



WASHOE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION Meeting Minutes

Planning Commission Members

Larry Chesney, Chair
Sarah Chvilicek
Francine Donshick, Vice Chair
R. Michael Flick
Kate S. Nelson
Larry Peyton
Pat Phillips

Tuesday, July 6, 2021
6:00 p.m.

Washoe County Administrative Complex
Commission Chambers
1001 E 9th Street, Building A
Reno, Nevada 89512

Secretary

Trevor Lloyd, Secretary

and available via
Zoom Teleconference

The Washoe County Planning Commission met in a scheduled session on Tuesday, July 6, 2021, in the Washoe County Commission Chambers, 1001 East Ninth Street, Reno, Nevada and via Zoom teleconference.

The meeting will be televised live and replayed on the Washoe Channel at: <https://www.washoecounty.us/mgrsoff/Communications/wctv-live.php> also on YouTube at: <https://www.youtube.com/user/WashoeCountyTV>

1. *Determination of Quorum

Chair Chesney called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. The following Commissioners and staff were present:

Commissioners present: Larry Chesney, Chair
Sarah Chvilicek
Francine Donshick, Vice Chair
R. Michael Flick (via Zoom)
Kate S. Nelson
Larry Peyton (via Zoom)
Pat Phillips

Commissioners absent: None

Staff present: Trevor Lloyd, Secretary, Planning and Building
Roger Pelham, MPA, Senior Planner, Planning and Building
Julee Olander, Planner, Planning and Building
Jennifer Gustafson, Deputy District Attorney, District Attorney's Office
Lacey Kerfoot, Recording Secretary, Planning and Building
Donna Fagan, Office Support Specialist, Planning and Building

2. Pledge of Allegiance

Commissioner Chvilicek led the pledge to the flag.

3. Ethics Law Announcement

Deputy District Attorney Gustafson provided the ethics procedure for disclosures.

4. Appeal Procedure

Secretary Lloyd recited the appeal procedure for items heard before the Planning Commission.

5. General Public Comment and Discussion Thereof

Chair Chesney opened the Public Comment period. There were no requests for public comment.

6. Approval of Agenda

Chair Chesney noted that Item 8a – Resolution of Appreciation of Service for Thomas Bruce would be heard when Thomas Bruce arrives. In accordance with the Open Meeting Law, Commissioner Donshick moved to approve the agenda for the July 6, 2021 meeting as written. Commissioner Chvilicek seconded the motion, which passed unanimously with a vote of seven in favor, none against.

7. Approval of the [June 1, 2021 Draft Minutes](#)

Commissioner Chvilicek moved to approve the minutes for the June 1, 2021, Planning Commission meeting as written. Commissioner Donshick seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of six in favor, none against and Commissioner Flick abstaining.

8. Planning Items

A. Possible action to approve a resolution of Appreciation of Service for Thomas Bruce and to authorize the Chair to sign the resolution on behalf of the Planning Commission.

9. Public Hearings

A. [Amendment of Conditions Case Number WAC21-0003 \(Ladera Ranch\)](#) [For possible action] – For hearing, discussion, and possible action to approve an amendment of conditions for Tentative Subdivision Map Case Number TM05-011 (Ladera Ranch), to accommodate a revision to the grading plans for the approved tentative map in order to allow flat lots where daylight basements were planned on 28 lots located off Dream Catcher Drive in the Ladera Development.

- Applicant/Property Owner: D.R. Horton
- Location: 28 parcels off Dream Catcher Drive
- APN: 502-711-08, 502-711-07, 502-711-06, 502-712-08,
502-722-37, 502-722-36, 502-722-35, 502-722-34,
502-722-33, 502-722-32, 502-772-31, 502-722-30,
502-722-23, 502-722-22, 502-722-21, 502-722-20,
502-722-19, 502-722-18, 502-732-10, 502-732-09,
502-732-08, 502-732-07, 502-732-06, 502-732-05,
502-732-04, 502-732-03, 502-732-02, 502-732-01
- Parcel Size: 28 parcels totaling 4.93 total acres
- Master Plan: Suburban Residential (SR)

- Regulatory Zone: Medium Density Suburban (MDS)
- Area Plan: Sun Valley
- Citizen Advisory Board: Sun Valley
- Development Code: Authorized in Article 608, Tentative Subdivision Maps and Article 408, Common Open Space Development
- Commission District: 3 – Commissioner Jung
- Staff: Julee Olander, Planner
Washoe County Community Services Department
Planning and Building Division
- Phone: 775.328.3627
- E-mail: jolander@washoecounty.us

Chair Chesney opened the item. He asked for Commissioner disclosures. He disclosed he was contacted by the applicant representative, who he then referred to speak with staff.

