



Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

October 21, 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 Toups, Commissioner Kaufman. Commissioner Clarin was noted absent.

Staff Present: Denyelle Nishimori, Community Development Director; Jenna Gatto, Town Planner; Yumie Dahn, Principal Planner; Laura Dabe, Senior Planner; Chantal Birnberg, Associate Planner; Scott Mathot, Engineering Manager; Slater Stewart, Assistant Engineer; Kayley Metroka, Administrative Technician.

3. Pledge of Allegiance

4. Public Comment:

Julie Arsenault: Regarding the navigation and emergency homeless shelter, believe there is an opportunity for this to be positive but as homeowners we do have questions regarding this proposal. We want an option to participate and partner with the Town to create a good solution to address the housing crisis in Truckee.

5. Approval of Minutes

5.1 June 17, 2025 Draft Minutes

Vice Chair Taylor made a motion that was seconded by Commissioner Kaufman to approve the June 17, 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: None

Absent: Commissioner Clarin

5.2 July 15, 2025 Draft Minutes

Commissioner Toups made a motion that was seconded by Commissioner Kaufman to approve the July 15, 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: None

Absent: Commissioner Clarin

5.3 July 29, 2025 Draft Minutes

Vice Chair Taylor made a motion that was seconded by Commissioner Toups to approve the July 29, 2025, Minutes as submitted. The motion passed and carried the following vote:

Ayes: Vice Chair Taylor, Commissioner Toups, Commissioner Kaufman

Noes: None

Abstain: Chair Cavanagh

Absent: Commissioner Clarin

6. Public Hearings (Minor Review)

- 6.1 The Village at Gray's Crossing Project Amendment Time Extension (Planning Application #2025-0000097; APNs 043-050-025 to -027, 043-060-009 to -012, 043-060-014 to -027, 043-070-008 to -021 (10222, 10202, 10204, 10151, 10105, 10162, 10073, 10036, 10020, 10012, 10003 Edwin Way; 10131, 10125, 10117, 10109, 10097, 10089, 10085, 10077, 10069, 10061, 10076, 10084, 10096, 10102, 10053, 10047, 10041, 10033, 10027, 10019, 10026, 10038, 10046, 10054 Jake's Way). Yumie Dahn, Principal Planner.**

Recommended Action: That the Planning Commission adopt Resolution No. 2025-14 approving a two-year Time Extension for the previously approved Village at Gray's Crossing Project Amendment and determining the project exempt from further environmental review pursuant to Section 15061(b)(3) of the California Environmental Quality Act.

Clarifying Questions for Staff:

- How many condos were built during the last extension?
 - The fourplex.
- How many time extensions are left?
 - If no changes are made to the project, they could ask for two additional years with a total of six years because they have a map attached to this project. The applicants are considering coming back for a project amendment, which would reset that clock.
- Are the affordable housing units on schedule per the requirements?
 - The four fourplexes are their inclusionary housing requirement and there are five more in the 21 loft units. I believe they are not required to build those until the commercial units come online or the remaining townhomes.

Public Comment:

None.

Deliberation:

None.

Commissioner Toups made a motion that was seconded by Commissioner Kaufman to adopt Resolution No. 2025-14 approving a two-year Time Extension for the previously approved Village at Gray's Crossing Project Amendment and determining the project exempt from further environmental review pursuant to Section 15061(b)(3) of the California Environmental Quality Act. The motion passed and carried the following vote:

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

Noes: None

Abstain: None

Absent: Commissioner Clarin

7. Public Hearings (Major Review)

7.1 Application 2022-00000079/TM-DP (Gray’s Crossing Lot F Development Permit); Applicant: Paradigm 8 (Hayes Parzybok and Brian Helm); Owner: DK Alviso LLC; Agent: Martin Wood (SCO Planning); No Address Assigned (APN 043-010-007-000). Chantal Birnberg, Associate Planner.

Recommended Action: That the Planning Commission adopt Resolution 2025-12, approving the following actions based on the recommended findings and subject to the recommended conditions of approval:

- 1) Determine the project to exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Government Code Section 65457 (Residential Projects Consistent with a Specific Plan); and
- 2) Approve the Development Permit; and
- 3) Approve the Tentative Map.

Chantal Birnberg, Associate Planner: The applicant has requested to continue Planning Application 2022-00000079 (Gray’s Crossing Lot F Development Permit) to a date and time uncertain.

Clarifying Questions for Applicant:

None.

Clarifying Questions for Staff:

None.

Public Comment:

None.

Deliberation:

None.

Commissioner Toups made a motion that was seconded by Vice Chair Taylor to continue Application 2022-00000079 to a date and time uncertain. The motion passed and carried the following vote:

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

Noes: None

Abstain: None

Absent: Commissioner Clarin

7.2 2040 General Plan Implementation—Development Code General Plan Amendments (Business Innovation Zoning District, Highway Commercial Zoning District and Clean-Up Amendments), Zoning Map Amendments, General Plan Clean-Up Amendments, and Development Code Clean-Up Amendments. Laura Dabe, Senior Planner.

Recommended Action: That the Planning Commission adopt Resolution 2025-13, 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 the following: 1) 2025 Development Code amendments for General Plan Implementation (Business Innovation zoning district, Highway Commercial zoning district and clean-up amendments); 2) Zoning map amendments; 3) General Plan clean-up amendments; and 4) Development Code clean-up amendments.

Clarifying Questions:

None.

Public Comment:

None.

