



WASHOE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION Draft Meeting Minutes

Planning Commission Members

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

Tuesday, September 7, 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, September 7, 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 Donshick called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. The following Commissioners and Staff were present:

Commissioners present: Larry Chesney
Francine Donshick, Chair
Sarah Chvilicek, Vice Chair
R. Michael Flick (joined the meeting at 6:01 pm)
Kate S. Nelson
Pat Phillips

Commissioners absent: Larry Peyton

Staff present: Trevor Lloyd, Secretary, Planning and Building
Chris Bronczyk, Planner, Planning and Building
Dan Cahalane, Planner, Planning and Building
Julee Olander, Planner, Planning and Building
Katy Stark, Planner Trainee, 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 Phillips 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 Donshick opened the Public Comment period.

Public Comment:

Andrea Caldwell (Zoom), resident of 430 Tranquil Dr in the Bridle Path community, responded to the Village Green item. Ms. Caldwell doesn't think it's good planning to review a master plan update via reviewing an individual parcel. She understands that there has been commentary regarding updating the master plan for Spanish Springs, potentially in response to this property. She encouraged the Commission to look at the entire plan, not to isolate a property and make decisions on that property in furtherance of updating the plan. Ms. Caldwell thinks that changing a large list of restrictions on the property with no commitment from the owner or the developer of the property as to what the future of that building site will be, doesn't provide enough information. It could affect property values, lifestyles, and use of our property if we end up with incompatible use there. If the Planning Commission allows these alterations, they are hampering the building permit process because the changes will have already been made. She thinks it'll be too late at that point in time to really have a good plan on that property. Thank you.

There were no further responses to the request for public comment.

6. Approval of Agenda

In accordance with the Open Meeting Law, Commissioner Chesney moved to approve the agenda for the September 7, 2021 meeting as written. Commissioner Nelson seconded the motion, which passed unanimously with a vote of six for, none against; Commissioner Peyton – absent.

7. Approval of the [August 3, 2021 Draft Minutes](#)

Commissioner Chesney moved to approve the minutes for the August 3, 2021, Planning Commission meeting as written. Commissioner Phillips seconded the motion, which passed unanimously with a vote of six for, none against, Commissioner Peyton – absent.

8. Planning Items

A. Master Plan Update [Non-action item] – Eric Young, Senior Planner, presented the Planning Commission with the status of the Master Plan Update.

Commissioner Chvilicek asked that the link to the Master Plan website be shared with the Commissioners.

B. [Appointments to Parcel Map Review Committee](#) [For possible action by Chair] – Recommendation that the Chair of the Washoe County Planning Commission affirm the

appointment of Larry Chesney to the Parcel Map Review Committee with a term to expire on June 30, 2022, and if desired, appoint a member of the Planning Commission to act as an alternate in the event Mr. Chesney is absent with a contemporaneous term to also expire on June 30, 2022.

Chair Donshick affirmed Commissioner Chesney as the Planning Commission's appointee to the Parcel Map Review Committee with a term to expire on June 30, 2022. Chair Donshick asked for volunteers for an alternate. Commissioner Chvilicek volunteered to serve as alternate. With no objection from the Commissioners, Chair Donshick appointed Commissioner Chvilicek as the Planning Commission's alternate to the Parcel Map Review Committee.

C. Regional Planning Commission (RPC) Alternate List [For possible action] – For review and possible action to recommend that the Board of County Commissioners set the order of alternates selected to represent the Washoe County Planning Commission (PC) on the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Commission (RPC) in the event the regularly appointed PC members are unavailable to serve. The existing Washoe County Planning Commissioners serving on the Regional Planning Commission are Larry Chesney, Sarah Chvilicek and Kate Nelson. The currently proposed order of alternates is as follows: First Alternate, Francine Donshick; Second Alternate, Larry Peyton; Third Alternate, Pat Phillips; and Fourth Alternate, Michael Flick. Once reviewed and a recommendation is made, to direct the Planning Commission Secretary to transmit the ordered list of recommended alternates to the Washoe County Board of Commissioners (Board) for its decision. After the Board's decision, the Planning Commission Secretary shall transmit the ordered list to the Executive Director of the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency (TMRPA).

Chair Donshick asked for a motion to approve the RPC Alternate List, as presented. Commissioner Chesney moved to approve the RPC Alternate List, as presented. Commissioner Flick seconded the motion, which passed unanimously with a vote of six for, none against; Commissioner Peyton – absent.

9. Public Hearings

A. 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. Remove sidewalk required along Calle de la Plata frontage;
5. Added color and evergreen trees as options for 50 feet in length of building walls;
6. 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;

7. Clarify that illuminated signs will only be allowed when not adjacent to residential property;
8. Remove security lighting section and parking lighting requirements;
9. Clarify that effluent water is required when available in the area;
10. Clarify that no loading docks are allowed to be adjacent to residential property;
11. Remove Figure D-5: Business Park Buffering;
12. APN: 534-561-10 is exempted from Low Impact Development (LID) Standards and Environmental Sustainability Standards
13. Clarify roadway improvements as required by Washoe County Engineering and Capital Projects; and
14. Remove equestrian easement.

- Applicant: Blackstone Development Group
- Property Owner: STN 375 Calle Group, LLC
- Location: 375 Calle De La Plata
- APN: 534-561-10
- Parcel Size: 39.12 acres
- Master Plan: Industrial (I)
- Regulatory Zone: Industrial (I)
- Area Plan: 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
- Phone: 775.328.3627
- E-mail: jolander@washoecounty.us

Commissioner Chesney apologized to Planning Staff for his commits made at the previous meeting.

