AGENDA

Regular Meeting

Reno City Planning Commission

Wednesday, March 18, 2020 ● 6:00 PM

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

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

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

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

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

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

Public Comment: A person wishing to address the Reno City Planning Commission shall submit a “Request to Speak” form to the Secretary. Public comment, whether on action items or general public comment, is limited to three (3) minutes per person. Unused time may not be reserved by the speaker, nor allocated to another speaker. No action may be taken on a matter raised under general public comment until the matter is included on an agenda as an item on which action may be taken. The presiding officer may prohibit comment if the content of the comments is a topic that is not relevant to, or within the authority of, the Planning Commission, or if the content is willfully disruptive of the meeting by being irrelevant, repetitious, slanderous, offensive, inflammatory, irrational or amounting to personal attacks or interfering with the rights of other speakers. Any person making willfully disruptive remarks while addressing the Reno City Planning Commission or while attending the Reno City Planning Commission meeting may be removed from the room by the presiding officer, and the person may be barred from further audience before the Reno City Planning Commission during that session of the Reno City Planning Commission. See, Nevada Attorney General Opinion No. 00-047 (April 27, 2001); Nevada Open Meeting Law Manual, § 8.05.
Appeal Process: Any final action (not including recommendations) or failure to take action by the Planning Commission may be appealed to the Reno City Council by the applicant, the Mayor or a City Council Member, or any person who is "aggrieved" by the action or inaction. An appeal (together with fees) must be filed with the City Clerk within ten calendar days starting on the day after written notice of the action is filed with the City Clerk, and if the tenth calendar day falls on a weekend or holiday when the Clerk's office is not open, the appeal may be filed on the next business day.

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

1 Pledge of Allegiance

2 Roll Call

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

4 Approval of Minutes  (For Possible Action)

   4.1 Reno City Planning Commission - Regular - Feb 5, 2020 5:00 PM  (For Possible Action)

   4.2 Reno City Planning Commission - Regular - Feb 19, 2020 6:00 PM  (For Possible Action)

5 Presentation and Discussion of how City of Reno Services are Funded

6 Public Hearings  Any person who has chosen to provide his or her public comment when a Public Hearing is heard will need to so indicate on the Request to Speak form provided to the Secretary. Alternatively, you may provide your comment when Item 3, Public Comment, is heard at the beginning of this meeting.

   6.1 Staff Report (For Possible Action): Case No. LDC20-00045 (Reno Coffee Company Amendment) - A request has been made for an amendment to a special use permit (LDC19-00061 – Reno Coffee Company) to operate a bar in conjunction with a coffee shop between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 12:00 a.m., Sunday through Thursday; and between 7:00 a.m. and 2:00 a.m. on Friday and Saturday. The ±1,122 square foot site is located within a greater ±0.184 acre site at the southeast corner of the intersection of Vassar Street and South Wells Avenue. The subject site is located at 1300 Wells Avenue and is within the Community Commercial/Wells Avenue Neighborhood Plan/Wells Avenue Mixed Use (CC/WANP/WAMU) zoning district and has a Master Plan land use designation of Suburban Mixed-Use (SMU). [Ward 3]
7  Annual Report to the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency

7.1 Staff Report (For Possible Action): Acceptance of the City of Reno Annual Report to the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency.

8  Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Liaison Report

9  Staff Announcements

9.1 Report on status of Planning Division projects.

9.2 Announcement of upcoming training opportunities.

9.3 Report on status of responses to staff direction received at previous meetings.

9.4 Report on actions taken by City Council on previous Planning Commission items.

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

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

12 Adjournment (For Possible Action)

IF THE MEETING GOES BEYOND 11:00 PM, THE PLANNING COMMISSION MAY POSTPONE REMAINING ITEMS.
1 Pledge of Allegiance

Angela Fuss, Planning Manager, called the meeting to order and called for a motion to appoint a temporary Chair.

It was moved by Commissioner Marshall, seconded by Commissioner Hawkins, to appoint Commissioner Gower as temporary Chair. The motion carried unanimously with four (4) commissioners present.

Commissioner Marshall led the Pledge of Allegiance.

2 Roll Call

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

The meeting was called to order at 6:14 PM.

3 Public Comment

Gordon Gossage spoke in support of the Silver Hills project.

4 Approval of Minutes (For Possible Action)
4.1 Reno City Planning Commission - Regular - Jan 9, 2020 6:00 PM  (For Possible Action)  6:20 PM

Commissioner Marshall stated he would abstain from voting on this item.

This item was continued to the next meeting due to the lack of a quorum.

5 Presentation and discussion regarding RENOvation Zoning Code Update (Workshop Follow-up)

Arlo Stockham, Community Development Director, presented the update following up on discussion from last week's workshop.

Public Comment:

Melinda Smith, Builders Association of Northern Nevada, stated they would like more time to evaluate the impact of the sustainability section and provide comments at a later time.

There were no further requests to speak under public comment.

Mr. Stockham explained for Commissioner Marshall the Tier II: Enhanced Administrative appeals and answered questions regarding the appeal process.

Commissioner Marshall suggested changing the language to appealable projects, not appeals.

Mr. Stockham explained for Commissioner Marshall that it would be unprecedented for a Planning Commission decision to be final and not appealable to the elected officials.

Commissioner Marshall expressed concerns regarding using a point system for some of the criteria. He also suggested coming up with a sketch tool that would be easy for developers to use.

Mr. Stockham confirmed for Commissioner Gower that this is not the last opportunity the Planning Commission will have for input.

Mr. Stockham stated staff is recommending regular monitoring and check in once the code is adopted.

Documents Presented to the Commission regarding the Code Update - Presented/Distributed at Meeting

6 Public Hearings - 6:00 p.m.
6.1 Staff Report (For Possible Action): Case No. LDC20-00044 (Spectrum – Dandini Mixed Use Site Time Extension)- This is a request for a six month time extension for the Spectrum - Dandini Mixed Use Site Special Use Permit (LDC17-00062). The ±25.66 acre site is comprised of four parcels located north of Dandini Boulevard between US 395 and Spectrum Boulevard in the Mixed Use/Dandini Regional Center (MU/DRC) zoning district. The site has a Master Plan land use designation of Suburban Mixed-Use (SMU).

Ken Krater gave an overview of the project and request for a time extension.

AnnMarie Lain, Assistant Planner, presented the staff report. If approved, the expiration date would be August 16, 2020.

Public Comment: There were no requests to speak.

Commissioner Marshall had no disclosures. The remaining commissioners present disclosed they visited or are familiar with the site and/or spoke with applicant's representative.

Ms. Lain confirmed for Commissioner Marshall that staff is in favor of this extension.

_It was moved by Commissioner Marshall, seconded by Commissioner Olivas, in the case of (LDC20-00044 (Spectrum - Dandini Mixed Use Site Time Extension), based upon compliance with RMC 18.06.405(I)(2), to approve a six month time extension for the Spectrum - Dandini Mixed Use Site Special Use Permit (LDC17-00062), subject to the original conditions of approval. The motion carried unanimously with four (4) commissioners present._

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

6.2 Staff Report (For Possible Action): Case No. LDC20-00033 (Coffee N’ Comics) - A request has been made for a special use permit to allow alcohol service with an existing restaurant use located within the Neighborhood Commercial (NC) zoning district. The ±0.46 acre site is located south of Moana Lane, east of Lakeside Drive, and west of Warren Way. The site has a Master Plan land use designation of Suburban Mixed-Use (SMU).

Kevin Wilfon and Alex Farside gave an overview of the project.
AnnMarie Lain, Assistant Planner, presented the staff report.

Commissioners disclosed that they visited or are familiar with the site.

Public Comment: There were no requests to speak.

Angela Fuss, Planning Manager, responded to Commissioner Marshall stating she will look into whether this item would require a special use permit or a site plan review in this particular zoning district under the new code.

It was moved by Commissioner Marshall, seconded by Commissioner Olivas, in the case of (LDC20-00033 (Coffee N' Comics), based upon compliance with the applicable findings, approve the special use permit, subject to conditions. The motion carried unanimously with four (4) commissioners present.

