



# WASHOE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION Meeting Minutes

## Planning Commission Members

Roger Edwards, Chair  
D.J. Whittemore, Vice Chair  
James Barnes  
Larry Chesney  
Sarah Chvilicek  
Philip Horan  
Greg Prough  
Carl R. Webb, Jr., AICP, Secretary

Tuesday, February 3, 2015  
6:30 p.m.

Washoe County Commission Chambers  
1001 East Ninth Street  
Reno, NV

---

The Washoe County Planning Commission met in regular session on Tuesday, February 3, 2015, in the Washoe County Commission Chambers, 1001 East Ninth Street, Reno, Nevada.

### 1. Determination of Quorum

Chair Edwards called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. The following Commissioners and staff were present:

Commissioners present: Roger M. Edwards, Chair  
D.J. Whittemore, Vice Chair  
James Barnes  
Larry Chesney  
Sarah Chvilicek  
Philip Horan  
Greg Prough – Arrived at 6:45 p.m.

Commissioners absent: None

Staff present: Carl R. Webb, Jr., AICP, Planning Manager, Planning and Development  
Trevor Lloyd, Senior Planner, Planning and Development  
Paul Lipparelli, Assistant District Attorney  
Kathy Emerson, Recording Secretary

### 2. Pledge of Allegiance

Commissioner Horan led the pledge to the flag.

### 3. Ethics Law Announcement

Assistant District Attorney Lipparelli provided the ethics procedure for disclosures.

### 4. Appeal Procedure

Mr. Webb recited the appeal procedure for items heard before the Planning Commission.

## 5. Public Comment

As there was no one wishing to speak, Chair Edwards closed the public comment period.

## 6. Approval of Agenda

In accordance with the Open Meeting Law, Commissioner Barnes moved to approve the agenda for the February 3, 2015 meeting as written. Commissioner Horan seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

## 7. Approval of Minutes of the December 2, 2014 Meeting

Commissioner Chvilicek moved to approve the minutes for the December 2, 2014 Planning Commission meeting. Vice Chair Whittimore seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

## 8. Consent Items

- A. Development Code Amendment Case Number DCA14-009** – To re-initiate an amendment to Washoe County Code, Chapter 110, Development Code, Article 500 (Signs: Title and Contents), Article 502 (Billboard Regulations) and Article 504 (Sign Regulations) to combine Articles 502 and 504 into a new Article 505 (Sign Regulations) in order to consolidate all Washoe County sign regulations and to provide comprehensive changes to those sign regulations (DCA14-009).

Staff Representative: Trevor Lloyd, Senior Planner, 775.328.3620, tlloyd@washoecounty.us

Chair Edwards asked if the Commission had any questions for staff. There were no questions. Commissioner Chvilicek moved to approve Consent Item 8A; Commissioner Horan seconded the motion which carried unanimously (6 for, 1 absent [Commissioner Prough]).

## 9. Planning Items and Public Hearings

- A. Tentative Subdivision Map Case Number TM14-003 (Falcon Ridge)** – To develop a previously approved and recorded 142 lot, single-family attached residential, common open space subdivision. Lots will range in size from 1,600 square feet to 2,526 square feet.

- Applicant/Property Owner: Townsend Enterprises, LLC
- Address/Location: El Rancho Drive directly east of Maynard Drive
- Assessor's Parcel Number: 035-660-02
- Parcel Size: ±25.92 acres
- Master Plan Category: Suburban Residential (SR)
- Regulatory Zone: High Density Suburban (HDS)
- Area Plan: Sun Valley Area Plan
- Citizen Advisory Board: Sun Valley (not active)
- Development Code: Authorized in Article 608, Tentative Subdivision Maps and Article 408, Common Open Space Development
- Commission District: 3 – Commissioner Jung  
5 – Commissioner Herman
- Section/Township/Range: Within Section 30, T20N, R20E, MDM  
Washoe County, NV
- Prepared by: Trevor Lloyd, Senior Planner
- Phone: 775.328.3620
- E-Mail: tlloyd@washoecounty.us

Chair Edwards opened the public hearing; no disclosures were made by members of the Commission. Trevor Lloyd reviewed his staff report dated January 15, 2015. Mr. Lloyd stated there is one additional condition not included in the packets. This additional condition is the removal of the earth and berm stockpile north of the drainage ditch and a re-vegetation plan. Also, condition 3JJ should be removed – the number of lots is down to 142 and requires no traffic signal.

