



Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

July 18, 2023, 5:00 PM

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

1. Call to Order 5:00PM

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

3. Pledge of Allegiance

4. Public Comment:

Chair Clarin opened Public Comment.

Seeing none, Chair Clarin closed Public Comment.

5. Approval of Minutes

5.1 June 20, 2023 Minutes - Regular Meeting

Edits: None.

Commissioner Cavanagh made a motion that was seconded by Commissioner Taylor to approve the June 20, 2023 minutes as submitted. The motion passed and carried the following vote:

Ayes: Chair Clarin, Commissioner Taylor, Commissioner Cavanagh.

Noes: None

Abstain: None

Absent: Vice Chair Gove, Commissioner Fraiman

6. Public Hearings (Minor Review)

7. Public Hearings (Major Review)

7.1 Request to Continue the Public Hearing for the Village at Gray's Crossing Car Wash (Planning Application 2022-00000034; 10012 Edwin Way; APN 043-070-010; Owner: Gray's Crossing Investments, LLC, Applicant: Matthew Abbate; Agent: Martin Wood, SCO Planning & Engineering)

Recommended Action: That the Planning Commission continue this agenda item to a date and time uncertain. This item is being continued at the request of the applicant.

As a reminder, the Planning Commission should open the public hearing and continue it to a date and time uncertain.

Commissioner Taylor made a motion that was seconded by Commissioner Cavanagh to continue the Public Hearing for the Village at Gray's Crossing Car Wash (Planning Application 2022-0000034) to a date and time uncertain. The motion passed and carried the following vote:

Ayes: Chair Clarin, Commissioner Taylor, Commissioner Cavanagh

Noes: None

Abstain: None

Absent: Vice Chair Gove, Commissioner Fraiman

7.2 Development Code Update – Objective Design Standards

Recommended Action: That the Planning Commission adopt Resolution 2023-12, taking the following actions:

1. Recommending approval to the Town Council of Development Code amendments for Objective Design Standards; and
2. 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.

Clarifying Questions for Staff:

- Are the height standards applicable to all new and existing single-family homes? Not just new subdivisions? And homes in the historic preservation district?
 - Yes.
- Regarding the plan to simplify the code language, is there a timeline for that?
 - It is on the longer-term timeline. Part of the action is to create more brochures and user-friendly ways for people to understand our code more easily. That may happen more quickly than the overhaul of the Development Code.
- Regarding roofs and decks – when it is referred to reviewing the white roofs from the right-of-way, does that include the right-of-way only around the immediate structure or also the right-of-way that's above a higher elevation than the structure?
 - Above as well. The downtown High Street has a good view of many downtown structures.
- Feeling confused about what is new, what is old, what is flexible? For example, Kurt Reinkens and I want to submit the Jibboom Street project, and I don't want to streamline it, I want to go through the regular process; what's the difference?
 - The Objective Design Standards Chapter as a whole, would not apply. There are provisions that apply like the balcony standards and the open space requirements but the material requirements, the roof articulation standards would not apply to a flexible design review project. You would request to do the flexible design review process and we would review the project against the Design Guidelines instead of using the Objective Design Standards. We would not count how many windows you have, how much percentage of glazing you have, roof types you have. It would probably go to Architectural Review or Historic Preservation Advisory Commission and they would provide feedback on how they think the project can comply with our design guidelines.
- How does counting windows and roofs streamline the process? Isn't that more work?
 - There is more work for staff to analyze the project and probably on the applicant's part to make sure they are checking all the boxes in the Objective Design Standards.

The State's intent is to take out the subjectivity. So, if someone were to not like the project, that's not a good enough reason to disapprove it, they would have to specifically identify something like, it doesn't have two roof types. It provides more clarity to the developer.

- Does a streamlined project get pushed in front of other projects that are submitted?
 - No, we're all subject to the permit streamlining act for every project. It goes in our queue and we are subject to a 30-day review for completeness and an additional 30-day review for consistency once we deem it complete. We already have timelines that are built into our jobs as planners so all projects are subject to that streamlining process.
- So, it goes in the queue as it was received just like any other project? The checking process is what is streamlined?
 - Correct. If the application checks all the boxes and everyone feels confident it is meeting the Objective Design Standards, it takes out the iterative process that we often have with architects.
- So, it either meets the Objective Design Standards or it doesn't, and if it doesn't, they can redesign it but there's no subjectivity? I can see that being a time saver. The iterations do take a while.
- Have we removed affordability from this? This is the furthest from affordable from a construction standpoint. The more rules and regulations there are, the more expensive it is to build.
 - That is one of the complexities of the Objective Design Standards. We do have a lot of affordable housing projects that probably wouldn't meet the standards of the Objective Design Standards; but historically, the Town has been willing partners with a lot of affordable housing projects without Objective Design Standards and using the flexible design approach would still be an option for any of them.