RESULT: APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER: John Marshall, Commissioner
SECONDER: Paul Olivas, Commissioner
AYES: Peter Gower, Ed Hawkins, John Marshall, Paul Olivas
ABSENT: Mark Johnson, Kathleen Taylor, Alex Velto

6.3 Staff Report (For Possible Action): Case No. LDC20-00031 (Caliber Collision Electric Fence) - A request has been made for a variance to: 1) increase the allowable fence height from six to eight feet; and 2) construct a fence in the side and rear yards that is not located on lot lines. The ±0.80 acre site is located to the west of the intersection of Harvard Way and Yale Way within the Community Commercial (CC) zone. The site has a Master Plan land use designation of Suburban Mixed-Use (SMU). [Ward 3] 6:59 PM

Keith Kaneko, Electric Guard Dog, gave an overview of the project.

Sienna Reid, Senior Planner, presented the staff report. Staff is recommending denial of this request based on non-compliance with variance finding a. Conditions are crafted to support one or both aspects of the variance request should Planning Commission be able to make the variance findings. The Ward 3 NAB reviewed this request and did not cite any concerns. Staff did not receive any calls or correspondence related to this request.

Commissioners Marshall and Gower had no disclosures. Commissioners Hawkins and Olivas disclosed they visited the site.

Public Comment: There were no requests to speak.
Ms. Reid explained for Commissioner Olivas this request has two fence components, a perimeter fence and an interior electrified fence.

Angela Fuss, Planning Manager, read the definition of a fence as stated in code.

Ms. Reid explained for Commissioner Hawkins that condition four is written to allow for non-electrified arms carrying barbed wire on portions of the fence/wall system over 6 feet in height consistent with fencing in industrial zones. More aggressive fencing allowed by code is razor ribbon or tape, but only for jails or correctional facilities.

Ms. Reid explained for Commissioner Olivas that electrified fencing is not expressly allowed or prohibited.

Ms. Reid explained for Commissioner Marshall the City of Sparks does allow for electrified fencing for Industrial zoned districts. This request area is zoned Community Commercial.

Commissioner Marshall stated finding a is the most troubling one as far as finding something unique about the parcel that would justify a variance.

Commissioner Olivas discussed past examples of variances for fences that were granted and stated if this is a high crime area and if that is considered an exceptional circumstance in itself, this could qualify for a variance.

Commissioner Gower stated a variance identifies an area of our code that needs more attention, or identifies a circumstance outside of things normally dealt with. This site does not meet the topographic constraints to allow for a variance.

Commissioner Marshall stated he cannot support granting a variance. He explained to the applicants that the Planning Commission faces two policy choices here between how we deal with variances and what they say about how we apply our code, and the applicant’s specific situation. There are other things that could be done to address the crime issue without a variance. He stated he cannot make the necessary finding that the characteristics of this particular site drive the need to have a variance.

*It was moved by Commissioner Marshall, seconded by Commissioner Hawkins, in the case of (LDC20-00031 (Caliber Collision Electric Fence), based upon non-compliance with the applicable findings, to deny the variance due to the inability to make variance findings a and b. The motion to deny the variance carried unanimously with four (4) commissioners present.*
Commissioner Gower read the appeal process into the record.

RESULT: APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER: John Marshall, Commissioner
SECONDER: Ed Hawkins, Commissioner
AYES: Peter Gower, Ed Hawkins, John Marshall, Paul Olivas
ABSENT: Mark Johnson, Kathleen Taylor, Alex Velto

7 Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Liaison Report

Commissioner Gower reported the Regional Planning Commission found Daybreak in conformance with the Regional Plan. Silver Hills was found not in conformance.

8 Staff Announcements

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

7:44 PM

Angela Fuss, Planning Manager, reported that next Tuesday, February 11, there will be a City Council workshop on the zoning code update. She also reported that two cases were appealed and will go to City Council on February 12: Verdi Boat and RV; and Majestic special use permit.

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

None

10 Public Comment

None

11 Adjournment (For Possible Action)

The meeting was adjourned at 7:50 p.m.
MINUTES
Regular Meeting
Reno City Planning Commission
Wednesday, February 19, 2020 ● 6:00 PM
Reno City Council Chamber, One East First St, Reno, NV 89501

Commissioners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Arrived</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark Johnson, Chair</td>
<td>326-8864</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Taylor, Vice Chair</td>
<td>326-8859</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Gower</td>
<td>326-8860</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Hawkins</td>
<td>326-8862</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Marshall</td>
<td>326-8863</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Olivas</td>
<td>326-8861</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Velto</td>
<td>326-8861</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

2 Roll Call

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

The meeting was called to order at 6:05 PM.

3 Public Comment
None

4 Approval of Minutes (For Possible Action)

4.1 Reno City Planning Commission - Regular - Jan 9, 2020 6:00 PM  (For Possible Action) 6:06 PM

It was moved by Commissioner Hawkins, seconded by Commissioner Gower, to approve the meeting minutes. The motion carried with five (5) in favor and two (2) abstentions by Commissioners Taylor and Marshall.
RESULT: ACCEPTED [5 TO 0]
MOVER: Ed Hawkins, Commissioner
SECONDER: Peter Gower, Commissioner
AYES: Johnson, Gower, Hawkins, Olivas, Velto
ABSTAIN: Kathleen Taylor, John Marshall

4.2 Reno City Planning Commission - Workshop - Jan 21, 2020 5:00 PM (For Possible Action) 6:07 PM

It was moved by Commissioner Gower, seconded by Commissioner Taylor, to approve the meeting minutes. The motion carried with five (5) in favor and two (2) abstentions by Commissioners Olivas and Velto.

RESULT: ACCEPTED [5 TO 0]
MOVER: Peter Gower, Commissioner
SECONDER: Kathleen Taylor, Vice Chair
AYES: Johnson, Taylor, Gower, Hawkins, Marshall
ABSTAIN: Paul Olivas, Alex Velto

5 Public Hearings

5.1 Staff Report (For Possible Action): Case No. LDC20-00035 (Project TUSK) - A request has been made for special use permits to allow: a) a ±146,500 square foot truck terminal use; b) 24-hour operations; and c) grading within two major drainageeways. The ±37.4 acre site is generally located north of North Virginia Street, south of U.S. 395, east of Stead Boulevard, and west of Webb Circle. The site is within the Mixed Use/North Virginia Street Transit Corridor (MU/NVTC) zones (a concurrent request for Industrial Commercial (IC) zoning is in process) and has an Industrial Master Plan land use designation. njg [Ward 4] 6:07 PM

Andy Durling, Wood Rodgers, gave an overview of the project.

Nathan Gilbert, Associate Planner, presented the staff report.

Commissioners present disclosed that they met with the applicant's representative and/or are familiar with the site.

Public Comment:

Ross Aikin expressed concerns related to his neighboring business. He would like to see a setback and protective barrier along the entrance near their neighboring business. There are 12 mature trees along the east perimeter that would have to be sacrificed to the project and he would like to see some compensation for those trees as well as a landscape buffer included with the protective barrier. He should not incur any cost associated with this
project but has already been served a lean notice from Wood Rogers.

Martin DeBard submitted a comment card in favor but did not wish to speak.

Joel Fountain submitted a comment card in favor but did not wish to speak.

Nick Knecht submitted a comment card in favor but did not wish to speak.

Rick LaMay submitted a comment card in favor but did not wish to speak.

Tom Fennell submitted a comment card in favor but did not wish to speak.

Baker Krukow submitted a comment card in favor but did not wish to speak.

There were no further requests to speak.

Mr. Durling reviewed the proposed parking in response to Commissioner Gower's questions. There was further discussion regarding parking and flaggers at the entrances.

Mr. Durling explained for Commissioner Hawkins the plans for drainage on the site.

Mr. Durling explained for Commissioner Hawkins that there are some trees in the access easement that need to be removed. The landscape plan will require us to mitigate that and it will be addressed during final design.

Mr. Durling explained for Commissioner Marshall why the truck bays will be located on the side closest to the existing mobile home park. The site is designed so the lower traffic generator would be on the side closest to the mobile home park. He explained that the mobile home park is a non-conforming use. It is not residentially zoned so the residential adjacency standards don't necessarily apply. There are residents there and that is why the sound wall is included in the conditions. He also answered questions regarding parking on the site.

