheet 2B related to site and building design standards.

July 31, 2019 - Council provided direction on Issue Sheet 2A related to development standard update topics.

June 5, 2019 – Council provided direction on Issue Sheet 1C related to residential zoning districts.

May 8, 2019 – Council provided direction on Issue Sheets 1A and 1B related to nonresidential and mixed use zoning districts.

March 27, 2019 – Council reviewed process options for the code update.

January 29, 2019 – Council and the Planning Commission provided direction on recommended approaches for drafting updated zoning districts and land uses, development standards, and procedures in Title 18.


August 22, 2018 – Council approved a consulting agreement with Clarion Associates for services related to the comprehensive code update.

April 25, 2018 – Staff presented an overview of plans to update the City’s zoning code.

**Background:** Updating the Land Development Code (RMC Title 18) is a Council priority and a priority implementation initiative in the City’s Master Plan, which was adopted in December 2017.

The code update is scheduled to be complete in summer 2020. The key objectives of the update are to:

- Implement the updated Master Plan;
- Make the code more user-friendly; and
- Establish a more predictable and transparent review process.

**Discussion:** Significant amendment and discussion topics are summarized below. Draft ordinances are presented sequentially based on the organization of the updated code. Workshop discussion in planned to be organized similarly, with a focus on the eleven key topics.

Feedback received during Council review will be reflected in the consolidated draft code. Additional phases for the code update are noted on the graphic below. Alternatively, some reviewers have suggested that the consolidated draft and adoption processes could be combined to expedite project completion.
Scope of Code Amendments: **[Key Discussion Topic #1: Code Update Process and Scope of Amendments]** During the Issue Sheet review process, the scope of amendments for the Title 18 update project was discussed and refined. Amendments to certain major topics were not included in the scope of the project, but were identified on a list of potential future initiatives to be considered separately (Attachment A). Some of these initiatives are complete or underway. Stakeholders have generally supported the process of addressing certain complex topics through focused processes. Of the topics not being updated with this process, feedback received focused on updating the City’s flood hazard, wetland and/or major drainageway ordinances; as well as additional efforts related to housing affordability and economic sustainability, such as increased density and greater allowances for accessory dwelling units. Significant interest in code updates related to low impact development (LID) was also expressed and the topic has been added to Attachment A.

Zoning Map Amendments: Targeted zoning map amendments will be needed for implementation of the Master Plan and certain text amendments. Public notification of draft district boundaries is planned to be provided in late March or early April. Map amendments will be proposed for:

- The mixed use district consolidations in the Downtown area and urban corridors.
- Targeted zoning map changes to conform with approved master plan land uses changes. These generally include certain Mixed Use areas being rezoned to Industrial or Mixed Employment in the North Valleys and certain Mixed Use areas being rezoned to Residential near the University and Meadowood Mall.
- Targeted zoning map changes from the IB and GO districts.
Zoning outside these areas is recommend to remain unchanged pending completion of future neighborhood engagement processes. Potential map adjustments based on public input will be considered with review of the consolidated draft code.

**Neighborhood engagement process for zoning and public improvements:** The updated Master Plan promotes a greater diversity of housing types, land uses and transportation options in and around Reno’s neighborhoods. A neighborhood engagement process is planned following the code update to consider parcel level zoning changes in consultation with the affected residents and businesses. Potential zoning map amendments and multi-modal capital improvements will be evaluated and discussed with stakeholders in each neighborhood.

Neighborhood Plans with neighborhood specific zoning overlay districts have been adopted in certain areas. Many of the topics covered by the existing neighborhood standards are also addressed in the updated design standards. Potential sun-setting or modification of the existing neighborhood overlay district standards will be considered with the neighborhood engagement process following the code update. In the interim, neighborhood plan standards will continue to apply.

**Planning Commission discussion included:**
- Support for the Code Update Process and the Scope of Amendments as proposed.

**Chapter 18.01 General Provisions:** [Module 3] Significant amendments and feedback include:
  - Some relaxation of restrictions on the expansion of nonconforming uses and structures.
    - General support
  - Provisions for the transition from prior ordinances.
    - No significant concerns

**Chapter 18.02 Zoning Districts:** [Module 1] Significant amendments and feedback include:
  - Simplified Zoning for Mixed-Use Areas: The existing mixed-use zoning framework for Reno’s Downtown and Urban Corridors is simplified and updated. The draft code reorganizes and maintains the Downtown districts and the two midtown districts. New Mixed Use Urban (MU) and Mixed Use Suburban (MS) districts replace 24 overlay districts for the remainder of the Virginia Street, Fourth Street and Mill Street corridors. Amendments also address the consolidated development standards for the new MU, MS and ME districts,
    - General support
  - Downtown Area Zoning: The existing overlay zoning districts for the Downtown area are reorganized into six base zoning districts with existing provisions generally retained. Master Plan land use and intensity guidelines are reflected, with provisions for reduced intensities in certain situations. Allowed density and intensity is reduced in the Powning
district, in conjunction with development of a conservation/historic overlay district. Uses in the University district are somewhat more restrictive.

- General support.
- Recommendations to not reduce intensity as much in the Powning District and allow intensity transitions adjacent to other downtown districts.

- General Commercial (GC) district: Consolidate the existing AC (Arterial Commercial) and CC (Community Commercial) zoning districts into a new GC (General Commercial) district.
  - General support

- Update employment area districts: The code update eliminates GO (General Office) and IB (Industrial Business) and establishes a new ME (Mixed Employment) district that allows offices, light commercial uses, flex space, and similar uses.
  - General support

- Residential Districts: Residential zoning districts are proposed to be maintained with generally unchanged standards for density, lot sizes, building height, setbacks, etc. Targeted amendments reduce setbacks adjacent to alleys, establish height/setback standards, and refine standards for accessory structures.
  - Significant input promoting the preservation of neighborhood character.
  - Significant input in support of targeted zoning intensification.
  - Recommendations to narrow expanded allowances for height and setback encroachments.

Chapter 18.03 Use Regulations: [Module 1] Significant amendments and feedback include:

- Targeted Changes to Land Uses Table: Allowed land uses are generally retained with minor changes to include additional non-residential uses in the MF-21 and MF-30 districts, allowances for open lot parking use, opportunities for expanded home occupations in all districts, the consolidation of similar districts and land use categories, and the addition of newer land use types.
  - General support
  - Recommendations to refine certain use regulations.

- Establish Historic/Conservation Overlay Zoning districts: Placeholders for Historic / conservation overlay districts are included for the Powning, Newlands Heights and Wells Avenue Conservation districts. Specific standards will be prepared through the neighborhood engagement process following the code update.
  - General support

- Targeted changes to Use Regulations: Changes include standardizing requirements for auto-oriented uses (gas stations, auto sales, drive through restaurants, etc.) and outdoor storage.
  - General support
- Multi-family density increases for projects with smaller unit size: This was a supplemental recommendation following publication of the planning commission staff report. Projects in multifamily districts could increase density up to 20 percent with smaller unit sizes.
  - General support

Planning Commission discussion included:
- Suggestion for more significant multifamily density increases with smaller unit sizes.
- Desire for further review of Powning District building height provisions in relation to existing development patterns.
- Mixed input on potential new single family land use allowances (duplexes, etc.). Overall support for draft ordinances, which do not intensify single family districts with the code update process. Support to consider targeted changes with future neighborhood outreach and/or housing initiatives.
- Support for the mixed use district consolidation and other amendments.

Chapter 18.04 Development Standards: [Module 2] Chapter 18.04 is the most complex and lengthy chapter of the updated code. This staff report addresses each Article separately.

Chapter 18, Article 1 Natural Resource Protection Standards: Significant amendments and feedback include:
- Major Amendments for environmental ordinances are planned to be considered separately.
  - General support for the process
  - Continued interest in additional amendment topics, including flood hazard, wetland, and drainageway ordinances.
- Codify 1.3:1 stormwater retention standard in closed basin areas
  - General support with some concern related to State water rights.
- New Source Water Protection ordinance (notification requirement)
  - General support

Chapter 18, Article 2 Grading, Erosion Protection, and Sedimentation Control and Article 3 Hillside Development: **[Key Discussion Topic #2: Grading and Hillside Development]**
Significant amendments and feedback include:
- Reno relies heavily on special use permits for the management of site grading and hillside development. The code update expands construction standards for grading and slopes, while relaxing special use permit requirements to generally reflect existing procedures in the City of Sparks. Grading-related special use permits would not be required for cuts and fills or for hillside developments under ten acres in size. Many common project review considerations and conditions of approval are proposed as code standards. Key changes
establish new limitations on the scale, location and design of finished slopes to address engineering and aesthetic topics.

- Significant support for the concept, combined with concerns from designers that the standards could be overly restrictive and may not allow for the best grading plans. Ongoing discussions are recommended to refine the standards and clarify the process and criteria to consider exceedances and alternative designs.

Planning Commission discussion included:

- Mixed input on the process streamlining and expanded grading standards. One member supported additional public hearing requirements. Majority support to proceed as recommended with process streamlining and new grading standards generally retained - and a public hearing process to consider grading exceedances.
- Suggestion to consider a generally applicable sustainability ordinance in Article 1. This topic is addressed with Articles 8-10 below.

Chapter 18.04 Article 4 Streets, Utilities, and Services: Significant amendments and feedback include:

- Increased residential sidewalk width (from four to five feet), to be implemented in conjunction with reduced road pavement width.
  - General support pending technical review of updates to the Public Works Design Manual.
- Clarified criteria and process for review of sidewalk waivers
  - General support.
- Related topics such as sidewalk designs, street trees, parkways, etc. are addressed in later Articles.

Chapter 18.04 Article 5 Access, Connectivity, and Circulation: Significant amendments and feedback include:

- New street connectivity standards, including a standard for through access to adjacent private lands every 1,500 feet, with certain exceptions.
  - Some concern about the standards being too rigid. Recommendations for technical review and refinement.
- New pedestrian and bicycle connectivity standards
  - General support with some clarification and refinement of the new standards.

Chapter 18.04 Article 6 Off-Street Parking and Loading: ** [Key Discussion Topic #3: Parking] ** Significant amendments and feedback include:

- Minimum Parking rates: The City has minimum parking requirements that significantly exceed contemporary professional recommendations and have been cited as a primary
regulatory impediment for infill development projects. Reducing and repurposing parking lots is also a priority of the Sustainability and Climate Action Plan.

The existing code includes parking reductions in certain infill development areas or in any location when “a report based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Manual, or another nationally accepted authority is submitted which substantiates/validates the use of a different standard.” The code update recalibrates and generally reduces minimum parking standards to reflect modern best practice recommendations.

Three “tiers” of minimum parking standards are proposed. Discretionary (aka voluntary) parking minimums are proposed to be expanded to all uses in the Downtown area. Parking is currently discretionary for all uses in the California Avenue district and for retail, restaurant and entertainment uses throughout the downtown area. Level 1 parking is for the urban corridors and is not significantly changed from the already reduced parking standards in these areas. Level 2 parking rates apply to the remainder of the city and are reduced.

The City is also working on a comprehensive parking management strategy, which these regulatory adjustments are a component of. Additional strategies include the potential expansion of public and shared parking facilities, updates to the parking meter and parking permit programs, and funding strategies. The general emphasis is moving away from reliance on the site specific provision of parking to an area-based approach that is less costly to maintain and less environmentally impactful.

Additional amendments in Article 6 are intended to further support this transition and include transitional parking rate areas, expanded allowances for off-site and shared parking, expanded eligibility for affordable housing parking incentives, and elimination of maximum parking regulations.

- Parking is a primary topic for public input, with many suggesting more aggressive parking reductions and others voicing concern about the availability of parking spaces. Overall, the majority of input has favored parking reductions as aggressive as or more aggressive than the proposed standards. Specific suggestions include the following:
  - Consider the further reduction or elimination of on-site parking standards in areas that are outside the downtown area, but served by rapid transit. This could include Midtown and the University area.
  - Consider use of American Planning Association recommendations for Level 2 off-street parking. These generally require less parking than the ITE recommendations and assume some parking congestion is desired.
- Staff is requesting feedback from the Planning Commission and Council regarding the general direction for parking standards.
Recommendation to utilize City of Sparks standards (reduced) for Level 2 parking rates.

A suite of refinements and clarifications are also proposed.

A draft trip reduction program is also included in this Article.

Recommendation to expand and refine the program to address travel distances rather than number of trips, to apply more broadly, and to have a menu of compliance options from which projects could choose some. Model ordinances to be referenced.

Planning Commission discussion included:

- General support for the tiered parking approach and most amendments.
- Mixed input on minimum parking standards. General support for the technical working group recommendations. Interest in further parking reductions in the Midtown Commercial area. Support for targeted reductions to tier 2 commercial parking standards, to generally align with the City of Sparks.
- Recommendation for enhanced bicycle circulation standards in Article 5.
- Support for an expanded trip reduction program. Suggestions to further explore approaches from other communities, including an evaluation of options that focus on vehicle miles travelled (VMT) or number of trips.
- Support for expanded traffic analysis provisions addressing off-site impacts.
- Mixed input on recommendations to eliminate maximum parking requirements.