Planner Julee Olander provided a presentation. Applicant Representative Kerry Rohrmeier (via zoom) stated they support Staff's recommendation for approval and stated that she and Mike Railey, Property Owner Representative (in Chambers) are available for questions.

Public Comment:

Jim Huston, resident in the Bridal Path community, stated that the Village Green plan was a small plan focused on a very small area. Everything was very clearly defined in the plan as to what was going to get built. As we move through this, it just becomes more and more ambiguous as to what is going to get built, and nothing has been really defined. A lot of things have been removed and excluded. If this passes, the property owner is not required to adhere to many things in the plan. The plan still stays in place it would still affect neighbor 08. He said the one thing that concerns him is the allowance that is being made for the applicant to be exempt from Appendix A of the Spanish Springs Area Plan. It is nothing to do with the Village Green Plan and suddenly, he's allowed to have much greater site coverage. This area is right next to a residential area which affects property values. Mr. Huston would like to see the Planning Commission enforce the Spanish Springs Area Plan and omit the part about giving them an exemption.

Jesse Maxim, resident within the Bridle Path community, stated that he works for a local general contractor and has a sound understanding of potential ramifications for zoning and land use changes. He raised some questions as to water management with development of the site and precedent for future use of parcels surrounding the area. Warehouses exist in the Spanish Springs area, but they're all on the West side of Pyramid Highway where water management, utilities, and infrastructure are available. The change of the master plan directly adjacent to the equestrian area known as Bridle Path completely changes that way of life and lifestyle. He stated he chooses to raise a family in Bridle Path because of the sense of community. A development like this changes that sense of community. A local judge omitted and removed the right and ability for developer to move forward with the development based on irresponsible impacts to the community. It didn't better serve the community and the surrounding neighbors. Mr. Maxim fears that this is a close representation of that. It doesn't better serve the community as a whole. Business and growth are inevitable, but there's a correct place for that. Business and growth taking place directly adjacent to equestrian properties and to single-family residential properties doesn't seem like the right place. Thank you for your time.

Cassandra Grieve stated that she lives in Bridle Path within the 750ft notice zone. Although Ms. Grieve received earlier notices sent out by Washoe County, it wasn't until the meeting held on August 3rd that she started to engage and do her own research on the master plan, the Spanish Springs area plan and the village Green Specific Plan, all of which were significantly outside her personal expertise and a struggle to work through and understand. Ms. Grieve said she has spent the better part of her personal time the last three weeks trying to wrap my head around the master plan changes been set forth. She has examined the Spanish Springs Area Plan Appendix A, Appendix D, and the Planning Commission staff report and have watched the recording of the August 3rd meeting and taken notes. Ms. Grieve stated that changing a master plan was a big deal; so much so that it requires a supermajority. She said she has watched this Commission struggle to differentiate the current with the proposed changes. She stated Miss Olander commented that many of the proposed changes merely modernize the Spanish Springs area plan. Appendix A and Appendix D are out of date. She said she respectively requests that if a plan is out of date, then modernize the plan. Please do not make piecemeal changes parcel by parcel. Bridle Path homeowners are residents of Washoe County, not residents of Reno or Sparks. The County is the only place we can bring our grievances. The parcel is in our neighborhood. It is still fortunately, very dark in the area where this property is located. The security lighting from an industrial-sized building will shine into our properties, especially if the building site coverage requirements are exempted. It is also fairly quiet in the area. We can hear football games from Spanish Springs High School. Sound carries as there is little to disturb it, and the noise from the industrial activity will echo in our yards. She said we have horses on our properties. She is concerned that the lighting and noise from an unrestricted industrial building will create an inhospitable area for the horses if this parcel is exempted from building size, lighting and buffering requirements. If whatever is built there is unrestricted in its size and shape, it will be the only such building as residential properties surround it. At the August 3rd meeting, it was understated that this would be a singular giant building standing over people's homes. The Village Green plan was made for specific industrial areas that never occurred.

Larry Thomas, resident of 365 Calle De La Plata, adjacent to the West of the parcel, said he isn't up to date on all of the requested changes. Mr. Thomas said that any kind of exemption is not right. Over the past three years there have been plans approved for 300 houses to go in across the street and residents have had to deal with a lot of things they didn't want. Mr. Thomas said residents did agree that this would be an industrial site with quite a few restrictions. It now seems like the developer wants most of those exempted. He said that he doesn't understand the clarifying language regarding setbacks and height of buildings. Mr. Thomas is concerned about the view of the mechanical equipment on top of the building since

it wouldn't have to be hidden. Mr. Thomas stated that an earlier publication allowed for buildings to be 50 feet long and now they're making them longer. It says no loading docks adjacent to residential property, that's pretty clear. This is a little unusual that they're already allowed to have this industrial property between residential on three sides. He said removing the equestrian easements because it was stated as unnecessary anymore is just not true. He said the easement should remain because that's the only thing that keeps motorized vehicles from racing up and down the Bridle Path.

Dan Engler (via Zoom) said he lives on the east side bordering the proposed project. He said he has been involved with the project since we first moved onto the property back in 2017. He said we fought the residential part of this and we're back to industrial. He said he is ok with industrial. He asked that the Commissioners pay attention to the exemptions that's being asked for closely that they're not just going to rubber stamp an exemption request. Mr. Engler stated that they asked the developer for an easement between properties to allay flooding concerns. He said he hopes the Commission makes the best decision.