Mr. Gilbert confirmed for Commissioner Marshall that code identifies SUPs for residential adjacency and this does not meet that criteria. The findings do reference compatibility and that is something for the Planning Commission to take into consideration.

Mr. Gilbert explained for Commissioner Taylor that code restricts perimeter fencing to 6 feet and there are no tools at this time to make that any higher.
Mr. Gilbert explained for Chair Johnson how this fits cleanly under the truck terminal definition. One distinction is that there is no significant warehousing and items are not being stored for longer than 24 hours.

Chair Johnson and Commissioner Gower discussed the large amount of paved area that is proposed and mitigation options such as the use of cool surfaces.

Commissioner Gower stated that he liked Mr. Gilbert's response of providing flexibility to staff to address the adjacency concerns and buffering with the neighboring residents. He expressed support for electric vehicle (EV) ready options as proposed by the applicant. He encouraged the applicant to look at options for cool surfaces.

It was moved by Commissioner Gower, seconded by Commissioner Taylor, in the case of LDC20-00035 (Project TUSK), based upon compliance with applicable findings, to approve the special use permit, subject to conditions in the staff report with modifications to Condition No. 6 as proposed by staff and the addition of a condition for implementing EV ready infrastructure.

There was discussion regarding the need for more specificity if a condition for EV readiness is going to be added. It was determined that a specific number of charging stations is not required. The intent would be to run sufficient backbone infrastructure to allow for the fleet to transition to electric in the future.

Motion carried with six (6) in favor and one (1) opposition by Commissioner Marshall.

RESULT: APPROVED [6 TO 1]
MOVER: Peter Gower, Commissioner
SECONDER: Kathleen Taylor, Vice Chair
AYES: Johnson, Taylor, Gower, Hawkins, Olivas, Velto
NAYS: John Marshall

5.2 Staff Report (For Possible Action - Recommendation to City Council): Case No. LDC20-00038 (Sharlands Business Resource Center PUD Amendment) – A request has been made for an amendment to a Planned Unit Development handbook to convert ±2.44 acres from a professional office use to neighborhood commercial and multifamily uses. The site is located within Sharlands PUD zoning district and has a Master Plan land use designation of Suburban Mixed-Use (SMU). The ±2.44 acre property is located on the south of Sharlands Avenue and ±1,600 feet west of its intersection of Ambassador Drive. [Ward 1] 6:59 PM
Scott Silva, representing the applicant, gave an overview of the project and amendment request.

Brook Oswald, Associate Planner, presented the staff report.

Commissioners Velto, Gower, and Marshall had no disclosures. The remaining commissioners present disclosed that they visited the site.

Public Comment:

Roger Kadz expressed concern regarding traffic issues.

Gideon Caplovitz spoke regarding trucks transporting boxes.

There were no further requests to speak.

*It was moved by Commissioner Marshall, seconded by Commissioner Gower, in the case of LDC20-00038 (Sharlands Business Resources Center PUD Amendment), based upon compliance with applicable findings, to recommend approval to City Council for the amendment to the Sharlands Design Guidelines. Motion carried unanimously with seven (7) commissioners present.*

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

Staff Report (For Possible Action): Meridian 120 South Villages 1 through 6: LDC17-00061 (Villages 1 & 2); LDC18-00087 (Villages 3 & 4); LDC20-00013 (Villages 1 & 2 Cluster Development); and LDC20-00018 (Villages 5 & 6) - A request has been made for three tentative map requests and associated special use permits that total 621 single family residential units. The project consists of six phases. The requests are more specifically described below: [Ward 5] 7:20 PM

Andy Durling, Wood Rodgers, gave an overview of the project.

Heather Manzo, Associate Planner, presented the staff report. Staff is recommending approval of the tentative maps and special use permits.

The commissioners present made the following disclosures: site visits, received and read emails, met with applicant's representative, met with the applicant, met with members of the public, familiar with the site.
Public Comment:

The following people spoke expressing concerns regarding the project: M.L. Belli; Pam McNeil; Catherine Smith; Ken McNeil; Addie Argyris; Trevor Mead; Vernon Anderson; Gideon Caplovitz; Joseph Callahan; Chance Reading; Ed Kaufer; DeeAnn Radcliffe; Alice House; Casey Corbett; Kathie Mead; Emanuela Heller-MacNeilage; Patricia Weaver; Robert Dufield; and Carly Borchard.

The following people submitted written comments expressing concerns but were not present or did not wish to speak: Susan and Stephen Oldham; Kenneth Greenwell; Bill Duras; Michael and Carol; Gary Kohler; Sue Kohler; Spencer Box; Christine Fish; Joel; Elizabeth; Pat Mead; Gene; Mr. Tinkham; Melody; Eugene; Edward; Susan; Pam; Paige Miller; John Cane; Giselle; Dustin; Martin; John Weaver; Anna Marie; Shannon Mead; Patrick Mead; Dianna; Christopher Lynch, Paul Roberts; Lauren; Brian White; Erica White; Heather Dillard; and Matt.

Chair Johnson closed public comment.

(Recess at 8:48 p.m. The meeting was called back to order at 9:01 p.m.)

Mr. Durling presented for Commissioner Velto a broad overview of traffic in the area and level of service (LOS) standards. All of the intersections shown in the traffic study operate within acceptable LOS with the improvements the applicant would make.

Paul Solaegui discussed the traffic study results for Commissioner Velto and confirmed Figure 5 is cumulative for all projects in the area.

Mr. Solaegui answered questions from Commissioner Velto regarding traffic flows, vehicle queuing at peak hours, and how the proposed roundabout would mitigate traffic queuing. He explained the traffic study does not include a biking or pedestrian component. A pedestrian/bike path is provided in a separate structure underneath the freeway and because of the narrowness of the bridge, we suggest that bikes and pedestrians use the separate underpass. He also discussed his coordination with the development team and was told a business park would be an appropriate use, so they looked at floor area ratios and took the acreage and calculated what size building might go there with the typical business park floor area ratio. They then went to the ITE manual and calculated the trips based on the size of that factored building.

Mr. Solaegui explained for Commissioner Marshall that there would still be about 2,000 average daily trips (ADT) of available capacity on the overpass before exceeding LOS C.
Mr. Soleaegui explained for Chair Johnson that the Boomtown truck stop was not included in the study.

Mr. Soleaegui explained for Commissioner Taylor that city staff, other agencies, and project designers use traffic study results. When we know what the business park will contain and the real unit count is yielded there may be a need to do an update on the traffic study. Right now this is a very detailed study based on the very best available information. He also confirmed that the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) will make the call about accepting all of the design parameters on the proposed roundabout.

Mr. Soleaegui explained for Commissioner Velto the primary options NDOT has to choose from are a stop sign, signal, or roundabout.

Carey Chism, Wood Rodgers, further explained all the work the applicant has done with NDOT to date. Until we can provide a design that satisfies all of NDOT's requirements, NDOT will not issue an encroachment permit.

Mr. Chism confirmed for Commissioner Marshall that NDOT prefers roundabouts. The applicant submitted preliminary designs and NDOT said everything looks good and that we should move forward and bring them a design when it's closer to final.

Fire Marshall Tray Palmer explained for Commissioner Hawkins that state law provides certain requirements for building in a wildland urban interface. He also provided details about fire code sprinkler requirements and thresholds to require a secondary access point.

Fire Chief Dave Cochran responded to Commissioner Taylor discussing the fire department’s comfort level with the requirements. The requirements could always be better but they are comfortable with where they are now. He confirmed that they would be involved at the final map stage.

Fire Chief Cochran discussed for Commissioner Marshall the funding components and process for a fire station and its operation. City Council recognizes the need for additional money to be spent on public safety including fire.

Chief Cochran explained for Commissioner Gower the cost for building a new fire station is about $550/square foot in today's dollars. He confirmed that the number of housing units being discussed would cover the construction cost of the station. He also discussed the fire apparatus replacement program and the staffing costs.
Fire Marshall Palmer confirmed for Commissioner Gower the response time from the closest station is 11 minutes and he discussed the standard response times.