Julee Olander, Washoe County Planner, provided a staff report presentation.

John Krmpotic, Applicant Representative, provided a PowerPoint presentation. Mr. Krmpotic introduced the VP of Operations, Max Haltom, and Robert Gelu, Civil Engineer.

Commissioner Chvilicek questioned why grading that was already done for daylight basements needed to be graded back to the single-story. Ms. Olander confirmed that the area had been graded in anticipation of daylight basements. Ms. Olander stated that the condition is asking to go back to the original slope and remove the daylight basement grading. Commissioner Chvilicek asked what the additional grading does to address the geotechnical issues of the soil. Mr. Gelu, the civil engineer, stated that it improves the structure and reduces risk by eliminating the retaining wall that would go down to the daylight basement.

There were no requests for public comment.

There was no further discussion.

MOTION: Amendment of Conditions Case Number WAC21-0003 (Ladera Ranch)

Commissioner Donshick 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 Amendment of Conditions Case Number WAC21-0003 for D.R. Horton with the amended conditions included as Exhibit A to this matter, having made all ten findings in accordance with Washoe County Code Section 110.608.25

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.

Commissioner Nelson seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously with seven in favor, none against.

B. Master Plan Amendment Case Number WMPA21-0002 (Village Green) [For possible action] – For hearing discussion and possible action to amend the Washoe County Master Plan, Spanish Springs Area Plan, Appendix D – Village Green Commerce Center Specific Plan (Plan), and if approved, to authorize the Chair to sign a resolution to this effect. Any approval would be subject to further approval by the Washoe County Board of County Commissioners and a finding of conformance with the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan by the regional planning authorities. If approved, the amendment would add clarifying language and include the following:

1. Remove Goal Five, Infrastructure;
2. APN: 534-561-10 is exempted from the Spanish Springs Area Plan, Appendix A including the building site coverage requirements;
3. Clarify language concerning setbacks from residential dwellings for building height;
4. Added color and evergreen trees as options for 50 feet in length of building walls;
5. APN: 534-561-10 is exempted from the following Architecture provisions: General Guidelines, Energy Efficient Tenant Criteria, Building Massing and Form, Mechanical Equipment, and Building Materials; the following Landscaping provision: Site grading; and the following Sustainability provisions: Low Impact Development (LID) Standards, and Environmental Sustainability Standards of the Village Green Commerce Center Specific Plan;
6. Clarify that illuminated signs will only be allowed when not adjacent to residential property;
7. Clarify that effluent water is required when available in the area;
8. Clarify that no loading docks are allowed to be adjacent to residential property;
9. Remove Figure D-5: Business Park Buffering;
10. APN: 534-561-10 is exempted from Low Impact Development (LID) Standards and Environmental Sustainability Standards;
11. Clarify roadway improvements as required by Washoe County Engineering and Capital Projects; and
12. Rename "equestrian easement" to "public trail easement" and relocate this easement to the western boundary of APN: 534-561-10;

- Applicant: Blackstone Development Group

- Property Owner: STN 375 Calle Group LLC
- Location: 375 Calle De La Plata
- APN: 534-561-10
- Parcel Size: 36.12 acres
- Master Plan: Industrial (I)
- Regulatory Zone: Industrial (I)
- Area Plan: Spanish Springs
- Citizen Advisory Board: Spanish Springs
- Development Code: Authorized in Article 820, Amendment of Master Plan
- Commission District: 4– Commissioner Hartung
- Staff: Julee Olander, Planner
Washoe County Community Services Department
Planning and Building Division
- Phone: 775.328.3627
- E-mail: jolander@washoecounty.us

Chair Chesney opened the item and called for Commissioner disclosures. There were no disclosures.

Julee Olander, Washoe County Planner, provided a Staff report presentation.

