



WASHOE COUNTY DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE Meeting Minutes

Design Review Committee Members

Principals:

Dan Kovach, ASLA, Chair
Mercedes de la Garza, AIA
Lucia D. Maloney, PMP
Brad Stanley

Alternates:

Larry Chesney, Vice Chair
Alison Cotey-Bourquin
John Krmpotic, AICP
Clay Thomas

The Washoe County Design Review Committee was scheduled to meet in regular session on Thursday, August 11, 2016, in the Community Services Department, Planning and Development, Mt. Rose Conference Room, 1001 East Ninth Street, Reno, Nevada.

1. *Determination of Quorum

Chair Kovach called the meeting to order at 9:07 a.m. The following Members and staff were present.

Members present: Dan Kovach, ASLA
Mercedes de la Garza, AIA
John Krmpotic, AICP
Clay Thomas

Members absent: Lucia D. Maloney, PMP
Brad Stanley
Larry Chesney
Alison Cotey-Bourquin

Staff present: Trevor Lloyd, Senior Planner, Planning and Development
Nathan Edwards, Deputy District Attorney, District Attorney's Office
Katy Stark, Recording Secretary, Planning and Development

2. *General Public Comment

Chair Kovach opened public comment. There was no public comment.

3. Approval of Agenda

Mr. Krmpotic moved to approve the agenda for the August 11, 2016 meeting. Ms. de la Garza seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of four for, none against.

4. Approval of Draft Minutes April 14, 2016 Draft Minutes

Ms. de la Garza moved to approve the April 14, 2016 draft minutes. Mr. Krmpotic seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of four for, none against.

5. Design Review Committee Items

A. Tentative Map Case Number TM16-003 – Hearing, discussion and possible action to approve the landscaping and design plans for Incline Creek Estates Tentative Map Case Number TM16-003 involving the development of a common open space subdivision with zero lot line setbacks that will include dividing a ±1.68 acre parcel into 10 single family lots and one common open space lot.

- Applicant/Property Owner: NCP/ICP, LLC.
- Location: 800 College Drive
- Assessor's Parcel Numbers: 129-280-21; 129-290-02
- Parcel Size: 1.68
- Master Plan Category: Urban Residential (UR)
- Regulatory Zone: Low Density Urban (LDU)
- Area Plan: Tahoe
- Citizen Advisory Board: Incline Village/Crystal Bay
- Development Code: Article 608 (Tentative Subdivision Maps) and Article 408 (Common Open Space Development)

- Commission District: 1 – Commissioner Berkbigler
- Section/Township/Range: Section 10, T16N, R18E, MDM, Washoe County, NV

- Prepared by: Trevor Lloyd, Senior Planner
Washoe County Community Services Department
Planning and Development Division

- Phone: 775-328-3620
- E-Mail: tlloyd@washoecounty.us

Chair Kovach provided a brief description of the item.

Mr. Lloyd reviewed his staff report dated August 11, 2016.

Jason Wooley spoke as the applicant's representative. There are three options for materials on the homes, which involve different configurations of asphalt shingles, stone siding, and colored windows. Materials include natural stone, cedar siding with various stain colors, aluminum-clad wood window systems with color, and asphalt shingle roofing.

Ms. de la Garza asked about the two floor plans (Manzanita and Rosewood) and how they will be arranged.

Mr. Wooley showed the distribution of the floor plans among the units.

Chair Kovach brought up the single level of seven of the units and asked if they were accessible. He also mentioned more of a split level to the other three units.

Mr. Wooley explained that there is an option to make the units accessible by putting in elevators. Also, both units are two-story, but there is more opportunity to split the bottom level in the three more northern units.

Ms. de la Garza commented on the lack of articulation on one of the elevations. She suggested creating something of interest, if possible.

Mr. Wooley stated that they are trying to break it up with the siding by using different stain colors. He added that the units are close to each other. There is not a great deal of experience between the buildings. The front is the predominant experience. Landscaping also focuses on the front and front corners.

Mr. Krmpotic asked about the setbacks.

Mr. Lloyd responded that it is zero lot line. It is common open space.

Ms. de la Garza asked about the roofs and the appearance of roofs touching in the drawings. She asked if the siding is true siding. She asked about gabled rooflines to prevent snow drifting off. She appreciated the garage fronts.

Mr. Wooley explained that the roofs do not touch; the lines in the drawings are property lines. The siding is all cedar. They do not have any shedding of snow onto the decks. They started with the floorplans from the first phase, but they wanted to modernize the design from Phase I.

Chair Kovach asked about a lighting plan.

Mr. Wooley said there will be wall-mounted sconces on either side of the main doors on the main level at the deck, one on the back deck if they have that as an option, and one at the entry. All of the lighting is in the front or the back of the units.