Angela Fuss, Planning Manager, explained for Commissioner Olivas the tax structure and City Council budgeting process for funding personnel.

John Enloe, Truckee Meadows Water Authority (TMWA), discussed for Commissioner Hawkins changes in water management in the Verdi area in the last two years. There is a project currently out to bid that will be a connection between TMWA's system and the Boomtown water system that will be operational within about a year. From a water supply standpoint, the developers are well aware of how much capacity they can serve.

Mr. Enloe explained for Commissioner Velto the service from the initial connection that will be completed in a year will be based primarily on groundwater. The connection will allow us to shut the wells off in the winter when demands are low and supply the area with surface water. During the summer peak period we will have to run the wells. Once the TMWA connection is made they will be pumping less groundwater overall than they do today.

Commissioner Hawkins referred to Mr. Belli's comments regarding his well going down and asked if there is anything that will happen with this development that will affect his well any more than it already has.

Mr. Enloe responded stating no.

Mr. Enloe confirmed for Commissioner Taylor that a will serve letter would not be issued if there is no water available, but they are confident there is water. He also confirmed TWMA would be involved in the final map process.

Commissioner Gower asked how TMWA's water supply interacts with water used for fire.

Mr. Enloe responded stating they meet all the standards that the City of Reno Fire Department requires.

Ms. Manzo explained for Commissioner Velto Condition No. 15 requiring a pedestrian bicycle path. It is a bit open as far as where the location would be. The applicant's plan shows the connection would be in the undercrossing where the cattle crossing is located today. However, that is private land and permission would need to be granted for easements to make the connection at that location. There are other possibilities and the applicant will need to determine where it will be located before the first final map for
village 3, 4, 5 or 6 is recorded.

Ms. Manzo explained for Commissioner Gower Condition No. 15 includes a requirement that the improvements be completed before the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy within village 3, 4, 5 or 6.

Mr. Durling confirmed for Commissioner Gower that the applicant is confident they will be able to get the easement needed to realize the full pedestrian bicycle connection.

Mr. Durling and Ms. Manzo answered questions from Commissioner Marshall regarding wildlife corridor requirements. They will be identified with the first tentative map for each planning area. The applicant has identified their major drainageways as their wildlife corridors.

Ms. Manzo and Ms. Fuss discussed the text amendment process and how this proposal relates to it for Commissioner Gower. The project is conditioned so that any amendment to the MGOD would have to be reflected when they come forward with a tentative map. If the code changes, their project would have to conform to the code when they come forward with their tentative map.

Ms. Manzo confirmed for Commissioner Taylor that Condition No. 10 is specifically to the approval of the Community Development Department but part of that is complying with the MGOD standards which require coordination with NDOW.

Staff and applicant representatives answered questions providing clarification regarding drainage features, coordination with Steamboat Ditch Company, potential price points for tri-plexes, residential development in an AC zone, and cluster development.

Commissioners began discussion.

Commissioner Gower expressed concern with the procedure related to the relationship of this request running concurrent with the text amendment. It is concerning because we as a city have initiated a process were we have involved the public stakeholders and it has the potential to change the decision space we are operating in tonight. He expressed concern related to the information provided on fire related to general special use finding c and tentative map findings d and j. He expressed concern related to connectivity. We heard that the project maintains an adequate level of service for automobiles but in terms of the connectivity component we have over 600 homes proposed and we are proposing a single point of access under a freeway through a potential truck stop with an easement to be determined. His concerns with that are relative to special use permit findings d and b and tentative map related to the master plan finding for connectivity. Lastly, he expressed...
concern related to affordability. As a city we are trying to develop strategies for increasing housing affordability. In addition to price points, when we start adding on other fees for mitigation efforts it does not improve our affordability issue.

Commissioner Velto stated it seems like we are evaluating a lot of things we should not be evaluating like whether or not the city is going to fund a fire station. He stated that they should not be considering costs and that their job is not to make the policy but to apply code as written. If the code allows what is being proposed, it should be approved. It is not our job to say we don't like the plan because it doesn't create affordable housing. If you increase supply, you lower the price point. The discussion regarding this procedural issue that we should wait for a text amendment is a violation of due process. With the conditions that are in place he can make all the findings.

Commissioner Taylor stated that sometimes this body operates outside of the perimeters of what we are supposed to be doing. She stated she does not see any findings that say to look at the general fund or the City Council priorities. That is not what we are directed to do and we don't have the authority to do that. She stated she heard concerns about fire, traffic, water, drainage, and wildlife and that she can make all of the findings because they had answers from subject matter experts who will be involved through the whole process.

Commissioner Marshall disagreed that the Planning Commission is stepping outside our boundaries. It is our job to look at what we are trying to do with implementing the master plan and code. He discussed concerns with the project's placement in growth tiers identified in the master plan. He also discussed concerns with infrastructure not being in place. We have to rely on things like discretionary approval of future budgets if infrastructure is to be in place concurrent with the demand. If you look at the structure of our master plan, including some of the key implementation and growth policy concerns, as a general matter I can't make the findings of consistency because this is developing at the fringes where we don't have infrastructure in place.

Commissioner Olivas stated this is a tough one and it is also unique as we have asked the developer to bring all phases to us at once. We don't normally see it that way and some things are too far out into the future to know exactly how they will shape up so there will be unanswered questions. He stated the infrastructure issues have been addressed. The residents have rights to not just be run over by developers, but the developers are also land owners and have rights as well. Our goal is to balance everything and minimize the negative externalities.

Commissioner Hawkins stated he cannot make findings related to infrastructure.
It was moved by Commissioner Velto, seconded by Commissioner Olivas, in the case of LDC17-00061 (Meridian 120 South Villages 1 & 2) and LDC20-00013 (Meridian 120 South Villages 1 & 2 Cluster Development), based upon compliance with the applicable findings, to approve the tentative map and special use permit, subject to conditions. Motion carried with four (4) in favor and three (3) oppositions by Commissioners Gower, Hawkins, and Marshall.

RESULT: APPROVED [4 TO 3]
MOVER: Alex Velto, Commissioner
SECONDER: Paul Olivas, Commissioner
AYES: Mark Johnson, Kathleen Taylor, Paul Olivas, Alex Velto

Motion: Motion to approve the tentative map and special use permits, subject to conditions for Case No. LDC18-00087 (Meridian 120 South Villages 3 & 4) 7:28 PM

It was moved by Commissioner Velto, seconded by Commissioner Olivas, in the case of LDC18-00087 (Meridian 120 South Villages 3 & 4), based upon compliance with applicable findings, to approve the tentative map and special use permit, subject to conditions.

Chair Johnson stated he is not able to make special use permit finding e based on the additional density for that area.

Motion failed with three (3) in favor and four (4) oppositions by Commissioners Gower, Hawkins, Johnson, and Marshall.

RESULT: DEFEATED [3 TO 4]
MOVER: Alex Velto, Commissioner
SECONDER: Paul Olivas, Commissioner
AYES: Kathleen Taylor, Paul Olivas, Alex Velto

Motion: Motion to approve the tentative map and special use permits, subject to conditions for Case No. LDC20-00018 (Meridian 120 South Villages 5 & 6) 7:28 PM

It was moved by Commissioner Velto, seconded by Commissioner Olivas, in the case of LDC20-00018 (Meridian 120 South Villages 5 & 6), based upon compliance with applicable findings, to approve the tentative map and special use permit, subject to conditions. Motion carried with four (4) in favor and three (3) oppositions by Commissioners Gower, Hawkins, and Marshall.
Chair Johnson read the appeal process into the record.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULT:</th>
<th>APPROVED [4 TO 3]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOVER:</td>
<td>Alex Velto, Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECONDER:</td>
<td>Paul Olivas, Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYES:</td>
<td>Mark Johnson, Kathleen Taylor, Paul Olivas, Alex Velto</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Liaison Report

Commission Gower had no updates to report.