Lisa Durgin (via Zoom), resident of Bridle Path, said she spoke at last month's meeting regarding the proposed public access trail easement. She said she agrees with and appreciates the decision to remove that element from the plan as it would have been a waste of the developers' time and money to create a trail that would go nowhere. She stated that everyone in her neighborhood that she has spoken with opposes adding an adjacent trail that would allow more illegal motorized vehicle traffic. She said she strongly disagrees with the idea of exempting the 39-acre parcel #10 from the requirements that would make Village Green a more compatible development with the surrounding properties. Other than the smaller industrial parcel that is not part of this immediate plan, the properties surrounding Village Green are all either lower medium density, suburban, rural or open space. The Spanish Springs Area plan visioning character statement which this plan purports to honor mentions rustic appearance, Western Heritage, rural character, and western character. All of the parts of the Village Green Commercenter plan that might have honored this statement are slated to be removed with the current proposed amendments. These amendments ask for exemptions for Appendix A, various architectural requirements, as well as low impact development and sustainability standards. These changes will, among other things, permit larger, taller, less aesthetically pleasing buildings, less landscaping, less attractive trees used in the landscaping, and will leave drainage issues, air, and light pollution. Any description of what lighting will be allowed on the buildings themselves seems to be absent, which is concerning considering the potential height of these buildings. As another example, under the current approved plan, 30% of the 39.1-acres may be covered by buildings as tall as 40 feet on parcel #10, and they're actually asking for more than that by asking to be exempted from the site coverage requirements. Ms. Durgin doesn't see how any of these changes contribute to implementing the vision and character statement of the Spanish Springs area. As a neighbor whose quality of life and property value will be impacted by these proposed amendments, Ms. Durgin asked the Commissioners to vote no.

Pat Caldwell (via Zoom), resident of 430 Tranquil Drive and lives within 750 feet of that building. Mr. Caldwell reference Eric's presentation about the master plan update. Mr. Caldwell stated that throwing out Appendix A of the Spanish Springs plan just muddies the water. Once again, making these one-off decisions to exempt a builder who has not clearly defined what this building will be, other than saying it is going to be for industrial use. It will create light pollution, noise pollution with loading docks. There are no real defined parameters around this building. Mr. Caldwell is surprised that the Commission would take action and vote on information that was not readily available from this parcel owner. Mr. Caldwell would appreciate if the Commission would reconsider a no-vote or table this motion until there is further information.

Cindy Thomas, resident of 365 Calle De La Plata, right next door to this property. Ms. Thomas said that the residents have taken so much of their time fighting this. They all came together as neighbors and approved putting the building in, because they didn't want houses. She said there is also a development across the street where there's going to be 300 houses. Ms. Thomas said she is confused as to why we can approve something and then the developer can make amendments after, so the residents have to come down here and fight them again. It's such a waste of our time. She said she was a little frustrated about having to be here again. We've already made the changes with what they wanted on their big building. They put in for all of the things they wanted, and now we're here again because they want to make more changes. Ms. Thomas is confused about what's going on for lot 8. She said she wasn't notified. She said she was sick of coming down here and wasting her time.

There was no further response to the call for public comment.

Mike Railey, the owner's representative, clarified that when this was going back through the system a few years ago it was apparent that there were discrepancies between the specific plan and the area plan that were missed. Mr. Railey said that nothing is changing, and it's clean-up and housing keeping, so that the plan can move forward as proposed before. With regard to the bridle path issue, he stated that the Bridle Path home owners have stated that there is no public access, it's building a trail to nowhere. That can come in if that access changes in the future.

Discussion by Commission:

Commissioner Phillips said she has several questions about the lights. Ms. Olander stated that the industrial standards used when an industrial building is adjacent to residential were recently updated. Article 414 requires that lighting structures that are more than 100 feet from residentially zoned properties shall not exceed 25 feet. She said code section 110 speaks to lighting, screening, and loading. The Village Green Plan was done years ago and this language was not yet written in our development code. Staff felt it was better to fall back on 110 versus the Village Green Plan, which is why the lighting portion was removed.

Commissioner Phillips said she is concerned about the compatibility of the surroundings. She said the easement is floating out there. She wants to see iron-clad guarantees to protect the neighbors and see that there aren't loopholes that could cause issues in the future. In response to Commissioner Phillips' concern, Ms. Olander stated there are no easements in the Village Green plan. The proposed easement along the perimeter has been removed. The easements are in Bridle Path, and that's not before you tonight and cannot be addressed. The equestrian easements on Bridle Path are a separate parcel.

Commissioner Flick asked about public improvements on street frontage on the highway. He said he is confused on the wording. He asked if the County is re-negotiating. He said it was clear last time that both sides of Calle De La Plata would get improved up to Pyramid, but now the the required sidewalk has been removed. Commissioner Flick asked if the improvements will be required or not. Ms. Olander stated that there will be other developments on Calle De La Plata and what is required of this development is not known yet. As developments come in and submit for permits, they would be required to improve Calle De La Plata. Staff left it up to the County Engineer. It will be decided at the time of the building permit process. Commissioner Flick said that two or three meetings ago Engineering required full improvements on the north side of the street; which was new news. Commissioner Flick is concerned that the County is giving up a lot in exchange for what they're getting back. He could support other things if the County get improvements. He asked how big the building will be. He asked why it's so important for an easement to be moved versus leaving as it is. Commissioner Flick said that he wants to get comfortable with these things. Ms. Olander stated the easement was moved because there wasn't connectivity and is now being removed. Part of the plan has a western equestrian theme. They thought people could ride their horses to

work, and it wasn't feasible. Staff thought it would be helpful to connect to Bridle Path, but they weren't in favor. Staff did not want to include a path that no one is going to use, just because it was there previously. Regarding the original question about improvements on Calle De La Plata; it was a burden for the developer. Developers are usually asked to improve the frontage of their property. Staff couldn't connect this development all the way out to Pyramid. The developer will be required to provide the infrastructure necessary at the time of building permit, which was deemed appropriate by the County Engineer.