Public Comment:

Kurt Reinkens, MWA Architects: This is being made way more complicated than it needs to be. You're right, Mitch, it's going to drive up the cost not just in architect's time but also the cost of construction. I feel we are going exactly opposed to the state's intent of affordable housing and getting it built. This is going to drive affordability away. I'd like to go on record declaring the Town is working against the State goals. I question the TRPA height standard as being any better than the Town standard. If it isn't broke, why are we trying to fix it. I believe the design guidelines for commercial should also work with the slope. Curious if the consultants are factoring urban, rural, mountain town with trails and parks. The quantity is excessive and expensive. I think going to not white roofs is against the Cool Roof Standard set by the Energy Commission. I think we're going to have a hot body effect the darker the finish goes. The white roofs also last longer. We are adding long-term costs.

Seeing no further Public Comment, Chair Clarin closed Public Comment.

Deliberation:

Are residential rooftop decks appropriate? If so, where?

- I think we need to clarify whether we are talking multi-family or single-family. Not sure if they're appropriate for single-family, but yes for multi-family.
- Seems like rooftop decks would be a nice amenity for multi-family housing. They might offer an opportunity to incorporate some of the exterior space that's required. Would they make sense to construct for water issues? Is it feasible to keep them watertight?
- In theory everything could be made watertight. In reality, does it work?
- I like the multi-family concept. I wouldn't mandate it, I wouldn't say you couldn't do it, I would let it be up to the designer.
- I agree.

- It seems reasonable.
- Why do you think it wouldn't be appropriate on a single-family dwelling? One of the nicest sets of decks in town is on a single-family dwelling, over Lorien Powers's studio.
- I think a deck over living space is fine, I was referring to a rooftop top floor deck like a widow's walk or something that would protrude above the top floor building.
- Maybe this is something we need to be more conscious in our definitions where a rooftop deck is defined and deck space over living space.
- Some draft verbiage for this definition could be "above living space not on the top floor".
- Is this only in the Objective Design Standards or is it also in the Flexible Standards?
 - Since this is in the balcony section, it is in both.
- I don't think the height standards now would or previously would have allowed that without projections above.
- It's a safety thing, too.
- We can say "not on the top floor of a single-family residence."
 - I don't believe the balcony standards apply to single-family subdivisions.
- Would you also think we should prohibit it on multi-family subdivisions or not?
- If they want their two percent possibility of having a dry space underneath, they can go for it?
- If they're on a more constrained site, it might help them meet that outdoor space requirement.

Do we want strong fence design requirements?

- We want fences, not major walls. We should be clear about that.
- Are wood and wrought iron the two materials allowed?
 - Currently, yes.
- There's no standard or language around how transparent we want these fences?
 - Currently the code is written to allow for only wood or dark wrought iron for projects that are using the Objective Design Standards, specifically. A project using the Flexible Design Review can propose whatever. We don't have any materials like vinyl or plastic that are specifically prohibited, but we do discourage barbed wire, electrified fencing and razor wire.
- It seems like staff has this covered except for transparency.
- What does the requirement for multi-family look like right now?
 - Because we do have setback requirements in the multi-family residential zoning district; if we're saying it is less than an acre, you can have a three-foot-high front yard setback and six foot side or rear yard setback. We don't have any screening or requirements specifically for multi-family unless it's adjacent to an industrial project where an industrial project would have to do screening.
- My concern is you see a lot of chicken wire to keep their kids in the yard. Crusher screen, do we want to allow that?
- It is a cousin to chain-link fence. If we don't like the looks of it, we should say it's not allowed.
- Let's just leave it the way it is.

Are SRI coatings sufficient to meet the needs for solar reflectivity if white roofs are prohibited? Or should white roofs be allowed for flat roofs?

- I wouldn't want to look down on a white roof.
- I think that is covered in how the objective design is written. I don't think we should disallow it just because of the numerous benefits white roofs do have, which is stronger than just putting a coating on a darker colored roof especially when it's flat and when half the year roofs are white anyway for natural reasons.
- I do think the protections around where the roofs can be viewed is strong language that would not allow for that situation.

