



# WASHOE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION Meeting Minutes

## Planning Commission Members

Larry Chesney, Chair  
Francine Donshick, Vice Chair  
James Barnes  
Thomas B. Bruce  
Sarah Chvilicek  
Kate S. Nelson  
Trevor Lloyd, Secretary

Tuesday, February 4, 2020  
6:30 p.m.

Washoe County Commission Chambers  
1001 East Ninth Street  
Reno, NV

---

The Washoe County Planning Commission met in a scheduled session on Tuesday, February 4, 2020, in the Washoe County Commission Chambers, 1001 East Ninth Street, Reno, Nevada.

## 1. \*Determination of Quorum

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

Commissioners present: Larry Chesney, Chair  
Francine Donshick, Vice Chair  
James Barnes  
Thomas B. Bruce  
Sarah Chvilicek  
Kate S. Nelson

Staff present: Roger Pelham, Senior Planner, (Acting Secretary), Planning and Building  
Eric Young, Senior Planner, Planning and Building  
Chris Bronczyk, Planner, Planning and Building  
Dan Cahalane, Planner, Planning and Building  
Julee Olander, Planner, Planning and Building  
Nathan Edwards, Deputy District Attorney, District Attorney's Office  
Katy Stark, Recording Secretary, Planning and Building  
Donna Fagan, Office Support Specialist, Planning and Building

## 2. \*Pledge of Allegiance

Commissioner Barnes led the pledge to the flag.

## 3. \*Ethics Law Announcement

Deputy District Attorney Edwards provided the ethics procedure for disclosures.

## 4. \*Appeal Procedure

Secretary Pelham 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.

Ronda Tycer, Incline Village resident, spoke about community character as referenced in the Tahoe plan. The purpose is to implement the planning concepts contained in TRPA in a manner consistent with vision created by the community throughout the development of the plan. Referenced is an appendix C, which was to include various documents, but it's missing from the plan. She read a prepared statement of those documents. Neither was the summary from Pathway 2020 workshops or 2020 rural development are quoted in this statement. She said the first statement is true; community character is not significantly different than what was planned. However, the second statement, establishing new opportunities for tourism with recreation in a natural outdoor setting, appears nowhere in the documents. The statement was created by Mr. Young. It should be removed from the plan so future readers aren't misled. TRPA and Washoe County keep promoting tourism at the expense of resident character. We want to save it from over tourism.

Carol Black, Incline Village resident, said she provided copies in an email. She spoke about the area plan and short-term rentals. She quoted a Boeing employee during AirMax discussion, "nothing we do is so important that its worth hurting someone," which is an important concept. She said we don't want another Paradise fire with lack of preparation and evacuation plan. We need your support. Tourism is important and so are the residents. She said she has concerns about the plan. There is a huge amount of materials provided in the last minute. She said she thinks there are gaps. She said there were study sessions conducted during an area plan update in the other town she lived in. She suggested delaying approval of the document. She said you won't get robust feedback with last-minute submissions. The proposal is misleading. She said there is inadequate occupancy. It doesn't meet the requirements. She said there is not a District 1 representative on the board. She said she has data to support her information and would be available to review it with them at a later date. This is a huge undertaking.

Alexandra Profant said she submitted an application for the District 1 seat. She provided copies for everyone. She reiterated what Ms. Black said. She said she was chair and co-chair of Pathways 2020, Advisory committee, facilitated by TRPA with multiple agencies involved. It's the most complex planning region. Under 106, we have a right to be heard by a local government. We learned state preservation office that TRPA serves as our local government. There is a lot of complexity jurisdictionally. Most of us aren't against development in Nevada. However, in this area, we have rich history relative to our nation. When we do our historical resources survey, we will out compete many other regions. There is an overlay with zoning regulations and emergency management planning. Currently, there is no fire Marshall for the State. The NLTFPD serve us, there is commingling of services which include the fire Marshall. They have done investigations regarding the fires with short term rentals in Incline Village.

With no further public comment, Chair Cheney closed the public comment period.

## **6. Approval of Agenda**

In accordance with the Open Meeting Law, Vice Chair Donshick moved to approve the agenda for the Tuesday, February 4, 2020 meeting as written. Commissioner Chvilicek seconded the motion, which passed unanimously with a vote of six for, none against.

## **7. Approval of January 7, 2020 Draft Minutes**

Vice Chair Donshick moved to approve the minutes for the January 7, 2020, Planning Commission meeting as written. Commissioner Nelson seconded the motion, which passed

unanimously with a vote of six for, none against.

## 8. Planning Items

**A. Possible action to approve a resolution of Appreciation of Service for Philip Horan and to authorize the Chair to sign the resolution on behalf of the Planning Commission.** Phil Horan was unable to attend. This item was rescheduled for March 3, 2020.