7 Staff Announcements

7.1 Report on status of Planning Division projects.

7.2 Announcement of upcoming training opportunities.

7.3 Report on status of responses to staff direction received at previous meetings.

7.4 Report on actions taken by City Council on previous Planning Commission items.

Angela Fuss discussed results of appeals to City Council for Majestic and Verdi Boat and RV Storage projects.

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

Commissioner Olivas requested a future agenda item for more information about revenue related to new developments.

Commissioner Marshall requested including discussed regarding concurrency findings.

9 Public Comment

None

10 Adjournment (For Possible Action)

The meeting was adjourned 11:46 p.m.
PLANNING COMMISSION
STAFF REPORT

Date: March 18, 2020

To: Reno City Planning Commission

Subject: 6.1. Staff Report (For Possible Action): Case No. LDC20-00045 (Reno Coffee Company Amendment) - A request has been made for an amendment to a special use permit (LDC19-00061 – Reno Coffee Company) to operate a bar in conjunction with a coffee shop between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 12:00 a.m., Sunday through Thursday; and between 7:00 a.m. and 2:00 a.m. on Friday and Saturday. The ±1,122 square foot site is located within a greater ±0.184 acre site at the southeast corner of the intersection of Vassar Street and South Wells Avenue. The subject site is located at 1300 Wells Avenue and is within the Community Commercial/Wells Avenue Neighborhood Plan/Wells Avenue Mixed Use (CC/WANP/WAMU) zoning district and has a Master Plan land use designation of Suburban Mixed-Use (SMU).

From: Heather Manzo, Associate Planner

Ward #: 3
Case No.: LDC20-00045 (Reno Coffee Company Amendment)
Applicant: Josh Callen
APN: 013-371-01
Request: A request has been made for an amendment to a special use permit (LDC19-00061 – Reno Coffee Company) to operate a bar in conjunction with a coffee shop between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 12:00 a.m., Sunday through Thursday; and between 7:00 a.m. and 2:00 a.m. on Friday and Saturday.

Location: The ±1,122 square foot site is located within a greater ±0.184 acre site at the southeast corner of the intersection of Vassar Street and South Wells Avenue. The subject site is located at 1300 Wells Avenue and is within the Community Commercial/Wells Avenue Neighborhood Plan/Wells Avenue Mixed Use (CC/WANP/WAMU) zoning district and has a Master Plan land use designation of Suburban Mixed-Use (SMU).

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

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

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

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

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

4. The hours of operation shall be limited to between the hours of 6:00 a.m. and 12:00 a.m., Sunday through Thursday, and between 6:00 a.m. and 2:00 a.m. on Friday and Saturday.

Background: On July 3, 2019, a special use permit (SUP) (LDC19-00061 – Reno Coffee Company) to establish a bar use in conjunction with a coffee shop was approved by the Planning Commission. At that time, no additional conditions of approval were recommended to mitigate the approved use.

This request is to allow for the hours of operation to be extended beyond the code allowable hours of between 6:00 a.m. and 11:00 p.m. The application materials note that the business currently opens at 7:00 a.m., daily. The request is to allow for extended nighttime hours to midnight Sunday through Thursday, and to 2:00 a.m. on Friday and Saturday nights.

Analysis: Per Reno Municipal Code (RMC), all special use permit (SUP) findings a through h must be made in order to approve this request. The following is an analysis of each of the required SUP findings as they relate to the request.

Finding a. The proposed use is compatible with existing surrounding land uses and development.
The subject site is surrounded by properties located within the Wells Avenue Neighborhood Plan/Wells Avenue Mixed Use with an underlying Community Commercial (CC) base zoning district. Uses surrounding the site include a variety of offices, a bank, and other commercial and service related businesses. The applicant provided an analysis of similar uses along Wells Avenue and Vassar Streets, which operate similarly to this request. The applicant has noted that in addition to 24 hour markets and grocery stores within the surrounding area, there are approximately five similar businesses, which are either open until 2:00 a.m. or operate 24 hours. The Wells Avenue corridor has experienced renewal and reinvestment in recent years. The subject site has undergone a recent interior and exterior remodel including the addition of windows along the building fronts (Exhibit A). Application materials note that additional visibility and a stronger business presence along Wells Avenue during nighttime hours will result in increased pedestrian activity and a safer, more active environment along the corridor. Condition No. 4 is recommended to allow for the hours of operation that have been requested.

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

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

The subject site has a Suburban Mixed-Use (SMU) Master Plan land use designation and is located within the Central Neighborhood Area, per the Structure Plan Framework identified in the Master Plan. This request as proposed and with recommended conditions is in support of the following Master Plan policies:

- Policy 1.2C: Existing Business – The proposed project supports the growth and retention of a local business.
Policy 1.5A: Quality of Life - The request to extend hours will provide for a more active environment along Wells Avenue and provide additional choices for nearby residents and employees.

Policy 2.2B: Underutilized Properties – Reno Coffee Company is located in a building that was renovated from a blighted, run-down large retail space to a more modernized multitenant space.

Policy 2.5B: Transit-Oriented Development - A transit service stop on the corner of Wells Avenue and Vassar Street allows the business to be easily accessible to public transit users. Access to public transit helps reduce vehicle miles traveled and encourages walk-ability and active lifestyles.

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

Public Safety (Exhibit B): The Reno Police Department comments noted no concerns with the proposal. Comments note that with recent tenant space improvements, there is 70% more visibility into the business from the street, and use of LED lighting assists in providing natural surveillance, which supports a decrease in crime opportunities. Comments also note that the request will generate activity that is complimentary to and encouraged within the area.

The subject site is located within proximity of Fire Station 3 located at 580 West Moana Lane with a response time of six minutes. The second closest fire station is Station 5 located at 1500 Mayberry Drive with a response time of eight minutes.

Infrastructure Improvements: The project site is already developed and all necessary infrastructure and improvements are in place. From the application materials presented, there is no indication that this request will have any adverse effect/impact to City infrastructure facilities beyond existing use.

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

The request to extend the hours of operation for the business will not change the current traffic volumes generated by the business during the peak hour. The proposed condition amendment will not have an impact to the adjacent street network or Level of Service (LOS). No additional traffic studies are recommended at this time.

Per RMC 18.08.406(f)(2)(a) (Wells Avenue Neighborhood Plan), there are no minimum parking requirements for retail, bars and restaurants in this area; patrons are encouraged to walk, bike and/or take public transportation to the site. Public transportation is available adjacent to the subject site.
Finding e. The proposed site location and scale, intensity, density, height, layout, setbacks, architectural and overall design of the development and the uses proposed, contribute to and enhance the character of the area in which it is located.

The subject site is located within a building that has been recently renovated and no site or building modifications have been proposed in association with this request. The proposed extended hours of operation are consistent with other businesses located along the Wells Avenue corridor and will support a more connected and active pedestrian environment with additional activity and site lighting overnight.

The applicant has stated the Reno Coffee Company business model does not include an entertainment venue. The applicant and staff (Exhibit B) have discussed the parameters for obtaining a special activity permit to hold an event that would be outside of the normal business operations. Should the applicant’s business model change to include more frequent entertainment activities, a SUP would be required.

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

The project is not anticipated to generate any adverse environmental impacts which would be detrimental, or cause a nuisance to area properties. An acoustical analysis was not required with the application, as the project site is not adjacent to any residential uses and it is not anticipated that the proposed use will generate noise levels that exceed the ambient noise levels of the surrounding area.

During the building renovation process, existing parkway landscaping was removed by the property owner. The applicant has been working with the City’s Urban Forester to extend irrigation to the existing landscaped parkways to ensure that placement of street trees along the frontage will have adequate water to survive. The applicant has noted their commitment to working with the City to ensure street trees can be accommodated and will receive water should they be installed in the future.

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

This request does not include any signs. The applicant will be required to comply with established sign standards for the site.
Finding h. The structure has been designed such that the window placement and height do not adversely affect the privacy of existing residential uses.

As identified in the land use compatibility analysis section of this report, there are no residential uses adjacent to the project site and no modifications to the existing building height and window location is proposed.

Neighborhood Advisory Board (NAB): This project was reviewed by the Ward 3 NAB on March 3, 2020. NAB comments were not available at the time that this report was prepared, but will be forwarded to the Planning Commission as they are received.

