



Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

November 18, 2025, 5:00 PM

Town Hall – Administrative Center | 10183 Truckee Airport Road, Truckee, CA

1. Call to Order 5:00 PM

2. Roll Call- Chair Cavanagh, Vice Chair Taylor, Commissioner Clarin, Commissioner Toups, Commissioner Kaufman

Staff Present: Denyelle Nishimori, Community Development Director; Jenna Gatto, Town Planner; Yumie Dahn, Principal Planner; Chelsea Crager, Senior Planner; Lynn Baumgartner, Housing Division Program Analyst; Kayley Metroka, Administrative Technician.

3. Pledge of Allegiance

4. Public Comment:

None.

5. Approval of Minutes

5.1 October 21, 2025 PC Minutes

Commissioner Kaufman made a motion that was seconded by Vice Chair Taylor to approve the October 21, 2025 Minutes as submitted. The motion passed and carried the following vote:

Ayes: Chair Cavanagh, Vice Chair Taylor, Commissioner Toups, Commissioner Kaufman

Noes: None

Abstain: Commissioner Clarin

Absent: None

6. Public Hearings (Minor Review)

7. Public Hearings (Major Review)

7.1 Application 2024-00000088/HDR (Vangorder Residence Historic Design Review); Applicant/Owner: John R. and Jennifer Vangorder; 10098 South East River Street; APN 019-152-041-000 (Continued from July 15, 2025 Planning Commission hearing)

Project Summary: The applicant is requesting Zoning Clearance approval, Historic Design Review and a Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of a new single-family dwelling within the River Character Area of the Historic Preservation Overlay. The proposed project is a new, 4,795-square-foot three-story single-family residence, including 4,115 square feet of conditioned space and a 680-square-foot garage. Chelsea Crager, Senior Planner.

Recommended Action: That the Planning Commission adopt Resolution 2025-10, denying the Zoning Clearance, Historic Design Review, and Certificate of Appropriateness and determining

the project exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Section 15270 (Projects Which Are Disapproved) of the CEQA Guidelines.

An applicant presentation was given by Ben Garberson, Architect and Jennifer Vangorder, Owner.

Clarifying Questions for Applicant:

- Regarding the photos provided on the staff report of other homes downtown Truckee- what are you trying to show us?
 - The similarity of these homes with the proposed home- specifically the gables and the stone-gray color.
- The Historic Guidelines encourage adopting a contemporary interpretation of architectural styles seen historically, and it lists the styles. Of the six listed, which were you most inspired by with the proposed design?
 - Is that one of the 12 questions we were asked to fix? Or are we going back to the design styles?
 - Staff: This was brought up in our last meeting and is listed in the staff report as #10 to discuss.
 - The front porch is a historical interpretation of the craftsman style. Simple covered front porch and a gabled entry.
- Truckee does have a lot of different styles,

Clarifying Questions for Staff:

- When were the Historic Guidelines promulgated?
 - 2003.
- Have there been any changes/amendments to the Historic Guidelines since this application process?
 - No.
- Do we have the number of homes in the Historic District that have been modified since the Historic Guidelines were adopted?
- Technically, we are supposed to compare it to actual historic homes, not newly constructed ones. There are three historic, the Chinese Herb Shop and the neighboring parcel, and one on the south side. There are a lot more on East River and Riverside Drive.
 - The town created a historic preservation program because there was recognition that the heart of Truckee was the downtown and the river. The community went through a process to identify the different character areas and how to define differences in historic value. We also wanted to become a national register. There was an effort to choose what we value as historic downtown. The program's goal is to honor the buildings, not prohibit.

Public Comment:

None.

Disclosures:

Commissioner Clarin: Received a phone call from Mrs. Vangorder regarding the siding.

Commissioner Kaufman: Had a conversation with Chelsea Crager, Senior Planner, to ask specific questions regarding the project.