## 9. Public Hearings

**A. Special Use Permit Case Number WSUP19-0030 (A Dog's Life)** – For possible action, hearing, and discussion to approve a special use permit to operate a Commercial Kennel. Commercial kennels refers to kennel services for dogs, cats and similar animals. Typical uses include commercial animal breeding with four (4) or more animals (dogs), boarding kennels, pet motels, or dog training centers. Commercial kennels require a parcel size minimum of two-and-one-half (2.5) acres regardless of the regulatory zone within which it is located. The project site will consist of a 20,000 square foot building, associated landscaping and parking. In addition to the commercial kennel, this project will also include a grooming and pet supply store and a construction sales and services operation that will function as materials storage and a takeoff point for a contractor. Fifteen thousand square feet of the building is planned to function as the commercial kennel with boarding and doggie daycare; two thousand square feet of the building will function as retail in the form of a grooming and pet supply store; three thousand square feet will function as the construction sales and services operation. Both the pet supply store and construction sales and services uses are allowed without a special use permit and are incidental to the operation of the commercial kennel. Lastly, the special use permit also includes grading of an area over 1 acre on a parcel smaller than 6 acres in size.

- Applicant/Property Owner: Dixie D. May Trust
- Location: Corner of Ingenuity and Pyramid Highway
- Assessor's Parcel Number: 530-492-01
- Parcel Size: 2.75 Acres
- Master Plan Category: Industrial (I)
- Regulatory Zone: Industrial (I)
- Area Plan: Spanish Springs
- Citizen Advisory Board: Spanish Springs
- Development Code: Authorized in Article 810, Special Use Permit
- Commission District: 4 – Commissioner Hartung
- Prepared by: Chris Bronczyk, Planner  
Washoe County Community Services Department  
Planning and Building Division
- Phone: 775.328.3612
- E-Mail: [cbronczyk@washoecounty.us](mailto:cbronczyk@washoecounty.us)

Chair Chesney called for Commissioner disclosures. Commissioner Nelson disclosed that the company that she works for, JP engineering, supplied lighting for this site. Commissioner Nelson recused herself. There were no other disclosures by the Commissioners.

Chris Bronczyk, Washoe County Planner, provided a staff presentation.

Commissioner Bruce said he is concerned with the turn off of Pyramid Highway and the traffic. He noted the primary traffic is heading south in the morning. Mr. Bronczyk stated this application was submitted for review to NDOT and they had no concerns. Commissioner Bruce asked about

the traffic they expect to have with 100 animals/cages. Mr. Bronczyk said the applicant submitted a traffic study which does not trigger a full traffic study with 80 ADT threshold.

In regard to the other services allowed on the property by right, Commissioner Chvilicek asked why they need a special use permit. Mr. Bronczyk said he included those other uses in order to provide full disclosure to understand what is happening at that site. DDA Edwards said the SUP tonight is just for the kennel.

Dave Snelgrove, CFA, Applicant Representative, provided a presentation.

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

**MOTION:** Commissioner Chvilicek moved that, after giving reasoned consideration to the information contained in the staff report and information received during the public hearing, the Washoe County Planning Commission approve, with the conditions included as Exhibit A in the staff report, Special Use Permit Case Number WSUP19-0030 for Dixie D. May Trust, having made all five findings in accordance with Washoe County Code Section 110.810.30.

1. Consistency. That the proposed use is consistent with the action programs, policies, standards and maps of the Master Plan and the Spanish Springs Area Plan;
2. Improvements. That adequate utilities, roadway improvements, sanitation, water supply, drainage, and other necessary facilities have been provided, the proposed improvements are properly related to existing and proposed roadways, and an adequate public facilities determination has been made in accordance with Division Seven;
3. Site Suitability. That the site is physically suitable for a commercial kennel and contractors office, and for the intensity of such a development;
4. Issuance Not Detrimental. That issuance of the permit will not be significantly detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare; injurious to the property or improvements of adjacent properties; or detrimental to the character of the surrounding area;
5. Effect on a Military Installation. Issuance of the permit will not have a detrimental effect on the location, purpose or mission of the military installation.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Bruce and passed unanimously with a vote of five for, none against (Commissioner Nelson had recused herself).

Commissioner Nelson returned to the meeting.

**B. Abandonment Case Number WAB19-0003 (Cooper Easement)** – For possible action, hearing, and discussion to approve abandoning a portion of the access and utility easement bulb, located in the southwestern corner of the subject parcel, in order to create a non-constrained buildable area.

**AND**

**Variance Case Number WPVAR19-0003 (Cooper Variance)** – For possible action, hearing, and discussion to approve a variance of the setbacks located on the relocated easement per WAB19-0003. The required setbacks are 30 feet front and rear, and 50 feet for the side yards. The variance request is for a zero (0) feet for the front yard setback off the relocated access easement, and a ten (10) foot side yard setback on the western property line.