Legal Requirements:

RMC 18.06.405(e)(1) Special Use Permit

Findings:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Attachments:

- Display Maps (PDF)
- Exhibit A - Existing Floor Plan & Elevations (PDF)
- Exhibit B - Agency Comments (PDF)
- Exhibit C - NAB Comments (PDF)
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LDC20-22245
1 message

Joe Henry <henryj@reno.gov>
To: Heather Manzo <manzoh@reno.gov>

Good morning Heather,
In reviewing this application I would recommend the following conditions of approval:

1. The city tree on vassar that has been removed must be replaced within 6 months of approval. The selection and installation of the tree must be coordinated through the Urban Forester.
2. There are to be no special activity permits allowed for this location for live or recorded entertainment.
3. Any application for cabaret license at this location will require an amendment to the special use permit.

Joseph Henry, CCEA

Senior Code Enforcement Officer
City of Reno
775 334-2360
775 221-9821 cell
To: City of Reno, Business License Division

Business Name: Reno Coffee Company Amendment  Case#: LDC20-00045
Address: 1300 S Wells Av
Completed by: Burow, C 13298

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

Proposed plans do not change physical structure of building so no additional feedback is available regarding CPTED principles from LDC19-00061. Previous comments are provided below for reference. Proposed extension of hours does not pose any specific concerns. Parking is limited and concerns of intoxicated patrons affecting adjacent residential properties does exist. A plan to mitigate nuisance type CFS is encouraged.

Natural Surveillance (Concept focuses on increased visibility):
Noted Concerns: No noted concerns with proposed plans in reference to natural surveillance. Reno Coffee will occupy an existing building which has undergone a renovation that included open view windows with 70% or more visibility. It is unknown what type of lighting exists but LED lighting with 90 degree cutoff and uniformity of spread in accordance with IES standards (proper color temperature of 4-5k Kelvin to illuminate true to color) promotes a decreased perception of crime and increases natural surveillance of normal users and observers.
Possible Solution / Resolution:

Natural Access Control (Concept that focuses on entry & exit points):
Noted Concerns: Natural access control concepts of physically guiding people through the space by strategic design of building entrance, building layout and landscape should be implemented upon changes. Building entrance is plain and blends into structure. Celebrated entry ways create social management and helps direct focus on entry points.
Possible Solution / Resolution:

Territorial Reinforcement (Concept of clearly defining ownership over space):
Noted Concerns: Upon any changes to existing development, the use of territorial reinforcement should be implemented. The use of pavement treatments to delineate semi-public and private space, landscaping, and signage all help define ownership of a property which contribute to a reduction in criminal activity and perceived safety.
Celebrated entry ways help create social management and ease building identification for first responders as well as customers.
Possible Solution / Resolution:

**Maintenance and Management** *(Concept focuses on how Mgmt. runs/maintains property):*
Noted Concerns: Maintenance and management techniques should be in place already. Proper maintenance plans define territory, controls access, and creates ownership over space which all contribute to the reduction in criminal activity. Any landscape should be maintained to CPTED standards with lower tree canopy trimmed up at least 6’ and bushes/shrubs trimmed down to 2’ to keep open visibility in this desired range. Graffiti removal as well as trash and debris should be removed immediately to prevent additional nuisance type CFS.
Possible Solution / Resolution:

**Design guide for reviewing project – CHECKLIST**

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

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

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

5. Does design allow for future sight line impediments such as landscaping in maturity? □ X □

6. Does access to hidden areas such as underpasses or parking areas have clear sight lines? □ X □

### Lighting

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

### Concealed or Isolated Routes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Can concealed and isolated routes such as staircases, passageways or tunnels be eliminated?</td>
<td>□ X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Are there entrapment areas within 50 - 100 meters at the end of a concealed or isolated route? □ x

3. Is there an alternate route? **NA** □ □

4. If a pedestrian cannot see the end of a concealed or isolated route, can visibility be enhanced by lighting or improving natural surveillance? **NA** □ □

5. Are concealed or isolated routes uniformly lit? **NA** □ □

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

7. Is there formal surveillance? **UNKNOWN** □ □

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

### Entrapment Areas

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

### Isolation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Does design incorporate natural surveillance?</td>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Do areas of concerns such as isolated routes and parking areas provide natural surveillance?  \( \checkmark \)  

3. If providing natural surveillance is not possible, are emergency telephones, panic alarm and attendants provided? \textbf{UNKNOWN}  

4. Can compatible land uses be provided to increase activity?  \( \checkmark \)  

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

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

Attachment: Exhibit B - Agency Comments (12079: LDC20-00045 (Reno Coffee Company Amendment))
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership, Maintenance, and Management</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Does the design provide territorial reinforcement through design features?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Does the design allow for easy maintenance?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Are there signs and information to guide people on how to report maintenance concerns?</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Does the management of space provide maintenance priorities e.g. removal of offensive graffiti?</td>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signs and Information</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Are signs visible and legible?</td>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Are signs conveying messages clearly?</td>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Is information adequate?</td>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Are sign strategically located to allow for maximum visibility?</td>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Are signs well maintained?</td>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Are maps provided in large areas such as underpasses, parks, etc.?</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Are signs displaying hours of operation?</td>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Design</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Do quality and aesthetically pleasing built environments compromise security concerns?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is the scale of development consistent with neighbors to avoid large gaps on streets?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Is design of the built environment simple and easy to understand?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Is there space that can become dead space?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How is the built environment used at night time? <strong>UNKNOWN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Are construction materials used to enhance safety and security?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Comments / Concerns:**
February 13, 2020

Angela Fuss, AICP
Planning Manager
Community Development Department
City of Reno
P.O. Box 1900
Reno, Nevada  89505

Subject:  City of Reno January 2020 Intake

Dear Ms. Fuss:

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

1. ANX20-00003 (Evans Creek Annexation)
2. LDC20-00045 (Reno Coffee Company Amendment)
3. LDC20-00046 (Sage Point #7)

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

These comments also align with the Ozone Advance Path Forward, ReImagine Reno Master Plan, the City of Reno’s Sustainability and Climate Action Plan, the 2019 Truckee Meadows Regional Plan, and the AQMD’s Ozone Advance presentation at the January 15, 2020 Reno Planning Commission meeting.

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

2. Ozone Advance Strategies: The AQMD is one of 30 areas in the country currently accepted into EPA’s Ozone Advance program. Ozone Advance’s primary goal is to encourage local governments to take proactive steps that improve air quality and prevent a “non-attainment” designation for ozone. The most effective approach to implementing Ozone Advance is to include those strategies into each jurisdiction’s codes. AQMD will continue to participate in Reno’s Title 18 update and is committed to incorporating Ozone Advance
strategies into Washoe County and Sparks’ codes. The following strategies are not uncommon in areas that are designated as “non-attainment” for the ozone NAAQS.

a. **Transportation:** Motor vehicles are the largest category of ozone precursors (nitrogen oxides and volatile organic compounds). As appropriate, these projects should include strategies that minimize vehicle trips, VMT, and tailpipe emissions. Example strategies include:

   i. Providing Employee Trip Reduction information to employees of all business sizes.
   
   ii. Requiring specific trip reduction targets for businesses with at least 25 employees, with increasingly higher targets as the number of employees increases.
   
   iii. Incorporating Electric Vehicle (EV) charging-ready infrastructure in new construction, especially in areas away from the urban core where cars are the only transportation choice.
   
   iv. Park and Ride areas.

b. **Energy:** Buildings use large amounts of energy and water. Short-term investments during construction can reduce the consumption of energy and have long-term air quality benefits. As appropriate, these projects should incorporate elements that reduce the long-term energy demands of buildings. Example elements include:

   i. Constructing to an ENERGY STAR standard.

   ii. Requiring specific energy efficiency standards for new construction.

   iii. Incorporating renewable energy sources, such as solar or geothermal, into new buildings.

   iv. Implementing energy-efficient lighting and HVAC systems.