Chapter 18.04 Article 7 Landscaping, Buffering, Screening and Fencing: **[Key Discussion Topic #4: Landscaping]** Significant amendments and feedback include:

- The draft ordinances include modest amendments to refine and clarify the mixed use district landscape standards, along with certain technical amendments.
  - General support for proposed changes.
  - Some Landscape Architect professionals convened a working group and recommended further amendments to promote the growth and survival of urban trees. Recommendations are being vetted with builders and engineers, with the concepts generally supported by staff and the technical working group. Key amendments include:
    - Reduce required tree sizes at planting (to 2 inch / 6 foot) to reduce costs and increase survival and growth rates.
    - Establish tree well and soil preparation standards to better promote tree growth.
    - Update standards for landscaped islands in parking lots.
    - Other technical refinements.
  - The Landscape Architect group also voiced support for new Low Impact Development (LID) standards. Targeted updates may be identified in ongoing
discussions, but major updates are not recommended for the code update. The topic has been added to the potential future amendment list (Attachment A).

Planning Commission discussion included:

- General support for the staff and Landscape Architect group recommendations.
- Suggestion to explore expanded tree canopy standards, possibly combined with reduced landscaped area standards.
- Input that drought tolerance is important and other features can provide shade without irrigation needs.
- Support for expanded links between landscaping and site and building design standards, such as options for additional landscaping for screening and land use compatibility.

Chapter 18.04 Articles 8, 9 and 10 Site and Building Standards for Residential, Mixed Use and Nonresidential Districts: **[Key Discussion Topic #5: Site and Building Design Standards]**

Significant amendments and feedback include:

- New site and building design standards focus on multi-modal connectivity, active streetscapes, efficient circulation, site layout, building orientation and building design. Architectural and landscape style is generally left to the designer’s discretion.
- Separate Articles apply to Residential (Article 8), Mixed-Use (Article 9) and Nonresidential (Article 10) districts.
- Standards for nonresidential uses in and adjacent to Residential districts are further addressed in Chapter 13 Residential Adjacency Standards.
- Additional standards to improve industrial/residential compatibility are outlined in Article 10.
- More prescriptive standards are proposed with provisions for variability and flexibility.
- Each article includes supplemental standards for certain zoning districts, which generally retain existing code standards.
  - This is a significant topic for public input and discussions. Most reviewers appear to generally support the framework and the topics addressed. Numerous suggestions for refinement have been received.
  - Input focused on the appropriate balance between having specific development standards “with teeth” and having sufficient flexibility to address a variety of different sites and circumstances. Sections with alternative design provisions or a choice of compliance options from which to choose were generally well received, although some concern was expressed for the use of “loopholes”.
  - Approaches for these Articles and for the process alternatives in Chapter 18.08 are inter-related. Proposed processes for flexibility and relief could be used to provide relief from the more detailed design standards.
Staff supports suggestions to generally maintain the level of specificity, to refine language in coordination with key stakeholders and to more clearly specify criteria and considerations for the approval of exceptions.

Recommendation to relocate Additional Setbacks and Stepbacks for Compatibility from 18.02.707 and 18.04.1305(e) to Article 8. These are new standards applicable to all uses in certain residential districts. General support has been expressed for amendments.

Planning Commission discussion included:

- General support for the standards and the suggested refinements - including the focus on bulk and intensity considerations and the “menu of options” approach for certain development standards.
- Significant discussion of sustainability ordinances, with general support to explore an expanded sustainability ordinance that requires additional sustainability features; but also provides reasonable flexibility, includes incentives, and is sensitive to compliance costs. Staff will be discussing options with the technical working group and planning commission, including an approach modeled after existing ordinances in Henderson, NV.
- Suggestions to reduce options for alternative design features that may be approved administratively.
- Discussion and mixed input on establishing a design review committee for project review. No consensus to modify the draft.
- Support for refining the nonresidential district building articulation standards, while making sure to maintain a minimum standard for design at least comparable to the current ordinance.

Chapter 18.04 Article 11 Improvement Standards for New Development: [no substantive amendments].

Chapter 18.04 Article 12 Exterior Lighting: Significant amendments and feedback include:

- The code update includes more detailed lighting standards that address different types of lighting and dark sky lighting requirements. Current standards are general in nature.
- General support with continued technical review and possible refinement.

Chapter 18.04 Article 13 Residential Adjacency Standards: **[Key Discussion Topic #6: Residential Adjacency]** Significant amendments and feedback include:

- The code update proposes enhanced residential adjacency standards addressing a broader range of potential impacts when nonresidential development occurs within or adjacent to residential areas. Expanded standards address use limitations, grading, site and building orientation, signage adjacent to residential, spillover lighting, noise, odor, off-street parking, cut-through traffic, use of alleys, and loading activities.
Process modifications are proposed to modestly streamline the project review process. Site plan reviews replace special use permits and would apply to all nonresidential development within 150 feet of a residential zoning district and nonresidential development over one acre in size within 300 feet of a residential zoning district. Development across major arterial roadway or freeway would not require a site plan review. Process changes are addressed in Chapter 18.08 below.

- Input generally supported the enhanced residential adjacency standards and focused on the details of certain standards and the appropriate level of specificity.
- Recommend retaining the site plan review process for large (over 10 acre) nonresidential projects that are adjacent to residential zoning but across a major arterial or freeway.

Planning Commission discussion included:
- General support for the updated residential adjacency standards and the suggested refinements.

Chapter 18.04 Article 14 Skyways: [no substantive amendments].

Chapter 18.04 Article 15 Safe Scape Regulations: [no substantive amendments].

- This material may be moved to another Title of the Reno Municipal Code to reflect its broader use for public safety and code enforcement purposes.

Chapter 18.05 Signs: [Module 2] Minor amendments to temporary sign standards are proposed to maintain compliance with new case law (Reed v Gilbert). Broader amendments are on the potential future project list (Attachment A).

- Amendments merge the standards for temporary real estate signs and temporary political signs. Where existing standards for size or duration differ, the less restrictive standard is applied.
  - General support

Chapter 18.06 Land Division: [Module 2] No substantive amendments.

Chapter 18.07 Historic Preservation: [Module 2] **[Key Discussion Topic #7: Historic Preservation]** Significant amendments and feedback include:

- Streamlined procedure for designation and zoning of historic resources.
- Historic Resource Commission review of projects adjacent to historic resources.
- Expanded mitigation measures for the demolition of historic resources, including donation of a resource if other mitigations are not completed.
- Preliminary review of certificates of appropriateness with opportunities for waivers of further review.
• Maintenance obligation and “demolition by neglect” provisions.
  ○ Review by the Historic Resource Commission is scheduled on January 15 (following staff report publication). Input will be summarized at the workshop.
  ○ Key issues include demolition permits, including if the City should assume the right to deny a demolition permit for a designated historic resource. Input also addressed ways to expand historic preservation efforts beyond the listed properties and historic overlay districts.
  ○ Some commenters suggested that documentation and/or mitigation should be applied more broadly when older structures are proposed for demolition.

Planning Commission discussion included:
• General support for the standards and the suggested refinements.
• Suggestion to consider additional incentives for designating historic resources.
• Suggestion to consider expanded documentation of older structures with demolition permits.
• Suggestion to consider expanding historic resource commission reviews to include work on properties listed on a state or national listing of historic properties (vs the Reno register only).

Chapter 18.08 Administration and Procedures: [Module 3] Chapter 18.08 addressed four distinct (but related) amendment topics. These are summarized separately.

Procedure Topic A: Development review process improvements ** Key Discussion Topic #8: Application Review Processes and Decision Making Bodies **

• The code update streamlines the approval process for relatively minor decisions. Development processing costs can be significant barriers for small businesses and are a substantial expense for the City. Changes include:
  ○ Reduce reliance on special use permits and increase use of site plan reviews for small projects and design review processes. Both applications involve discretionary approvals with notification requirements for nearby properties and appealable decisions, but site plan reviews are simpler applications with lower costs and an initial administrative decision in 30 days.
  ○ Distinguish between major and minor site plan reviews and further streamline application requirements for minor site plan reviews.
  ○ Modify site plan review appeal procedures to include review by the Planning Commission instead of the Hearings Examiner.
  ○ Expand exceptions to special use permit and site plan review requirements to include:
    ■ Hillside developments less than 10 acres in size.
- Grading with cuts over 20 feet or fills over 10 feet.
- Nonresidential developments that are adjacent to residential zoning - but only across a freeway or major arterial.
- Administrative approval of additions to existing development up to 20 percent in size (increased from 10 percent).
- Administrative approval of certain amendments to Planned Unit Developments up to 10 percent.
  - A Land Use Hearing Examiner process is being considered for expeditious review of certain flexibility and relief applications (discussed below). This process involves mailed project notices and a public hearing overseen by a land use professional (staff or appointed). This concept could be expanded to include other categories of applications, modified to include a small panel of experts, or not utilized at all.
  - Significant input was received on the process and administrative topics. Discussion topics include:
    - Some input expressed opposition to process streamlining, citing the increased potential for impactful development activities.
    - Other input, including from real estate professionals and preliminary discussions at the technical working group, expressed interest in further streamlined processes. Suggestions include a process for administrative use permits and minor site plan reviews with administrative discretion for approval, but no public notification or hearing process. Certain elements of this recommendation are in currently in place in Sparks, Carson City and other communities.
      - The appropriate level of public notification and involvement is a policy decision warranting discussion at public workshops. This is a key decision that could influence approaches to other decision topics. With expanded development standards, staff is comfortable with a variety of procedural options, including more significant streamlining and delegation.
    - Recommendations from land use professionals also addressed a desire to more clearly differentiate land use decisions from decisions related to physical development. Business licenses and various forms of “Use” permits would be required for certain land uses. Building permits and various forms of “Site Plan” permits would be required for development meeting certain dimension, size or location criteria. Approval findings would be different for the different application types. Some elements of this suggestion are reflected in the increased use of site plan review processes.
- Staff thinks this suggestion has some merit and could be implemented in different ways depending on the desired level of discretionary review. Alternatively, the blending of “land use” reviews and “site plan” reviews is commonly used and retaining that framework is also acceptable from the staff perspective. In practice, issues related to project reviews often involve a combination of land use and site design considerations.

- Feedback regarding the land use hearings examiner options has been mixed. There is interest in the process simplification and potential for increased predictability, but also uncertainty if benefits outweigh the costs of implementing an additional review process and periodic meetings.

- Recommend refinement or possible elimination of this proposal, with specific approaches considered in light of other discretionary review decisions.

Discussion at the January 21 Technical Working Group meeting focused on:

- General support for differentiating land use from site plan review processes.

- General support for additional targeted process streamlining, including the relaxation of public hearing thresholds for multi-family and other uses to reflect ordinances in City of Sparks.

- Recommendation for a “single-step” appeal process for site plan reviews and other discretionary administrative decisions.

- Recommendation to develop criteria for appeals to limit appeal rights for people not directly impacted by a project decision and to require that noticing costs for appeal hearings be paid by the appellant.

Planning Commission discussion included:

- General support for the streamlined processes, with mixed input on more significant streamlining.

- Support for further differentiating land use approvals from site plan approvals. Options will be further reviewed with separate administrative and public hearing processes for applications related to land use, site design, and flexibility and relief.

- Discussion of appropriate thresholds for public hearings. Some support for further streamlining processes if the exceptions allowed for development standards can be tightened up.

- Support for “single-step” appeal processes, including direct appeals to the City Council for discretionary administrative decisions such as site plan reviews.

- No significant Planning Commission input on establishing criteria for appeals.
**Procedure Topic B: New Tools for Design Flexibility**

**Key Discussion Topic #9: Processes for Flexibility and Relief**

- The code update includes new tools and approaches for design alternatives and flexibility.
  - Minor Deviations: The code update expands use of minor deviations to the maximum allowed by state law. This process applies to deviations not exceeding 10 percent with written consent from affected property owners.
  - Major Deviations: The City of Sparks uses Major Deviations to review applications for deviations of code standards up to 50 percent. A similar ordinance is proposed for Reno. Approval would require public notice, a public hearing, and a finding of no significant impact.
  - Alternative equivalent compliance: Similar to major deviations, the code update includes an alternative compliance provision that allows deviations from design-based standards (versus quantifiable standards like setbacks and height) with public notice, a public hearing and a findings generally requiring that the project be as good or better than would be provided under standard code provisions.
  - A Land Use Hearing Examiner process is being considered for expeditious review of Major Deviations and Alternative Compliance applications. This process involves mailed project notices and a public hearing overseen by a land use professional (staff or appointed). This concept could be expanded to include other categories of applications, modified to include a small panel of experts, or these applications could be processed with a planning commission public hearing similar to the current process for special use permits and variances.
  - Design Review Committee (DRC): The code update considered the establishment of a DRC. This is not proposed in the draft ordinances, but could be considered in conjunction in the future or as an alternative to the Land Use Hearings Examiner.
  - Feedback related to these concepts has been generally positive. Discussion has focused on details of each process and the type of public input process that is appropriate for each application.

- Based on input received to date, staff is leaning towards utilizing a standard Planning Commission public hearing process for Major Deviations and Alternative Compliance applications. Planning Commission meetings agendas have been relatively light and should be lighter following approval of other process changes. Additionally, planning commissioners currently have the type of expertise desired for a land use hearings examiner or design review committee. This could be supplemented with further delegation of authority for small projects.

- Recommend continued refinement in accordance with general policy direction provided by Planning Commission and City Council.
The Technical Working Group expressed support for the new process options.

Planning Commission discussion included:
- General support for the new processes (major deviations and alternative compliance applications) and the suggested refinements.
- Given discussion related to process options, the Land Use Hearing Examiner option is not recommended.