Dwayne Smith, Director of Engineering and the County Engineer, thanked Planning Staff for the much clearer approach to the master plan amendment. Mr. Smith assured Commissioner Flick that the safety of the traveling public and pedestrians are paramount. He stated that whenever a project comes into the County and specifically within engineering, Staff will apply the development code as required to make sure that the developer meets the requirements of that project. That's a separate process from the Master Plan amendment work that the Commission has in front of them. As stated by Ms. Olander, the goal and the intent were to provide clarity and understanding to the developer regarding what they may be facing when they come in with the project. Mr. Smith stated that Staff would apply the full code at the point that the building permit request comes into the County and make sure all of those development code requirements are met. Commissioner Flick stated he wants to make sure the plan complies, and the County should get something in return for the consideration.

Commissioner Chesney stated the property's frontage has a huge drainage canal that runs down to holding ponds to the west; stating that curb and gutter is a pipe dream on that side of that street. Commissioner Chesney said there is enough clarification for a master plan amendment and that he can support it. He said the building permit process has checks and balances.

Commissioner Flick asked about maximum size of the building that can be placed on this parcel according to the information. Mr. Lloyd said the county code doesn't restrict building size except for minimum parking standards, drainage, and landscaping requirements. There isn't a maximum size. Mr. Lloyd pointed out that the County doesn't limit the size of a house or industrial building. Commission Chesney referenced Appendix A, which talks about setbacks and landscaping. He stated building and engineering will enforce all the codes. Mr. Lloyd provided clarification: there is a restriction within the Spanish Springs Area Plan with maximum coverage of 30%, which is one exception the developer is requesting.

MOTION: Commissioner Chesney 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 adopt the resolution contained at Attachment A of this staff report to amend the Master Plan as set forth in Master Plan Amendment Case Number WMPA21-0002 having made at least three of the following five findings in accordance with Washoe County Code Section 110.820.15(d), and having made the required Spanish Springs Area Plan finding. Commissioner Chesney further moved to certify the resolution and the proposed Master Plan Amendments in WMPA21-0002 as set forth in this staff report for submission to the Washoe County Board of County Commissioners and authorize the Chair to sign the resolution on behalf of the Planning Commission.

1. **Consistency with Master Plan.** The proposed amendment is in substantial compliance with the policies and action programs of the Master Plan.
2. **Compatible Land Uses.** The proposed amendment will provide for land uses compatible with (existing or planned) adjacent land uses, and will not adversely impact the public health, safety or welfare.

3. **Response to Change Conditions.** The proposed amendment responds to changed conditions or further studies that have occurred since the plan was adopted by the Board of County Commissioners, and the requested amendment represents a more desirable utilization of land.
4. **Availability of Facilities.** There are or are planned to be adequate transportation, recreation, utility, and other facilities to accommodate the uses and densities permitted by the proposed Master Plan designation.
5. **Desired Pattern of Growth.** The proposed amendment will promote the desired pattern for the orderly physical growth of the County and guides development of the County based on the projected population growth with the least amount of natural resource impairment and the efficient expenditure of funds for public services.

AND

Spanish Springs Area Plan Findings:

- a) The amendment will implement the Vision and Character Statement.
- b) The amendment conforms to all applicable policies of the Spanish Springs Area Plan and the Washoe County Master Plan.
- c) The amendment will not conflict with or diminish the public's health, safety or welfare, including possible effects upon water quality and quantity.

Commissioner Chvilicek seconded the motion, which passed with five in favor; one against – Commissioner Phillips; Commissioner Peyton – absent.

B. Abandonment Case Number (WAB21-0006 Liles) [For possible action] – For hearing, discussion, and possible action to approve the abandonment of 13 feet of an existing 33-foot access easement on the western property line of APN 017-200-21. If the applicant's request is granted, the length of the easement to be abandoned is 205 feet, and the total area of the abandonment is 2,665 square feet.

- Applicant: Danelle Liles
- Property Owner: Kelly and Danelle Liles
- Location: 15755 Secret Pass Rd., Reno, NV 89521
- APN: 017-200-21
- Parcel Size: 1.574 acres
- Master Plan: Suburban Residential (SR)
- Regulatory Zone: Medium Density Suburban (MDS)
- Area Plan: Southeast Truckee Meadows
- Development Code: Authorized in Article 806, Vacations and Abandonments of Streets and Easements
- Commission District: 2 – Commissioner Lucey
- Staff: Katy Stark, Planner Trainee
Washoe County Community Services Department
Planning and Building
- Phone: 775.328.3618
- E-mail: krstark@washoecounty.us

Planner Katy Stark provided a presentation. Applicant Danelle Liles provided a presentation.

Commissioner Chesney asked whether the applicant agreed with Staff's recommendation for a 25 foot easement. Ms. Liles said it's not what she requested, stating she really wants 20.01. Commissioner Chesney asked Counsel about the requested change not being agendized. DDA Gustafson stated that the request was agendized for a 20 foot remaining easement and that any easement 20.01 feet or larger would be appropriate.

Commissioner Nelson asked Mr. Smith for his reasons for the 25 foot easement request. Mr. Smith noted that Staff conditioned it for 25 feet considering the originally presented need and other road maintenance needs such as plowing and drainage that can be impacted. Mr. Smith wasn't aware that there was a fence. He asked the applicant if the fences would remain in place. Ms. Liles stated nothing would be changed. Mr. Smith said that with the new information, Engineering can support reducing the impact to require a 21 foot easement.