c. **Areas Around Schools:** Schools attract hundreds to thousands of students who must travel to and from school each day. Infrastructure within two miles of a school determines students’ transportation choices. Multiple access points before and after school can greatly reduce travel distances for students that walk and bike. As appropriate, these projects should incorporate elements that reduce the number of school-related motor vehicle trips. Example elements include:

   i. Incorporating elements that could improve pedestrian and bike connectivity, especially in areas within two miles of a school. These can include easier connections to a multi-use path or wider sidewalks 0.5 miles around a school.

   ii. Considering using a walkability index, such as Walk Score, to evaluate transportation choices around a school.

d. **Urban Heat Island (UHI):** Summertime temperatures in the Truckee Meadows have been increasing for several decades. Warmer temperatures increase ozone formation as well as increase the energy demand for cooling buildings and motor vehicles. As appropriate, these projects should incorporate best practices that minimize factors contributing to Washoe County’s UHI. Example practices include:
i. Creating tree canopies for cool corridors and islands.
ii. Minimizing heat absorbing impervious surfaces.
iii. Increasing vegetative cover.
iv. Applying cool roof practices to all buildings. These practices can include a lighter shade of roofing material and green roofs.
v. Ensuring landscape plans contribute to Reimagine Reno’s goal of increasing the tree canopy to 10 percent by 2036.

e. **Construction Impacts:** Off-road motor vehicles, such as construction equipment, are the second largest category of ozone precursor emissions. Grading operations are also a large source of PM$_{10}$. As appropriate, these projects should: incorporate elements that reduce construction equipment tailpipe emissions. Example elements include:

i. Requiring contractors to implement policies and technologies that reduce unnecessary equipment idling.
ii. Discouraging use of older, inefficient, high-polluting construction equipment (Tier 0 or 1 diesel engines). Two funding resources for contractors with older diesel construction equipment are: 1) EPA’s Diesel Emissions Reduction Act (DERA), and 2) VW Mitigation Funds.
iii. Encouraging use of newer, efficient, lower-polluting construction equipment (Tier 3 or cleaner diesel engines).

Again, thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on these projects. Feel free to contact me at 775-784-7200 if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

Francisco Vega, P.E., MBA
Director, Air Quality Management Division
Washoe County Health District
Ward 3 NAB Project Review Form

The Citizen Input and Review is an opportunity for you to tell us what you think about the plans and projects discussed. We hope the presentations from the developers and City of Reno staff on this project has been beneficial and informative. We want your feedback and comments as we gather information to share with the Planning Commission as they make their findings and decisions. As appropriate, please share your comments on these project areas and other potential issues or modifications.

The form can also be submitted online. Visit Reno.Gov/Residents/Your-Neighborhood

Thank you!

Case #: LDC20-00045 Date: 3/3/20

Community Liaison: Cynthia Espanza

Your Name: Frank Nelson Your Ward: 3

Your Email Address: fnelson1@comcast.com Your Phone Number: 775-434-3595

Do you wish to opt-in to receive Reno Connect email newsletters? YES NO

Reno Connect is the best way to stay informed about the latest news and updates from the City of Reno. We'll never share your email address with third-party persons, companies, or organizations.

Compatibility of proposal with surrounding area:

Reno Coffee Company works well with the area. The time requested as well.
Traffic impacts & pedestrian safety:

---

Proposed design contributes to and enhances the character of the area:

---

Environmental impacts

---

Appropriate signs

---

Other Issues/Suggested Modifications

---
Date: March 18, 2020

To: Reno City Planning Commission

Subject: 7.1. Staff Report (For Possible Action): Acceptance of the City of Reno Annual Report to the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency.

From: Angela Fuss, Planning Manager

Background: The City of Reno Regional Plan Annual Report (Exhibit A) has been updated to provide information on specific planning activities from January – December 2019. This report is designed to meet the requirements of both Nevada State law and the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan and follows a specific format provided by the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency (TMRPA).

Legal Requirements:

- NRS 278.0286 requires each local planning commission responsible for the preparation of a city or county master plan and each affected entity to prepare and submit to the Regional Planning Commission and the Regional Planning Governing Board a report indicating any action taken within the previous calendar year which furthers or assists in carrying out the policies or programs contained in the comprehensive regional plan, and any work relating to the comprehensive regional plan that is proposed for the next fiscal year;
- Truckee Meadows Regional Plan Policy RC7 requires each local government and affected entity to submit an annual report covering the previous calendar year.

Proposed Motion: I move to recommend that the Planning Commission accept the 2019 Annual Report and forward to the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Commission and the Regional Planning Governing Board.

Attachments:

- Exhibit A - City of Reno 2019 Regional Planning Annual Report (DOCX)
City of Reno Regional Planning Annual Report Calendar Year 2019

This annual report outlines activities of the City of Reno during calendar year 2019 pertinent to the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan (TMRP). The report is organized to correspond to the Principles, Goals and Policies of the 2019 Truckee Meadows Regional Plan, adopted on October 10, 2019.

A. POPULATION GROWTH (PG)

Chapter 3 of the Regional Plan, Section 1: Population Growth includes policies that address population forecasting, the use of TMRPA forecasts by local jurisdictions and affected entities for planning, and strategies by local government jurisdictions to support affordable housing.

The ReImagine Reno Master Plan went into effect in March of 2018. The Master Plan includes goals, policies and implementation strategies designed to encourage a more diverse mix of housing options to meet the needs of existing and future residents of all ages, abilities, and income levels, and consistent with the Housing Demand Forecast and Needs Assessment. The Master Plan identifies developing a targeted affordable and workforce housing strategy as a priority initiative to facilitate and incentivize the creation of affordable housing units for low income residents and attainable housing for the city’s workforce. A variety of other implementation strategies also aim to increase the overall diversity of the City’s housing supply, including strategies that provide more guidance regarding the desired types and mix of housing in planned unit developments.

Key objectives of the City’s Zoning Code update include implementation of ReImagine Reno Master Plan, creation of a more user-friendly code, and establishment of a more predictable and streamlined development review process. Code amendments to implement the Master Plan focus on housing affordability, sustainability, and development of site and building design standards consistent with new Master Plan design principles. Housing is a City Council priority involving a variety of programs and strategies. The code update seeks to support the Master Plan through standards that support increased density, reduced parking regulations in targeted areas, connecting new and existing neighborhoods with features such as sidewalks, trails and gathering spaces, targeted infill and redevelopment, and through increased housing types and design alternatives.

B. REGIONAL FORM (RF)

Chapter 3 of the Regional Plan, Section 2: Regional Form includes policies that manage growth in the Truckee Meadows region. These policies address where urban and suburban growth should and should not occur in the future through the use of the Truckee Meadows Service Area (TMSA), Regional Land Designations (i.e. Tiers), and the Rural Area outside of the TMSA. The RF section describes the priority hierarchy for growth, with an emphasis on growing within our core areas before we open up new lands on the fringe.

The ReImagine Reno Master Plan Area-Specific Policies guide the character and form of development in different types of places of the City and its Sphere of Influence (SOI). Area-Specific Policies are embodied in Design Principles for the City’s various place-types that are reflected on the Structure Plan map. Place-types, defined through the Structure Plan, include two adopted regional centers (Downtown and Convention Center), four types of connecting corridors (Urban, Suburban, Neighborhood, and Greenway), three types of neighborhoods (Central, Outer and Foothill), and three types of employment areas (Innovation, Industrial/Logistics and Airport Transportation). The Area-Specific Policies work in
tandem with the Citywide Policies to more clearly define the geographical locations that are infill/redevelopment priority areas for the City. Both policy frameworks (Area-Specific and Citywide) are then supported with implementation strategies that outline actions the City will take to support infill and redevelopment in these priority locations. Specifically, the ReImagine Reno Master Plan identifies growth tiers that support the efficient use of existing public facilities and services by prioritizing development, infrastructure improvements and public investments in the following locations:

- Infill and redevelopment priority areas
- Targeted employment areas that are located within the existing city limits as of the adoption of this Master Plan
- Areas that are located within the existing city limits as of adoption of this Master Plan and have existing infrastructure and services in place
- Areas that are located within the existing city limits that do not have infrastructure and services in place but can be served by the City if infrastructure is built and services can be provided in accordance with other City policies and targets
- All other locations within the SOI.