Mr. Lloyd stated that all of the bulbs in all of the sconces cannot be exposed; they have to be 100-percent shielded and down shielded.

Mr. Wooley stated that there is one light fixture at the entry to this portion of the development. Otherwise there is only lighting on the buildings.

Mr. Lloyd mentioned the proximity of the lighting fixture to the property line. Discussion ensued regarding the entry tower – a 12-foot, eight-inch-tall stone tower. The maximum height for the tower should be six feet. A gate can be six feet. A fence at the property line can be four and a half feet.

Ms. de la Garza asked about the outriggers.

Mr. Wooley believes that they are glulams. They will use a metal cap to protect the top.

Mr. Lloyd mentioned that this site is denuded, because it was the site of the Sierra Nevada College, which was relocated.

Chair Kovach noted small planters on the civil sheet between the entry walk and the building, but these are not shown on the landscape sheet. There was a large amount of shade.

Mr. Wooley responded that they do not plan to have planters in that location, under that cover.

Mr. Wooley called landscape architect Eric Roverud, a landscape architect at Design Workshop, and put Mr. Roverud on speaker phone.

Mr. Roverud gave consent to being recorded.

Chair Kovach asked Mr. Roverud landscape questions, mainly involving coordination between landscape plans and civil plans. Chair Kovach asked questions regarding the backflow preventer and its enclosure on the landscape plan. He asked how the landscape is coordinated with the snow storage areas. He also mentioned the lack of an irrigation plan in the submittal.

Mr. Roverud explained that the backflow preventer, required by IVGID, should be about six feet long and could be as high as four feet. They are trying to use some landscaping around it to screen it from College Drive. They typically use a fake rock that covers the backflow prevention device. Regarding the snow storage areas, he said that the perennial plants will come back yearly regardless of the snow. The shrubs usually need to be wrapped to survive the snow load. They could push back some of the shrubs further from the roadway to accommodate the snow storage. As it relates to the backflow prevention device, they would not want to pile snow on top of that enclosure in a really bad snow year or snowstorm.

Chair Kovach approved of most of the plan material selections. He questioned some of the really small containers (six and four-inch pots) and wondered if a little bigger container and fewer numbers of the plant material would be a better approach.

Mr. Roverud said that the sweet woodruff will take over quickly even as a four-inch pot. He will double check on upsizing the Shasta daisy and the blue fescue to survive the first winter.

Chair Kovach addressed revegetation. He stated that it appears the whole site will be disturbed, except for where they are preserving existing trees. He asked how the plan to salvage two inches of topsoil and reapply it to the revegetation areas will be accomplished.

Mr. Roverud thinks the contractor will be required to bring in material in order to create the revegetation areas. All of the areas that are going to receive plants will get groundcover mulch. The revegetation area beyond that is any area that has been disturbed in construction. He said that two inches may not be adequate to cover their planting needs.

Mr. Lloyd estimated that the site has been empty for approximately ten years.

Chair Kovach questioned whether any sort of topsoil has been developed over that time and whether salvaging that material will be worth it. He would expect some organic material, but not much – maybe only an inch. Chair Kovach said that a rock cobble type hatch is shown on College Drive, north of the driveway, but it does not show up on the grading plan. He would like to know what type of material it is going to be. He asked what material will be used in the detention basins and rock-lined swales.

Mr. Roverud said that the rock-lined swales are just that, but the detention basins are imagined to be rehabilitated with native grasses and shrubs. In a previous design, the rock-lined swale continued north on College Drive. It should end where the overflow comes from the basins.

Chair Kovach asked about the infiltration basins. The landscape plan shows pine duff mulch, but the civil plans show a rock material. It is a coordination issue. South of the driveway, there is a rock-lined swale that is very close to Lot 59; it looks like it needs more coordination between the rock shown on the civil and the landscape plan.

Mr. Roverud asked if Chair Kovach had a preference on the aesthetics. If they have an option, then would the pine duff depressions or the rock be preferable?

Chair Kovach did not have a preference. If there is any water flow, then the pine duff may not stay put. He asked Mr. Roverud to coordinate the landscape plan with the civil improvements and the drainage. At the front entry gate structure, they will need to coordinate their landscaping around the gate. He asked if all of the irrigation throughout this development will be common.

Mr. Wooley replied that there will be one irrigation system throughout the common area. The HOA will take care of all of the landscaping.

Chair Kovach said that it looks like revegetation will come right up to the back patios on the east side of the units. He wondered if some kind of transition would be a better choice in that area.

Mr. Roverud said they decided it would be better not to have lawn and irrigation.