Commissioner Flick asked whether the applicant could request a variance for the covered patio. Mr. Lloyd stated based on the new information, Staff and the applicant are in agreeance with a 21 foot easement. While a variance is possible, it is very stringent, which is why the applicant initially requested an abandonment instead of a variance.

There was no response to the request for public comment.

MOTION: Commissioner Nelson 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 partially approve, with the amended conditions included as Exhibit A to this matter, Abandonment Case Number WAB21-0006 for Danelle Liles to include the abandonment of 12 feet of a 33-foot public access easement, having made all three findings in accordance with Washoe County Code Section 110.806.20:

1. **Master Plan.** The abandonment or vacation is consistent with the policies, action programs, standards and maps of the Master Plan and the Southeast Truckee Meadows; and
2. **No Detriment.** The abandonment or vacation does not result in a material injury to the public; and
3. **Existing Easements.** Existing public utility easements in the area to be abandoned or vacated can be reasonably relocated to provide similar or enhanced service.

Commissioner Chesney seconded the motion, which passed with six in favor; none against; Commissioner Peyton – absent.

C. [Abandonment Case Number WAB21-0007 \(Nachlinger Taylor\)](#) [For possible action]
– For hearing, discussion, and possible action to approve a partial abandonment of 16 feet of the existing 33-foot access easement on the northern property line of APN 150-221-04. If the applicant's request is approved, this would result in the length of easement to be abandoned at 158.13 feet, and the total area of abandonment at 2,530.08 square feet.

- Applicant/Property Owner: Kendrick Taylor Jr. and Janet Nachlinger
- Location: 15435 Fawn Lane, Reno, Nevada 89511
- APN: 150-221-04
- Parcel Size: 1.176 acres
- Master Plan: Suburban Residential
- Regulatory Zone: Low Density Suburban (LDS)

- Area Plan: Forest
- Development Code: Authorized in Article 806, Vacations and Abandonments of Streets and Easements
- Commission District: 2 – Commissioner Lucey
- Staff: Katy Stark, Planner Trainee
Washoe County Community Services Department
Planning and Building
- Phone: 775.328.3618
- E-mail: krstark@washoecounty.us

Planner Katy Stark provided a presentation. Applicants Kendrick Taylor and Janet Nachlinger did not have any questions but were available in Chambers to answer any questions.

Public Comment:

Charles Donohue, resident of 15445 Fawn Lane, is neighboring this proposed abandonment. He thanked Staff for answering his questions regarding this abandonment and the potential of impacting future access to his property. The principal access for these parcels is also Fawn Lane through a similar 35 foot easement, which was established in the patent at the time the parcels went out of federal ownership; as well as being established by parcel Map 1210 which was recorded in 1981 by Frederick Stole. The same parcel map 1210 was referenced when a 30-foot easement for ingress and egress was established over the patented 33 foot right of way on the southern portion of APN's 150-221-04, 150-221-05, and 150-221-06. This 30-foot easement was recorded in 1988. Mr. Donohue said he recognizes the Taylor-Nachlinger request to abandon a portion of this easement through their property line to the north of their home. His research on the issue and comments from Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District regarding maintaining a 20-foot easement for fire apparatus access have him concerned regarding the principal access to the site, particularly during a wildland fire. His research and discussions with neighbors indicate that landscaping, installation of fencing, and a rockery wall have been placed within the 33-foot and 30-foot easements to the north and the south. He attached an aerial photo highlighting these restrictions which are less than 20 feet and confirm the measurement in the southern portion of APN 150-221-06. He said that the fence was constructed without the benefits of a permit or having gone through the abandonment process. Mr. Donohue said he wouldn't want access by the local Fire Protection compromised during a fire, considering Fawn Lane does not benefit from fire suppression hydrants and because the Health Department recently excluded this area from pile burning to reduce fuel loads for air quality purposes. Washoe County staff recommends the approval of the modified abandonment of the 33-foot easement to the north to 20 feet. Mr. Donohue said that he could support that. He requested the County ensure that the Fire Protection District can access this modified easement to ensure that the existing public life and safety issues are not compromised.

There was no further response to the call for public comment. There were no questions or discussion by the Commission.

MOTION: Commissioner Chesney 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 partially approve, with the conditions included as Exhibit A to this matter, Abandonment Case Number WAB21-0007 for Kendrick Taylor Jr. and Janet Nachlinger to include the abandonment of 13 feet of a 33-foot public access easement, having made all three findings in accordance with Washoe County Code Section 110.806.20:

1. **Master Plan.** The abandonment or vacation is consistent with the policies, action programs, standards and maps of the Master Plan and the Forest Area Plan; and
2. **No Detriment.** The abandonment or vacation does not result in a material injury to the public; and
3. **Existing Easements.** Existing public utility easements in the area to be abandoned or vacated can be reasonably relocated to provide similar or enhanced service.

Commissioner Phillips seconded the motion, which passed with six in favor; none against; Commissioner Peyton – absent.

D. Abandonment Case Number WAB21-0009 (Rock Springs Solar) [For possible action] – For hearing, discussion, and possible action to approve an abandonment of a 50ft wide access and public utility easement along the southern property lines of APNs 074-061-29 and 074-061-30. If the applicant's request is approved, the length of the easement to be abandoned is 1479.67 linear feet and the total area of abandonment is 73,983.5 square feet.