The applicant representative, John Krmpotic with KLS Planning, stated they are in agreement with all of Washoe County's conditions on this project, including the new condition. Commissioner Horan asked how many buildings are in the plan. Mr. Krmpotic stated there are 29 to 30 buildings. Commissioner Horan asked if all of the buildings were the same size. Mr. Krmpotic stated that they differ in sizes depending on the lay of the land and the roads. Chair Edwards asked if these would be classified as Affordable Housing. Mr. Krmpotic stated they will be classified as Market Rate Housing.

Chair Edwards opened up the public comment.

Dorothy Baldwin, property owner on El Rancho Drive, stated that El Rancho is two lanes and the speed limit is 35 mph. She voiced concern about traffic volume, speed and limited visibility due to a berm at Moorepark. Ms. Baldwin asked that Washoe County address the traffic concerns.

At this time (6:45 p.m.), Mr. Webb announced to Chair Edwards that Commissioner Prough has joined the meeting. Chair Edwards acknowledged.

Chair Edwards cited Exhibit J, a submittal from the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC), identifying a moderate access controlled arterial with no improvements scheduled until 2012 or 2030 scenarios. Chair Edwards asked if this approval was taking the additional traffic flows into consideration or just generic growth in the area. Mr. Lloyd stated that it is his understanding that El Rancho is an arterial and will remain that way, and based on the analysis the road can handle the additional traffic flow.

Commissioner Chvilicek noted that the RTC report was dated 2007 and asked if there was a more recent study conducted. Mr. Lloyd stated he did not receive an updated study from RTC. He received an email from RTC stating that all previous conditions and comments still apply.

Commissioner Horan asked Mr. Lloyd to address whether this is a two or four lane road. Chair Edwards stated that the road starts as a four lane from Clearacre Lane and then goes down to two lanes. Mr. Lloyd stated that is correct.

Chair Edwards addressed the public comment speaker Ms. Baldwin and stated that RTC looks at the traffic flow as it is now. The development would have to be in an established traffic flow before they could make a decision to extend the four lanes.

Chair Edwards closed public comment.

Mr. Webb stated for the record that the condition to remove the street light is Condition 3JJ on page 10 of the staff report in Exhibit A. Also, if it is the Commission's decision – the motion should specify the addition of Condition 1S and the removal of Condition 3JJ.

Vice Chair Whittemore commented on the traffic. As the traffic in this area increases, the speed of travel might slow down and he is comfortable that the project will be safe and that the RJC will do its job.

Vice Chair Whittemore moved that after giving reasoned consideration to the information contained in the staff report and information received during the public hearing, the Washoe County Planning Commission approve Tentative Subdivision Map Case Number TM14-003 for Falcon Ridge with conditions, adding 1S, deleting 3JJ, having made all following ten required findings in accordance with Washoe County Code Section 110.608.25. Chair Edwards seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

The motion was based on the following findings:

- 1) Plan Consistency. That the proposed map is consistent with the Master Plan and any specific plan;
- 2) Design or Improvement. That the design or improvement of the proposed subdivision is consistent with the Master Plan and any specific plan;
- 3) Type of Development. That the site is physically suited for the type of development proposed;
- 4) Availability of Services. That the subdivision will meet the requirements of Article 702, Adequate Public Facilities Management System;
- 5) Fish or Wildlife. That neither the design of the subdivision nor any proposed improvements is likely to cause substantial environmental damage, or substantial and avoidable injury to any endangered plant, wildlife or their habitat;
- 6) Public Health. That the design of the subdivision or type of improvement is not likely to cause significant public health problems;
- 7) Easements. That the design of the subdivision or the type of improvements will not conflict with easements acquired by the public at large for access through, or use of property within, the proposed subdivision;
- 8) Access. That the design of the subdivision provides any necessary access to surrounding, adjacent lands and provides appropriate secondary access for emergency vehicles;
- 9) Dedications. That any land or improvements to be dedicated to the County is consistent with the Master Plan; and
- 10) Energy. That the design of the subdivision provides, to the extent feasible, for future passive or natural heating or cooling opportunities in the subdivision.