Procedure Topic C: Application Review Findings **Key Discussion Topic #10: Application Review Findings**

- The draft ordinances include revised application review findings that are more closely related to the specific types of application.
  - Review considerations include general criteria applicable to all application types (18.08.304(e)), as well as updated findings for specific application types.
  - Findings specified in State Law are retained.
  - As drafted, findings for site plan reviews and special use permits are the same. Draft findings address land uses and site plan considerations as components of an integrated project review. If changes are made to differentiate site plan and land use review processes, findings should be updated accordingly.
    - Recommend continued refinement in accordance with general policy direction provided by Planning Commission and Council.
- The Technical Working Group generally supported the new findings with further review following City Council direction on process options.

Procedure Topic D: Planned Unit Developments, Specific Plan Districts and Development Agreements

- The draft ordinances include targeted changes to requirements for the Planned Unit Development (PUD) district. Policy direction from Council was to clarify standards for Planned Unit Developments, but not to discourage the use of PUD zoning. Key changes include:
  - Requirements for a fiscal analysis.
  - Provisions for reconsideration of PUD zoning if development does not begin within ten years of approval or if the project is less than half built within 20 years of approval.
  - Provisions for minor amendments to approved PUDs (10 percent or less) to be reviewed administratively, subject to criteria.
  - Updated Findings.
• The draft ordinances propose reinstating the Special Plan District (SPD) zoning district as a tool to establish supplemental land use limitations and development standards in certain areas.
  ○ Format and content criteria for SPDs should be expanded.
• The draft ordinances propose the elimination of some limitations for the use of Development Agreements to allow increased use of Development Agreements.
  ○ Requirements for Development Agreements to be associated with a special use permit or PUD are removed.
  ○ Subject to additional legal review, requirements limiting development agreements to be used only for projects of regional significance are also proposed to be removed.
  ○ Changes will allow the City to enter into development agreements with a broader range of projects, including urban developments that may not require special use permit review and may not meet the size criteria to be classified as Projects of Regional Significance.
• Feedback related to these amendments has been generally positive.
  ○ Recommend continued refinement.
• The Technical Working Group generally supported the changes and recommended refinements to the new PUD criteria to have findings for approval of minor amendments and expiration decisions and to allow administrative approval of updates to architectural standards.

Planning Commission discussion included:
• General support for the amendments and the suggested refinements.

Financial Implications: None at this time.

Legal Implications: Review of the draft ordinances by the City Attorney’s Office will continue through adoption.

Recommendation: The City Council should review the draft ordinances and provide direction to staff.

Proposed Motion: I move to direct staff to proceed with the Code update process with the following Council direction: (insert direction to staff).

Attachments:
• Attachment A - potential future projects - 2020-01-13 (PDF)
• Attachment B1 - Module 1 - Zoning Districts and Uses - Public Draft (electronic attachment only; hard copy on file with City Clerk) (PDF)
• Attachment B2 - Module 2 - Development Standards - Public Draft-clean (electronic attachment only; hard copy on file with City Clerk) (PDF)
• Attachment B3 - Chapter 18.07 - Administration - Public Draft - clean (electronic attachment only; hard copy on file with City Clerk) (PDF)
• Attachment C - Code Review - TWG Input - 2020-01-21 (PDF)
• Attachment D - Zoning Code Update - Public Comment 1-13-20 (electronic attachment only; hard copy on file with City Clerk) (PDF)
• January 21, 2020 - PC Workshop Meeting Minutes - DRAFT (PDF)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Future Code Amendment Topic</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reno Mayor’s Housing Committee - Interim Code Amendments</td>
<td>Adopted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is an interim suite of targeted amendments to address glitches in the current code and help reduce housing construction costs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signs Required by State Law</td>
<td>Adopted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is a code maintenance item to address a glitch with the current code.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Licenses for Package Alcohol, Beer and Wine</td>
<td>City Council passed a 1-year Moratorium and directed staff to prepare code amendments on May 8, 2019. Ordinance development in is process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is a targeted amendment to address businesses with package alcohol licenses and package beer and wine licenses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Engagement Efforts.</td>
<td>This is a priority initiative to begin following adoption of the Code update in the summer of 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A process is planned to review zoning maps and capital improvement priorities at the neighborhood scale following adoption of the Code update.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation District Overlays</td>
<td>This a priority initiative to be completed in conjunction with Neighborhood engagement efforts following adoption of the Code update.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In coordination with neighborhood stakeholders, prepare overlay district standards for the Powning, Newland Heights and Wells Avenue Conservation Districts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing Code Maintenance</td>
<td>Staff recommends a regular and continuing process to monitor and refine the updated code as needed following its adoption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Protection Ordinances</td>
<td>The project in initiated and ordinance development in is process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is an initiative of the Urban Forestry Commission to enhance Reno’s tree protection ordinances.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Future Code Amendment Topic</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Review of Short Term Rental, Accessory Dwelling Unit and/or Guest Quarter Ordinances</strong>&lt;br&gt;These are Code topics that are not being amended in the Code update and could be considered at a later date through a separate process. These topics could also be included in a broader review of housing standards.</td>
<td>Pending prioritization process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affordable Housing: Phase 2 Amendments</strong>&lt;br&gt;This potential project would evaluate additional Code amendments beyond those to be included in the Code update.</td>
<td>Pending prioritization process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flood Hazards: Phase 2 Amendments</strong>&lt;br&gt;This potential project would evaluate additional Code amendments related to Flood Hazards beyond those to be included in the Code update.</td>
<td>Pending prioritization process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wetlands and Streams</strong>&lt;br&gt;This potential project would evaluate Code amendments related to Wetlands and Streams. This could be combined with other topics in a broader review of hydrological ordinances.</td>
<td>Pending prioritization process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major Drainageways</strong>&lt;br&gt;This potential project would evaluate Code amendments related to Major Drainageways. This could be combined with other topics in a broader review of hydrological ordinances and/or as a component of an open space and greenway planning initiative.</td>
<td>Pending prioritization process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open Spaces and Greenways</strong>&lt;br&gt;As an option, Open Space and Greenway planning initiatives that are outlined in Master Plan Policies 7.2a-g could be expanded to also include an update of the major drainageways plan and ordinances.</td>
<td>Pending prioritization process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Future Code Amendment Topic</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Wildland Interface and Fire Safety</td>
<td>Pending prioritization process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is a master plan implementation topic that will be led by the Reno Fire department, but also involves updates to the Land Development Code.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signs: Phase 2 Amendments</td>
<td>Pending prioritization process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This potential project would evaluate additional Code amendments for signs beyond those to be included in the Code update.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Impact Development (LID)</td>
<td>Pending prioritization process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is a potential project to update site development and engineering standards with increased utilization of Low Impact Development Practices.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Planning Commission Workshop on the RENOvation Development Code Update
January 21, 2020
Updated Exhibit C

Updates were made to reflect the January 21, 2020 Technical Working Group (TWG) meeting discussion. Additional input is noted in red text on page 3 and pages 37-45.
RENOvation Code Update  
Technical Working Group  
Code Amendment Review Sections  
Updated January 21, 2019

This working document began with a list of significant amendment topics in each chapter of the preliminary draft code, along with some initial staff suggestions for refinement based on public input received. The technical working group is reviewing the complete document and providing recommendations for changes, including other topics not listed.

Review will begin with module 1 (chapters 18.02 and 18.03), then proceed to module 2 (Chapters 18.04 through 18.07), then module 3 (Chapters 18.01 and 18.08). This review will continue through multiple meetings. The document will be updated as issues are identified or addressed.

For chapters reviewed by the technical working group, recommendations (including items requiring further discussion) are noted in blue text. Draft ordinances and staff recommended changes not highlighted were generally supported by the technical working group.

December 17, 2019  
Technical Working Group reviewed Chapters 18.02, 18.03 and 18.04 (Articles 1 through 5)

January 7, 2020  
Technical Working Group reviewed Chapter 18.04 (Articles 6 through 8)

January 13, 2020  
Technical Working Group reviewed Chapter 18.04 (Articles 9 through 15), Chapter 18.05, Chapter 18.06 and Chapter 18.07.

January 21, 2020  
Technical Working Group reviewed Chapter 18.08 (all), and had a follow-up discussion on Chapter 18.02 provisions for residential density (page 3).
Module 1 Zoning Districts and Uses:
Chapter 18.02: Zoning Districts:

Major Discussion Topics:
1. Simplified organization
2. Zoning District reorganization and consolidation
   a. Refine Powning District Standards
   b. Refine building setback and separation standards
   c. Refine height and setback encroachment standards
3. Future map amendments
   a. Pending property owner notifications and feedback
4. Residential Density in Multifamily districts (Follow-up Discussion)

- 18.02.106: Classification of Newly Annexed Land.
  o Updated table 1.2 for land use and zoning upon annexation to reflect current City and County designations.

- Article 2: Residential Districts
  o Process to consider updates post-update with neighborhood outreach
  o Updated naming for SF districts (density vs lot size)
    ▪ Updated density minimum, but no change to lot sizes, setbacks, etc
  o Standardized accessory structure heights (29’ / 16’ / 12’)
  o Standardized accessory structure setbacks (regular for 2 story, reduced for one story, zero setbacks allowed along alleys with 24 foot vehicle back up space)
    ▪ Recommend refining language to clarify zero foot alley setbacks are allowed for primary buildings, not just accessory buildings.
  o (Follow-up Discussion) Staff and TWG recommend a new subsection 18.02.2013(c) allowing density bonuses in Multi-Family districts, as follows:
    ▪ 10 percent density increase when average unit size is less than 1,600 square feet.
    ▪ 15 percent density increase when average unit size is less than 1,200 square feet
    ▪ 20 percent density increase when average unit size is less than 800 square feet.
  Note that this amendment would not change standards for lot sizes, building heights, setbacks, etc.

- Article 3: Mixed Use Districts
  o Conversion of overlay districts to primary districts
  o MU district consolidations
TWG Recommends revising building separation for all districts to 10 feet regardless of number of units. Currently 20 foot separation is required between buildings with 50 units or more.

- Side and rear setbacks – reduced from “zero or 10’ min” to “zero or 5’ min”
- 18.02.306 MD-PD: Downtown – Powning District
  - Draft proposes reduced building height and density – significant public input to allow more, especially in transition areas to downtown standards.
  - Staff recommends height and density match MF-30 (45 feet / 30 du per ac), not MF-14 (35 feet / 14 du per ac)
  - Staff recommends transition area as follows:
    - 65 feet / 45 du per acre for parcels fronting Second Street
    - 65 feet / 45 du per acre for parcels fronting and west of Ralston Street
    - 105 feet (no density max) between Ralston and Arlington Street with additional height allowed by site plan review

- 18.02.307 MU: Mixed Use Urban – consolidated district
  - Review density and setback standards
  - Review height (85 feet, additional w/ discretionary review
  - Suggest SPR process for increased height
  - Suggest replacing “abutting corridor” and “supporting corridor” standards with street names (corridors are Virginia, 4th and Mill St)

- 18.02.307 MS: Mixed Use Suburban – consolidated district
  - Review density and setback standards
  - Review height (55 feet, additional w/ discretionary review)
  - Suggest SPR process for increased height

- 18.02.3014 Additional Standards for Mixed Use Districts (Initial material - review topics with development standards)

- Article 4: Nonresidential Districts
  - 18.02.402 IC: Industrial Commercial
    - Height increase from 40 to 45 feet
  - 18.02.403 ME: Mixed Employment New district
    - Review development standards
      - Recommend side and rear setbacks of “zero or 10’ min”
      - Note height standard and note 2

- Article 5: Special Purpose Districts
  - 18.02.501 PG: Park, Greenway and Open Space
    - Recommend additional building height be allowed with site plan review and finding of compatibility
- 18.02.502 **PF: Public Facility**
  - Recommend additional building height and stories be allowed with site plan review and finding of compatibility (vs special use permit)
  - TWG recommends updating lot size and width standards with size waivers similar to the Washoe County process.
- 18.02.502-505 **UT districts: Unincorporated Transition**
  - Accessory building height changes from 29 feet to 35 feet to reflect county code.
- 18.02.506 **PUD: Planned Unit Development**
  - Review with changes in 18.08 (module 3)
- 18.02.507 **SPD: Specific Plan District**
  - Add new section per module 3

- **Article 6: Overlay Districts**
  - 18.02.602 **General Overlay Districts**
    - (c) Cooperative Planning Area Overlay: Delete per Regional Plan and module 2
    - (d) Gaming Overlay District: Placeholder – review with module 2.
    - (e) Historic Overlay District: Placeholder – review with module 2
    - (f) Wellhead / Source Water Protection Overlay
      - Module 2 recommended general standards and no overlay district – delete
  - 18.02.603 **Neighborhood Plan Overlay Districts**
    - Neighborhood Overlays retained – address post-update with neighborhood outreach

- **Article 7: Measurements and Exceptions**
  - 18.02.702(b) **Affordable Housing Incentives**
    - To be reorganized
    - Expanded eligibility for density and parking incentives
  - 18.02.704 **Property Line Setbacks / Yards**
    - Public input: Recommend changes to (e) to be closer to current code (allow less setback encroachments)
  - 18.02.706 **Heights**
    - Public input: Recommend changes to (c) to be closer to current code (allow fewer height exceptions)
    - TWG recommends in making changes, to keep allowance for access enclosures for rooftop decks to not be considered a story.
  - 18.02.707 **Additional Setbacks and Stepbacks for Compatibility**
- Relocate to and review with module 2, 18.04.8xx (residential district development standards)

- Any other discussion topics??
Chapter 18.03 Use Regulations

Major Discussion Topics:
1. Simplified organization
2. Consolidated Land Use Table
3. Use Regulations
   a. Refine certain use regulations

- 18.03.207 Table of Allowed Uses
   o Format of Use Table
   o Changes to uses or permissions

- 18.03.302 Residential Uses
   o New (a)(1) Duplex, Triplex and Fourplax
     ▪ TWG Recommends updating use standards to provide additional design flexibility, especially (a) and (d)
   o New (a)(2) Live/Work dwelling
   o Section (a)(7)(b) Per Footnote 103, recommend development of incentives for improvements to existing mobile home parks.