Deliberation:

- The horizontal siding works, the front door, the gooseneck light fixtures. The matching of the garage and the front door, color works.
- Largest surprise was the amount of windows/glass in the back of the house. We specifically asked for a change there during the last meeting and there is very little change.
- The deck rails had a very slight change from what was requested at the last meeting.
- We do need to maintain town standards and objectively apply those standards.
- The Historic Design Guidelines have been consistent throughout this process.
- I agree with staff on their interpretation of the table in the staff report outlining the inconsistencies with the guidelines. I think we need to solve all of these inconsistencies before moving forward.
- Building form, mass and scale, building orientation are the big issues/inconsistencies.
- Staff have been working with this applicant since June of 2024, and I am sure have been stating these things throughout the process.
- The CDD has stopped charging the applicant for staff time. All of us in Truckee are paying for this staff time, as valuable as it is.
- We are in the historic district, and it does take more time.
- I am with staff's recommendation on this one.
- Does this meet the intent of a contemporary interpretation of a historic architectural style listed in the guidelines? I cannot agree that it is compatible, and I respect and agree with the staff report's findings.
- This does not meet the design guidelines.

Commissioner Kaufman made a motion that was seconded by Commissioner Toups to adopt Planning Commission Resolution 2025-10, denying the Zoning Clearance, Historic Design Review, and Certificate of Appropriateness. The motion passed and carried the following vote:

Ayes: Vice Chair Taylor, Commissioner Toups, Commissioner Kaufman, Commissioner Clarin

Noes: None

Abstain: Chair Cavanagh

Absent: None

7.2 2040 General Plan Implementation—Development Code Amendments for Deed-Restricted Housing Incentives

Recommended Action: That the Planning Commission adopt Resolution 2025-15, taking the following actions:

1) Recommending the amendments to be exempt from CEQA because the adoption of this ordinance is not a "project" pursuant to Sections 15060(c)(2) and 15060(c)(3) of Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations, and because under Section 15061(b)(3) of the State CEQA Guidelines, the amendments are exempt from the requirements of CEQA because it can be seen with certainty that the provisions contained herein would not have the potential for causing a significant effect on the environment; and

2) Recommending approval to the Town Council of Development Code Amendments to create a Deed-Restricted Housing Incentives ordinance and related clean-up amendments.

Clarifying Questions for Staff:

- None.

Public Comment:

Brian Helm: Development team sent in a public comment letter. Requesting staff makes the deed restricted duration included in the code match what's used in Homegrown Housing, which is the 55 years. Requesting staff consider eliminating the restrictions on the development program including percents of specific unit types. These will only serve to eliminate design flexibility that is required to make challenging projects feasible.

Blair Portius: Concerned about the flexibility of the plan development process. The proposed revision to the code creates a circular reference tied to the eligibility requirements included in the deed-restricted housing section of the code. This would limit the ability to use flexible design review or the PD process to request relief from the Objective Design Standards. Regarding the decks, balconies, outdoor storage- being more flexible there and letting the developer or owners have the discretion of that need. We request the town adopts the state levels of parking and no guest parking.

Hayes Parzybok: Regarding the unit mix prescription- it would likely kill any potential project because anything above a one-bedroom is not financially feasible.

The commission took a 10-minute recess.

Discussion:

- What is the AMI we use for the town's rental programs?
 - We use an average AMI for Lease to Locals and Rooted Renters. Those are based on 150% AMI average. In our rental programs we see more households with roommates and that is based on the average adult income. They average the adult's income in the home and that must be under 150% AMI for the one household- that would be \$130,800 annual income at the 150% level.
- Do you feel that it has been working out well?
 - Yes.
- I would be in support of changing the formula to have more qualifying applicants.
- What is the deed-restriction length?
 - In perpetuity and within 55 years.
 - Studios are a large part of our waiting list.
- Council wants to see a mix. I don't love this way of enforcing a mix.
- Some of it is because the market hasn't built those to date.
- There are also site constraints. Studios might be the only thing that fits that makes the project pencil.
- Take out this condition but bring up a monetary incentive.
- 400 square feet minimum is high for storage.
- The height size could be increased.
- I like the idea of proportioning it per bedroom.
- 20-25 square feet per bedroom with a studio counting as a one-bedroom. The length and width proposed is fine.
- Require a minimum of 50% of the units including the deed restricted to have a deck or patio and council take the advisement of developers in our community with 5x6 minimum.
- Parking: three votes for keeping it as written.
- A lot of our projects have been approved without required parking management. They are now looking more seriously at assigning spots.
- Which ones are required? Is this for all projects or of a certain size?
 - A plan will be required going forward for all projects.
- I think it should be required for all deed-restricted projects.
- I don't think it should require covered parking.
 - It is saying "if covered parking is proposed, to fully cover the parking."