- The standards are not requiring any SRI value or solar reflectivity in pavers or concrete. Some colors have different SRI values; lighter colors obviously are higher in reflectivity than darker colors.
- Do we talk about what materials are allowed for driveways and walkways?
 - Driveways are determined by our Engineering Division; they currently allow asphalt in the right-of-way. They do allow for concrete and pavers on private property but there isn't any specific SRI value associated with them.
- I think how they updated the roof section is fine. I am okay with white roofs, that is my opinion.
- I don't like looking at white roofs aesthetically, but if there isn't a reason to prohibit them, I get it. In the non-snow season, I wouldn't want to look down on that.
- We are okay with the way it is written.

Is mirrored design sufficient to reduce potential costs?

- I think it's good we are including it in terms of cutting in half the number of designs that are needed.
- It's something. Is it enough and have to deal with mirrored houses? Over time, they do look different. They paint them, extend them differently, remodel them. So, I am okay with it.
- If mirrored design isn't enough is there something else that we could incorporate in terms of reducing the number of designs?
- It just cut the design in half.
- It reduced it by one.
- The first classification had four, now we have two with two mirrors. It only helps with the upfront design costs; the construction costs stay the same.
- Growing up in a neighborhood like this, it originally has a suburban feel, but as time goes on they look different.
- Unless there is a suggestion to reduce the cost associated with a number of different designs required, I would say it is sufficient as is.
- We are good with how this one is written then.
- Didn't I hear that the number of building varieties were reduced but the edits are showing they were increased?
- It was increased and then reduced with the mirrored.

Are there other standards that we are missing? Should any be removed?

- We can cover this when we discuss the changes in more depth.

What needs to be clarified or defined?

- We can cover this when we discuss the changes in more depth.

Discussion Continued

- Will staff provide a handout or checklist for project applicants to help make this easier to know which process to go and how to use the standards?
- Yes, once it is adopted, staff will be creating other documents.
- Page 4: The orientation for passive solar gain; if a house is oriented for more passive solar gain does that reduce the amount or the need to put PV panels up? Is that why you would allow the orientation change?
 - I believe it is for the sun to warm the house.
- It would be to reduce in the winter heat increase inefficiency and in order to meet building performance standards you'd have to put in some sort of shade screening for vegetation or an awning or overhang to produce solar gains in the summer.
- So, there is no regulatory reason for requiring or providing more flexibility in that respect.
- Page 10: Parking structures- if we have a multi-family structure in the downtown, zero to 100 units could have surface parking?
 - That is correct.

- That's a lot of surface parking in the downtown area. I believe it's cheaper to build a parking lot rather than a parking structure, but that is a lot of parking spaces.
 - Parking structures in terms of the parking structure and the podium parking it's up to 100. There is a requirement for parking garages.
- So, zero to 100 would be surface parking, 100 to 200 is podium parking. So if we had a 99 unit building, how many parking spaces would that be?
 - Around 200 parking spaces.
- That seems like an excessive amount of open asphalt. Why was it raised from 50?
 - It is mostly based on the feasibility factor. Parking structures in Truckee are pretty cost prohibitive. The only way a multi-tiered parking structure would get constructed is by the Town or a public entity for the benefit of the community.
- These numbers don't seem practical.
 - In the particular zoning districts where these are required there isn't much land available for parking structures. We could try to make more responsive to our existing environment within the downtown. There aren't many opportunities for 200 or more units in the historic downtown.
- It doesn't seem like the numbers work for a pedestrian activated downtown area.
- But if the structures mean you can't build something affordable, I see where this whole housing thing is an issue.
- The number of units seem to be too high before you have to start doing something like podium parking or a structure.
 - The more feasible area to work on is the podium parking. We do have one project within our community so if you want to look at reducing the numbers there, that may be more feasible.
 - Currently our Development Code does require that at least one parking space per unit has to be in a fully enclosed space. That is another layer of standards that is on top of the Objective Design Standards. A developer would have to do a parking structure, a garage, or podium parking to meet the standard of the other standard that already exists in our Development Code. However, many of our larger multi-family projects all have surface parking. They have all asked for that waiver for affordable housing projects.
- Based on some of the affordable projects built in Truckee, how many of them have gone after a parking reduction as part of their density bonus?
 - Within the density bonus law, you are provided the parking reduction automatically. It is not considered a density bonus, so they all have used it.
- So, it's not likely we will see a 200 unit building with 400 parking places?
 - Correct.
- The way the code is written almost doesn't allow someone to build a 200-unit project.
- Regarding roof types – I don't think you can have an A-frame that is a 6: 12 slope. I'm not even sure you can do that. Letter C specifically shows the seven and 12 slope. I think the shed roof minimums and maximum should go.
 - To clarify- the gable roof doesn't have a maximum or minimum slope. The maximum and minimums slopes apply just to a shed type roof. The gable roof includes a-frame roofs.
- What's the point of having any minimum and maximum?
 - I think it's just to maintain the character of our community.
 - The shed roof is one side opposed to the gable having two sides.
 - There is no minimum or maximum on the gable. When you have a pitch greater than 7:12 there needs to be snow retainage considerations, that is what D2 is talking about.
- In C- even if you have two roofs that are the same type but different pitches that's one roof type, so you would need a second?
 - That's correct.