- Applicant: CED Rock Springs Solar, LLC with permission of property owners
- Property Owner(s): Linda Bell and Tina Hampe
- Location: Approximately ¼ mile west of the intersection of Rainbow Way and Indian Lane
- APN(s): 074-061-29, 074-061-30
- Parcel Size: 10.934 and 10.872 acres
- Master Plan: Rural
- Regulatory Zone: General Rural
- Area Plan: High Desert
- Development Code: Authorized in Article 806, Vacations and Abandonments of Streets and Easements
- Commission District: 5 – Commissioner Herman
- Staff: Dan Cahalane, Planner
Washoe County Community Services Department
Planning and Building
- Phone: 775.328.3628
- E-mail: dcahalane@washoecounty.us

Planner Dan Cahalane provided a presentation. Representative Joan Heredia did not have a presentation but was available via Zoom for questions.

There was no response to the request for public comment.

Commissioner Phillips asked if the lease makes a difference in how the parcel is used. Mr. Cahalane stated that the Planning Commission has previously approved the use, so it makes no difference.

DDA Gustafson asked the board to include "as conditioned in Exhibit A" in their motion, as it was left out of the motion language on the first page.

MOTION: Commissioner Chesney 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 Abandonment Case Number WAB21-0009 for CED Rock Springs Solar LLC, having made all three findings in accordance with Washoe County Code Section 110.806.20, as conditioned in Exhibit A.

1. **Master Plan.** The abandonment or vacation is consistent with the policies, action programs, standards and maps of the Master Plan and the High Desert and
2. **No Detriment.** The abandonment or vacation does not result in a material injury to the public; and
3. **Existing Easements.** Existing public utility easements in the area to be abandoned or vacated can be reasonably relocated to provide similar or enhanced service.

Commissioner Chvilicek seconded the motion, which passed with six in favor; none against; Commissioner Peyton – absent.

E. **Master Plan Amendment Case Number WMPA21-0005 (North Valleys CMA) [For possible action]** – For hearing, discussion, and possible action to approve a master plan amendment to the North Valleys Area Plan, Appendix A- Character Management Plan Map, for the purpose of removing up to 421 parcels from the North Valleys Rural Character Management Area in order to correct non-conforming regulatory zones. Of the 421 parcels that are the subject of this request, 268 parcels were formally in the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan area and 153 other parcels in the vicinity are almost completely surrounded by the City of Reno; and if approved, authorize the chair to sign a resolution to this effect. Any approval would be subject to adoption by the Washoe County Board of County Commissioners and a finding of conformance with the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan by the regional planning authorities.

- Applicant: Washoe County Planning Division
- Property Owner: See Exhibit A – Noticing
- Location: Generally, the former Reno-Stead Joint Corridor Plan Area
- APN: See Exhibit A – Noticing
- Parcel Size: Varies
- Master Plan: Suburban Residential (SR), Rural (R), Rural Residential (RR), Commercial (C), and Open Space (OS)
- Regulatory Zone: Low Density Suburban (LDS), Medium Density Suburban (MDS), General Rural (GR), High Density Rural (HDR), Open Space (OS), Parks and Recreation (PR), Public and Semi-Public Facilities (PSP)
- Area Plan: North Valleys
- Development Code: Authorized in Article 820
- Commission District: 5 – Commissioner Herman
- Staff: Dan Cahalane and Chris Bronczyk, Planners
Washoe County Community Services Department
Planning and Building
- Phone: 775.328.3628 (Dan); 775.328.36xx (Chris)
- E-mail: dcahalane@washoecounty.us;
cbronczyk@washoecounty.us

Planner Dan Cahalane provided a presentation.

Public Comment:

Mary JoKivi, resident in the Horizon Hills subdivision, said that she is not representing everybody from the Horizon Hills, just our own parcels that we own up there. For those of us that attended the meetings, both virtually and at the public meeting workshop, we were against having Horizon Hills included in this. Ms. JoKivi asked the Commission to support option 2 and leave us out of it. Ms. JoKivi understands that it makes it a little more difficult for Staff, but it keeps the rural character out there, and we would like to keep it with the rural title on it. We know it doesn't change how many horses we can have, but we do like the rural title for our subdivision. Thank you.

Andy Gordon (via zoom) from Paradise Valley, AZ is speaking on behalf of residents in Black Springs. He said he appreciates all the hard work of Staff and the Commission. He said he was a Vista volunteer in the 1960s in what was known as Black Springs, Nevada; the name was changed to Grand View Terrace in the 1990s. Perhaps the name should be "masonry model building view," as it's the only property on that map between Martin Luther King Memorial Highway and North Virginia Street. Mr. Gordon has stayed in contact with people in Black Springs who weren't aware of the details of this. Mr. Gordon understood it as a correction for nonconforming regulatory zones, but the community members did not feel they fully understood what was going on. The only in person meeting was not held in Grandview Terrace or Black Springs, where Washoe County has a park – The Martin Luther King Memorial Park and the Westbrook Community Center. Mr. Gordon said it would be appropriate to hear those voices. He said there was a book written about the history of Black Springs called 'A Cry for Help' by Helen Townsell, who couldn't attend the meeting. Those papers from 1950 of rural Black Springs community are now at the Nevada Historical Society. He stated the six elements that are looked at in planning don't seem to embrace history and heritage, which this community has quite a bit of. The street names are named after historical figures such as John F Kennedy, Malcolm, and the Westbrook family. Mr. Gordon encouraged the Commission not to take a vote today. He asked that they make sure to get feedback from members in Black Springs or Grand View Terrace.

Michael Salmon, Horizon Hills property owner, stated he echoes Mary's comments. He thanked Staff for considering option 2.

Debi Christenhusz, 40-year resident of Horizon Hills, said encouraged the Commission to go with option 2. She said the community doesn't want to be part of the city and that they want to keep their rural standing. Ms. Christenhusz stated she wants the lots to be legal again.