- For RM zoning districts- that is really low. Edmunds lofts covered 70%. I think adding a 15% bonus for RM is too small.
- In CMU and NMU what is the max?
 - 70%
- Which parts of the RM would be a problem at massively high site coverage?
 - I don't think it's based on areas of town but based on a site.
- I would suggest we increase the number of washer and dryers per unit.
 - In Frishman Hollow Phase II, they were having problems with tenants sharing these amenities and tenants on wait lists for units that had their own.
 - One set of units for every four units. Make a recommendation to carry this throughout the code, not just this section.
- The goals of this are affordability. We have other ordinances for workforce housing.
- The deed restricted part does require that we do monitoring.
- What is the exact difference between the design review and a planned development?
- All in favor of adding Flexible Design Review.
- I would not put the HPAC review in the deed-restricted programs except for the flexible design review.
- Mixed opinions on flexibility and let council make the final decision.

Draft Recommendations:

- 150% AMI Average of Adults + 1.25 for single parents (Rooted Rentals/Lease for Locals)
- Terms of deed restriction: 55 years and re-ups upon transfer
- Take out 15% studio cap; consider monetary incentives for unit mix
- Storage: Whole development storage based on per bedroom 20-24 sf, but it can be allocated as decided by the developer
- Decks: Minimum of 50% of units have a deck with 30 sf minimum; minimum dimension of 4' in any direction, equally distributed between deed-restricted and market rate units; update diagram to include that the hatched area is considered a "private deck"
- Parking: Keep as-is
- On-street parking: To be maintained by Town (not developer)
- Fully enclosed parking: Review covered parking language for clarity
- Adjacent Development: Reword and create diagram
- Site Coverage: Increase site coverage for RM to 60%
- Open Space: Decrease open space requirement to be correlated to Site Coverage increase in RM
- Laundry: Increase ratio to one per four units
- Planned Developments:
 - Mixed opinions on PD – remove limits on what flexibility can be requested (can lengthen review if remove limits)
 - Deed-restricted agreement – including monitoring of building for maintenance
 - Add Flexible Design Review option within Deed-Restricted Incentives Chapter – all projects will be allowed Flexible Design Review even if a PD is not requested
 - No HPAC review for deed-restricted units using objective historic design standards in program
 - HPAC review for flexible design review option for deed-restricted units
 - Grammatical changes

The commission took a 5-minute recess.

Commissioner Toups made a motion that was seconded by Vice Chair Taylor to continue Item 7.2: 2040 General Plan Implementation—Development Code Amendments for Deed-Restricted Housing Incentives to a date and time certain of January 20, 2026. The motion passed and carried the following vote:

Ayes: Chair Cavanagh, Vice Chair Taylor, Commissioner Toups, Commissioner Kaufman, Commissioner Clarin

Noes: None

Abstain: None

Absent: None

8. Staff Reports

- Joint Town Council workshop on 12/9/2025 from 5:00 PM – 7:00 PM.

9. Information Items

None.

10. Commission Member Reports

None.

11. Adjournment. 9:12 PM To the next meeting of the Planning Commission, December 9, 2025, at 5:00 PM at 10183 Truckee Airport Road, Truckee, CA 96161.

Kayley Metroka