



Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

September 17, 2024, 5:00 PM

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

1. Call to Order 5:01 PM

2. Roll Call- Vice Chair Gove, Commissioner Fraiman, Commissioner Taylor, Chair Clarin and Commissioner Cavanagh were noted absent.

Staff Present Denyelle Nishimori, Community Development Director; Jenna Gatto, Town Planner; Andy Morris, Town Attorney; Becky Bucar, Assistant Public Works Director; Slater Stewart, Assistant Engineer; Adam Petersen, Senior Planner; Kayley Metroka, Administrative Technician.

Applicants Present Kurt Reinkins, MWA; Lindy Winter, Martin Wood, SCO Planning; Sean Whelan, MWA.

3. Pledge of Allegiance

4. Public Comment:

Steve Deshera, Truckee Resident: Would like to inform the community about Measure E on the November ballot. Measure E is a half percent sales tax, we are conducting a campaign website: esone4truckee.org. Would like to encourage people to go on website to learn about the measure.

Bil Greeno, running for the Airport Board: Is here to serve the community, is pro-people. If elected, we seek to continue serving the community by creating a safer airport, healthy forests, workforce development locally from our educational institutions and a healthy business habitat. Website: greeno-airportboard2024.

Brian Biega, Truckee resident: Wants to know more about the railyard crossing on Bridge Street, Donner Pass Road and East and West River Streets. Wants to know what kind of outreach went on for the downtown area and the 2040 General Plan and where things are going. Looking for what is going on with funding with these projects and the big overpass that is going in over East River Street. Is there going to be money spent on consultants?

5. Approval of Minutes

6. Public Hearings (Minor Review)

7. Public Hearings (Major Review)

7.1 Planning Application 2024-0000014/DP-UP-MUP-ZC-TM-HDR-SP (Residences at Jibboom Development Permit, Use Permit, Minor Use Permit, Zoning Clearance, Tentative Map, Historic Design Review and Sign Plan); 10012 Jibboom Street (APN 019-102-016), 10090 Jibboom Street (APNs 019-102-011, -012, -013, -014, -015 and -17) and Unknown Address (APN 019-102-018); Owner/Applicant: Sean Whelan and Kevin Sloane; Agent: Lindy Winter, MWA. Adam Petersen, Senior Planner

Applicant Presentation by Kurt Reinkins

Clarifying Questions for Applicant:

- Do we know what color the original building was?
 - No. Historically, they worked in a narrow palette of mustard yellow, forest green, etc. Our intent is to match that.
- Are all these units intended to be rentals, or is there an intent to sell?
 - The 10 affordable units will be rentals. Building D will be for sale. Buildings B and C will be dependent on market conditions.
- Are there any design recommendations for HPAC?
 - HPAC had a very strong opinion on the previous design. They just said “no”. One or two of the HPAC members made it to the workshop. They are told whatever they say doesn’t matter.
- What might or might not happen with deed restricting an additional 20 units?
 - I previously submitted an application to the THAP program and requested to voluntarily add 20 units with the intent to make them rentals. The town’s THAP program changed significantly while in the application process and there is a very onerous participation agreement if I didn’t build those 20 units, so I backed out. My intent is to provide local housing.
- So, are those units off the table with this particular project?
 - I can’t, that is one million dollars. We had more of less and agreement with two council members before the goal post was moved.
- Do you know which of the 62 units will be deed restricted?
 - 10 of the 15 units in Building A. It will be roughly \$1,600 a month in rent.
- Have you considered how you will deal with parking assignments in the future?
 - In a past project, we entered in a parking management plan where the tenants were given placards that were made available in certain zones in town.
- Do we have an agreement in this plan similar to that?
 - No.

Clarifying Questions for Staff:

- Regarding the effective date on Condition #5 it says September 30th, Condition #5 says September 17th- which date is correct?
 - Condition #6 should say “September 30th, 2026.
- Regarding Condition #14 – is that standard to have the CDD or Planning Staff to review a management agreement for an apartment complex?
 - Yes, that is standard with new multifamily projects.
- Is the parking requirement zero?
 - Yes. Under AB-27 the parking requirement is zero. The town cannot impose a parking standard on the project.
 - They are not required to do parking, nor does the town have any conditions requiring them to do parking.
- Is this the third meeting for this project?
 - This has gone to HPAC, Town Council, and now here, three total so far.
- Town Council had a meeting on this project?
 - Yes, on August 13, 2024, Town Council addressed the historic classification of the project site and it was changed from a Category B to D and approved the demolition.
 - Once it is deemed complete it is related to the approvals and tied to review and approval of any environmental documentation.
 - The applicant submitted a preapplication last summer and that locks in the Development Code and General Plan town standards and the fees that are in place at that time. As long as the applicant submits within 180 days of submittal of the

preapplication, they submit their final application, then it locks in the fees and standards at the time of submittal.