- The language doesn't require two it says you can have up to two. You just can't have three, four, five and so forth. You can get up to two but you can have multiple pitches.
- I am satisfied with the way it is written.
- Why is there a restriction on how many roof types?
 - In general, once you get to having three different roof types, it is less characteristic of the current development pattern is and can be a little difficult to read from an architectural perspective. Trying to encourage simplified buildings that are true to Truckee's existing character and mountain environment was the idea here. We also heard through the community engagement what types of roofs are most characteristic and should be continued vs what should not be and we heard a lot about gable and shed roofs being appropriate.
- In the historic district you see all kinds of roofs as people added on to the buildings but not in current construction.
- 250 people out of 15,000 is two percent of the community. Why are we making rules on two percent of the people's opinion?
- There were also workshops and other discussions.
- If we don't restrict it, are we risking Frankenstein buildings and new constructions that meet the objective standards?
- When driving through Lahontan there are several different roofs on those homes.
- Are you suggesting we don't restrict it?
- That is their desired aesthetic, but does that fit in with the town is the question.
- If I had a mostly flat roof building with a shed roof on one piece of it and I want to put a gable in the front entryway, why shouldn't I be able to do that?
- Would there be space to talk about that in the entry design standard or does that count as a third roof type?
- Restricting and having a lot of regulations interrupts the architectural flow. The more regulations in place, the more everything starts to look the same.
- A different third roof type is more consistent with Truckee funk.
- I agree, we want that little bit of funk. Let it flow.
- Do we have to say how many or do we just not restrict it?
- Don't restrict it, just take that part out. Remove item C on page 21.
- All agree.
- Page 26: Regarding the inappropriate colors, it doesn't state orange as inappropriate, that is so subjective.
- The only way to make this objective would be to list every pantone value of every color that's not allowed. How do we make this more objective?
- For example, the Richardson House is a prominent house in Downtown Truckee, but it couldn't be yellow in Glenshire.
 - It would be allowed in Glenshire because it's an existing single-family subdivision.
 - This is only related to multi-family. We can try to make it more objective by saying a bright yellow, or if there's a specific yellow you don't like we can add that in there.
- Since this is the first version of this and there will likely be amendments, maybe in the next iteration of this we can deal with it then and be more specific if necessary.
- Page 28: 3 A regarding the brick – are you trying to limit the brick or allow for more brick?
 - We were trying to put a maximum.
- In the storage units- did we make that smaller to make it more affordable and make it just big enough for a bike?
 - We made it smaller based off some comments we received about the size of the previous storage square footage. Yes. Based on previous input on storage sizes.
- I would hate to have us end up with more multi-family buildings whose balconies are filled with stuff like we have now. I object to them being smaller but understand they might need to be for affordability reasons.