Kerry Rohrmeier, Applicant Representative, provided a PowerPoint presentation.

Jennifer Heeran, Washoe County Engineer, provided an update of the recent changes: noting the intent is to provide continuity with pedestrian and driver safety, as well as protecting roadway assets. She noted the current road is not built for industrial truck traffic, so Washoe County (WC) Engineering is requiring that Calle De La Plata from the eastern project boundary to the intersection at Pyramid Highway be improved to support industrial truck traffic. Ms. Heeran stated this is part of the conditions with updating the transportation traffic plan. WC Engineering would require that concrete curb, gutter, and sidewalk be provided along Calle De La Plata with the roadway improvements from the eastern project boundary all the way to the intersection. In discussions with the developer, WC Engineering went back and forth regarding requiring sidewalks, curb and gutter on both sides. Ms. Heeran stated that Dwayne Smith wanted to impress the importance of the long-term durability of the project, the roadways and improvements. Ms. Heeran concluded that changes requested by WC Engineering would be modifying what was presented by Ms. Olander back to the initial conditions: the Village Green Commerce Center would be required to improve Calle De La Plata to a commercial collector roadway standard from the easterly project boundary to the intersection of Pyramid Highway. These improvements would include: pavement widening and overlay to meet minimum pavement structural section for truck traffic, curb, gutter and sidewalk on the north and south side of Calle De La Plata from eastern project boundary to the intersection of Pyramid Highway, and intersection improvements to the satisfaction to the county engineer. Ms. Hearan relayed that Dwayne Smith requested the Commission discuss this, as it is contrary to what Ms. Heeran discussed with the developer and WC Planning staff prior to the meeting.

Mark Siegel, the Developer, thanked staff. He stated that he appreciates the responsibility to ensure proper infrastructure is in place. He stated he spoke with various employees prior to the meeting. Mr. Siegel stated that the County is going back and forth with requirements, specifically regarding curb, gutter and sidewalk on both sides from the development to Pyramid Highway; which is a significant cost. While the developer could live with the

modifications presented to the Commission, what is now being presented by Ms. Heeran is problematic. Mr. Siegel introduced Mike Railey, who worked originally on the project. Mr. Siegel stressed that this is a clarification and clean-up of the original project to provide improvements for the neighbors in terms of lighting, back doors, and signage. The last bit of information presented by Ms. Heeran on behalf of WC Engineering is problematic. Mr. Siegel introduced Garret Gordon.

Commissioner Chvilicek asked for clarification and guidance from DA and staff. She stated that the conditions had changed significantly. Mr. Lloyd stated there was some back and forth discussion; however, WC Engineering was back to the original requirement. Mr. Lloyd acknowledged that the applicant was expressing frustration, but stated that it's up to the Planning Commission to decide whether it's appropriate to require the developer to make improvements to both sides of Calle De La Plata or just one. Commissioner Chvilicek asked if the changes meant going back to the original conditions placed on this property when the project was approved some time ago with curb and gutter, and Calle De La Plata being improved to handle truck traffic. Mr. Lloyd stated the language, as it exists in the Master Plan, is less stringent in terms of when those improvements need to be made, or if they need to be made at all. He explained that Engineering is coming forward with a requirement, a change to the language of the specific plan, requiring improvements to upgrade to accommodate industrial development and trucks. Commissioner Chvilicek asked legal counsel if this was enough of a change for this item to be continued due to notification issues. Mr. Lloyd clarified that Engineering is requesting to go back to the language as presented in the Commissioners' packets. Commissioner Chvilicek asked for clarification since this item has come before the Commission numerous times and asked if it is the language in the current packet. Mr. Lloyd stated it's not a specific condition, as one would find in a tentative map, but is actually written into the new language of the specific plan. Jennifer Hearen, Washoe County Engineer, stated that what Julee Olander presented was a change from what was provided in the Commissioner's packets; what Ms. Heeran proposed is the language that was presented to the Commissioners.

Chair Chesney asked if Lot 08 is landlocked or whether an easement exists for the owner to gain access to their property. Chair Chesney stated that it is ludicrous to ask the applicant to put curb, gutter, and sidewalk on the north side for Calle De La Plata. He stated that would be enriching other people's properties that the applicant has no control over and he will not support it.

