



# WASHOE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION **DRAFT** Meeting Minutes

## Planning Commission Members

Jim Barnes  
R. Michael Flick  
Linda Kennedy  
Daniel Lazzareschi – Chair  
Kate S. Nelson  
Amy Ownes  
Rob Pierce – Vice-Chair  
**Secretary**  
Trevor Lloyd

Tuesday, August 5, 2025  
6:00 p.m.

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

and available via  
Zoom Webinar

---

The Washoe County Planning Commission met in a scheduled session on Tuesday, August 5, 2025, 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 Lazzareschi called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. The following Commissioners and staff were present:

Commissioners present:

- Jim Barnes
- R. Michael Flick
- Linda Kennedy (Zoom)
- Daniel Lazzareschi, Chair
- Kate S. Nelson
- Amy Owens
- Rob Pierce, Vice-Chair

Staff present:

- Trevor Lloyd, Secretary, Planning and Building
- Courtney Weiche, Senior Planner, Planning and Building
- Kat Oakley, Senior Planner, Planning and Building
- Tim Evans, Planner, Planning and Building
- Jennifer Gustafson, Deputy District Attorney, District Attorney's Office
- Adriana Albarran, Office Support Specialist, Planning and Building
- Brandon Roman, Recording Secretary, Planning and Building

## **2. Pledge of Allegiance**

Chair Lazzareschi led the pledge to the flag.

## **3. Ethics Law Announcement**

Deputy District Attorney Jennifer Gustafson provided the ethics procedure for disclosures.

## **4. Appeal Procedure**

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

## **5. General Public Comment and Discussion Thereof**

Chair Lazzareschi opened the Public Comment period.

### Public Comment:

Ms. Ronda Tycker thanked County staff for representing Incline Village residents' concerns at recent Tahoe Area Plan workshops. She expressed concern about the Truckee Regional Planning Agency following California legislation which eliminates accessory dwelling unit (ADU) zoning restrictions. Allowing ADUs will exacerbate parking, traffic, and evacuation concerns, and she urged the Planning Commission to tell the Board of County Commissioners not to make it more difficult for Incline Village residents to escape danger.

## **6. Approval of August 5, 2025, Agenda**

Chair Lazzareschi indicated that the applicant for Agenda Item 8.C. has requested that the item be pulled from the agenda and rescheduled for a different meeting.

Vice-Chair Pierce moved to approve the agenda for the August 5, 2025, meeting as amended. Commissioner Owens seconded the motion, which passed unanimously with a vote of seven for, none against.

## **7. Approval of July 1, 2025, Draft Minutes**

Vice-Chair Pierce moved to approve the minutes for the July 1, 2025, Planning Commission meeting as written. Commissioner Nelson seconded the motion, which passed unanimously with a vote of seven for, none against.

## **8. Public Hearings**

**A. Abandonment Case Number WAB25-0003 (Red Rock Road)** – For hearing, discussion, and possible action to approve an abandonment of Washoe County's interest in 20,606 square feet of right-of-way along Red Rock Road on APNs 087-390-10 and 087-380-11.

- Applicant: Christy Corporation
- Property Owner: Lifestyle Homes TND LLC
- Location: Along Red Rock Road
- APN: 087-390-10 & 087-380-11

- Parcel Size: 308.6 acres
- Master Plan: Suburban Residential
- Regulatory Zone: Specific Plan (SP) and Public Semi-Public Facility (PSP)
- Planning Area: North Valleys
- Development Code: Authorized in Article 806, Vacations and Abandonments of Easements or Streets
- Commission District: 5 – Commissioner Herman
- Staff: Courtney Weiche, Senior Planner  
Washoe County Community Services Department  
Building and Planning
- Phone: 775.328.3608
- E-mail: CWeiche@washoecounty.gov

Senior Planner Courtney Weiche conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles or descriptions: Request; Background; site maps (3 slides); Noticing; Reviewing Agencies & Findings; and Possible Motion.

Public Comment:

There was no response to the call for public comment.