- Page 39: I suggested we add tangent line to the figure for designers who perhaps don't know what a tangent line is.
- Page 43: Regarding maximum family residential unit sizes, 1,000 seems too small.
 - The 1,000 square feet came from our Innovate Gateway Strategy, which looked specifically at the Gateway area where most of our mixed-use buildings will likely go in the future. Our Council approved that plan to require 1,000 square feet maximum average living area within mixed-use buildings. That's intended to drive a variety of housing types. For example, you can have a 2,000 square foot unit as long as you have a 500 square foot unit. We did receive multiple comments about that from our commission and the public and small changes to that number were proposed. We will forward those comments to Town Council but because that was language that was ultimately decided by Council, we didn't change it at this moment.
- So, you can have a 500 square foot unit and a 2,000 square foot unit as long as they're averaging around 1,000 square feet for the building itself it's, okay?
 - Correct.
- Most people who need affordable housing have bigger families.
- Regarding the Site Organization, other sections in the code say "straight at," and this section talks about "random orientation" doesn't feel consistent.
 - Included in the minor edits suggestion in the presentation, the following language was removed: "In random positions." Now the language would say, "Buildings should be oriented to avoid instances where living spaces of one structure face the living spaces of another and significantly reduce indoor privacy".
- Regarding site disturbance, I'm not an excavator, but I'm concerned it's not enough to do the construction.
 - This also applies to existing single-family residential homes. Tahoe Donner and Glenshire are nowhere near one and a half acre parcels, so this wouldn't apply because you could technically under this provision, disturb the whole area. This is specific to rural residential parcels where we have tried to be cognizant that in these areas you might want to spread out a little more and maybe have animals or have other structures on your property. We tried to find a balance where they would be allowed to do those things within reason while still maintaining the perceived open space.
 - This is an item where we will see how it plays out and if we need to amend it, we will.
- What was the percentage for 5 acres? 40%?
- 30%. That seems like you should be able to do something in that space.
- Regarding the Public Comment submitted by Sean Whelan and MWA Architects - I do not agree with the suggestion to reduce the amount of open space or common outdoor area per unit I don't think that's fair. Based on an example with the pandemic, everyone cherished their outdoor space and I wouldn't want to take that away from people. The concept is we already have a lot of open space so it cuts into the building envelope if we have to supply more. I see that and it does make it more expensive but outdoor amenities are important and play space near apartment dwellings are important because the children may not be able to go off to the trails. You're more likely to use it if it's downstairs. It builds community as well. I don't understand the shared entry.
- Brick is allowed outside the historic district, right?
 - We allow it.
- Do we have any Firewise landscaping? Are these in compliance with these standards?
- We have WUI, (Wildland Urban Interface), and yes, these are all materials that follow WUI.
- The regular Development Standards address night sky and ridgelines.
- Regarding the decarbonization- for construction that doesn't fit in ODS that fits in the building and energy code.
- Has the Jibboom Street project been submitted?

- No, we do not have a formal application for that project yet. It was included as part of a public comment in the 2040 General Plan process but since we don't have the project in front of you, we can't talk specifically about that project.
- Coburn Crossing has gable roofs, correct?
 - They have shed roofs and tiny gables also.
- Regarding the rolled steel comment- it wasn't listed as an acceptable material for multi-family dwellings.
 - Rolled steel is an approved material listed within the Exterior Cladding Materials section.

Commissioner Cavanagh made a motion that was seconded by Commissioner Taylor to adopt Resolution 2023-12 with the following changes:

- **Incorporate a standard to limit additions of legal non-conforming single-family dwellings in side yard setbacks to up to one additional story or 12 feet (Section 18.30.120.F.7.c);**
- **Minor clarifying edits to the Design Guidelines (Chapter 18.24) and Hillside Development Standards (Section 18.36.040);**
- **Allow rooftop decks on single-family residential dwellings, except on the top floor, and on multi-family residential;**
- **Remove the requirement limiting the quantity of roof types allowed on a building, under Section 18.25.060.E.1.c (Multi-Family Massing and Articulation, Roofs and Rooflines);**
- **Under Section 18.25.080.B.3.a (Multi-Family Colors and Materials, Exterior Cladding Materials), change the sentence "Brick may be applied to the ground floor of the structure and shall comprise up to 50% of the building façade" to "Brick may be applied to the ground floor of the structure up to a maximum of 50% of the building façade"; and**
- **Add a tangent line in the figure depicting Curvilinear Lot Frontages**
- **Grammatical copy edits and minor edits to ensure clarity and consistency between the Design Guidelines and Objective Designs Standards.**

Additionally, the Planning Commission requested forwarding its comments to the Town Council regarding the 1,000 s.f. maximum average living area requirement.

The motion passed and carried the following vote:

Ayes: Chair Clarin, Commissioner Cavanagh, Commissioner Taylor

Noes: None

Abstain: None

Absent: Vice Chair Gove, Commissioner Fraiman

8. Staff Reports

None

9. Information Items

Next month's agenda will potentially include the Tahoe Donner Ski Lodge and Development Code Amendments.

10. Commission Member Reports

- Used the new bikeshare over the weekend. Very excited about it. Concerned people do not use helmets on these bikes and want to see what we can do to change that.
- Also used the bikeshare program.

11. Adjournment. 7:16 PM To the next meeting of the Planning Commission, August 15, 2023, at 5:00 PM at 10183 Truckee Airport Road, Truckee, CA 96161.

Kayley Metroka