**B. Special Use Permit Case Number SW15-001 (Apple, Inc.)** – To allow the construction of one 50 Megawatt substation and the addition of one NV Energy switching yard and the extension of transmission lines to support the substation and switching yard. The construction of a new substation will require a conformance review with the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan for a Project of Regional Significance.

- Applicant/Property Owner: Apple Inc.  
Attn: Real Estate and Development
- Address/Location: 21505 Interstate 80 East  
Sparks, NV 89434
- Assessor's Parcel Number: 084-110-29

- Parcel Size: ±345.205 acres
- Master Plan Category: Commercial (C), Industrial (I), and Rural (R)
- Regulatory Zone: General Commercial (GC), Industrial (I), and General Rural (GR)
- Area Plan: Truckee Canyon
- Citizen Advisory Board: East Truckee Canyon
- Development Code: Authorized in Article 810, Special Use Permit and Article 812, Projects of Regional Significance
- Commission District: 4 – Commissioner Hartung
- Section/Township/Range: Within Section 28 & 29, T20N, R22E, MDM
- Prepared by: Trevor Lloyd, Senior Planner
- Phone: 775.328.3620
- E-Mail: tlloyd@washoecounty.us

Chair Edwards opened the public hearing; no disclosures were made by members of the Commission. Trevor Lloyd reviewed his staff report dated January 23, 2015.

Chair Edwards asked whether the transformer will power other commercial properties to the east and the north of the site. Mr. Lloyd stated there is no mention of the facility powering offsite data centers. The NV Energy power plant that has been approved has not been constructed and Apple is in need of power now.

Commissioner Chvilicek asked whether the transmission lines are buried or overhead. Planner Lloyd confirmed the lines are overhead.

Additionally, this case was not heard by the CAB due to scheduling. This meeting came before the scheduled CAB meeting. Commissioner Chvilicek stated she would like to hear what the CAB has to say about this project. Mr. Lloyd stated he will provide that information.

Cynthia Albright from Stantec Consulting presented on behalf of the applicant. Ms. Albright reiterated the fact that Apple needs additional power. Apple, Inc. is in agreement with all of the conditions of approval from Washoe County. Commissioner Prough asked about construction timing. Ms. Albright stated construction will begin in early summer and will be completed by early fall.

There was no public comment on this item.

Commissioner Barnes moved that, after giving reasoned consideration to the information contained in the staff report and information received during the public hearing, the Washoe County Planning Commission approve, with the conditions included as Exhibit A to the staff report for this item, Special Use Permit Case Number SW15-001 for Apple, Inc., having made all four of the findings in accordance with Washoe County Development Code Section 110.810.30. Vice Chair Whittemore seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

The motion was based on the following findings:

1. Consistency. That the proposed use is consistent with the action programs, policies, standards and maps of the Master Plan and the Truckee Canyon Area Plan.
2. Improvements. That adequate utilities, roadway improvements, sanitation, water supply, drainage, and other necessary facilities have been provided, the proposed improvements are properly related to existing and proposed

roadways, and an adequate public facilities determination has been made in accordance with Division Seven.

3. Site Suitability. That the site is physically suitable for proposed substations and transmission lines, and for the intensity of such a development.
4. Issuance Not Detrimental. That issuance of the permit will not be significantly detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare; injurious to the property or improvements of adjacent properties; or detrimental to the character of the surrounding area.

**C. Development Code Amendment Case Number DCA14-007** – To amend Washoe County Chapter 110 (Development Code) at Article 821, *Amendment of Regulatory Zone*, to add a new Section 110.821.02, *Definitions*; to amend Section 110.821.05, *Requirements for Application*, to correct references to the Director and Division and to add a provision for pre-application meetings; Section 110.821.10, *Supplemental Guidelines, Standards and Criteria*, to correct references to the Director; Section 110.821.15, *Review Procedures*, to clarify notice for the public hearing and procedures for concurrent application processing, to provide for adoption, denial and no action on the amendment by the Commission, and to remove findings for a denial; Section 110.821.20, *Notice*, to reference NRS for noticing and to add provisions for notice to GIDs and military installations; Section 110.821.25, *Appeal of Denial*, and Section 110.821.30, *Action by Board of County Commissioners on Appeal*, to amend procedures for Board action on amendments to be consistent with other Development Code provisions; Section 110.821.35, *Written Record*, to provide provisions for Board findings when the Commission makes no findings; Section 110.821.45, *Modification of Regulatory Zone Amendment*, and Section 110.821.50, *Moratorium*, for minor grammar changes; and, Section 110.821.60, *Minor Amendment of a Regulatory Zone map*, to modify procedures for Board Action on minor amendments to be consistent with other Development Code provisions and to define the content of the Board's adopting resolution; and, providing for matters properly related thereto.