- 18.03.304 Commercial Uses
   o New (b)(4) Allow permanent urban farm with site plan review (currently temporary only)
   o New (c)(1) microbrewery size limit in certain districts
   o New (g)(2) banquet hall standards
   o New (i)(2)(b) consistent location standard for vehicle sales/rental in certain urban districts
   o New (i)(4)(b) consistent location standard for gas stations in certain urban districts
   o New (i)(5) allowance for permanent open parking lots (currently only temporary). Willow allow parking businesses.
     ▪ TWG recommends deleting (i)(6)a.2.[f] related to LID concepts for truck stop projects.

- 18.03.306 Industrial uses
   o Updated (b)(3) consolidated standards for outdoor storage
     ▪ TWG recommends updating (b)(3)a.2 to reduce residential district screening from 750 feet to 300 feet, to address height limits for outdoor storage and consider landscape screening as an alternative.

- 18.03.403 Accessory Structure dimensional standards
   o Table 1.7 Clarified accessory structure dimensions
     ▪ TWG recommends further review of code organization and possible including these standards with each zone district.

- 18.03.405 Standards for certain accessory uses
   o Updated (g)(1) standards for drive through facilities (food service)
- Consistent location standard in certain urban districts
- Recommend correcting organization error (b-h should be applicable in all districts)
- Recommend deleting e – addressed in 18.04.13xx (Residential Adjacency Standards)
  - TWG recommends also updating or deleting (h)(1)d for consistency.
  - New (l)(17) allows expanded home occupations with site plan review
  - New (m) standards for live entertainment use
    - TWG recommends modifying standards to not require a SUP for every situation (eg downtown)
  - Updated (n) consistent standards for accessory outdoor storage.
    - TWG recommends updating (b)(3)a.2 to reduce residential district screening from 750 feet to 300 feet, to address height limits for outdoor storage and consider landscape screening as an alternative.
- 18.03.503 Standards for Temporary Uses
  - Updated (f)(1) consistent standards for temporary open lot parking
- Any other discussion topics??
**Module 2 Development Standards:**

**Chapter 18.04 Development Standards**

**Article 1: Natural Resource Protection Standards**

Major Discussion Topics:

1. Scope of Amendments considered in this process vs separate processes
   
   a. Update flood hazard text to reflect current documents, but not initiate major regulatory change

- Scope of Amendments: Minor edits only. Other amendments may be considered through separate processes.
- **18.04.101 General Environmental Standards**
  
  o TWG Recommends revisions to 18.04.101(c) Shading of Parks and Residences to provide design alternatives for infill development in conjunction with enhanced building design and compatibility standards.

- **18.04.102 Flood Hazard Areas**
  
  o New (c)(7)(2) codifying 1.3:1 stormwater detention/retention requirement in closed drainage basin areas (Silver, Swan and Whites Lakes).
    
    i. TWG recommends deleting “on site” from retention requirement to allow off site retention.
    
    ii. Cary Chisum to send proposed text changes to reflect current flood regulation documents.

- **18.04.106 Wildland Interface / Fire Safety**
  
  o New text referencing applicable State requirements in the Wildland Urban Interface (WUI)

- **18.04.107 Source Water Protection**
  
  o New section with notification standards to enable TMWA monitoring of potentially contaminating uses.

- Any other discussion topics??

**Article 2: Grading:** (draft proposes enhanced standards with streamlined review process)

Major Discussion Topics:

1. Streamlined process and additional standards for grading and hillside development.

- Note that Chapter 18.08 (module 3 procedures) removes special use permit requirement for 20 foot cuts / 10 foot fills.
- **18.04.202 Limits on Grading (Cut and Fill)**
  
  o Updated (e)(2) references residential adjacency standards for grading
New (e)(3) location limits for slopes. Subsection a facilitates maintenance by property owner. Subsections b and c address infrastructure maintenance issues for public works dept.

- TWG recommends updating c to require access and flat ground around manholes, not the entire sewer or storm drain pipeline.

New (e)(4) codified typical condition of approval for noxious weed abatement.

New (e)(7) (missing footnote) applies hillside development slope treatment standards (18.04.309) to slopes exceeding four feet in height.

Updated (e)(9) updates grading hours of construction near residential zoned properties (common condition of approval).

- Any other discussion topics??

Article 3: Hillside Development: (draft proposes enhanced standards with streamlined review process)

Major Discussion Topics:

1. Streamlined process and additional standards for grading and hillside development.

- 18.04.302 Applicability and Exemptions
  - New (b) removes special use permit requirement for hillside developments less than ten acres in size.

- 18.04.307 Visually prominent ridgelines
  - No change to code. Note map.

- 18.04.309 Slope Treatment (consider side review with subdivision designer(s).)
  - Significant updates include:
    - New (a) slope height limits – Recommend update to refine for non-stabilized slopes (3:1 or less steep) and stabilized slopes (steeper than 3:1). For 3:1 slopes, allow cut slopes up to 60 feet and fill slopes up to 50 feet. For steeper slopes, allow cut slopes up to 40 feet and fill slopes up to 30 feet. Maintain option for larger slopes with major deviation and finding.
    - Updated (b) “contouring” standard – common condition of approval
    - New (c) slope variations – common condition of approval
    - New (f) through (i) – standards for retaining walls
    - New (j) exception provision for cuts into stable rock.
    - TWG recommends focused discussion of proposed 18.04.209 Slope Treatment standards. Cary Chisum, public works and community development staff. General concern that the standards are overly restrictive.

- 18.04.3012 Hillside Architecture
Updated with last sentence with more directive language for stepped foundations where major grading disturbances (cut slopes over 30 feet or fill slopes over 15 feet) are proposed.

- TWG recommends continued review with designers.
- Any other discussion topics??
  - TWG recommends relaxation of density reduction formula for multi family units and clarification of requirements for natural and disturbed slopes.

### Article 4 Streets, Utilities and Services

**Major Discussion Topics:**

1. Applicability of curb, gutter and sidewalk requirements and criteria for waivers.

- **18.04.401: Streets**
  - Intersection spacing removed to eliminate conflict with PWDM.
- **18.04.402: Sidewalks, Cubs and Gutters**
  - TWG recommends clarifying in (a)(3) that the sidewalk determination is to occur at the tentative (not final) map stage.
  - Updated (a)(4) with clarified requirements for waivers to sidewalk, curb and gutter requirements
  - TWG recommends further discussion of sidewalks with articles 8-10.
  - Updated (b) sidewalk dimension standards:
    - Reconciled for consistency with the PWDM
    - Expanded residential sidewalks from 4’ to 5’ proposed together with PWDM updates to reduce street widths
    - Administrative modification provisions to address existing conditions
      - TWG recommends further review of proposed street sections. Public works to prepare drafts

- **18.04.403: Utilities and Services**
  - Redundant with PWDM. Plan to delete from Title 18 with consolidated draft.
- Any other discussion topics??

### Article 5: Access Connectivity and Circulation

**Major Discussion Topics:**

1. Requirements for traffic impact analysis
2. Connectivity standards / subdivision design

- **18.04.501: Vehicle Access/Circulation and Traffic Analysis**
  - Updated (c) with clarified Traffic Impact Analysis Requirements
• TWG recommends further discussion of traffic impact analysis standards.
  o New (d) with standards for street connectivity
  o TWG recommends changes to increase subdivision design flexibility.
• 18.04.502: Pedestrian and Bicycle Connectivity
  o Expanded and new material with standards for pedestrian and bicycle connectivity.
    o TWG recommends edits to (b)(2)c and d to minimize subjectivity
• Any other discussion topics??
Article 6: Off Street Parking and Loading

Major Discussion Topics:

1. Minimum parking rated
   a. Downtown discretionary parking
   b. Level 1 parking
   c. Level 2 parking
2. Maximum Parking
3. On Street parking and shared
4. Trip reduction ordinance

- **18.04.603: General Standards**
  o Single family driveway/parking standard updated and moved to Article 8 (residential site and building design)

- **18.04.604: Calculation of Parking and Loading Requirements**
  o Updated (c) with options for shared parking (retain table of standard reductions and allow parking study)
    - TWG recommends clarification of (c)(1) and consolidation of this material with similar material for shared and off-site parking in 18.04.606(c).
  o New (e) project specific parking calculations for certain uses

- **18.04.605: Off-Street Parking Requirements**
  o New (a)(1) with three tiers of minimum parking and blended calculations in transition area.
    - TWG recommends inclusion of a map of parking tiers.
  o Note removal of “parking study” option, as ITE/APA recommended standards are proposed to be codified.
    - Recommend retaining the option (based on public input) for alternative parking rates or adjustments with a ITE-based parking demand study (existing 18.12.1102(a)(3)).
    - TWG recommends continuing to not require preparation by a licensed traffic engineer.
  o Updated (2) with recalibrated and relaxed maximum parking standards –
    - Recommend deleting (2) and not having maximum parking limits.
  o ***Updated Table 1.7*** Updated parking table

- Recommend updates to not require parking in Level 1 areas for food and beverage and retail uses in structures constructed prior to adoption of this code update. This generally reflects the existing standard in the South Virginia Transit Corridor.
- Other discussion of parking rates?
TWG recommends investigation of further relaxation of level 2 parking rates. Reference City of Sparks rates.

TWG recommends clarifying that the rates listed in the table for certain residential uses are the “maximum minimum” requirement (i.e., requirement will not exceed the highest requirement listed).

- Footnote on (b)(4) Suggestion to move design specs to an administrative manual.
  - TWG supports use of administrative manuals for technical requirements that are frequently updated.

New (c)(3) location and design standards for bicycle parking.

18.04.606 Parking Alternatives, Credits and Adjustments

- Updated (b) with reduced on-street parking allowance reflecting generally lower rates (25% on-street vs 50%).
  - Recommend discussion and possible increased on-street parking.
  - TWG supports the 25% on-street allowance in conjunction with reduced parking rates.
  - TWG recommends requiring that the on-street parking abut a site (rather than adjacency, which allows parking on the other side of streets).
  - TWG recommends trying to not use employees as a measure for parking standards to the greatest extent feasible.
  - Require that accessible spaces be on site whenever feasible.

- Updated (c) with expanded allowances for off-site and shared parking.
- Updated (d) with expanded eligibility for affordable housing parking incentives
- New (e) with trip reduction program for large employers.
  - TWG recommends changes to:
    - Focus on VMT (total travel distances) rather than number of trips.
    - Apply the program to all projects.
    - Provide a menu of compliance options from which projects could choose.
    - Allow centrally located projects to satisfy requirements with little or no additional requirements, while requiring additional measures for projects in auto-dependent areas.

18.04.607 Off-Street Parking Layout and Design

- Clarified (a) standards for use of parking areas
- New (d)(4) addressing pedestrian conflicts
  - TWG recommends standards for walkway accessibility from all spaces (no large rocks blocking access).
- Updated (e) permitting additional modifications to parking design.

18.04.608 Off-Street Loading and Stacking

- Updated and reorganized (b) vehicle stacking standards.
TWG recommends clarifying requirements for each drive through window vs total stacking requirement. Suggest a base requirement, with additional spaces for each additional window.

- Any other discussion topics??
Article 7: Landscaping, Buffering, Screening and Fencing

Major Discussion Topics:
1. ASLA recommendations for changes to better promote tree growth.

Draft ordinances are listed below. Additional recommendations from a group of landscape architects is listed on the following page.

- 18.04.703 Landscape Plan
  - Updated (f) to expand allowance for landscape installation following Certificate of Occupancy and to increase bonding from 120% to 125% of cost.
    - TWG recommends possible relaxation of requirements for a preliminary landscape plan.

- 18.04.704 Minimum Landscaping Required
  - New (b) prioritizing shading of paved areas in landscaping plans.
  - Updated (c)(2) / Table 1.14 with refined landscape area standards for MS (Mixed Use Suburban), MU (Mixed Use Urban), MU-MC (Mixed Use Midtown Commercial) and MU-RES (Mixed Use Midtown Residential). Added 10% standard in all districts for moderate density projects (vs 5% or 20%). Removed 5% standard in MS.
  - Updated (d)(5), consistent with practice, to not include public right-of-way landscaping in the minimum landscaped area calculation, except in parkways or medians with maintenance arrangements.
  - Updated (e)(2)a.4 to require extra landscaping in large parking lots when parking exceeds minimums by 150% (current code is 100%). The change is to generally keep the standard, but adjust to reflect reduced minimum parking standards.
    - Recommend deleting this as part of a shift towards increased shared and off site parking. This would eliminate the penalty for “overparking”.
  - Note for (f)(1)c.3 to reference the updated Downtown Streetscape Master Plan.
    - Recommend change to reflect the new name “Downtown Streetscape Design Manual”.
    - TWG recommends clarification that work permits from the city are not required for regular maintenance and pruning of trees in landscaped parkways (City ROW).
  - Note for (f)(5) and other sections to potentially move the street tree species list and other material to an administrative manual.
    - Also need to update and reflect current updated list.