- Applicant/Property Owner: Jimmy and Marianna Cooper
- Location: 0 El Molino Drive
- Assessor's Parcel Number: 076-381-64
- Parcel Size: 10 acres
- Master Plan Category: Rural (R)
- Regulatory Zone: General Rural (GR)
- Area Plan: Spanish Springs
- Citizen Advisory Board: Spanish Springs
- Development Code: Authorized in Article 806, Vacations and Abandonments of Streets and Easements and Article 804, Variances
- Commission District: 4 – Commissioner Hartung
- Prepared by: Dan Cahalane, Planner and Chris Bronczyk, Planner  
Washoe County Community Services Department  
Planning and Building Division
- Phone: 775.328.3628 (Dan); 775.328.3612 (Chris)
- E-Mail: [cbronczyk@washoecounty.us](mailto:cbronczyk@washoecounty.us) and [dcahalane@washoecounty.us](mailto:dcahalane@washoecounty.us)

Chair Chesney called for Commissioner disclosures. Commissioner Bruce stated he visited the location. There were no other disclosures by the Commissioners.

Dan Cahalane, Washoe County Planner, provided a staff presentation.

Ryan Switzer, Applicant Representative/civil engineer, was available to answer questions and stated the applicant supported staff's recommendation.

Public comment:

Larry Cooper referenced a slide and said the yellow square is the property in consideration. He showed where his property was in regard to the subject property. He said the applicant wants to have zero setback on the property line. They have to stop at the utility easement which is in his backyard. He said he bought his property to be away from neighbors. He hopes this is turned down; he doesn't want a property next to him. He said he likes his space.

Brenna Smith showed on the map where her property is located. She showed the proposed abandoned easement which currently allows her to access the backside of her property. She said if the easement goes away, she doesn't know how she will access the backside of her property.

Steve Tischler stated he lives near the subject property but was speaking on behalf of another neighbor who couldn't attend who lives to the west of the subject property. He said his neighbor will be affected the most. This subject property sits 160 feet above his neighbor's house. If they build a two-story house, it will tower over the neighbor's house. He provided the background story of the property. He used the overhead to show a map of a property, and the proposed bulb. He spoke about an underground power line that dissects the bulb. (Not speaking into the microphone). He spoke about the steep topography. He said the bulb is for safety and access for fire trucks. He said what is being proposed is a safety hazard. He spoke about a fire that went through that area.

There were no more requests for public comment.

Commissioner Bruce asked if NV power line is a big line in regard to capacity. Mr. Cahalane said there is a 10-foot public utility access which won't be affected by the change the bulb to hammerhead. Mr. Cahalane spoke about the abandonment detail with the turnaround. The easement for electrical supply line is 10 feet; they won't be able to build there. He stated staff is recommending denial of the variance, so the side backs would remain 30 feet and won't be affected.

Commissioner Nelson requested clarification if the 10-foot easement is utility. Mr. Cahalane said that won't be affected. He said we are just looking at the access easement turn around. In response to her question, he said the other neighbor is not landlocked.

### **Abandonment Case Number WAB19-0003 (Cooper Easement)**

**MOTION:** Vice Chair 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, with the conditions included as Exhibit A in the staff report, Abandonment Case Number WAB19-0003 for Cooper, 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 Spanish Springs 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 Bruce seconded the motion, which passed unanimously with a vote of six for, none against.

### **Variance Case Number WPVAR19-0003 (Cooper Variance)**

**MOTION:** Vice Chair 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 Variance Case Number WPVAR19-0003 for Cooper, having been unable to make all five required findings in accordance with Washoe County Development Code Section 110.804.25:

1. Special Circumstances. Because of the special circumstances applicable to the property, including exceptional narrowness, shallowness or shape of the specific piece of property; exceptional topographic conditions; extraordinary and exceptional situation or condition of the property and/or location of surroundings; the strict application of the regulation results in exceptional and undue hardships upon the owner of the property;
2. No Detriment. The relief will not create a substantial detriment to the public good, substantially impair affected natural resources or impair the intent and purpose of the Development Code or applicable policies under which the variance is granted;
3. No Special Privileges. The granting of the variance will not constitute a grant of special privileges inconsistent with the limitations upon other properties in the vicinity and the identical regulatory zone in which the property is situated;



4. Use Authorized. The variance will not authorize a use or activity which is not otherwise expressly authorized by the regulation governing the parcel of property;
5. Effect on a Military Installation. Issuance of the permit will not have a detrimental effect on the location, purpose or mission of the military installation.

Commissioner Bruce seconded the motion for denial, which passed unanimously with a vote of six for, none against.

