



Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

November 15, 2022, 5:00 PM

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

1. Call to Order 5:05PM

A recess was taken to address technical difficulties.

2. Roll Call- Chair Gove, Commissioner Riley, Commissioner Fraiman. Vice Chair Tarnay was noted absent.

3. Pledge of Allegiance

4. Public Comment:

None.

5. Approval of Minutes

5.1 September 20, 2022 - Regular Meeting

The September 20, 2022, minutes was postponed to the next Planning Commission meeting due to a lack of quorum.

5.2 October 18, 2022 - Regular Meeting

The October 18, 2022, minutes was postponed to the next Planning Commission meeting due to a lack of quorum.

6. Public Hearings (Minor Review)

6.1 Request to Continue Martis Valley Quarry Two-Year Review; 10701 Soaring Way (APN 019-620-067-000); Owner/Applicant: Teichert Aggregates; Agent: Michael Smith; 13879 Joerger Drive, APN 049-330-006-000

Recommended Action: That the Planning Commission continue this agenda item to a date and time certain at the Planning Commission hearing on December 20, 2022 at 5:00 p.m. This item is being continued at the mutual request of the applicant and staff to further discussions regarding odor impacts from the asphalt plant.

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

The request to continue Martis Valley Quarry Two-Year Review was approved and rescheduled to the December 20, 2022, Planning Commission meeting.

7. Public Hearings (Major Review)

7.1 Joerger Ranch Phase 2 (Application #2022-00000006/DP-TM-ZC); 10110 Soaring Way (APN 019-620-061-000); Applicant: Rick Hauser, NLD Truckee, LLC; Owner: Joerger Associates, LLC; Agent: Martin Wood, SCO Planning and Engineering

Recommended Action: That the Planning Commission adopt Resolution 2022-14, determining the project consistent with the adopted Joerger Ranch Specific Plan and thereby precluding any further environmental review consistent with CEQA Section 15183 (Projects Consistent with a Community Plan, General Plan or Zoning) and Public Resources Code Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 (Lead agency prohibition to require subsequent reports for a certified project unless specific events occur), and approving the Development Permit, Tentative Map, and Zoning Clearance, based on the recommended findings and subject to the recommended conditions of approval.

Clarifying Questions for Staff:

- Why is there only one egress and ingress in this project?
 - The applicant team will need to speak to that. Truckee Fire said based on the scope of the project, a second access wasn't required for their purposes, but the applicant can explain why they chose not to have a second access.
- To clarify, we are looking at the actual buildings, not an entitlement for uses. We would be approving the architecture that was presented, not just theoretical ideas?
 - Yes, the buildings and residential are being presented tonight.
- Regarding the RMW-20 trigger - all the phases of Soaring Ranch were vested under the original specific plan, and that trigger was \$181,000 square feet. Are they held to that standard? Would those projects be required to build the foundations that RMW did, or are they exempt and only looking at this project being responsible?
 - When the trigger was put into the specific plan it was the \$181,000, so those projects are vested under the original plan because under state law they submitted a housing preliminary application, so we couldn't impose any new standards on them. At the time it was based on non-residential, so it is a different standard that is in the current specific plan.
- So, the sense is this project would trigger because of the square footage they are planning to build would trigger the RMW-20 requirement?
 - If they wait to get building permits until after another phase of Soaring Ranch builds out. If they were to come in for building permits before Soaring Ranch builds out then it would still only be a hundred thousand feet of constructed square footage so it wouldn't trigger it. It all depends on the timing.
- Soaring Ranch Phase 2 and 3- \$180,000 is their threshold?
 - Correct, they're vested.
- Any future projects are 139,000?
 - Yes.
- They're asking for a tentative map, so this is actually 41 projects, is that correct? Or 37, or however many lots they're doing? Everyone else will get a separate building permit?
 - It depends on how they build it out. They could build out all of the buildings and then subdivide after they've built the shell buildings and so on.
- Are we reviewing to approve the tentative map?
 - The tentative map; but when they record the parcel map I suppose that could be a question if that's their plan to build the buildings and then do the subdivision or vice versa.