- 18.04.708 Screening

Updated (b)(1) / Table 1.17 with targeted changes generally addressing discretionary review recommendations, including definition of “wall” screening reflecting “solid” screening standards, but with a masonry wall.

- New (c)(1)c.4 requiring recycling containers for certain projects per state law.
- Note (c)(2) (landscaping for outdoor storage) to be relocated to chapter 18.03 use standards for consistent organization.

- 18.04.709 Fences and Walls
  - New (c)(7) requiring city approval and maintenance agreement for any fences within public right-of-way. This reflects current practice.
  - Updated (c)(8) to clarify open view fencing adjacent to open space may be solid for portions of the fence less than 4 feet in height.
    - TWG recommends investigating if the fence code could be simplified and clarified, including addition of graphics.

- Any other discussion topics??

Recommendations of the Landscape Architect group are listed below. The TWG generally supported the proposals with further discussion of details.

- 18.04.701 Purpose
  - Expand purpose statement to include reduction of the urban heat island, encouraging low impact development (LID), and benefiting the pedestrian, bicycle and roadway environments.

- 18.04.703 Landscape Plan
  - Update (f)(2) to clarify the landscape inspection letter is to be prepared by a Nevada landscape architect except for projects where professional landscape plan preparation is not required.
  - Update (d)(3) Sample Plant List to differentiate “size at planting” from “size at maturity”.

- 18.04.704 Minimum Landscaping Required
  - Consider deleting (d)(3) landscape credit related to wetland preservation.
  - Update (e) Parking Area Landscaping and Screening Requirements to:
    - Require separation between parking lot light poles and parking lot trees so tree pruning won’t be needed to maintain lighting levels.
    - Update (e)(2)b.2 to require large canopy trees (or two medium canopy trees) in each parking lot island.
    - Consider updating (e)(2)b.2 parking lot tree placement to replace current requirement for one tree per 10 spaces (which may include edge landscaping) to instead require no more than 12 spaces in a row without a tree island.
- Consider updating (e)(2)b.4 to modify the minimum size of landscaped parking lot islands to approximate one parking space.
  - Update (f) Street Tree Requirements to:
    - Update street tree sizes to be 2 inches (vs 2 ½ inches). Update (f)(1)b.1 and (f)(1)c.3.[a]. Note same change is recommended for all trees.
    - Update (f)(5) / Table 1.16 Street Tree List.
- **18.04.705 Landscaping Standards**
  - Update (c)(2)b to relax requirement for groundcover to achieve full coverage in three years.
  - Update (c)(2)c to increase allowances for inert material and require variability, including limits on the use of large rocks for mulch.
  - Update (c)(3) to update minimum tree sizes:
    - Eliminate small and large tree categories
    - Require 2 inch deciduous trees (vs 30% @ 1 inch and 70% @ 2 ½ inch).
    - Require 6 foot evergreen trees (vs 30% @ 10 feet and 70% @ 6 feet)
  - Suggestion for soil depth or volume standard for tree plantings. This would likely be an update to (c)(3)f to apply generally.
  - Update (c)(4) to eliminate the small and large shrub categories and allow all shrub and vine plantings to be 1 gallon pots (vs combination of four inch, one gallon and five gallon).
- Additional adjustments related to low impact development may be considered.
Article 8: Site and Building Standards for Residential Districts (**Significant Discussion Topic**)

Major Discussion Topics:
1. Site design standards
2. Circulation standards
3. Building design standards

- **18.04.802 Applicability**
  - (a) Applies Article to all residential districts
  - (b) Provides small project (less than 500 sf) exemption - same as for sidewalk installation.
  - (b) Also applies NC district standards for mixed use and nonresidential projects in residential districts.

- **18.04.803 General Standards for all Residential Development**
  - Recommend renaming to “General Standards for Residential Districts” to better reflect applicability.
  - (a) *Site layout and Development Pattern*
    - (a)(1) *Relationship with Major Roadways* requires 30 foot setback from freeway frontage and outlines design considerations for arterial streets.
    - (a)(2) *Streetscape Design* references general sidewalk standards (5 feet) and refines landscaped parkway requirements to apply to all residential districts (expanded from MF14, SF4, SF6 and SF9) and provides exceptions based on adjacent development.
      - TWG Recommends looking into the option of deferred installation in some cases with bonding (review Sparks approach and possible replicate).
      - Clarify allowed adjustments for hillside development.
      - Consider increased front setback standards where parkways are not provided (primarily for subdivisions)
      - Consider alternatives to parkway to include street trees.
    - (a)(3) *Parking and Garage Location* refines and generally increases flexibility for limitations for residential driveways and front yard parking.
      - Recommend updating c to clarify and also allow single family driveways up to 30 feet wide in the front setback area on parcels with 30 foot or wider garages.
      - TWG Recommends clarification and refinement of this standard.
TWG Recommends lot width (90 feet) rather than lot size as the standard for circular or multiple driveways.

- **(a)(4) Building Orientation** generally maintains current provisions.
- **(a)(5) Setbacks and Building Location** updates current residential infill standards with increased flexibility for residential front setbacks.
  - TWG Recommends adjustments to focus this standard on the dominant front building elevation, which would allow front porches and similar features to extend closer to the street.
- **(a)(6) Cluster Development** converts existing cluster development land use to a similar (optional) development standard.
- **(a)(7) Site Compatibility and Adjacency Standards** is a new development standards applying some of the existing cooperative plan overlay standards city wide (which are proposed to be deleted). Standards address parcel size matching, buffering, yard width matching and building height matching.
  - Recommend correction to formatting so parcel size matching, buffering and yard matching and the three allowable options (1-3) under d.
  - Recommend update to Height Matching to only apply the limitation to buildings within 100 feet of a different adjacent district.
  - TWG Recommends clarification that density transferred to address this standard may be located in other zoning districts within a large project.
  - TWG Recommends maintenance of zoning maps to reflect adjustments.

- **(b) Circulation and Access**
  - **(b)(1) Cul-de-Sacs** limits cul de sacs to 25% of total street length with sidewalk connections and exception provisions.
    - Discuss changes per prior meeting discussion.
    - TWG Recommends deleting this standard.
  - **(b)(2) Pedestrian and Bicycle Connectivity** limits barriers that hinder access to abutting streets, sidewalks and trails.
    - TWG Recommends clarifying applicability and generally exclude connections to private (gated) streets and where topography or other features obstruct connectivity.
  - **(b)(3) Recreational Access** requires trailheads and public access to abutting public land trails.

- **(c) Building Design**
• (c)(1) **Wall Articulation** updates design standards to provide a certain number of articulation features from a menu of options.

• (c)(2) **Ground Level Interest** requires ground floor windows along 20 percent or street facing frontages.

• (c)(3) **Roof Planes** updates design standards to provide a certain number of distinct roof planes based on building type and size.
  - TWG Recommends increased design flexibility related to the number of required roof planes.

• (c)(4) **Exceptions** allows approval of alternative building designs for adaptive reuse or expansion of existing buildings.

• (c) **Building Design** standards should also include standards for *Additional Setbacks and Stepbacks for Compatibility*, which are currently located in 18.02.707 and 18.04.1305(e). A cross reference should remain in Article 13 Residential Adjacency. All standards apply in and adjacent to the MF-14 and lower intensity residential districts, with certain exceptions. Review 18.02.707 topics noted below:
  - Recommend relocating material to this section and removing MD-PD (Powning) district from applicability for all subsections.

• (1) **Front Setbacks** requires a 2:1 height/setback ratio from front property lines for building massing.

• (2) **Side Setbacks** require side setback matching, 1:1 additional side setback above 24 feet in height, 1:1 additional side setback above 12 feet in height for structures in the front or rear setback area, and provisions to waive standards with consent of the adjacent owner.

• (3) **Stepbacks and Height Limits** apply tiered building height limits of 60 feet within 75 feet of these districts and 100 feet within 150 feet of these districts.

- **18.04.804 Supplemental Standards for Single Family Residential Structures**
  - (b) **Site Layout and Development Pattern** retains existing Street Image Standards
    - TWG Recommends clarification of “varied front setback” standard in relation to new site design standards for the same topic.
    - TWG Recommends referencing or relocating the RV parking standard in this section.
  - (c) **Circulation and Access** retains current limits for RV parking on single family lots.
    - Recommend changing title to “Recreational Vehicle Parking”.

- Any other discussion topics??

**Article 9: Site and Building Standards for Mixed Use Districts**
Major Discussion Topics:
1. Site design standards
2. Circulation standards
3. Building design standards

- **18.04.902 Applicability**
  - (a) *District Applicability* applies Article to all mixed use districts
  - (b) provides small project (less than 500 sf) exemption - same as for sidewalk installation.
  - (b) *Project-Specific Applicability* also allows administrator approval for use of Article 8 residential design standards for residential development in mixed use districts.
  - (c) *Discretionary Review* generally maintains expedited processing provisions from the current Mixed Use zoning district, but not in the new MS district.

- **18.04.903 General Standards for all Mixed Use Development (**Significant Discussion Topic**)**
  - Recommend renaming to “General Standards for Mixed Use Districts” to better reflect applicability.
  - (a) *Site layout and Development Pattern*
    - (a)(1) *Relationship with Major Roadways* requires orientation towards arterial and collector streets and design accommodations for planned roadway expansions.
      - TWG Recommends clarification that the standards refer to City (not RTC) roadway classifications.
    - (a)(2) *Setbacks* clarify that setbacks in downtown and higher intensity districts in measured from the curb, not property line. Provisions also allow setback reductions due to existing building locations and excess street right-of-way.
      - TWG Recommends change to measure from back of curb, not face of curb to better address use of sloped or rolled curbs.
    - (a)(3) *Minimum Lot Sizes* requires maintenance of alley access for land divisions under 6,000 square feet.
      - TWG Recommends changes to restrict new curb cuts and allow shared access from existing driveways (with possible driveway widening) in these situations.
    - (a)(4) *Densities* maintains and expands existing provisions allowing exceptions to minimum density and intensity standards.
      - Recommend adding the additional existing allowance for lower densities with SUP approval, modified to use a site plan review
process. This is consistent with Council direction and was a drafting omission.

- TWG Recommends clarification of intensity standards for projects that are partly new development and partly adaptive reuse.

  - (a)(5) Sidewalks generally maintains the existing sidewalk/streetscape standards from existing mixed use districts with added provisions for site by site adjustments.
  - Recommend edits to specify locations for the 18 foot, 12 foot and 10 foot setback standards so readers don’t need to cross reference with chapter 18.02.
  - TWG Recommends adding standards for utility boxes that are located in sidewalk areas (likely a case by case decision).

- (a)(6) Pedestrian Amenities maintains current standards for 1 percent of project cost to be applied to enhanced pedestrian amenities.
  - Recommend removing this requirement from the MS district to reflect reduced priority as a high intensity transit corridor. Also note that footnote 148 was carried forward from an initial staff draft – staff is not recommending these changes and did not propose the Common Open Spade article that is referenced.

- (a)(7) Building Orientation modifies existing standards to require building orientation toward the front property line, or pedestrian connections.

- (a)(8) Street Frontage Requirements generally maintains existing standards with added clarity establishing a quantifiable standard and allowances for pedestrian amenities in lieu of buildings along street frontages.

- (a)(9) Loading and Service Areas maintains current standards with added limitation against trash and loading facilities along the Truckee River.

- (b) Circulation and Access
  - (b)(1) Site Connectivity requires accommodations for off-street connections between mixed use development projects where feasible.
  - TWG Recommends clarifying that this applies to vehicular connections.
  - (b)(2) Pedestrian and Bicycle Connectivity limits barriers that hinder access to abutting streets, sidewalks and trails.
  - (b)(3) Recreational Access requires trailheads and public access to abutting public land trails.

- (c) Building Design
  - (c)(1) Wall Articulation updates design standards to provide a certain number of articulation features from a menu of options. Language expands design flexibility compared to current code.
Note that an intended section (c)(2) was inadvertently omitted from the public review draft.

- Recommend adding the following:
  - (2) Ground-Level Interest: Ground floors of street facing facades shall have transparent doors or windows no less than four feet in height along at least 60 percent of the facade’s horizontal length facing Fourth Street or Virginia Street and 40 percent along other street frontages. Primary building frontages not facing streets shall also have transparent windows or doors along at least 60 percent of the facade’s horizontal length. Modifications may be approved by the Administrator for adaptive reuse of existing buildings. See Section 18.04.904 for transparency standards in the Downtown Districts.
  - TWG Recommends a relaxed standard for ground floor residential uses in mixed use districts.

- (c)(2) (reorganized to (c)(3)) Parking Structures maintains current standards, with clarifying language.

- (c)(3) (reorganized to (c)(4)) Building Massing and Form requires design variations in multi-building mixed use developments.

  - (d) Sustainability Elements maintains existing provisions for the mixed use district, with updates reflecting new building code requirements and expanded applicability to include all mixed use districts in the updated code.