Lacey Kerfoot noted an email was received and posted online and provided to the Commission from Debbie Woods.

There was no further response for public comment.

Discussion by Commission:

Commissioner Chvilicek inquired about outreach to the Grand View Terrace community members. Mr. Cahalane noted Grand View Terrace was noticed and that Staff held several meetings both online and in person at the North Valleys Community Center. Staff went to the public instead of having them come down to the County Chambers. Commissioner Chvilicek asked if Grand View Terrace is tier one or tier two. Mr. Cahalane showed the map; it's in the tier two area. Commissioner Chvilicek asked if this information could be shared with the Grand View Terrace community, which would put many people at ease.

Commissioner Flick asked the difference between tier one and tier two in terms of Staff time. Mr. Cahalane said that it's difficult to determine future staff costs between option 1 and option

2. Staff notes that option 2 deals with Horizon Hills, which is in a tier three zone and unlikely to undergo a master plan amendment in the near future. Therefore, it's unlikely to cause additional staff time but it does create the potential for not being able to change those parcels within the already designated master plan category. Most are designated for medium-density suburban, whereas other areas could come in for a regulatory zone increase to high-density suburban. Commissioner Flick asked how much Staff time it would take to complete it. Mr. Cahalane said it would be hard to say, but probably minimal.

Commissioner Phillips asked how long Horizon Hills has been an established County development. Mr. Cahalane said that he believes Horizon Hills was constructed in the 1960s and 70s, but is not sure of the exact timeframe. As a transplant, he doesn't have the institutional knowledge that some others on staff do. However, Mr. Cahalane noted that Horizon Hills has been there longer than the recent Regional Plan update and Character Management plan of 2010. Commissioner Chvilicek complimented Staff for dealing with multiple factors and bringing it into compliance. Chair Donschick appreciated the options and considering the community feedback.

MOTION: Commissioner Chvilicek noted she is making a motion for option 2; RCMA from 253 of the 421 parcels exempting the parcels within horizon hills subdivision as noted by Staff because horizon hills is tier three. She 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 adopt the resolution contained as Attachment [Exhibit] B of this staff report to amend the Master Plan as set forth in Master Plan Amendment Case Number WMPA21-0005, having made at least three of the following five findings in accordance with Washoe County Code Section 110.820.15(d), and having made the required North Valleys Area Plan findings. Commissioner Chvilicek further moved to certify the resolution and the proposed Master Plan Amendments in WMPA21-0005 as set forth in this staff report for submission to the Washoe County Board of County Commissioners and authorize the Chair to sign the resolution on behalf of the Planning Commission.

1. **Consistency with Master Plan.** The proposed amendment is in substantial compliance with the policies and action programs of the Master Plan.
2. **Compatible Land Uses.** The proposed amendment will provide for land uses compatible with (existing or planned) adjacent land uses, and will not adversely impact the public health, safety or welfare.
3. **Response to Change Conditions.** The proposed amendment responds to changed conditions or further studies that have occurred since the plan was adopted by the Board of County Commissioners, and the requested amendment represents a more desirable utilization of land.
4. **Availability of Facilities.** There are or are planned to be adequate transportation, recreation, utility, and other facilities to accommodate the uses and densities permitted by the proposed Master Plan designation.
5. **Desired Pattern of Growth.** The proposed amendment will promote the desired pattern for the orderly physical growth of the County and guides development of the County based on the projected population growth with the least amount of natural resource impairment and the efficient expenditure of funds for public services.

AND

North Valleys Area Plan Findings:

1. **Character Preserved.** The amendment will further implement and preserve the Vision and Character Statement.
2. **Consistency with the Area Plan.** The amendment conforms to all applicable policies of the North Valleys Area Plan and the Washoe County Master Plan, and the Regional Water Management Plan.
3. **Public Welfare.** The amendment will not conflict with the public's health, safety or welfare

Commissioner Nelson seconded the motion, which passed with six in favor; none against; Commissioner Peyton – absent.

F. Tentative Map Case Number WTM21-007 (Village Parkway) [For possible action] –

For hearing, discussion, and possible action to approve a tentative subdivision map for 166 detached single family dwelling units and 183 attached single family dwelling units in a common open space development on 3 parcels totaling 124.6 acres and associated major grading for 57.5 acres of ground disturbance, 326,548 cy of cut and 255,214 cy of fill for the proposed tentative map.

- Applicant/Property Owner: Lifestyle Homes TND, LCC
- Location: West side of Village Parkway, north of Cold Springs Drive
- APN(s): 087-400-11, 087-400-23, 087-400-24
- Parcel Size: 124.6 acres total
- Master Plan: Rural, Suburban Residential
- Regulatory Zone: 62.1% General Rural, 37.9% High Density Suburban
- Area Plan: Cold Springs
- Development Code: Authorized in Article 608
- Commission District: 5 – Commissioner Herman
- Staff: Dan Cahalane, Planner
Washoe County Community Services Department
Planning and Building
- Phone: 775.328.3628
- E-mail: dcahalane@washoecounty.us

Planner Dan Cahalane provided a presentation. Applicant Representative, Mike Railey, provided a presentation.

There was no response to the request for public comment.

Discussion by Commission:

Commissioner Phillips stated she likes the lower cost and targeted need for this area. She asked about the maximum height of the attached homes. Mr. Cahalane said high-density suburban has a maximum height of 35 feet, which cannot be exceeded. Mr. Railey said they are two-story townhomes; no three story units.