- Assuming they can start this project without having the trigger already started, the residential units are separate from the industrial correct, those are separate buildings with separate building permits?
 - As of now it's all one parcel so I suppose if they wanted to come in and do single building permit and build the whole thing at once I supposed they could?
- Different buildings are required different building permits is it not?
 - Soaring Ranch Phase 2 has four buildings, but it is one building permit.
- They are building ten buildings, and every time they finish a building they are bumping up the threshold so theoretically, their own project they would hit that threshold midway through the project which means the rest of the project could not be finished, is that correct?
 - In theory, yes. You should ask the applicant team what their plan is for construction.
- What is the status of Soaring Ranch Phase 2 specifically?
 - They need one agency approval and there's a couple of corrections and a couple of fees that need to be paid then they should be ready to issue.
- Which agency are they waiting on?
 - The PUD.
- Regarding the specific plan on P 8.6 and P 8.7- does that mean theoretically these guys could actually exceed the 139,000; build their entire project with nothing built, and then also Soaring Ranch Phase 2 and Phase 3 because they're 181,000 can then build both of those? Then, creating a scenario where we directly go against the specific plan and all three projects are built and RMW-20 is not built?
 - When the language was crafted that way it wasn't anticipated that all of these projects were going to be trying to build at the same time. So there is probably some timing that wasn't taken into consideration when that was written. It wasn't envisioned there would be housing associated with phases one, two, or three and since then state laws have changed drastically so we are now reviewing and approving housing projects rather than what we'd originally contemplated, which was a regional commercial shopping center. The plan is much older now at this point and the state housing laws have changed substantially such that some of the plan has somewhat been invalidated because of recent state law.
- Regarding LSC's recommendations- would like clarification on what the language means?
 - (Staff team brings up Google Earth for a visual description.) the improvement they're describing is the exact same improvement that is currently functioning on the eastbound approach into the 267 Brockway intersection. There is a dedicated right turn movement which is called a "right turn overlap phase" so you are protected to take that right turn. The right turn movement wasn't warranted coming down Soaring, so there you only have green bulb instead of a green right turn bulb. This means you're turning right at the same time when other movements may be occurring.
- Is there a plan to incentivize or lure West River industrial to this location?
 - There are some things built into the plan like the targeted uses that were envisioned to try to encourage people to do that but there is not a mandate in the plan for anyone to relocate so the applicant may have some thoughts on what types of businesses might be interested in these spaces.
- Was it contemplated to remove the housing and just do the industrial?
 - That is not allowed under this specific plan. They are required to build on-site workforce housing and they chose to build it on site. There's the eight workforce units that are required and there's the four market-rate units.
- Are all of the industrial buildings going to be built together like a condo where the property line will occur in the middle of the building?
 - Unsure if the applicant is planning to do it as airspace or have the actual footprint.
- Can they get all buildings under one building permit? Is that possible?
 - It would be up to the Chief Building Official to determine how he would want to see that broken up but there have been other projects; for example, 10969 Industrial

Way has a residential portion and two warehouse buildings all under one building permit. So, it is not uncommon for a development all on one parcel to have different pieces under one permit.

- There is a design standard for clear glass and in these industrial buildings the applicant is proposing to use tinted glass. Why?
 - There is specific language in the plan that talks about having clear glass. The applicant team feels that because they're industrial buildings it would be more appropriate to not have the visibility into the spaces when people walk along Soaring Way. That is something the commission can consider if they think it's appropriate to be tinted or not.
- One of the policies in the specific plan is to not have blank unarticulated facades and on the north side of the industrial building, what is proposed looks unarticulated and blank. Why did staff not weigh in on this?
 - Originally that was all one material and color and staff did raise that as not being consistent with the plan. They are now proposing to have a difference between the upper and lower colors and materials on that building to provide a little variation.
- The trigger you said is completed buildings, correct?
 - Yes.
- So theoretically this project could be issued a building permit concurrently with both Phase 2 and Phase 3. Phase 2 and 3, if this project got a Certificate of Occupancy first, then Phase 2 and 3 finished, then all three projects could get C of O without RMW-20 being built?
 - Correct, because of the way that policy is written based on constructed square footage not entitled.
- Even if they got a building permit and then phase 2 was built, and C of O before they got a C of O then they would not get a C of O but they could finish building it?
 - The policy in the specific plan says you can't issue building permits once that threshold has been met so if they get their permits issued they can complete their construction.
- It seems highly unlikely there's any way we'd actually get our RMW-20 built; is that right?
 - If they were to move quickly, yes, that would be the case.