There were two annexations adopted in the 2019 calendar year totaling approximately ±11.57 acres. Each annexation and its associated acreage is listed in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approval Date</th>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 9, 2019</td>
<td>ANX19-00002</td>
<td>De Spain Lane Annexation</td>
<td>±4.57 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 4, 2019</td>
<td>ANX20-00002</td>
<td>Trego Grid Annexation</td>
<td>±7.0 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Acreage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>±11.57 acres</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The zoning code update proposes to increase minimum density and intensity standards in the downtown area zoning districts, which will help encourage growth in the City's core area. The code update replaces infill development standards with new site and building design standards for each zoning district, including new height/setback standards for single family and mixed residential zoning districts.

C. PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES (PF)

Chapter 3 of the Regional Plan, Section 3: Public Facilities and Services aims to coordinate the effective and efficient provision of public services and facilities through the use of standards (see Policy PF 1) for five key elements of public service provision including: potable water, wastewater, flood control and stormwater management, transportation, and schools. Standards are provided and vary for areas both inside and outside of the TMSA. Policies in the section identify the creation of a public infrastructure investment plan (PIIP), and address capital improvement programs, large facilities plans (such as the Regional Transportation Plan and Regional Water Management Plan), renewable energy technology, and regional utility corridors and sites.

The City of Reno’s Concurrency Management System promotes the timely, orderly, and efficient arrangement of adequate public facilities and infrastructure that support existing and planned development within the city and its sphere of influence. The system also ensures new development does not create a financial burden for existing residents or decrease existing levels of service. This is achieved through the establishment of concurrency requirements and monitoring of facility and infrastructure level of service targets.
Public infrastructure and services included in the Concurrency Management System include water, wastewater/sewer, flood management and storm drainage, transportation, police, fire, and parks and recreation facilities. Responsibilities for providing infrastructure improvements necessitated by new development fall to different public or private entities, as described in the table below. Private developers are responsible for building and/or paying for many of the capital facilities needed to support their projects, particularly those that will service their new development directly (such as local streets). In such cases, developers must demonstrate concurrency prior to the issuance of building permits by the City. Below is a table outlining the roles and responsibilities for infrastructure and service provisions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure/Service</th>
<th>Provider (who builds it?)</th>
<th>Owner (who maintains it?)</th>
<th>Funding Source(s) (who pays for it?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>TMWA/Private Water Purveyors¹</td>
<td>TMWA</td>
<td>Water Resources and Facilities Fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Supply</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>TMWA</td>
<td>Developer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Mains</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>TMWA</td>
<td>Developer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Service Lines</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>TMWA</td>
<td>Developer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater/Sewer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment Capacity</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>Connection Fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer Interceptors</td>
<td>Local Governments; Developer</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>Connection Fee; Developer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer Mains²</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>Local Governments</td>
<td>Developer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Control Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Control and Storm Drainage Improvements</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>City of Reno/ HOA or similar</td>
<td>Developer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Streets</td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td>City of Reno</td>
<td>Developer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Streets</td>
<td>RTC; Developer</td>
<td>City of Reno, RTC</td>
<td>Regional Road Impact Fee; Developer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Protection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Police Stations</td>
<td>City of Reno/Developer</td>
<td>City of Reno</td>
<td>Developer Dedication; Assessment District; General Fund &amp; CIP; Impact Fee; Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Protection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Fire Stations</td>
<td>City of Reno/ Developer</td>
<td>City of Reno</td>
<td>Developer Dedication; Assessment District; General Fund &amp; CIP; Impact Fee; Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Parks</td>
<td>City of Reno; Developer</td>
<td>City of Reno/ HOA or similar</td>
<td>Residential Construction Tax; Developer Dedication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td>Washoe County School District</td>
<td>WBSD CIP; Voluntary Developer Dedication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ In limited situations  
² Sewer mains are less than 18 inches in diameter

The code update modifies closed basin stormwater retention standards to require stormwater retention at a 1:1.3 ratio. A new wellhead protection overly district requires that potential polluting projects near drinking water wells notify TMWA prior to approval. The code updated expands site design requirements for pedestrian and bicycle connectivity. The update also anticipates future development of a
detailed sidewalk and trails plan to replace the current administrative review process for variations to standard sidewalk requirements.

D. NATURAL RESOURCES (NR)

Chapter 3 of the Regional Plan, Section 4: Natural Resources discusses the management of the Region’s natural resources. Prominent ideas in this section include the coordination of natural resource management, the implementation of development restriction in the Development Constraints Area water management, air quality, open space and greenways, and sustainable development practices. Finally, Policy NR 1 - Natural Resources Plan presents a path forward for TMRPA to continue refining the protection of natural resources in the region through a cooperative approach.

The Master Plan supports preservations of natural features and mitigation of impacts including major drainageways, environmentally sensitive areas, hydrologic resources, air quality and development constraints areas. This is also accomplished through identification and prioritization of potential trail, bikeway and access improvements and open space criteria.

On July 31, 2019, the City Council adopted Reno’s first Sustainability and Climate Action Plan. The plan reflects goals and policies in the City of Reno’s Master Plan and builds on the city’s commitment and previous actions to reduce climate pollution while improving the quality of life for all residents. The plan includes the following nine priorities:

1. Lead by Example—Sustainable City Operations
2. Transition to Clean, Renewable Energy
3. Green Building as Standard Practice
4. Create Lively, Low-Carbon Neighborhoods
5. Toward Zero Waste
6. Healthy, Equitable Urban Forest
7. Access to Fresh, Local Foods
8. Safeguard Water Resources
9. Strengthen Climate Resilience

Code amendments are part of an integrated land use and transportation strategy intended to enhance sustainability and promote vibrant urban centers, natural resource protections, and multi-modal transportation options.

E. REGIONAL COORDINATION (RC)

Chapter 3 of the Regional Plan, Section 5: Regional Coordination aims to coordinate the implementation of the Regional Plan across the various jurisdictions and entities in the region. This is accomplished through reviewing applicable actions of each jurisdiction/entity and reporting out a collection of related data as part of the Truckee Meadows Annual Report (the product of this request).

The Master Plan supports ongoing cooperative planning efforts, as well as the evaluation of existing and future joint planning efforts through the Growth & Reinvestment Framework. All ministerial and discretionary development projects adhere to overlay design and review requirements.
The City continues to build on current initiatives and tools and collaborate with regional partners to ensure that Reno is an attractive place for existing and future employers and residents. Investments in infrastructure, public safety, and quality of life amenities are a key focus. The City continues to leverage the presence and continued growth of UNR, define local priorities in terms of serviceable employment land, provide workforce training and adult education programs for workers in Reno, and continue to attract residents from outside the region—especially for those with jobs skills that can support existing and new businesses.

F. IMPLEMENTING THE REGIONAL PLAN IN 2020

Local governments and affected entities are encouraged to include a section regarding implementation of the 2019 Truckee Meadows Regional Plan that addresses ongoing projects and policy changes (e.g. scheduled additions resulting from the official conformance review) that are planned to be completed in 2020 as a result of the new plan’s adoption.

The following list identifies ongoing policy changes and master plan amendments to implement the Regional Plan:

- Deletion of Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan from Master Plan and assignment of City of Reno land use designations to areas previously within the joint planning area boundary.
- Assignment of City of Reno Master Plan land use designations to all locations in Reno’s SOI.
- Amendments to the Cooperative Planning Area portion of the Master Plan to address the removal of identified Cooperative Planning Areas in the Regional Plan and associated amendment to City of Reno Zoning Code to address cooperative planning area overlay zoning district standards.
- Amendments to address scheduled additions identified during the review of the City of Reno Master Plan against the recently adopted 2019 Truckee Meadows Regional Plan.
- Potential amendments revisiting minimum density/intensity standards for Regional Centers and Urban Corridors.

The following list identifies ongoing projects to implement the Regional Plan in the 2020 timeframe.

- Adoption of the Zoning Code Update
- Master Plan Performance Measures report to support ongoing data-driven policy evaluation
- Participation in Public Infrastructure Investment Plan (PIIP) Natural Resources Plan efforts led by TMRPA