Commissioner Phillips asked if those who use the equestrian easement would have access to the public area now. Ms. Olander stated yes, the bridal path would give the public access to the Blackstone development up through Sugarloaf. Commissioner Chvilicek asked if it will be mixed access with equestrian and foot traffic. Ms. Olander stated it's for all non-motorized access.

In response to Chair Chesney's inquiry about easement access, Ms. Ronrmeier stated that parcel 08 has its own access.

Ms. Kerfoot stated that a public comment was received via email. The comment was emailed to Planning Commissioners prior to the meeting and posted to the County website.

Public Comment:

Garret Gordon, on behalf of the applicant, stated the item has gotten confusing. He continued by saying that there is a condition from staff, a modified condition from Ms. Olander, and the applicant's proposed condition. Mr. Gordon reiterated that there have been multiple discussions between the developer and staff. He requested a continuance to allow the applicant to come back with a clean, clear proposal.

There were no further requests for public comment. Chair Chesney closed the public comment period.

Commissioner Chvilicek stated she would feel more comfortable with a continuance. Chair Chesney stated he could not support it as is and believes it is best to continue the item.

MOTION: Commissioner Chvilicek moved to continue this item, time certain, to the August 3, 2021 Planning Commission Meeting. Commissioner Donshick seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously, seven in favor, none against.

***Former Commissioner Bruce is now present at the meeting. Chair Chesney called for an end to the public hearing period.

A resolution of Appreciation of Service was presented to Thomas Bruce for his service on the Planning Commission. The Commissioners commended Mr. Bruce for his service and dedication.

Commissioner Chesney reopened the public hearing period.

C. [Tentative Map Case Number WTM21-009 \(Cold Springs\)](#) [For possible action] – For hearing, discussion, and possible action to approve a tentative subdivision map to allow the subdivision of ±14.05 acres into a 42-lot common open space, single family residential development, with lots ranging in size from 7,219 SF to 19,740 SF located at 18030 Cold Springs Drive.

- Applicant/Property Owner: Lifestyle Homes TND, LLC
- Location: 18030 Cold Springs Drive
- APN: 566-041-01 & 566-041-02
- Parcel Size: ±9.05 & ±5 acres
- Master Plan: Suburban Residential (SR)
- Regulatory Zone: Medium Density Suburban (MDS)
- Area Plan: Cold Springs
- Citizen Advisory Board: North Valleys
- Development Code: Authorized in Article 408, Common Open Space Development and Article 608, Tentative Subdivision Maps
- Commission District: 5 – Commissioner Herman
- Staff: Julee Olander, Planner
Washoe County Community Services Department
Planning and Building Division
- Phone: 775.328.3627
- E-mail: jolander@washoecounty.us

Chair Chesney opened the item. He called for Commissioner disclosure. There were no disclosures.

Julee Olander, Washoe County Planner, provided a Staff report presentation.

Mike Railey, Applicant Representative, provided a PowerPoint Presentation.

Public Comment:

Felix Rojas stated his home is in an adjoining area. Mr. Rojas is concerned about the pond - specifically water runoff, standing water and sewage. He asked if runoff would be draining towards Cold Springs or the Glen Lakes Community.

There were no further requests for public comment. Chair Chesney closed the public comment period.

MOTION: Tentative Map Case Number WTM21-009 (Cold Springs)

Commissioner Donshick 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 WTM21-009 for Lifestyle Homes TND, LLC, being able to make all ten findings in accordance with Washoe County Code Section 110.608.25:

1. **Plan Consistency.** That the proposed map is in conformance with the Development Code and Master 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.

Commissioner Chvilicek seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously with seven in favor, none against.

D. [Tentative Map Case Number WTM21-006 \(Silver Hills\)](#) [For possible action] – For hearing, discussion and possible action, to approve a tentative subdivision map to allow a 358-lot, single-family residential, common open space subdivision, with lots ranging in size from 5,000 square feet to 8,072 square feet.