Deliberation:

- Permit requirements for zoning – isn't a Zoning Clearance already required outside of the downtown below the cap? The way it is written makes it sound like it would apply to all single-family homes.
 - Technically we require a Zoning Clearance for all single-family homes; it just happens mostly as part of our building permit review. It is not adding a new step.
- There is a single-family cap of 7,500 sq. ft. – correct?
 - Yes, but there is an exception for certain types of ADUs.
- We have requirements based on parcels with open space and things that are related to the parcel.
- Regarding the BI Zoning – why are nature reserves and trails allowed in the BI Zone but not in DMU and NMU?
 - Which zones do you think it would fit?
 - CMU and NMU.
- Why would a manufacturing makerspace not be allowed in BI?
 - We allow a “craft” makerspace which is lighter industrial vs heavy industrial.
 - Would we cover furniture making in BI?
 - Yes, that is listed as a permitted use.
- Why not multifamily dwellings?
 - The only two types of housing that were identified in the General Plan were workforce and work-live units; that is why we included those two types.
 - Do those not fall under the multifamily umbrella?
 - Multifamily is broader than those two and those were specifically identified in the General Plan.
- There were a few uses in the PD that are not permitted in this list: “Theaters/meeting halls” which is now “theaters and events spaces” in the Code, “bars and drinking establishments” where we created a new category called “breweries”, and “carwash” being the last.
- Are you asking to add “breweries” to the allowed uses in General Commercial?
- Yes, General Commercial and Service Commercial to be consistent with beverage production.
 - The other thing we would need to look at is the Joerger Ranch Specific Plan and the Railyard Master Plan to avoid inconsistencies and a monopoly of potential uses in areas of town.
- I am leaning towards adding theaters and event space under BI.
- Is movie theater in the Service Commercial section?
 - They are also allowed in the Railyard Master Plan and Joerger Ranch Specific Plan. We had done an economic analysis for both of those and one of the things learned

is that there is a substantial amount of land wanted, partially for parking, and those uses tend to be bigger, so that was the history of why we didn't have that use in other zoning districts.

- I think it can make a lot of sense for a business to have more retail space.
- Is the “commercial parking” use a lot, or parking for commercial vehicles?
 - It is just a commercial parking lot.
- Vote on leaving commercial parking and vehicle storage in BI? Vote: 1-3.
- Isn't there a brewery in manufacturing now?
 - There are two; they were approved as production with an accessory tasting room.
- Vote on breweries being allowed in General Commercial and Service Commercial. Vote: 4-1. Recommend staff do more research on this and the breweries requiring a Use Permit.
 - We tend to try to preserve our manufacturing areas because they are so limited.
- What is the difference between the Downtown Commercial zoning district, the Commercial Row overlay and Commercial Core overlay?
 - The overall zoning district these are in is mostly Downton Mixed Use. Commercial Row overlay is what we have in the Code now, and Commercial Row is a subset of the core.
- Regarding adult entertainment businesses, they are mostly showing in manufacturing areas; but given you want to preserve manufacturing, where does that fit appropriately?
- Maybe it would be proactive to do a survey of what similar towns have done.
- Does the Commercial Row have something we need to maintain?
 - It is a legacy name for that section of downtown. It spans from Spring Street to the Railyard boundary including Commercial Row.
- Regarding museums, what about the railroad museum downtown?
 - Since it is currently in a caboose, it doesn't have room for growth, so I don't see any issues with them being legal, non-conforming. The arch downtown is more of a historical site since it has been there so long.
- Agricultural resources – I think those should we allowed in Neighborhood Commercial or mixed-use areas.
- Regarding studios, there are some that are quiet and some that are very loud. Is there a decibel we should be measuring that by?
 - We haven't received any complaints regarding any of the fitness studios in town.

Chair Cavanagh reopened Public Comment:

Ciro Mancuso: Regarding the definition of “studios,” it would be an interesting idea to put a cap on the size of the establishment. I think that it would be appropriate to differentiate between an art studio versus an exercise studio if it had a size restriction.

Final Recommendations to Staff:

- Consider allowing “Breweries” in M/CS/CG with use permit.
- Revising “Commercial Row” “Commercial Core” language for clarity.
- Allowing trails in NMU.
- Text edits (noted in presentation)
- Consult Town Attorney on use of “etc.” in code.

Vice Chair Taylor made a motion that was seconded by Commissioner Touns to Adopt Resolution 2025-13, taking the following actions:

1. **Recommending approval to the Town Council of the following actions: 1) 2025 Development Code amendments for the Business Innovation zoning district, Highway Commercial zoning district, and General Plan clean-up amendments; 2) Zoning map**

amendments; 3) General Plan clean-up amendments; and 4) Development Code clean-up amendments with edits discussed in this hearing and noted in text above.

2. **Recommending the amendments to be exempt from CEQA pursuant to Section 15061(b)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines and Sections 15060(c)(2) and 15060(c)(3) of Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations.**

The motion passed and carried the following vote:

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

Noes: None

Abstain: None

Absent: Commissioner Clarin

8. Staff Reports

Possible agenda items for November Planning Commission meeting: Homegrown Housing, Code amendments, VanGorder residence.

9. Information Items

None.

10. Commission Member Reports

None.

11. **Adjournment.** 6:55 PM To the next meeting of the Planning Commission, November 18, 2025, 5:00 PM at 10183 Truckee Airport Road, Truckee, CA 96161.

Kayley Metroka