Commissioner Chvilicek stated they used to have an ‘approved, but not built’ in the packets. Mr. Lloyd stated it wasn't added. She requested that it becomes practice again. Commissioner Chvilicek stated Lifestyle Homes has brought many changes and tentative map changes before the Commission; she asked how much more the Commission can expect. Mr. Railey stated the goal is to title out all of the developer's holdings to keep up with demand and keep

the workers working in the unforeseeable future. In Cold Springs, Woodland Village has been being built out. There is another map off of Cold Springs Drive that was recently approved with 42 units. Commissioner Chvilicek stated it's not meant as a criticism, but it's exhaustive to have the public try to keep up with this. She said usually the community tunes in when there is a concept, but it gets hard to compare the current information with the concept. She implores the need for public input since CAB's response has been curtailed significantly. Peter Lisner said the developer decided some time back to come all at once, since it's painful for all of us. He said his father is 80 and it would be good for the family to make sure everything is cleaned up. Mr. Lisner said the family has had the land for 30 years and they're finally making things happen; it's on purpose to bring it all at once. Commissioner Chvilicek stated she had been involved with Lifestyle Homes since her time on CAB, probably 30 years.

Chair Donshick asked for clarification about the adjustment with setbacks. Mr. Cahalane stated Staff's opinion is that it's cleaner to go with code because special setbacks are confusing for homeowners down the road. Still, Staff has no issue in terms of health safety or welfare to modify setbacks as proposed by the applicant. There are a variety of needs in evaluating the setbacks, which include regulatory, economic, and aesthetic. It's the opinion of Staff that it is easier to administer the setbacks as proposed; however, Staff has no strong objection to the applicant's proposal. She reiterated the request for clarification. Mr. Cahalane highlighted the specific language from the applicant's presentation that requested front yard setbacks shall allow for articulation and maintain a minimum of 10 feet with an overall average of 15 feet and leave side and rear at 10 feet, which was in their original request as a 10 foot front yard setback and 20 foot setback for the garage.

Chair Donshick stated that Mr. Cahalane's Staff report states something different. He said he is requesting to follow 110.406.05, Table 1, Part 1-4. Mr. Cahalane stated that it's on page 8 of Exhibit A, condition 1(v), ii, 1 and 2. Chair Donshick clarified that Staff wants to go with 1 and 2. Mr. Cahalane stated the applicant would like to change it to be a different condition. Commissioner Chesney said we need the specific setbacks in order to modify the motion. Mr. Railey said every house needs a 20-foot garage setback, but we don't want to stack every house at the same setback, which has come up in the past. In order to accomplish that, the developer is proposing a minimum of 10-foot frontyard setback with average of 15 foot setbacks. It's a hybrid of what's in the staff report, without changing the side or rear set backs.

Commissioner Flick asked about current road conditions and impact on road conditions. Mr. Railey said the Cold Springs Area Plan has a level of service 'C.' RTC is under service level 'D.' Cold Springs is held to a higher standard. A traffic study has been completed with mitigations to meet the service level 'C.' He noted Paul Solague is available to answer questions.

Commissioner Chvilicek stated for clarification, as we go through the motion, it would be a minimum of 10 feet with average of 15 feet for all detached single-family residences. Mr. Railey explained the square footage and lot sizes vary. He noted the developer is requesting that all single-family, detached lots have a minimum front yard setback of 10 feet, with an overall average of 15. Secretary Lloyd asked the Chair for a brief recess.

Chair Donshick called for a recess at 8:49 p.m. Chair Donshick called the Commission back to order at 8:52 p.m.

Mr. Cahalane noted that the staff decided to go with a front yard setback of 10 feet, side yard of 5 feet, and back yard of 10 feet for all detached, single-family residences. Chair Donshick asked Counsel if there were any legal issues with the proceedings; DDA Gustafson stated she doesn't see any legal issues.

Recording Secretary, Lacey Kerfoot, read into the record that Staff received eight voicemails for this item prior to the June Planning Commission meeting from: Carmen Jones, Emily Pecka, Jonnie Maderas, Ken Butler, Marie Butler, Michelle Butler, Phyllis Foster and Shannon;

as well as four emailed public comments from: Irene Crouse, Stacey Dinan, Laurel Quam and Andrea Corbett. Before the Planning Commission meeting, all public comments were provided to the Commissioners and posted to the Washoe County website.

MOTION: Commissioner Chesney 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 WTM21-007 for Lifestyle Homes TND, with the conditions included as Exhibit A to this matter, having made all ten findings in accordance with Washoe County Code Section 110.608.25, as amended in the meeting for Condition 1.v(ii):

- 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 are 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, which passed with six in favor; none against; Commissioner Peyton – absent.

10. Chair and Commission Items [Non-action item]

A. Future agenda items

Commissioner Chvilicek asked Secretary Lloyd to remind Staff about "planned, but not yet built."

B. Requests for information from Staff

Commissioner Chvilicek asked that Secretary Lloyd provide the Planning Commission with links to the Master Plan Update website and all documents referred to by Planner Eric Young during his status report.

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

A. Report on previous Planning Commission items

Secretary Lloyd stated that the Board of County Commissioners approved the Silver Hills Tentative Map's appeal, overruling the Planning Commission's denial.

Secretary Lloyd also reported that the Board of County Commissioners voted to dissolve the Citizen Advisory Boards (CABs) as they are currently structured. Mr. Lloyd stated that he would brief the Planning Commission regarding the future structure of the CABs as updates become available.

B. Legal information and updates

DDA Gustafson did not have any legal information or updates.

12. Public Comment [Non-action item]

There was no response to the request for public comment.

13. Adjournment

With no further business scheduled before the Planning Commission, the meeting adjourned at 8:59 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Misty Moga, Independent Contractor.

Approved by Commission in session on October 5, 2021.

Trevor Lloyd
Secretary to the Planning Commission