Mr. Krmpotic asked if Mr. Roverud had a specific plant list for Tahoe. He also asked about TRPA purview on design review and whether they have reviewing authority.

Mr. Roverud uses a list that was designed for the Martis Camp area, as well as the TRPA approved plant list. This plan has gone to TRPA for review, and it has been approved at the planning level. They would have looked at things like what sort of irrigation is being proposed for the project and whether the plans are consistent with their own landscape guide.

Mr. Krmpotic asked about quantities and sizes. He asked whether it is a regulatory developed list or personal judgment.

Mr. Roverud answered that it is not regulatory, and there is flexibility. In the tree selection, they have chosen fairly large plant material – eight to ten-foot Jeffrey pine trees. They are trying to balance that, because they understand the cost. For the perennials, they are including smaller sizes, too. It is a judgment call on their part, and it also has to do with availability. They look at the plant lists of local nurseries and see what kind of stock is available.

Mr. Krmpotic asked what the SEZ setback is.

Mr. Roverud said that it is the Stream Environment Zone. It is the creek corridor, and they generally avoid that zone.

Mr. Krmpotic asked about the tree table and tree protection.

Mr. Roverud said there was a TRPA permitting issue with a mitigation requirement where for every tree removed, they needed to replace that tree with another tree or more than one tree.

Mr. Krmpotic asked about parking and code requirements.

Mr. Lloyd replied that they exceed parking. Parking is pretty minimal. The minimum standard is two off-street parking per unit; one has to be enclosed. There are two additional spaces.

Mr. Roverud left the conversation.

Ms. de la Garza thanked Mr. Wooley for a lovely project.

Mr. Krmptic asked about structural articulation versus texture and color as a form of articulation.

Ms. de la Garza answered that a change of material is better as a change in texture, separated with a fairly heavy belly band. The goal is to have shadows that are different. On a home, the goal is to have no more than 40 feet of a single material on a horizontal plane. It is not always entirely possible given budgets, etc. She suggested that Mr. Wooley look at using a heavy belly band on that side to get a little bit of that articulation from a vertical standpoint to break it up.

The Committee discussed and identified the specific units and sides to which Ms. de la Garza was referring.

Mr. Lloyd asked if any thought was given to mixing up the Rosewood and Manzanita units by alternating between them.

Mr. Wooley explained that there are really two zones and two experiences, where the back of certain parcels is the more negative experience and the floorplan of one of the units is more positive towards the front. For the other parcels, they have the opportunity to have exposure to the rear that the other side does not. One floorplan works significantly better in one location.

Ms. de la Garza asked about flipping the plan for one end unit so that the neighbors' doors face each other. She mentioned a sense of community.

Mr. Wooley suggested that a buyer might prefer to have his front door exposed to no one and might prefer privacy.

Chair Kovach asked if trash is individual and if each unit will have its own container.

Mr. Lloyd agreed that this was his understanding. There is a standard that must be met for bears. The trash containers must be bear proof.

Mr. Wooley confirmed that trash collection comes into the subdivision for pickup.

Mr. Thomas asked about parking. It appeared that the outside parking spots for certain parcels might be too short to accommodate longer pickup trucks.

Mr. Wooley and the Committee discussed and measured the outside parking allotment for various parcels. It was determined that the parking requirement had already been met with the two inside spaces. They also included larger garages than those that were used in Phase I.

Chair Kovach listed some of the items that he had recorded. Lighting needs to meet code. The entry gate pilaster needs to change its shape, size, and geometry to meet code. The pilasters are being looked at as a fence. The landscape needs to be coordinated with the civil in the existing conditions. He is not sure that they will find much reasonable topsoil on site to salvage, so that should be considered. He suggested looking at some kind of landscape transition at the patio areas.

Chair Kovach opened public comment. There was no public present.

Mr. Lloyd read the list of conditions:

- The lighting and entry gate features must meet code requirements.
- Coordinate the landscaping with the civil design plans.
- Look into the topsoil issue.

Chair Kovach also provided a suggestion (not a condition) that the applicant look into landscape transitioning at the patio areas.

Mr. Krmptic moved to approve Tentative Map Case Number TM16-003, subject to the suggestion and conditions as stated by Mr. Lloyd.

Ms. de la Garza seconded the motion, which passed unanimously, with a vote of four for, none against.

6. *General Public Comment

There was no comment from the public.

7. Adjournment

Ms. de la Garza moved to adjourn. Mr. Krmptic seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of four for, none against. The meeting adjourned at 10:17 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Katy Stark, Recording Secretary

Approved by Committee in session on March 9, 2017.

Trevor Lloyd, Senior Planner
Secretary to the Design Review Committee