- Applicant/Property Owner: Lifestyle Homes TND, LLC
- Location: West side of Red Rock Road, approximately ¾ of a mile north of its intersection with Silver Knolls Boulevard
- APN: 087-390-10 & 13
- Parcel Size: ± 308.6 acres
- Master Plan: Suburban Residential (SR)
- Regulatory Zone: Silver Hills Specific Plan
- Area Plan: North Valleys
- Citizen Advisory Board: North Valleys
- Development Code: Authorized in Article 608, Tentative Subdivision Maps and Article 408, Common Open Space Development
- Commission District: 5 – Commissioner Herman
- Staff: Roger Pelham, Senior Planner
Washoe County Community Services Department
Planning and Building Division
- Phone: 775.328.3622
- E-mail: rpelham@washoecounty.us

Chair Chesney opened the item. He called for Commissioner disclosures. Commissioner Chvilicek stated she is a resident of Silver Knolls and spoke with counsel in terms of summary judgment against Silver Knolls Community Organization which was brought by Lifestyle Homes. She said she had not been involved with the Silver Knolls Community Organization through any deliberation or activity associated with Silver Hills. There were no other disclosures. Counsel Gustafson asked questions of Commissioner Chvilicek to confirm that she did not have any pecuniary interests in the item. Commissioner Chvilicek confirmed that she did not have any interests in the matter.

Roger Pelham, Washoe County Senior Planner, provided a Staff report presentation.

Garrett Gordon, Applicant Representative, provided a PowerPoint presentation.

Commissioner Flick asked if it's typical that staff doesn't make a recommendation. Chair Chesney said no, it's not typical, unless staff feels they have presented both sides of a case and truly don't have a recommendation. Commissioner Flick asked if staff cannot make a recommendation due to incomplete information. Mr. Lloyd stated that the answer is in the application; there are many policies and requirements that apply to the entire project, of which the current request is a small piece. Mr. Lloyd does not believe that staff were able to make all of the findings for this small piece. Mr. Pelham said he is not convinced that the intent of the specific plan is being met by this tentative map. The conditions of approval are meant to implement specific technical requirements. He pointed out that conditions of approval are meant to implement specific technical requirements; Mr. Pelham said that the conditions as presented to the Commissioners could probably do that. However, the Commission does not have the entire project to evaluate. Mr. Pelham pointed out that if the entire project were being evaluated, he could say yes or no; but that is not the case.

Mr. Pelham proceeded to explain that there are other policies present in the North Valleys Area Plan, such as minimizing curb and gutter, that the current project does not address. Mr. Pelham also pointed out the discrepancy between the varied development shown in the specific plan and the long, linear lot and blocks shown in the current project. It can, may, or

may not be seen as consistent based on the judgment of the Commission. He said he has some discomfort.

On the other hand, Mr. Pelham agreed that the minimum requirements for a subdivision have been met; although he's not convinced that the overall policies and character have been implemented as required to be. He said, therefore, the documentation is being brought forward to the Commissioners but he is reserving his recommendation. He said he has evaluated many applications over the years and has come forward with a no-recommendation only a handful of times in 20+ years.

Commissioner Donshick asked about the front yard setbacks being between 15-17 feet. She asked what the standard variation is. Mr. Pelham said there is no particular standard for variation of setbacks and explained that the handbook is not specific on what that will look like. Mr. Pelham said that this application is seeking to alternate setbacks with each house and that this would apply only to the portion of the dwelling that would be for the entryway. He clarified that in all cases, the garage would be set at exactly 20 and asked the Commission whether that variation of setback provides a less linear, more organic aspect to the neighborhood. Mr. Pelham conceded that this meets the criteria of variation, but said that it's up to the Commission's judgment. Commissioner Flick said where he comes from, a specific plan becomes the zone. He said the deviation from that requires an amendment. He said this is a complex project, but if we don't treat phase 1 as a complete package to meet requirements, we might be coming back as we did with the earlier application (Village Green). Commissioner Flick asserted that there was no architectural control, and that the applicant/developer primarily gets to do whatever they want if the item gets approved. He stated he understands the developer's dilemma in not wanting to commit to what the County wants them to commit to. Commissioner also commented that 2 feet in variation is not substantial.

Commissioner Chvilicek stated that she was struggling to find that the project complies with finding number 1, consistency with the master plan and the North Valleys Area plan. She specifically mentioned that the applicant's representative said that the proposed tentative map is identical to what was seen on page 210 of the Silver Hills specific plan development. Commissioner Chvilicek stated that the rendition of streets on page 210 is more eye appealing than the straight, long, utilitarian blocks shown in this project. She said she has questions about the specific design. Commissioner Chvilicek asked for feedback from the public meeting and for clarification on what "some impact" referred to in the traffic study.