- Is there a clock ticking of when we have to say yes or no to this project?
 - Not necessarily related to a decision, there are other countdown clocks. There is a five-meeting limit and that is a collective review of the entire project including workshops and public hearings.
- Can you explain the difference between CEQA 15332 stated in the Staff Report and CEQA 15300.2 regarding the historical exemptions?
 - That was the intent of going to Town Council to change the historic classification. There are no longer impacts to historical resources.
- Are there any provisions of SB330 that afford the applicant any automatic renewals or time extensions?
 - No. The Town Development Code would take precedence.
 - In the last 5-10 years, California Housing Law has changed at a dizzying pace and what is true today might change next year.
- Construction hours- where do those come from?
 - Those are standardized.
- Regarding a Construction management plan, is that something that could be applied here?
 - There will be some level of review, like if they need to shut down a lane for example, it will need to come through the Engineering Department.
- Is it correct that our construction hours are 7am-9pm, including Sundays?
 - Monday-Saturday: 7am-9pm, Sunday: 9am-6pm.

Public Comment:

Sarah Green, Truckee Resident: I do think there are safety concerns with this project including traffic and wildfire. The size of this project is massive. Parking is an issue. Regarding the workforce housing units – community members were under the impression that there were more than being proposed.

Joe McGinity, Property owner on High Street: I do salute development in Truckee. This project doesn't fit in with downtown.

Reina Markheim, Truckee Resident: I used to have a post office box downtown and I just relinquished that because it is too busy downtown. I don't hear a plan for snow removal in here. I don't think it's safe. I lived on Jibboom back in the 80's and I did walk to town and my job back then. I don't think they have addressed the traffic. It is a different world now. I don't think it's safe for pedestrians anymore.

Rolf Godon, Truckee Resident: I agree with everyone else on the size and mass of the building. I know the town has increasing Short Term Rental requirements – these second homeowners can still rent them as a ski lease.

Dan Cockrum, former member of HPAC: I am well-versed in our historic guidelines. We had one official meeting regarding this topic which only two of the residents were invited to attend. The town staff and the developer have made it very clear that the applicant is no longer willing to change their proposal.

Mike Olinger, Truckee Resident: I want to know how they concluded that this project isn't a safety threat to downtown Truckee. The amount of traffic coming through there right now is horrible and you are going to add 50 cars to that. Was there a traffic study done on this?

Vince Koski, Tahoe City Resident & Real Estate Developer: I have a lot in Tahoe Donner and I am trying to put in five-unit workforce housing and it is impossible to build workforce housing unless it is on the back of a commercial building. The minimum is 20%, I believe the developer is proposing

24%. We are blocking this type of unit from going in – the state is going to come on and say this is going to happen. Do we want housing and if so, there are some sacrifices and changes.

Alexis Ollar, Executive Director of Mountain Area Preservation (MAP): MAP has been engaging with the project developer since 2016. We are in support of housing. Prior to the General Plan there was a willingness to take risks. There are ten affordable units, but Truckee needs and deserves more. We would like to see this project change to hold more affordable units. There is a willingness to work with the town and the community. I hope the 20 units can be brought back. We have an opportunity to rewrite this and make this project work.

Sophia Heidrick, MAP: This was a project that MAP really wanted and hoped to support. It does have to be the right kind of mixed-use development. We need housing that is right for the workforce. Their original application was submitted over a year ago and just changed one month ago and the applicant can no longer use this program. If not, we might see a lot of short term rentals.

Jason Tuks: We need more parking, more commercial, more affordable housing. It does comply with the AB27 and provides one spot per unit. I'd rather have more affordable housing and fewer parking spots. I personally do not like building D, the structure does not match the downtown area.

Brian Biega, Truckee Resident: The historic character of Truckee is the downtown district. We are not against the entire Jibboom project, but we are against this proposed structure. If you took height off a structure, maybe building D.

Ruth Hall, Truckee Resident: I am flabbergasted that there would be so much more support for this project if the 20 units are described. These units start at 4k for a one bedroom or a studio. A person should only be paying 33% for their housing. I feel like the building is out of place and in the middle of historic downtown.

John Marks, Truckee Resident: I would like to remind everyone the state law severely constrains the approval of this project. The applicant has been patient and willing to work with the town and the community. The town risks something much worse if this project doesn't move forward.

Applicant's response to public comment:

- The average unit size is small. They will only afford certain rents. I am not sure where the 4k a month number came from stated in Public Comment. Coburn is renting for around 2k per month.
- Regarding the views- we have studied that, and the historic home included on the presentation will maintain their view and have a small impact.
- Regarding snow storage – part of our design is to put the parking under the building, and we are hydraulically heating the walkways, so we don't have to off haul snow.
- Regarding parking – we are wiring in electrical lifts so 2 cars can be stacked as well as bike storage with cameras.