**MOTION: Vice-Chair Pierce moved that Abandonment Case Number WAB25-0003 for Christy Corporation be approved with the conditions included as Exhibit A to this matter, having made all three findings in accordance with Washoe County Code Section 110.806.20.**

**Commissioner Kennedy seconded the motion, which passed unanimously with a vote of seven for, zero against.**

**B. Abandonment Case Number WAB25-0004 (Lemos) –** For hearing, discussion, and possible action to approve an abandonment of Washoe County’s interest in the 130-foot portion of a 50-foot-wide grading easement coterminous with the northern property line of Lot 10 of Tract Map 1413A.

- Applicant/Property Owner: Gene Lemos
- Location: 2805 Old Ranch Road
- APN: 055-092-10
- Parcel Size: 5.093 acres
- Master Plan: Rural
- Regulatory Zone: General Rural (GR)
- Planning Area: South Valleys
- Development Code: Authorized in Article 806, Vacations and Abandonments of Easements or Streets
- Commission District: 2 – Commissioner Clark
- Staff: Tim Evans, Planner  
Washoe County Community Services Department  
Planning and Building

- Phone: 775.328.2314
- E-mail: TEvans@washoecounty.gov

Planner Tim Evans conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Vicinity Map; Request; Site Plan; Reviewing Agencies; Public Notice; Findings; and Motion. He noted the reason for the abandonment was to allow for construction of a detached garage on a portion of the property that does not have steep topography.

Architect Kirt Hilker reviewed a series of slides on behalf of the applicant with the following descriptions: street view photos (2 slides); aerial view; aerial view with topography; parcel map with slopes; and proposed garage map.

Public Comment:

There was no response to the call for public comment.

**MOTION: Vice-Chair Pierce moved that Case Number WAB25-0004 for Gene Lemos be approved with the conditions included as Exhibit A to this matter, having made all three findings in accordance with Washoe County Code Section 110.806.20.**

**Commissioner Owens seconded the motion, which passed unanimously with a vote of seven for, zero against.**

**C. Amendment of Conditions Case Number WAC25-0010 (St James Village) for TM5-2-92** – For hearing, discussion, and possible action to approve an amendment of conditions for Tentative Subdivision Map Case Number TM5-2-92 to remove three parcels from the St. James's Village Tentative Map that total 224.10 acres that were cut off from the project when the I-580 Freeway was constructed. This request will also result in a reduced total unit count for the St. James's Village Tentative Subdivision Map from 510 lots to 450 lots. The parcels to be removed have the following APN's: 046-060-45, 046-060-47, and 046-080-40.

This item was continued until the September meeting per the Applicant's request.

**D. Master Plan Amendment WMPA25-0001 (2025 Tahoe Area Plan Update)** – For hearing, discussion and possible action to adopt an amendment to the Tahoe Area Plan (the Washoe County Master Plan for Washoe Tahoe) to add the Tahoe Transportation District to the development of a parking management plan; update a section related to transit; update sections related to pedestrian, bicycle, and multi-modal facilities; update planned roadway network project details; update references to the University of Nevada, Reno at Tahoe; and add dates to data tables; and if approved, authorize the chair to sign a resolution to this effect. Any adoption by the Planning Commission is subject to approval by the Washoe County Board of County Commissioners and a finding of conformance with the Tahoe Regional Plan by the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency.

- Development Code: Article 820, Amendment of a Master Plan
- Commission District: District 1 – Commissioner Hill
- Staff: Kat Oakley, Senior Planner  
Washoe County Community Services Department  
Planning and Building
- Phone: 775-328-3628
- E-mail: koakley@washoecounty.gov

Senior Planner Kat Oakley conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Background; Tyrolian Village Special Area; Tyrolian Village; Master Plan Amendments; Public Outreach; and Recommendation – Approval. She noted the only difference between a previous presentation on this matter and the current proposal is the recommendation to retain a reference to the Tyrolian Village Special Area.

Chair Lazzareschi wondered what would happen if the Planning Commission opted not pass this measure.

Ms. Oakley noted the Master Plan Amendment has not yet gone before the Board of County Commissioners because staff is looking for it to be modified by the Planning Commission first. If the Commission does not approve the requested change, staff could bring the originally approved Master Plan Amendment to the Board for approval without the proposed reference.