Clarifying Questions for Applicant:

Applicant Team: Martin Wood, Principal SCO Planning Engineering; Rick Hauser, Applicant; Pete Rosado, Project Architect.

Applicant's responses to commissioners above questions:

- Regarding the phasing/construction of this project- makes sense to do most of the infrastructure and the shell buildings for all the industrial in one single phase.
- Regarding the workforce housing– it was added into the plan in June 2011 by this commission and the council. Those eight units would be constructed at the same time as well. If you would approve this project, the plan would be to design essentially the whole project and construct at a minimum all the shells of the industrial buildings, main infrastructure, parking, trash enclosures, etc. as well as the eight workforce housing units as required per the development code. We did ask for separate phases for possibly doing the four market-rate at a separate time to have some flexibility. There is a possibility it will all be built at once.
- Regarding the tentative map- we think it's probably more effective to do a zero lot line on the dividing walls and that is why we asked for more than one phase on a final map because they may build the shell and as either occupying one or two buildings you don't know if the tenant in the third building is going to want more space or where those lines need to be, and that flexibility for multiple phases in a final parcel map would allow that.

- We have the options per the development code on the workforce housing to do either for rent or for sale. If we do for sale, they would have to be condominiumized in airspace because the units are stacked.
- Regarding the ingress and egress question- we talked with the town staff at the beginning and one of the things that was determined early on is we had to line up our driveway entrance with the Phase 3 that was approved for Soaring Ranch so that is our primary entrance aligning with that point. We looked at the potential of adding an additional ingress/egress closer to the roundabout at the other end and that is problematic it's not good to have in such close proximity to the roundabout tapers and also know that was a concern about where the transit stop and those things are. We meet all the requirements of dead and road length, and the fire department was okay with it. We do have a wider access aisle at 26 feet instead of 24.
- Regarding the housing question- we believe the industrial space is an employment generator for the town. We have that maxed out at the fifty some thousand square feet we are allowed. With the site being so efficient, there was a lot of leftover space, so we put in the four market-rate units. Hopefully these units will offset the costs and make it more viable.
- Regarding the glass- we did get that comment from staff and our thoughts were to protect the retailer's products if possible.
- Regarding the north elevation on the airport side- when we first did it, it felt like a waste of money because the building is facing the hangers. When staff brought it up, we wanted to be 100% in compliance with what the specific plan said as far as articulation and change of materials. We talked to Pete Rosado about that and he integrated some different metal features and some different colors so we are providing some variation.
- I am feeling concerned with the amount of rooves that seem to shed their snow in the pedestrian way. My concern is this is not snow country architecture where we experience the snow load and safety issues. The specific plan says there's no snow cleats allowed on the rooves, so I am questioning the design and intent.
 - One of the main intents of this is a lot of snow is supposed to stay on the rooves.
 - The residential units have gable rooves that are metal standing seam with heated wire in the gutters and downspouts and snow cleats to protect pedestrians underneath.
- Snow cleats are allowed. They aren't allowed under the general commercial zone, not the manufacturing zone.
- Regarding the industrial buildings- are those going to be timber framed or steel?
 - Steel frame.
- Does the applicant own the property? And have you identified any tenants, potential tenants or use types?
 - The property is in contract to own, and no, tenants have not been identified.
- What are you going to charge for rental rates?
 - We don't have that planned out yet we're waiting to get through Planning Commission and getting all our plans set in stone before we went to market.