Staff response to public comment:

- Long-term bike parking – this project does satisfy the requirement.
- There is a waiver request for the installation of the mechanical lift system for long-term biking storage.
- The project does include hydronic heating of the driveways, and it would alleviate the need for snow storage and clearing.
- This is a multi-family project so rentals must be for 31 days or more.
- Regarding the traffic analysis – the town looked at intersections and what the projected level of service is; these intersections received a grade of "F", meaning they have high volume vehicle hour delays, and we are going to abandon requirements around level of

service. The project does have to pay traffic impact fees which go to regional improvements in the town.

Vice Chair Gove called for a five-minute recess.

The meeting reconvened.

Deliberation:

- Is there a way we can manage the parking that is being provided that is fair to all units?
- I don't see a way for us to mitigate that, I commend the developer for putting in the option for car lifts.
- Regarding safety improvements on Jibboom, can we talk more about our options there?
 - We are working on a crosswalk policy, but it will be a town-wide comprehensive evaluation. We don't have level of service in the downtown and it relates to VMT, which this project is exempt from. It would be hard to tie it to this project specifically.
- I would like to see if the applicant would make their sidewalks 4 inches wider and encroach into the planting areas.
- If this project gets approved tonight and there was a future change to the THAP program, can the applicant reengage their number of workforce housing units?
 - Yes, that request would go to council.
- How do we get the 20 workforce housing units back? Is that something we can do?
 - That is outside the scope of the Planning Commission, that is under a program that was created by the council.
 - When the program was originally created, it was open-ended for the council to have full discretion of which projects they wanted to consider as part of the program. That left it as an unknown as a developer. The Council just adopted revisions to the THAP program and made it explicit for new development and took that level of discretion out and made it more of a checklist level.
- Regarding Condition 16- it says 46 parking spaces are required, but staff stated there is no parking required?
- Can we say "provide a minimum of 50 spaces?" with a minimum of three spaces on the street.
 - Applicant: We are okay with that condition.
- - That condition was included because that is the applicant's proposal under the California State Density Bonus Law.
 - Remove first and fourth bullet point.
 - Change minimum required parking in bullet 2 to 50 onsite spaces, bullet 3 change to 3 parking spaces.

Vice Chair Gove called for a 10 minute recess.

The meeting reconvened.

- Condition 65: This is duplicative, remove.
- Onsite amenities waiver should be added.
- Condition 82.a change word "permitted" to "submitted".
- What would the maintenance district be responsible for?
 - The maintenance districts vary but they maintain sidewalks, landscaping, streetscape, and furniture.
 - The purpose of an assessment district is for the town to take over the maintenance responsibility, relieving the property owner of that responsibility, while the property owner agreeing to pay for it.
 - Strike Condition 62.

Resolution Edits to be included in final motion:

- Removal of Condition of Approval No. 69 – duplicative
- Update with Waiver for Onsite Amenities
- Amend Condition of Approval 82.a, changing word “permitted” to “submitted” in the second sentence for compliance with SB 330
- Condition No. 16:
 - Remove first and fourth bullet point
 - Change minimum required parking in bullet 2 to 50 onsite spaces; bullet three to 3 parking spaces
- Condition No. 6, to September 30, 2026
- Condition No. 56, “and a minimum sidewalk as proposed will be required along the Jibboom Street frontage.”
- Condition No 12: “Town of Truckee Engineering Division, excluding curb and gutter improvements on High Street”
- Condition No. 65: “vertical clearance shall be 9 ft. 5 in. on Building A and knee braces on Building B down to 7 ft.”
- Delete Condition No. 15
- Condition No. 19: delete “to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director, or Director’s Designee;” change to “same color as background building.”
- Delete Condition No. 62.

A motion was made by Commissioner Fraiman and was seconded by Commissioner Taylor to approve Resolution 2024-12, determining the project exempt from CEQA pursuant to Section 15332, approving the requested land entitlements, and amending the conditions of approval with the above list. The motion passed and carried the following vote:

Ayes: Commissioner Fraiman, Commissioner Taylor

Noes: None

Abstain: Vice Chair Gove

Absent: Chair Clarin, Commissioner Cavanagh

8. Staff Reports

- Full agenda for October – Development Code Amendments and Building K-4.

9. Information Items

10. Commission Member Reports

11. Adjournment. 8:26 PM To the next meeting of the Planning Commission, October 15, 2024 5:00 PM at 10183 Truckee Airport Road, Truckee, CA 96161.

Kayley Metroka