Public Comment:

There was no response to the call for public comment.

**MOTION: Commissioner Nelson moved that amendments to update the Tahoe Area Plan be adopted as set forth in WMPA250001. She further moved that the Chair be authorized to sign the resolution contained in Exhibit A on behalf of the Washoe County Planning Commission and staff be directed to present a report of this Commission’s recommendation to the Washoe County Board of County Commissioners within 60 days of today’s date. This recommendation for approval is based on the ability to make all five findings set forth in section 110.820.15(d).**

**Commissioner Kennedy seconded the motion, which passed unanimously with a vote of seven for, zero against.**

**E. Master Plan Amendment Case Number WMPA25-0002 and WRZA25-0002 (700 Harper Court) – For hearing, discussion, and possible action to:**

- (1) Adopt an amendment to the Washoe County Master Plan, Tahoe Area Plan, to change the master plan land use category on a 5.74-acre parcel (APN 125-010-21) from 80% Conservation/20% Residential to 100% Residential; and
- (2) Recommend adoption of an amendment to the Tahoe Area Plan regulatory zone maps to change the regulatory zone on the same parcel from 80% Mount Rose/20% Incline Village-1 to 100% Incline Village-1. Any approvals by the

Planning Commission are subject to final approval by the Board of County Commissioners and the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency; and

(3) If approved, authorize the chair to sign resolutions to this effect.

- Applicant: Exline & Company, Inc.
- Property Owner: Mitchell E. Larson Living Trust
- Location: 700 Harper Court
- APN: 125-010-21
- Parcel Size: 5.75 acres
- Master Plan: Conservation - 80%/ Residential - 20%  
Residential - 100%
- Regulatory Zone: Mount Rose - 80% / Incline Village 1 - 20%  
Incline Village 1 -100%
- Planning Area: Tahoe
- Development Code: Authorized in Article 820, Amendment of Master Plan & Article 821, Amendment of Regulatory Zone
- Commission District: District 1 – Commissioner Hill
- Staff: Courtney Weiche, Senior Planner  
Washoe County Community Services Department  
Planning and Building
- Phone: 775.328.3608
- E-mail: CWeiche@washoecounty.gov

Commissioner Nelson disclosed that the Engineering Department for the Incline Village General Improvement District, for which she is the director of public works, engages with Exline & Company to do Truckee Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) planning. However, she has not discussed this issue with them and did think the relationship would hinder her ability to make an independent judgement.

Senior Planner Courtney Weiche conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles or descriptions: Request; Vicinity Map; shaded map; Section 110.220.355 Mount Rose Regulatory Zone; Public Comment; Agency Comment; Findings; Recommendation; Possible MPA Motion; and Possible RZA Motion.

Ms. Weiche stated the dwelling is located within the Conservation/Mount Rose Master Plan and Regulatory Zone portion of the property and is considered nonconforming. The applicant has indicated that there are fire insurance implications with the existing use type. Per TRPA guidelines, the amount of impervious surface allowed on the parcel has already been exceeded, so no more development can take place on the property. She mentioned that the TRPA has informally approved the proposed change as presented, though it must still go through all their processes to amend the Area Plan.

Nick Exline confirmed this amendment is being sought to address fire insurance concerns, as the insurance company will not cover fire damage given the bisected zoning on the parcel. He conducted a slideshow presentation on behalf of the property

owner and reviewed slides with the following titles: Proposed Project; Amendment = No Increase in Development Potential; No Additional Development Potential...; Current zoning map; The Specifics; Why are we proposing an area plan amendment?; and Neighborhood Meeting.

Mr. Exline noted the property currently contains excess coverage, which is typical for properties developed before or during the early formation of the TRPA. Providing continuous zoning for the entire parcel, he remarked, would ensure that it could be rebuilt in the event of a disaster. He praised staff member Jaden Wuelzer for her work on this item.

Commissioner Flick inquired about the 7,000 square foot coverage.