- 18.04.904 Supplemental Standards for Downtown Districts:
  - (b) Maintains standards currently in place for the Entertainment District.
  - (c) Maintains standards currently in place for the Truckee River District (including Riverfront Esplanade) and California Avenue District. This is a little challenging, as the Master Plan includes both existing districts in the new Mixed Use Downtown Riverwalk (MD-RD) District. Locational criteria are added to keep current standards in the areas they currently apply.

  - Recommend final review for accuracy in maintaining existing supplemental standards in this area – the current document has some drafting errors, including:
    - Subsections 2, 3, 5 and 6 should only apply within the former Truckee River District (West of Lake Street and North of State Street or East of Lake Street and North of Mill Street)
    - On (c)(2) / Table 1.18: Side setback outside the Riverfront Esplanade is 0 ft. or greater than 5 ft.
    - Subsection 5 title is for the MD-RD district, not MD-PD.

- 18.04.905 Supplemental Standards for Other Mixed-Use Districts
o (b) maintains existing supplemental standards for the PO district.
  o (c) maintains existing supplemental standards in portions of the MU district.
  o (d) maintains existing supplemental standards for the Midtown districts with targeted edits to remove standards that duplicate new city-wide standards.
    ▪ TWG Recommends clarification of hours of operation limits and maintenance of existing provisions.

• 18.04.906 *Supplemental Standards for Large Retail Establishments* maintains existing standards with targeted edits to reduce repetition.
  o TWG Recommends clarification of applicability (move from definitions) and inclusion of standards related to the subdivision of large retail establishments and reciprocal parking and access agreements.

• Any other discussion topics??
Article 10: Site and Building Standards for Nonresidential Districts

Major Discussion Topics:
1. Building design standards
2. Standards for compatibility with residential districts

- 18.04.1002 Applicability
  - (a) District Applicability applies Article to nonresidential districts, including Mixed Use – Airport.
    - Note footnote 192 is incorrect – RTIA standards are included.
  - (b) Project-Specific Applicability provides small project (less than 500 sf) exemption - same as for sidewalk installation.

- 18.04.1003 General Standards for Nonresidential Districts (**Significant Discussion Topic**)
  - (a) Site layout and Development Pattern includes general site design standards, which are considerably more flexible than in residential and mixed use districts.
    - TWG Recommends clarification of subjective language, including “framing streets”.
  - (b) Circulation and Access
    - (b)(1) Use of Public Streets limits truck loading from public streets
    - (b)(2) Site Layout requires a pedestrian access route from public sidewalks.
    - (b)(3) Pedestrian and Bicycle Connectivity limits barriers that hinder access to abutting streets, sidewalks and trails.
    - (b)(4) Recreational Access requires trailheads and public access to abutting public land trails.
  - (c) Building Design
    - (c)(1) Building Articulation retains current articulation standards with reduced applicability to only apply in nonresidential districts.
      - TWG Recommends changes to existing horizontal and vertical articulation standards to allow other forms of quality design, which may include materials, landscaping and other features. Consider a menu of options similar to the draft residential and mixed use standards, but with different design requirement standards more applicable to industrial and other nonresidential buildings.
    - (c)(2) Integration of Architecture, Signage and Lighting requires certain design features to maintain visual interest when viewed from public streets.
- (c)(3) **Materials and Colors** includes limitations to blend with natural surroundings.
  - TWG Recommends updating and consolidating these standards with building articulation standards into a more comprehensive building design section. Standards related to fire resistant materials are redundant and requirements for earth tone colors may preclude good design.

- (c)(4) **Parking Structures** generally retains standards for parking structures.
  - (d) **Sustainability Elements** applies existing provisions for the mixed use district, with updates reflecting new building code requirements and expanded applicability to include all nonresidential districts in the updated code.
  - (e) **Additional Standards for Residential District Compatibility** establishes new design standards to minimize impacts of large nonresidential buildings on adjacent residential areas.
    - (e)(1) regulates the orientation of truck loading, outdoor storage and refuse areas.
      - TWG Recommends the addition of an option to screen these features with walls and landscaping.
    - (e)(2) requires larger landscaped buffers adjacent to residential areas for buildings over 100,000 square feet and sites over 10 acres.
      - TWG Recommends addition of a compliance option involving physical separation and distance.
    - (e)(3) requires a site specific assessment of potential impacts on adjacent residential areas (if any) for buildings over 100,000 square feet and sites over 10 acres.
      - TWG Recommends change to trigger this at 150,000 sf of building area, which is more typical for a 10 acre project site.

- 18.04.1004 **District Specific Standards**
  - (a) **Mixed-Use Airport District** retains existing standards for the Reno-Tahoe International Airport and the Reno-Stead Airport, including the option to use IC and I district standards in certain circumstances.
    - TWG Recommends clarification related to the location of the Boynton Slough to better describe where certain requirements apply.

- Any other discussion topics??
Article 11: Improvement Standards for New Development

- No substantive changes.
- Any discussion topics??
  - TWG Recommends technical revisions to better align existing code language with actual processes. For example, many subdivisions are approved by the Planning Commission, but code language only identifies the City Council as a deciding body. Changes may also relocate some technical design requirements to a technical manual.
Article 12: Exterior Lighting

Major Discussion Topics:
1. Unpermitted lighting
2. Light pole height
3. Color of lighting

- 18.04.1202 Applicability
  - (b) Additions and Renovations provides small project (less than 500 sf) exemption - same as for sidewalk installation.
  - (c) Exemptions provide certain exemptions for emergency lighting, seasonal lighting, lighting required by the FAA or FCC, special event lighting, lighting required by the building code, and lighting for outdoor recreation and entertainment facilities.
    - TWG recommends clarification of requirements related to unpermitted use of light strands and other lighting to attract attention to buildings. Consider not allowing.
- 18.04.1203 Administration requires a lighting plan submittal and allows administrative approval of alternatives.
- 18.04.1204 General Exterior Lighting Standards apply outside the Downtown districts (but within Powning)
  - (a) prohibits certain types of lighting
  - (b) requires shielding of light fixtures and limits light trespass onto other properties
  - (c) limits light outputs
  - (d) establishes limits for nighttime lighting and motion sensors
  - (e) establishes standards for floodlights and spotlights
  - (f) allows exceptions for nonrestricted gaming operations
- 18.04.1205 Parking Area Lighting establishes a 30 foot maximum height for parking lot lights and exempts lighting within parking structures from illumination limits.
  - TWG Recommends retaining the 30 foot height limit in the non-residential districts, and having a reduced 20 foot height limit in Mixed Use districts (and retaining the 18 foot limit near residential)
  - TWG Recommends a reference to proposed landscape code requirements to not locate parking lot light poles in tree islands (or a duplicate standard).
- 18.04.1206 establishes standards for Outdoor Recreation and Entertainment Facility lighting.
- 18.04.1207 outlines Installation and Maintenance standards
- Any other discussion topics??
TWG Recommends consideration of standards for the tint (temperature) of lighting for increased consistency. In general, warmer shades that appear similar to incandescent lights are preferred over cold/blue shades.
**Article 13: Residential Adjacency**

**Major Discussion Topics:**
1. Grading adjacency standards
2. Residential privacy provisions
3. Noise standards
4. Trash removal

- **18.04.1302 Applicability** applies article 13 standards to nonresidential development within, adjacent to, and within 150 feet of residential zoning districts.
- **18.04.1303 Use Limitations** outlines limitations for public address systems, outdoor storage, drive through lanes, and hours of operation.
- **18.04.1304 Grading**
  o (a) establishes fill depth limits adjacent to residential districts with provisions for exceptions.
  o (b) maintains current (more restrictive) standard for grading adjacent to single family districts.
  o TWG Recommends refinements to applicability and allowed alternatives, including consideration of adjacent building locations and potential waivers if adjacent residences are a considerable distance from the development site and possible alternative compliance measures including increased landscaping.
- **18.04.1305 Site and Building Orientation**
  o (a) Site Orientation addresses orientation of higher activity areas away from residential areas where feasible.
    ▪ TWG Recommends clarification to focus adjacency requirements on adjoining residential properties preferentially over residential properties that are adjacent across a street.
  o (b) Building Configuration calls for transitional/reduced building heights on portions of sites that adjoin residential districts.
    ▪ Recommend deleting language at the end of (b)(1): “so that new structures....”. This conflicts with the new setback and stepback standards and may be too restrictive.
  o (c) Outdoor Above Grade Spaces requires design so that upper story balconies avoid direct views into rear yards of single family areas.
    ▪ TWG Recommends changes to address privacy more broadly, noting that floor to ceiling windows can be more impactful that upper floor porches. Broader to require landscaping or other buffering to address residential district privacy concerns.
  o (d) Building Facades requires architectural treatments on all facades visible from public streets or residential districts.
(e) **Additional Setbacks and Stepbacks for Compatibility** is to be relocated to Article 8 and was addressed in that section.

- Replace with a reference to the Article 8 standards so applicable provisions also apply adjacent to and within 150 feet of residential districts.

- **18.04.1306 Signage Adjacent to Residential**
  - (a) prohibits side or read wall signage abutting residential districts.
  - (b) addresses the design of signage adjacent to residential areas and prohibits internally illuminated signs from being orientated towards residentially zoned property. Indirect illumination of signs may still be allowed.

- **18.04.1307 Spillover Lighting** limits spillover light levels to 0.5 foot candles adjacent to certain residential districts (MF-14 and lower intensity), limits light fixture heights within 100 feet of residential districts to 18 feet in height, and allows administrative flexibility.

- **18.04.1308 Noise** generally retains noise limitations with clarifications regarding sustained and recurring noise levels.
  - TWG Recommends refinements in coordination with noise experts, to include a review of other community ordinances, improved provisions for ambient noise levels and clarification of standards for single event, recurring and sustained noises.

- **18.04.1309 Odor** clarifies nuisance limitations related to Odor and requires that garbage containers be located at least 25 feet from residential areas where feasible.

- **18.04.13010 Off-Street Parking** outlines locational considerations for the location of off street parking for nonresidential uses adjacent to residential areas.

- **18.04.13011 Cut-Through Traffic** seeks to prevent site designs that promote cut through traffic in adjacent residential areas.

- **18.04.13012 Use of Alleys** prohibits use of residential alleys for commercial business deliveries at night.

- **18.04.13013 Loading Activities** addresses the location, orientation and screening of commercial loading areas adjacent to residential areas.

- **Any other discussion topics??**
  - TWG Recommends investigation of authority (or voluntary agreements) with waste management to not collect trash during overnight hours in alleys that separate businesses from homes.
Article 14: Skyways

- No substantive changes.
- Any discussion topics?
  - TWG Recommends consideration of site plan reviews to replace special use permits for skyways (pending process discussion).

Article 15: Safe Scape Regulations

- No substantive changes.
- This section of code was written to address ongoing operational standards from a law enforcement perspective. The entire article may be relocated to a section of RMC not in Title 18 to better reflect the sue and applicability of these code provisions.
- Any discussion topics??
Chapter 18.05 Signs

Major Discussion Topics:
1. Consolidated limitations for real estate and political signs.

Updates to sign ordinances are generally outside the scope of this code update project. Substantive changes are limited to the minimum required for compliance with a recent supreme court ruling (Reed v Gilbert) involving content neutrality.

- 18.05.1010(b) is updated to consolidate existing standards for temporary real estate signs and temporary political signs. Where standards for size or duration differ, the more permissive standard is applied.
- 18.05.1003 / Table 1.22
  - Table note [6] is updated to remove allowance for one additional 16 q. ft. freestanding sign for gas stations price signs. Freestanding signs for all use types are limited to one per frontage in specified mixed use districts.
- Any other discussion topics??

Chapter 18.06: Land Division

- No substantive changes.
- Any discussion topics??
  - TWG Recommends technical corrections to reference current building codes and remove a redundant and inconsistent provisions related to townhomes.
Chapter 18.07 Historic Preservation

Major Discussion Topics:
1. Incentives for preservation
2. Demolition standards
3. Certificate of Appropriateness exemptions for certain maintenance activities.

Targeted changes were made per Master Plan implementation measures. These provisions apply to the locally designated historic resources, not the more common federally designated historic resources.

- 18.07.202 Procedures for Nomination and Designation
  - (f)(2) is amended to automatically apply the HL overlay district upon designation of a historic resource with approval of the property owner. This eliminates the need for a separate rezoning process.
  - (g) is amended to automatically rescind the HL overlay district upon approval of a demolition certificate, also eliminating the need for a separate rezoning process.
    - TWG Recommends clarification of historic features upon nomination to focus future review of proposed improvements on significant historic matters.

- 18.07.302 Historical Resources Commission Recommendation on Related Zoning Applications
  - (c) is added to call for HRC review of Planning Commission cases located adjacent to an historic resource.

- 18.07.303 Demolition Certificate
  - (b)(4) Findings are added
  - (c) Mitigation of Historic Resource Loss or Alteration is added to specify acceptable mitigation options for demolition if an historic resource, including a new process by which the HRC may initiate the relocation or salvage of historic resources proposed to be demolished without completing other mitigation actions. Some have proposed granting the HRC and City Council the right to deny demolition permits, but this document does not do that.

- 18.07.304 Certificates of Appropriateness
  - (c)(introduction) is added to administratively allow modifications determined to have no significant impact.
  - (c)(4) is added to establish an initial review by staff and two HRC members to determine if applications are significant enough to warrant review by the full HRC and to approve applications deemed to create no significant impact.
    - TWG recommendation for more meaningful streamlining to eliminate Certificate of Appropriateness requirements for maintenance activities
and minor improvements such as window replacement, painting and similar work.