Mr. Pelham stated the public meeting was well attended and cordial. The questions were mainly with regard to public access and questions regarding when the development would occur in relation to adjacent, existing parcel. The answers were 'I don't know because it's market-driven.' There were questions about how much the dwellings were going to cost, to which the reply was also 'it's market-driven.' Mr. Pelham said there was relatively little substantive criticism or changes requested by the citizens that were in attendance. To whether or not the lot and block layout is the same or consistent with the type of neighborhood shown in the specific plan – Mr. Pelham stated it is a judgment call. Mr. Pelham said he would like to leave the reply regarding traffic impact to the traffic engineer or to WC Engineering. Commissioner Chvilicek stated she would like someone to define "some impact" as stated in the traffic study.

Paul Solague, the traffic engineer who prepared the traffic study, stated the primary point of concern is the intersection on Red Rock. In the vicinity of the project, they have recommendations and have found that those accesses will all meet level of service policy. However, they found that the freeway ramps currently operate below policy levels and the project is adding some additional traffic there. This is why the language states "some impact", as it is still below policy level of service. RTC has planned improvements on Red Rock beginning at the freeway. In the RTC roadway planning system, roadway improvements will be coming in time. Mr. Solague stated that their project will generate traffic impact fee

revenue. He stated that there is a plan in place for those problems to be resolved through regional project improvements. As a final point Mr. Solague pointed out that Washoe County, NDOT, and RTC all submitted review letters with no negative comments on traffic. Mr. Solague stated that there will be some impact and that their plan is to contribute to the ultimate solution through impact fees. Commissioner Donshick asked about trip generation rate and whether the 10th edition of the ITT Trip Generation 2018 is the latest version. Paul Solague said that it is the most current published edition.

There were no requests for public comment. Chair Chesney closed the public comment period.

Commissioner Donshick thanked staff. She said that she had serious concerns regarding whether the project meets the characteristics of the master and area plans with the way that the applicant manipulated what was presented to the Commissioners

Commissioner Chvilicek stated that she is troubled with what is before the Commission as a tentative map for Village 1. Silver Hills has been before the Commission numerous times and there have been suggested changes brought each time. Commissioner Chvilicek points out references to agri-business and community hoop houses in a statement, but nothing to support it. She said she is deeply concerned with traffic. The current condition on 395 traveling out of and into the valley is atrocious. Any additional impact is going to have a negative impact on the well-being of everyone who lives in that valley. In terms of the design of Village 1 matching what is already existing, it doesn't match. Commissioner Chvilicek stated that this is a very intense development and stated that the current plan is boring compared to what is already presented in the valley. She has concerns that this will continue to come back to the Planning Commission and that it will be different each and every time. Directed to Washoe County Planning staff, she said that she is deeply troubled that there seems to be a pattern of lack of engagement with the Citizen Advisory Boards.

Commissioner Flick stated that he is uncomfortable since he hasn't seen the specific plans, because he was just appointed. He stated that he needs to become more familiar before making a good judgment about what has been presented. He stated that putting together a packet of this size is no easy task under current building conditions. The developer needs to be flexible as possible. The Planning Commission, on the other hand, needs to know what the product is and take steps to ensure that it complies with County requirements and the law. Commissioner Flick said there may be some things in the specific plan that he hasn't read that may give him a better comfort level. He said it's not the fault of the staff or applicant. He said he is new and hasn't done the research. The conditions in the specific plan were put there for a reason. The prior commissions had a reason to put this in there. He said that it's the Planning Commission's obligation to ensure the conditions are there or modify the project to make sure it's in compliance.

Commissioner Nelson agreed that the Commission is looking at a tentative map for the first phase of the project. She stated the conditions of approval are a check and balance to make sure the conditions are in accordance with plan consistency. Going through the conditions of approval, she said she doesn't see the they point in that direction. Commissioner Nelson is also concerned that there were no CAB meetings, which will be an issue moving forward.

Commissioner Peyton said that if he doesn't get an approval from staff, who did the research and conducted the reports, then he does not feel comfortable approving the project.