Mr. Exline responded that that square footage includes the house and all impervious structures. While that coverage could theoretically be reduced or relocated, he noted, it would be problematic given the slopes on the property. While property owners have the option to relocate coverage, the volume of coverage could never be exceeded, and density cannot be increased. Coverage also cannot be relocated to a different parcel without completely retiring the coverage on the original parcel.

Public Comment:

There was no response to the call for public comment.

**MOTION: Chair Lazzareschi moved that the resolution contained as Exhibit A of this staff report to amend the Tahoe Area Plan as set forth in Master Plan Amendment Case Number WMPA25-0002 be adopted, having made all five of the findings set forth in Washoe County Code Section 110.820.15(d). He further moved that the resolution and the proposed Master Plan Amendments in WMPA25-0002 as set forth in this staff report be certified for submission to the Washoe County Board of County Commissioners, and the Chair be authorized to sign the resolution on behalf of the Planning Commission.**

**Commissioner Kennedy seconded the motion, which passed unanimously with a vote of seven for, zero against.**

**MOTION: Chair Lazzareschi moved that the resolution included as Exhibit B, recommending adoption of Regulatory Zone Amendment Case Number WRZA25-0002, be adopted, having made all the findings set forth in Washoe County Code Section 110.821.15. He further moved that the resolution and the proposed Regulatory Zone Amendment in WRZA24-0002 as set forth in this staff report be certified for submission to the Washoe County Board of County Commissioners, and the Chair be authorized to sign the resolution on behalf of the Washoe County Planning Commission.**

**Commissioner Owens seconded the motion, which passed unanimously with a vote of seven for, zero against.**



**F. Development Code Amendment Case Number WDCA25-0004 (560 Lakeshore)**

– For hearing, discussion and possible action to recommend approval of an amendment to Washoe County Code Chapter 110 (Development Code), Article 220 Tahoe Area, to increase the maximum density for multiple family dwellings in the Crystal Bay Condominiums Regulatory Zone Special Area from four (4) units per acre to six (6) units per acre; and all matters necessarily connected therewith and pertaining thereto.

If approval is recommended, the Planning Commission is asked to authorize the Chair to sign a resolution to that effect.

- Applicant: GilanFarr Architecture
- Property Owner: Village Springs, LLC
- Location: Tahoe – Crystal Bay Condominium, Special Area
- APN: 122-128-07 (1.113-acres or 48,482-sf)  
122-128-15 (16,552-sf)  
122-591-01 (26,528-sf)  
122-591-02 (5,750-sf)  
122-591-03 (4,792-sf)
- Parcel Size: 2.34-acres or 102,104-sf  
Residential
- Master Plan: Tahoe – Crystal Bay Condominium, Special Area
- Regulatory Zone: Tahoe
- Planning Area: Authorized in Article 818, Amendment of Development Code
- Development Code: 1 – Commissioner Hill
- Commission District: Tahoe – Crystal Bay Condominium, Special Area
- Staff: Courtney Weiche, Senior Planner  
Washoe County Community Services  
Department  
Planning and Building
- Phone: 775.328.3608
- E-mail: CWeiche@washoecounty.gov

Senior Planner Courtney Weiche conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Request; Subject Location; 560 Lakeshore Blvd; Agency Review; Findings; and Possible Motion. She conveyed the applicant's contention that the proposed increase in density would allow for a more viable project and incentivize redevelopment in the project area.

The project area is 2.3 acres and contains five parcels, two of which are airspace condominium units with a third being a common area parcel, and the requested change in density would increase the total number of allowable units from 9 to 14. Ms. Weiche noted that would be unlikely given that four of the parcels are already completely built out or constrained due to Truckee Regional Planning Authority (TRPA) restrictions. She described that nature of detached airspace condominiums.



Ms. Weiche indicated the parcel to the west of the condominiums is developed with a commercial office space building and is deed restricted for the project area. She emphasized that there is no available coverage to develop beyond the development currently on the parcels, and any addition of units would require a new parcel map.

Ms. Weiche said the purpose of the application is to develop the westernmost parcel, and its approval will increase the maximum number of units on that parcel from four to six dwellings. The three existing structures on that parcel would likely be demolished and a new structure constructed. She stated that the Engineering Division will require a traffic trip generation letter at the time of building permit application, and it will need to comply with various agencies' requirements.