- **18.07.305 Maintenance Obligation and Demolition by Neglect** is a new section, drafted per Master Plan language, to establish maintenance obligations and a process for determination of “demolition by neglect”. Note that subsection (c)(5) ultimately allows the City to determine that demolition by neglect is occurring, which would trigger the mitigation measures required for demolition permits.

- **18.07.306 Economic Hardship** includes expanded criteria whereby applicants may petition for approval of demolition permits or certificates of appropriateness based on economic hardship.

- **18.07.307 Incentives for Historic Resource Preservation** is a new section calling for HRC development of an incentive package.
  - TWG recommends the development of actual incentives in accordance with Master Plan provisions, rather than a call for a future work program that may or may not occur. Incentives could include:
    - Eliminating on-site parking requirements
    - Allowances for minor improvements without HRC review
    - Members to research other City ordinances and may identify other topics to more effectively encourage preservation of historic resources.

- Any other discussion topics??
Module 3 Administration and Procedures

Chapter 18.01: General Provisions:

- 18.01.403: Nonconforming Uses (Generally allowed to continue and requires SUP to expand).
  - New subsection (b) allows expansion up to 20% in the same building administratively with finding
    - TWG Recommends increasing to 25% for consistency with (d)(5) below.
  - New subsection (d)(5) allows expansion up to 25% with site plan review and findings
  - New (d)(7) allows expansion of single family use by right
  - Revised (f) allows planning commission approval of SUP to reestablish a non-conforming use, except for gaming (revised from council approval).

- 18.01.404: Nonconforming Structures (Generally allowed to continue and requires SUP to expand).
  - Reorganized to be distinct from nonconforming uses
  - New (a) clarifies ongoing interpretations
    - Non-conforming buildings may be expanded in a conforming way
    - Non-conforming expansions may be allowed with SUP and findings
  - Updated (b) allows restoration within 18 months following calamity without limitations/conditions

- 18.01.504: Enforcement, Remedies and Penalties
  - Updated/new (b) and (c) clarify right to issue stop work orders, and withhold or deny permits for violations (vs revocation only).

- Article 6: Transition from Prior Regulations
  - In process applications may pick old or new code (not some of each)

- Any other discussion topics??
Chapter 18.08 Administration and Procedures
This chapter is generally based on existing Chapters 18.04, 18.05, and 18.06 with modifications to improve organization, streamline certain review procedures, establish additional processes for flexibility and relief, update findings and address PUDs and SPDs.

- Article 2 / Table 8.1 is an updated version of existing Section 18.06.108 Summary Table with new procedures (discussed later) included.
  - TWG Recommends additional efforts to streamline the appeal process. Key suggestions include:
    - Have a single appeal step (to City Council) for all discretionary approvals. This would eliminate the initial site plan review appeal to planning commission.
    - Develop criteria to determine standing for the filing of appeals.
    - Require that notification costs for appeals be paid by the appellant.
  - TWG recommends technical review and clarification of footnotes 11 and 4.
- Article 3 Common Review Procedures
  - 18.08.302 Pre-Application Meeting specifies procedures for (voluntary) pre-application meetings
  - 18.08.303 Application Submittal and Handling
    - New (a) outlining authorities to submit an application
    - New (b) referencing administrative fees and application forms
    - Updated (d) outlining concurrent review procedures reflecting current (new) practice allowing review of separate zoning and SUP applications (or similar) at the same meeting. Intended to provide a faster option for pre-development entitlements.
    - Updated (e) establishing intake dates twice per month and calling for site plan reviews and new application types to be submitted on intake dates. The change for site plan reviews is proposed in conjunction with increased use of site plan reviews instead of special use permits.
      - TWG Recommends clarification of timelines in relation to final maps.
    - New (f) addressing state law requirements for determination of application completeness.
    - New (g) addressing withdrawal of applications and fee refunds.
      - Recommend adding a new (3) allowing Administrator to establish additional allowances for partial fee refunds.
  - 18.08.304 Review and Action
    - New (a) through (d) specifying typical procedures for review and action.
    - New (e) specifies approval criteria for all applications, covering some topics currently address in application specific findings.
- New (f) authorizes conditions of approval with criteria for potential conditions generally reflecting legal requirements.
  - **18.08.305 Scheduling and Notice of Public Hearings**
    - Updated (b)(2) outlining current practice for on site notification posting
    - Updated (c) with consolidated standards for mailed and posted notice (eliminates duplication).
    - New (f) addressing constructive notice, including minor notification defects and failure to receive notice.
  - **18.08.306 Review and Decision**
    - Expanded (a) and (b) include generally applicable review and decision criteria, allowing the removal of duplicative language in individual procedure sections.
  - **18.08.307 Post-Decision Actions and Limitations**
    - New section consolidating and expanding generally applicable post-decision actions and limitations. This includes certain provisions that are currently specified for some applications, but should properly be applied to all applications (e.g. (e) Revocation of Approval, (f) extension of approval, (g) modification or amendment of approval, (h) compliance with plans, and (j) Temporary Certificates of Occupancy).
      - TWG Recommends modifications to (e) to replace the general reference to findings for revocation of approvals with specific findings that would need to be met in order to revoke an approval. Examples would include non-compliance with conditions, non-compliance with plans as submitted, etc.
- **Article 4 Annexation, Interpretation and Master Plan Procedures**
  - Material is reorganized from Chapters 18.04 and 18.05, with few substantive changes.
    - Recommend moving 18.08.402 Administrative Interpretations to Article 5 and Renaming Article 5: Ordinance Amendments and Interpretations
  - Updated 18.08.404 (b) Applicability including NRS criteria for minor master plan amendments.
  - Updated 18.08.404 (c)(1) allowing Planning Commission initiation of Minor Master Plan Amendments. Planning Commission is already authorized to initiate major master plan amendments.
- **Article 5 Ordinance Amendments and Interpretations**
  - Material is reorganized and updated from Chapter 18.06 Article 4.
  - Updated 18.08.501(c) with procedures for Code Text Amendments
  - In 18.08.502 Rezoning, Footnote 85 indicates new review timelines have been established, but they have not.
    - Recommend adding procedures similar to SUP + appeal.
18.08.503 Rezoning to Planned Unit Development

- New (c)(7)b Minor Amendments to PUD Plans establishing administrative amendment procedure for PUDs allowing up to 10% increase.
  - Discuss scope – should this allow additional development as written or be limited to reconfigurations or land use conversions?
  - Recommend authorizing conditions and making PUD approval findings applicable.
  - TWG recommends expanding the minor amendment process to include updated architecture and design provisions with comparable, but current, design aesthetics.
  - TWG recommends findings or criteria for approval of minor amendments.

- New (c)(7)c Reconsideration and Expiration establishing time limitations for development of PUDs. Applies to future approvals. Rezoning may be initiated if no development occurs in 10 years or less than 50% in 20 years.
  - TWG recommends findings or criteria for reconsidering or expiring an approved PUD.

- New (c)(7)d specifies procedure to rezone a PUD to another district.

- New (d) Findings for PUDs. Findings address compatibility, public benefits and also codifies master plan language related to consistency of PUD land uses with the City Master Plan Map.

Article 6 Development Permits.

- Updated 18.08.601 Projects of Regional Significance clarifies procedures for PRS review to reflect current practice.

- Updates to 18.08.602 Site Plan Review
  - TWG recommends further streamlining processes to be closer to process requirements in Sparks and Carson City. Certain categories of site plan review could be processed as administrative permits. General support for minor site plan reviews (or similar size/use threshold) being administrative and major site plan reviews (or similar) having public notice and appeal provisions. Discussion that most commercial uses, residential adjacency and larger residential projects are all administrative approvals in Sparks.
  - TWG support for additional public notice and appeals of billboards and large signs, with more streamlined process for buildings that meet new design standards.
- Some TWG members support having separate processes for “land use” approvals and “site plan” approvals. This is a less important topic for other members.
- Updated (b)(4) Activities Subject to Site Plan Review establishes site plan review procedures for adjacency to residentially zoned property and cluster / small lot development.
- New (c) Exemptions expanded to allow small additions (updated and expanded from current SUP exemptions). Also exempts residential adjacency across a major arterial or freeway.
  - Recommend correction of drafting error – exemption (c)(2) should be the same as special use permit exemption 18.08.603(c)(2).
- Updated (d)(2) Public Notice to establish major and minor site plan review noticing standards. Noticing radius reduced to 250 feet and ten owners for smaller projects.
- Updated (e)(3) Appeal changes appeal procedure from hearings examiner to planning commission. Final appeals go to council.
- Updated (f)(2) Time Limitations and Extensions with time extension allowances similar to SUPs.
- Updated (g) Findings similar to SUP findings.

  Updates to 18.08.603 Special Use Permit
  - Updated (b) Applicability to eliminate SUP review (now site plan review) for residential adjacency and cluster / small lot development.
  - Note footnote 109 regarding formatting with some duplication of SUP triggers.
  - Updated (b)(9) reflects grading and hillside development review changes.
  - Updated (c)(2) broadens applicability for additions to nonresidential facilities. Does not require that the project previously received an uncontested SUP. Keeps 20,000 sf limit, but increases allowed addition from 10% to 20%. Modifies compatibility language.
  - Updated (e) Findings with new general findings for approval.
  - (e)(2) findings for hillside development to be relocated to 18.04.3xx to apply to all hillside development applications, including those not requiring SUP approval.
  - Note highlighted material suggested for relocation to applicable code sections.

  Article 7 Other Development Permits and Approvals
• Note and correct drafting error in 18.08.604 (b) Grading Permits with general finding language inserted where existing language regarding permit requirements and findings should be. Intent is to not change current grading permit standards.

  o Article 8 Flexibility and Relief

    • 18.08.801 Variances

      • Updated (c)(6) Time Limitations for consistency with SUP and tentative map procedures.

    • 18.08.802 Major Deviations. This is a new process allowing deviations up to 50% from quantifiable code standards. This is similar to a variance, but without a requirement for a “hardship” or “exceptional situation”.

      • Discuss option of public hearings before the planning commission vs land use hearings examiner (as specified in text). Following research, staff and consultants determined that NRS requirements for special exceptions (NRS 278.315) permit the use of an administrative hearings examiner for land use matters. This process involves an administrative public hearing with appeals to the city council. Alternatively, the process could include a planning commission hearing, similar to a variance. Another option is to standardize the process for variances, major deviations and alternative compliance applications and have review triggers based on project size. There are some new administrative duties associated with a new process and the value added may not be significant. If this process is established, it could also be used for site plan reviews.

      • If retained, recommend adding an alternative procedure available to applicants involving planning commission review similar to a variance or SUP.

      • TWG support for land use hearings examiner for smaller projects/requests and planning commission hearings for larger requests.

    • (b) establishes applicability at 50% of quantifiable development standard.

      • Recommend edits clarifying that major deviations are not allowed for density or lot size standards.

    • (c) establishes the review process and introduces the Land Use Hearings Examiner

    • (d) establishes findings for approval.
- 18.08.803 *Alternative Equivalent Compliance* is a second new process, similar to major deviations, allowing deviations from other development standards.
  - Recommend keeping the process consistent with major deviations.
  - (b) establishes applicability limited to Chapter 18.04 Development Standards.
  - (c) establishes the review process and introduces the Land Use Hearings Examiner
  - (d) establishes findings for approval.

- 18.08.804 *Minor Deviations*
  - Updated (b) *Applicability* to maximize use of the process as specified in NRS 278.319
  - Updated (c)(1) to use written consent language consistent with NRS.

- 18.08.805 *Appeal*
  - New (a) *Appeal of Administrative Decisions to Planning Commission* establishes a new appeal process. This is for site plan reviews in the draft code.
  - Updated (c)(2)a, consistent with NRS, to provide options for scheduling appeals before the City Council based on meeting attendance or length of agenda
  - TWG recommendations (specified above) to streamline the appeal process, including:
    - Have a single appeal step (to City Council) for all discretionary approvals. This would eliminate the initial site plan review appeal to planning commission.
    - Develop criteria to determine standing for the filing of appeals.
    - Require that notification costs for appeals be paid by the appellant.

- 18.08.806 *Development Agreement*.
  - Updated (b) to allow development agreements for projects not requiring PUS, SPD or SUP approval. Plan to further update (b), if permissible following further legal review, to allow development agreements for any project rather than only those projects qualifying as projects of regional significance.

- **Article 9 Review and Decision Making Bodies**
  - 18.08.903 *Planning Commission*
    - Updated (d) to be consistent with City Council resolution for appointments.
18.08.904 Hearings Examiner
- Updated (b) *Powers and Duties of the Historical Resources Commission* to clarify responsibilities.
- Updated (c) *Composition* to have broader qualifications and attract a wider variety of professionals and increase the pool of potential candidates.

18.08.906 Land Use Hearings Examiner
- New decision making process proposed for major deviations, alternative compliance and potentially other processes.
  - (c) requires the examiner be a licensed attorney or AICP planner to be appointed by the mayor and confirmed by the city council.

- Any other discussion topics??
Chapter 18.09: Rules of Construction and Definitions

Code construction and definitions are largely retained from the existing code with targeted updates made. Substantive amendments are addressed in prior review topics. Updated terms are footnoted in the draft code.