Commissioner Phillips said as the Planning Commission, they are looking for a plan. This specific request is more of a footprint rather than the vision of what the Commissioners are looking for in a neighborhood. Commissioner Phillips says they need something more concrete.

Chair Chesney stated that he shares the concerns of the other Commissioners. This is a big project, of which the Commission is only getting a snap shot of a small portion of the project.

The project has a lot of moving parts, and the Commission is only seeing one moving part. Until the Commission sees the big picture – be that higher density housing or commercial development, he is not comfortable with the project. The Commission repeatedly sees piecemeal villages; he wants to see a full package. Chair Chesney stated that there needs to be more planning on behalf of whoever schedules the CAB meetings. He stated that there needs to be more public scrutiny and not just meetings held by the developer. Chair Chesney also stated that the the money isn't there for traffic improvements for many years out. He said he sits on an RTC committee and there is gridlock already with no relief in sight. At this point in time, he said he cannot support this.

DDA Gustafson stated that CAB meetings are not required by Development Code. She encouraged Commissioners not to consider that as dispositive in this case. Counsel Gustafson also reminded Commissioners that they are an independent body and that while staff's comments can be considered everyone needs to meet their own individual decisions based specifically on the ten findings based on Code 110. Chair Chesney stated whether the Code requires CAB meetings or not, the local population is affected. He said he comes from CAB background, and many Commissioners come from CAB background, and it's important that the County put together a CAB meeting before a project of this magnitude.

MOTION: Tentative Map Case Number WTM21-006 (Silver Hills)

Commissioner Donshick 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 deny Tentative Subdivision Map Case Number WTM21-006 for Lifestyle Homes, TND, LLC, being unable to make all ten findings in accordance with Washoe County Code Section 110.608.25, specifically finding 1, Plan Consistency, and finding 2, Design or Improvement:

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.

Commissioner Phillips seconded the motion. Commissioner Flick stated he would prefer to continue the item. The motion carried with six in favor, one against, with Commissioner Flick dissenting. Secretary Lloyd read the appeal procedure.

10. Chair and Commission Items

A. Discussion and election of Planning Commission officers, including Chair and vice-chair, for a one-year period running July 2021 to July 2022.

MOTION: Commissioner Chvilicek moved to nominate Commissioner Donshick as the Planning Commission Chairperson for the one-year period running July 2021 to July 2022. Commissioner Nelson seconded the motion. Commissioner Donshick accepted the nomination. The motion passed unanimously with six in favor, none against – Commissioner Donshick did not vote.

MOTION: Commissioner Chesney moved to nominate Commissioner Chvilicek as the Planning Commission Vice-Chair for the one-year period running July 2021 to July 2022. Commissioner Donshick seconded the motion. Commissioner Chvilicek accepted the nomination. The motion passed unanimously with six in favor, none against – Commissioner Chvilicek did not vote.

Control of the meeting passed from former Chair Chesney to newly elected Chair Donshick.

B. Future agenda items – None

C. Requests for information from staff –

- Commissioner Chvilicek stated that the school numbers were not in agreement between Julee and Roger's presentation. She asked that staff be consistent with school references.
- Commissioner Nelson referenced the gridlock caused by the fires. She asked what Planning does with regards to evacuation during a fire. Mr. Lloyd stated that Planning emphasizes fire suppression and evacuation routes when reviewing tentative maps or master plans. Mr. Lloyd agreed that it's a good discussion to have with this Commission to bring everyone up to speed.

11. Director's and Legal Counsel's Items [Non-action item]

A. Report on previous Planning Commission items – None

B. Legal information and updates –

- DDA Gustafson reported that former counsel Mr. Nate Edwards was promoted to Assistant District Attorney of all the civil divisions and asked that Commissioners and staff congratulate him when they see him.

12. Public Comment

There was no request for public comment.

Chair Donshick indicated that Exhibit A, page 3, of the Silver Hills item has a typo where it talks about NDOT's work on the I-80 instead of the I-580.

13. Adjournment

With no further business scheduled before the Planning Commission, the meeting adjourned at 8:41 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Misty Moga, Independent Contractor.

Approved by Commission in session on August 3, 2021

Trevor Lloyd

Trevor Lloyd

Secretary to the Planning Commission