Phil GilanFarr, representing the applicant, clarified that the subject parcels sit in a special area within the Crystal Bay Condominium Regulatory Zone. Historically, that zone has encompassed all condominiums along the lake, in an area that is 99 percent developed. He said the parcel has featured a gas station since 1961, but rebuilding the gas station is inappropriate. Increasing the density from four to six units would allow this parcel to be more in line with other condominium densities surrounding the parcel. He noted that no specific project is being proposed, but residential or mixed-use zoning would make the site more viable for a project.

Commissioner Flick asked several questions about the nature of the five parcels and how they would be impacted by the proposed change in density.

Ms. Weiche responded that each parcel is separate with their own parcel numbers and ownership. Two of them are airspace condominiums. The five parcels comprise a special area of the Condominium Regulatory Zone. She explained that the two airspace condominiums are on a common open-space parcel, all of which constitutes three parcels. Approval of this proposal would permit a total maximum density of 14 buildings, but it is highly unlikely that the airspace condominium parcels would be developed beyond their current development given TRPA restrictions. The only parcel that would likely take advantage of the increased density would be the parcel with the gas station. The remaining parcel contains an office building, but that parcel is also restricted. She stressed that 15 units could not be constructed on the 560 Lakeshore Boulevard parcel because, given its acreage and the density restrictions, only five units could be constructed there. She added that the area plan specifies a desire for higher densities in areas like this.

Mr. GilanFarr explained that most of the nearby condominium complexes were built in the 1960s and 1970s, and most had a maximum density of 15 units per acre. He simplified Ms. Weiche's explanation by saying one of the three parcels in the special area was approved for two single-family dwelling units and a common area, and that density cannot be increased without an amendment. Even then, the TRPA would likely not allow an increase. One of the remaining two parcels contains an actively used building, though the applicants, should they choose to redevelop that parcel, could only construct three units there. He felt the westernmost parcel should be developed in a manner more conducive to the residential community. A maximum of six units could be developed on that parcel if the existing structures were replaced.

Commissioner Kennedy requested clarification about the developability of each parcel.

Ms. Weiche confirmed that most of the parcels were already fully developed, and this increase would basically only impact one parcel. However, though staff's analysis contemplated all parcels as if they saw the same increase in density, it was unlikely that that would occur due to TRPA restrictions. Approval of this proposal would result in a maximum net increase of three dwellings.

Public Comment:

There was no response to the call for public comment.

**MOTION: Vice-Chair Pierce moved that WDCA25-0004, to amend Washoe County Code Chapter 110 (Development Code), Article 220 Tahoe Area, as provided in Exhibit A-1, be approved. He further moved that the Chair be authorized to sign the resolution contained in Exhibit A on behalf of the Washoe County Planning Commission, and staff be directed to present a report of this Commission's recommendation to the Washoe County Board of County Commissioners within 60 days of today's date. This recommendation for approval is based on all of the following four findings in accordance with Washoe County Code Section 110.818.15(e): Consistency with Master Plan; Promotes the Purpose of the Development Code; Response to Changed Conditions; and No Adverse Effects.**

**Commissioner Nelson seconded the motion, which passed unanimously with a vote of seven for, zero against.**

**9. Chair and Commission Items**

A. Future agenda items

There were no items.

B. Requests for information from staff

Chair Lazzareschi requested an update on the Incline Village evacuation plan. Secretary Trevor Lloyd said he would return to the Planning Commission with a status, possibly via memo.

**10. Director's and Legal Counsel's Items**

A. Report on previous Planning Commission items

There was no report.

B. Legal information and updates

There were no updates.

**11. \*General Public Comment and Discussion Thereof**

There was no response to the call for public comment.

## **12. Adjournment**

With no further business scheduled before the Planning Commission, the meeting adjourned at 7:12 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Derek Sonderfan, Independent Contractor.

Approved by Commission in session on September 2, 2025

---

Trevor Lloyd  
Secretary to the Planning Commission