- Article 1 (Module 2) *Rules of Construction and Interpretation* includes expanded general provisions typical of modern codes.
- Article 2 (Module 1) *Definition of Use Categories and Use Types* includes definitions for new use categories, consolidation and certain use categories, and some targeted modernization and clarification.
- Article 3 (Module 2) *All Other Terms Defined* includes some targeted modernization and clarification.
- Any discussion topics??
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Commissioners

<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>Chair</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Gower</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Late</td>
<td>5:15 PM</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>Absent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Velto</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

2  Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 5:06 PM.

3  Public Comment
Andrew Samuelsen expressed support for reducing or eliminating parking minimums where possible.

Mercedes de la Garza spoke regarding historic preservation and her support for incentives for listing properties on the City Register.

4  Workshop Item

4.1 Staff Report (For Possible Action): Workshop for review of preliminary draft ordinances for the RENOvation Development Code Update. 5:14 PM

Arlo Stockham, Community Development Director, presented the staff report. The staff report focuses on the major amendments and significant discussion topics that have

Attachment: January 21, 2020 - PC Workshop Meeting Minutes - DRAFT (11987 : Development Code Update Workshop)
emerged. Eleven key topics for discussion include: 1) Code Update Process and Scope of Amendments; 2) Land Use table (housing); 3) Grading and Hillside Development; 4) Parking; 5) Landscaping; 6) Site and Building Design Standards; 7) Residential Adjacency Standards; 8) Historic Preservation; 9) Application Review Processes and Decision Making Bodies; 10) Processes for Flexibility and Relief; and 11) Application Review Findings. More detailed information is provided in the digital attachments.

(Commissioner Gower present at 5:15 p.m.)

Mr. Stockham reviewed the basic scope of amendments and asked for any comments or concerns. There were no comments from the Planning Commissioners at this time.

**Code Organization:**

**Chapter 18.01 - General Provisions**

Mr. Stockham explained the targeted updates.

**Chapter 18.02 - Zoning Districts and Chapter 18.03 - Table of allowed uses**

Mr. Stockham stated there has been a lot of discussion on housing, density, and residential use allowances. That is the main public input point on Chapters 18.02 and 18.03. He reviewed the changes, feedback, and recommendations.

Commissioner Hawkins discussed concerns with accessory dwelling units (ADU).

Mr. Stockham explained the regulations for ADUs are not modified in this draft and staff is not recommending that.

Commissioner Gower appreciated the discussion on the housing options related to single family and addressing affordability and density. That is something we can consider and he likes the idea of a phase II taking a closer look at that. What came up with ADUs was that we had just gone through a master plan update process and we were not clear with the community that we were looking at things like ADUs or changing the density of existing neighborhoods and that's where we got pushback from the community. If we go through a public process and explain some of the advantages related to affordability and density, it would be a valuable exercise to go through as a community.

Commissioner Marshall agreed with Commissioner Gower and stated it would be best politically to address ADUs and other mechanisms as a general housing topic. He also discussed the need to focus not just on the cost of building housing but also sustainability
and other costs associated with housing.

Mr. Stockham responded to questions from Commissioner Marshall regarding the 20% bonus for units less than 800 square feet. It is a fairly modest density bonus proposal maxing out at 20% that will make a meaningful impact for some property but would not replace a bigger housing initiative. Commissioner Marshall expressed support for a more significant incentive.

Chair Johnson discussed the need to explore this further.

18.04 - Development Standards

Mr. Stockham stated the Technical Working Group (TWG) had recommendations regarding the shadowing ordinance for parks and residences that will require further discussion.

Commissioner Taylor expressed support for the TWG recommendation to streamline the process for modifications to grading and hillside development.

Mr. Stockham summarized for Commissioner Gower the rationale for holding off on the tree protection ordinance component. Staff’s recommendation was not to load too many controversial topics into this process and to focus on some of these important issues by themselves. City Council already initiated a tree protection ordinance update that involves part of Title 18 and other portions in the municipal code.

Commissioner Gower discussed the hillside process noting that multiple special use permits (SUP)s are triggered by a project in a scenario where this procedural path is chosen with the SUP for hillside. His recommendation is that the city consider being more overt about splitting that component of the SUP out from whatever other component is triggering an SUP so they are not being lumped together as part of an overall SUP since they do require separate findings.

Mr. Stockham responded stating they will hear some broader recommendations along those lines when discussing procedures.

Mr. Stockham reviewed the key issues for Access, Connectivity and Circulation, and Parking.

Commissioner Marshall stated he is in favor of bringing Midtown in to the downtown standard and asked what the reason is for eliminating the maximum parking limits.
Mr. Stockham stated some cities adopt maximum parking to prevent businesses from building a huge parking lot that would be environmentally impactful. We have not found that to be an actual problem. As we are moving to more reliance on shared parking areas and offsite parking, we thought removing the maximum would help encourage shared and offsite parking. Land values are so high that no one is buying a bunch of extra land to pave it as a parking lot these days.

Commissioner Marshall urged that they not eliminate the maximum parking. If there is a need to develop something about shared parking, we can work with that but there may be unintended consequences from eliminating the maximum parking. He also discussed trip reduction programs and stated he would like to see some programs that work off of vehicle miles traveled (VMT).

Mr. Stockham confirmed that they plan to pull together some possible VMT ordinances from other communities and bring them forward for discussion.

Commissioner Gower discussed the need to be more specific in the contents of required traffic impact analyses. He suggested that more discussion or metrics in those analyses would be valuable so we're not focused specifically on trips related to level of service on intersections directly adjacent to a proposed project for example, but asking and providing a little more criteria on what we are looking for in the contents of those analyses so we can understand for a particular project in a given location relative to other uses what we could expect with not only the trips generated but the directionality of those trips beyond the site and the potential for VMT given the location of the site relative to other uses.

Mr. Stockham summarized feedback so far stating he heard mixed thoughts on the maximum parking standard and general support for refining the trip reduction program and reviewing traffic analysis standards.

Commissioner Gower discussed the connectivity section. Staff did a good job pulling in the connectivity components and emphasizing those. With regard to walkway design, there is a series of criteria for the physical components of the sidewalk but nothing related to the building design that it is adjacent to.

Mr. Stockham stated that language would belong in Articles 8, 9 and 10. This is more of a subdivision than site design.

*(Commissioner Marshall absent at 6:18 p.m. Commissioner Marshall present at 6:18 p.m.)*
Commissioner Gower discussed the bike connectivity section and felt they could do a little bit more.

Mr. Stockham explained it was a model ordinance that came from our consultants. We can look at that and expand on it.

Mr. Stockham moved on to Landscaping, Buffering, Screening and Fencing.

Commissioner Gower stated he did not see tree canopy requirements included in the landscape area requirement.

Mr. Stockham explained there is a general standard that says landscaping shall prioritize shade trees over streets, sidewalks, and other paved areas but we don't have specific language on tree canopy requirements. We can probably expand on that.

Commissioner Taylor stated she does not want to get in a situation where we have a drought and we have a requirement for people to plant all these trees when we don't have the water. She suggested taking into consideration shade features that can be used that don't require water and maintenance.

Public Comment:

Melinda Smith, Builders Association of Northern Nevada, we believe things are going in the right direction and are excited about the possibility of streamlining the process with findings that are more specific to uses and conditions.

Jeff Borchardt, Builders Association, Toll Brothers and member of the Technical Working Group, discussed the work done by the TWG and their recommendations. He also discussed the benefits of streamlining the process and proposed a more clear differentiation between land use and site plan review processes.

Stacie Huggins expressed support for the proposed changes making the code more user friendly and streamlining the processes. She suggested topics for further streamlining and refinement of development standards.

Donna Keats expressed concern for process streamlining and commented on the earlier discussion regarding making Midtown parking discretionary. She suggested considering Midtown commercial versus Midtown residential. She will submit more comments to Mr. Stockham.

Jack Hawkins expressed support for code changes and explained challenges he faces as
an architect specializing on infill development.

Chair Johnson stated he will open public comment again later in the meeting.

Mr. Stockham reviewed the Site and Building standards.

Commissioner Gower asked about sustainability elements. He noted that in the mixed use district there is a list of options with varying levels of benefits, and asked what the logic was in including certain of these elements versus others.

Mr. Stockham explained this was modeled largely after the existing code. Currently you have to pick two options from a broader menu but one of the options was energy efficient buildings and that is now a code requirement so we deleted that. It is generally a continuation of the existing regulation but applied to additional properties.

Commissioner Gower asked if there is interest in looking at those in more detail. For example, LEED Certification requires a suite of green building and site design components that include some of the other components in the list. He suggested an option might be to pursue green building certification or choose from three of the other options to create more of a balance.

Mr. Stockham stated that was existing code. He asked for help coming up with something that does more on sustainability but is also sensitive to the affordability priorities of the City Council. The Planning Commission has recommended this before and City Council said they were concerned about affordability.

Commissioner Gower stated he would like to be involved in this issue and suggested a similar model to the citizen group the City Council initiated for putting together the components of what is now the city’s Sustainability Plan might work here.

Commissioner Marshall expressed concern regarding relaxing the articulation standards for a menu approach. With regard to big box buildings, if we are going to go to an alternative menu type approach, it needs to really focus on the building itself.

Chair Johnson stated what has been put in here has opened it up to a suite of options in an attempt to give the architects a little more freedom. He expressed concern regarding alternative design elements requiring only administrative approval. If that is going to be left in here, we need to be looking at a design review body and not just for architectural standards but for site design standards and everything else.

Commissioner Marshall clarified that his concern is with large box structures, not mixed
use on a smaller scale.

Commissioner Taylor stated she is not in support of design review committees. She stated she is not a design review expert and there are people at the staff level that are more experienced to make those decisions. If that can be streamlined while still getting a quality project within the enhanced regulations, she is supportive of that.

CHAIR JOHNSON CALLED FOR A 15 MINUTE RECESS.

(COMMISSIONER HAWKINS ABSENT AT 7:26 P.M.)

THE MEETING RESUMED AT 7:42 PM.

Public Comment:

Tray Abney, NAOP Northern Nevada Chapter, spoke in support of the more flexible menu of building design elements. He expressed concerns regarding the appeal process and how easy it is to appeal a project that has been approved.

Donna Keats expressed concern that the streamlining is cutting the public out of the process and making the appeal process harder. With regard to the discussions about alleviating the cost of SUPs to get more builders, she stated if they can't afford the SUP they probably shouldn't be building the project.

Cary Chisum, Wood Rodgers, thanked staff for their work on this and expressed support for the changes to streamline the process allowing more time for better solutions.

Jack Hawkins spoke regarding design standards and suggested another option instead of administrative approval would be to have either a design review board or an in house architect.

Chair Johnson stated Commissioner Marshall has to leave and there will not be a quorum.

Karl Hall, City Attorney, explained that with the loss of a quorum the meeting must adjourn. The workshop presentation can continue with the commission providing feedback but no action can be taken.

(COMMISSIONER MARSHALL ABSENT AT 7:57 P.M.)
RESULT: NO ACTION TAKEN

5 Public Comment

6 Adjournment (For Possible Action)

The meeting was adjourned at 7:57 p.m. due to lack of quorum but the presentation continued.
6 Adjournment (For Possible Action)

The meeting was adjourned at 7:57 p.m. due to lack of quorum but the presentation continued.

18.04 - Development Standards (continued)

Mr. Stockham continued with the presentation.

Commissioner Taylor asked Mr. Stockham to respond to earlier public comment.

Mr. Stockham noted that additional exemptions across railroad tracks was suggested. Staff did not propose that because they are generally narrower and don't always have the same type of noise and inherent activity of a major arterial, but this is not a major staff concern. The drive through was already flagged to add some refining language.

18.05 - Signs

There is a case law we have to come into conformance with. There were no significant changes.

18.06 - Land Division

No changes were proposed.

18.07 - Historic Preservation

Chair Johnson stated this is going in the right direction. He expressed interest in seeing additional incentives for listing, expanded documentation standards, and HRC review of development adjacent to state and national identified historic resources in addition to the city's identified historic resources.
18.08 - Procedures

Mr. Stockham reviewed the key issues and changes in the procedure section.

Commissioner Taylor asked if this process allows for easier building or less requirements or regulations for builders.

Mr. Stockham explained that the regulations are stricter. The process is somewhat streamlined. The overall objective is to require quality design with more predictability.

Chair Johnson stated he can appreciate the difference between land use and site plan applications. He has no issue with the idea of appealing a site plan review directly to City Council. He still has concerns with respect to the administrative approval of exceptions.

Mr. Stockham explained what that would probably look like is having an administrative and public hearing option for site plan reviews and an administrative and public hearing option for land use approvals; and having trigger points where applications change from being an administrative process to being a Planning Commission process. Where those thresholds are is going to be important. He suggested generally having larger projects and special exceptions come before the Planning Commission and having smaller and more straightforward applications use an administrative process.

Chair Johnson agreed if we are differentiating between land use and site plan there needs to be a defined process for each. He supported streamlining with a public hearing process to review exceptions to development standards.

Mr. Stockham explained they have ongoing technical working group meetings and they are planning to circle back and look at things in response to these workshops. The deadline to get edits back to the consultants is February 24, 2020.

Commissioner Taylor stated sometimes the findings are a little ambiguous and they can be interpreted differently.

Mr. Stockham explained they need to a little bit subject to interpretation but should not be overly so.

Chair Johnson stated he is in favor of modifications to the PUDs.

Commissioner Gower stated staff has done a great job of taking all of this information and putting it into a draft code. Overall we are moving in the right direction.