Staff Representative: Bob Webb, Planning Manager, 775.328.3623, [bwebb@washoecounty.us](mailto:bwebb@washoecounty.us)

Chair Edwards opened the public hearing; no disclosures were made by members of the Commission. Bob Webb reviewed his staff report dated January 15, 2015. He noted that 4 people had attended the CAB Workshop hosted on January 13, 2015. As there were no requests to provide testimony, Chair Edwards closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Chvilicek moved that, after giving reasoned consideration to the information contained in the staff report and information received during the public hearing, the Washoe County Planning Commission recommend approval of DCA14-007, to amend Washoe County Chapter 110 (Development Code) at Article 821, *Amendment of Regulatory Zone*, to clarify actions and findings by the Washoe County Planning Commission and the Washoe County Board of County Commissioners on such amendments, to include minor amendments of Regulatory Zone maps. I further move to authorize the Chair to sign the resolution contained in Attachment A on behalf of the Washoe County Planning Commission and to direct staff to present a report of this Commission's recommendation to the Washoe County Board of County Commissioners within 60 days of today's date. This recommendation for approval is based on all of the four findings in accordance with Washoe County Code Section 110.818.15(e): Commissioner Chesney seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

The motion was based on the following findings:

1. Consistency with Master Plan. The proposed Development Code amendment is in substantial compliance with the policies and action programs of the Washoe County Master Plan;
2. Promotes the Purpose of the Development Code. The proposed Development Code amendment will not adversely impact the public health, safety or welfare, and will promote the original purposes for the Development Code as expressed in Article 918, Adoption of Development Code;
3. Response to Changed Conditions. The proposed Development Code amendment responds to changed conditions or further studies that have occurred since the Development Code was adopted by the Board of County Commissioners, and the requested amendment allow for a more desirable utilization of land within the regulatory zones; and,
4. No Adverse Affects. The proposed Development Code amendment will not adversely affect the implementation of the policies and action programs of the Conservation Element or the Population Element of the Washoe County Master Plan.

## **10. Chair and Commission Items**

### **A. Report on previous Planning Commission items**

Mr. Webb had some updates for the Commission:

The Regional Capital Improvement Plan and the Regional Road Impact Fee were approved by the Washoe County Board of County Commissioners (BCC) on January 27, 2015. The fees will take effect March 2, 2015. The BCC also approved to accept the associated Development Code amendment at the same time.

The Master Plan Amendment and the Regulatory Zone Amendment for Lakeshore Drive were approved by the BCC on January 27, 2015. The Tahoe Regional Planning Agency determined these were in conformance with the Tahoe Regional Plan.

The Village Green and the new Commercial at the corner of Pyramid and La Posada Master Plan Amendments and Regulatory Zone Amendments were approved and found in conformance with the Regional Plan.

Village at the Peak was found not to be in conformance with the Regional Plan. This means it will go back to the BCC to see if they would like it to be returned to the Regional Planning Commission for reconsideration.

### **B. Future agenda items and staff reports**

None

## **11. \*Director's Items**

None

### **A. \*Legal information and updates**

Assistant District Attorney Lipparelli expressed his appreciation for Counselor Greg Salter's work with the Planning Commission and with the Department.

**12. \*Public Comment**

With no response to the call for public comment, Chair Edwards closed the public comment period.


**13. Adjournment**

With no further business scheduled before the Planning Commission, the meeting adjourned at 7:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Kathy Emerson, Recording Secretary

Approved by Commission in session on March 3, 2015.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Carl R. Webb, Jr., AICP  
Secretary to the Planning Commission