Public Comment:

None.

Deliberation:

- Thinks it's a nice project but feels like we are likely going to see this built and then Soaring Ranch Phase 2 and 3 and not get our RMW-20; and that seems contrary to the specific plan.
- Agree with the above.

- My sense is that this project in itself would trigger that requirement and so then they would be beholden to do the RMW-20 because they are set at the 139,000 industrial residential. Whereas the Soaring Ranch 2 and 3, Truckee Lumber Phase 1 or 181,000 of non-residential.
- It seems highly unlikely there's any way we'd actually get our RMW-20 built.
- If we make an amendment to the trigger or the specific plan it doesn't actually impact any of these three projects that we're talking about because they're already all water under the bridge/grandfathered in?
 - Staff: If this project were approved under the current specific plan and then if the plan were to be amended to say remove the trigger if the council decides that is the right answer; then this project could ask for project amendment to revisit removing that condition out of their approval.
 - Applicant: Parcel 4, which includes the RMW-20 is making progress moving forward so aside from what we're proposing tonight, Parcel 4 has made significant strides in the year or two on coming onboard. It's a lot about the infrastructure so we've worked with staff on doing the 30% design drawings for the roundabout at Martis Drive and Brockway Road. We've revised the tentative map that was submitted around three plus years ago on Parcel 4, all with the intent of wanting to bring that RMW-20 forward. I just want to make the point it is not being moved to the side.
- Feel hung up on the architecture, design, and compatibility. Raley's and the lumberyard are done nicely and this architecture lacks appeal and has unarticulated wall planes, two-story unarticulated planes. Doesn't think the snow cleats are going to take care of the snow load with the metal roof. The proportions are poor, and we have policies against allowing blank sides of the building.
- Having trouble supporting what's being proposed from an architecture standpoint.
- Would prefer for this to come back at a later date with tweaks.
- Would like to approve the project, but not feeling like it's going to happen tonight.
 - Applicant requested an approval on project with the condition they come back with modifications to the architectural aspects.
- The request was denied, and staff suggested the Planning Commission make conditions of approval that are specific but then be handled at the staff level.
- Specific architectural changes the commission would like to see:
 - On the North wall- making sure there's additional articulation consistent with the specific plan
 - The roof snowshed – having something other than snow cleats.
 - Mirroring of facades on the parking lot side primarily.
 - A response to if the uses will engage the street because that's a question about the glazing.
 - The metal siding – using substantial gauge so it doesn't appear warped
 - The large spans of standing seams since it seems to be not as durable and the aesthetic that would be consistent with the specific plan.
 - To review the colors of the project, specifically the garage doors.

Commissioner Fraiman made a motion and was seconded by chair Gove to adopt Resolution 2022-14 determining the project consistent with the adopted Joerger Ranch Specific Plan and thereby precluding any further environmental review consistent with CEQA Section 15183 and Public Resources Code Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162, and approving the Development Permit, Tentative Map, and Zoning Clearance, based on the recommended findings and subject to the recommended conditions of approval listed above, including roofs not shedding into driveways and walkways, incorporating snow country design, changing the color of the garage doors, more articulation on the north side of the building, reduce mirroring facades, using metal siding of a substantial gauge and smaller panels.

Ayes: Commissioner Fraiman, Chair Gove

Noes: Commissioner Riley

Absent: Vice Chair Tarnay

The motion passed with a 2-1 vote.

8. Staff Reports

None.

9. Information Items

Staff is unsure at the moment if the Planning Commission meeting for December 20th will have a quorum, they will follow up on that. The two items on the agenda will be the Tiechert Quarry Annual Report continuation and Golden Valley/River Sage Charter School.

10. Commission Member Reports

None.

11. Adjournment at 8:30PM to the next meeting of the Planning Commission, December 20, 2022, 5:00 PM at 10183 Truckee Airport Road, Truckee, CA 96161.

Respectfully submitted,

Kayley Metroka