**C. Master Plan Amendment Case Number WMPA19-0007, Regulatory Zone Amendment Case Number WRZA19-0007, and Development Code Amendment Case Number WDCA19-0007 (Tahoe Area Plan Updates)**

Possible action at the Planning Commission to adopt amendments to the following:

- 1) The Washoe County Code (WCC) at Chapter 110, Development Code, Article 220, Tahoe Area, commonly referred to as the Tahoe Area Modifiers;
- 2) The Washoe County Code (WCC) at Chapter 110, Development Code, adding Article 220.1 Tahoe Area Design Standards;
- 3) The Washoe County Master Plan, Volume 2, Tahoe Area Plan, including changes to the goals, policies and maps; and
- 4) The Tahoe Area Regulatory Zone map.

These amendments are meant to ensure the conformance of Washoe County's plans with the 2012 Regional Plan adopted by the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA), including but not limited to the following:

- A. Adopting the TRPA's permissible uses set forth in TRPA Regional Plan Chapter 21 *Permissible Uses* in lieu of Washoe County's allowed uses set forth in article 302 of the Washoe County Development Code;
- B. Adopting Design Standards that are in conformance with the requirements set forth in TRPA Regional Plan Chapters 13 *Area Plans* and 36 *Design Standards*;
- C. Adopting development standards that are consistent with the developments standards set forth in the TRPA Regional Plan;
- D. Adopting TRPA's Master Plan land use categories in lieu of Washoe County's Master Plan land use categories set forth in Article 106 of the Washoe County Development Code;
- E. Adopting neighborhood plans utilizing the boundaries and allowed uses of TRPA's plan area statements and community plans in lieu of Washoe County's regulatory zones set forth in Article 106 of the Washoe County Development Code;
- F. Adopting Goals and Policies for the following TRPA required subjects: Land Use, Transportation, Conservation, Public Services and Facilities, Recreation, and Implementation;
- G. Adopting TRPA's implementing plans by reference when necessary, including but not limited to portions of the TRPA Code of Ordinances and the Shore Zone plan; and,
- H. Adopting other matters necessarily connected therewith and pertaining thereto.

- Applicant: Washoe County
- Location: Tahoe Planning Area, i.e. all of Washoe County's jurisdiction inside the Tahoe Basin
- Assessor's Parcel Numbers: All parcels within the Tahoe Area Plan
- Area Plan: Tahoe
- Citizen Advisory Board: Incline Village/Crystal Bay CAB

- Development Code: Authorized in Article 818, *Amendment of Development Code*, Article 820, *Amendment of Master Plan*, and Article 821, *Amendment of Regulatory Zone*
- Commission District: 1 – Commissioner Berkbigler
- Prepared by: Eric Young, Senior Planner  
Washoe County Community Services Department  
Planning and Building Division
- Phone: 775.328.3613
- E-Mail: [eyoung@washoecounty.us](mailto:eyoung@washoecounty.us)

Chair Chesney called for Commissioner disclosures. There were no disclosures by the Commissioners.

Eric Young, Senior Planner, introduced Michael Conger from TRPA.

Michael Conger, Senior Planner with TRPA, provided an alternative PowerPoint presentation.

Eric Young, Washoe County Senior Planner, provided a staff presentation.

Mr. Young requested that the development code motion include expanded memory care and other assisted living facility.

Commission Chvilicek inquired about page numbers and a glossary. Mr. Young said he wasn't sure if the Commission was going to ask for changes. He added that pagination is laborious and time consuming. The glossary is not required. The table of contents will be established. Commissioner Chvilicek noted it was hard to find things.

Public comment:

Alexandra Profant, Incline Village resident, submitted an application for the District 1 seat. She said she spoke on behalf of others from Incline. Once they hear that there could be a vote on this without a District 1 seat, there may be an appeal and enormous liability like there has been in the past due to the TRPA ignoring law. She spoke about historical preservation and view corridor standards. This region has enormous rich architectural history. Owner occupancy and transient occupancy must be protected. She asked for this to be tabled or denied.

With no further requests for public comment, Chair Chesney closed the public comment period.

Commissioner Bruce thanked staff for their effort. He said he has some problems and reluctance. He said it's coalescing, not coalesced. These are huge changes. He said he has a hard time approving without safeguards.

Commissioner Chvilicek asked counsel regarding the Commission body as a whole. DDA Edwards advised this Commission is not bound by one District's representative. You are appointed by Districts at large. In regard to a District 1 seat, DDA Edwards said you are free to continue, as it's agendaized as an action item.

Mr. Young said he appreciated Commissioner Bruce's comments. He said it's a lot of information and a big change; however, land use doesn't change. He said there is a lot that doesn't change. In response to Commissioner Bruce's statement, he requested feedback and direction. He said the safe-guard or backstop he proposes is once we get this started and find the little things that don't work, we would bring it back and ask this Commission to approve changes. Mr. Young said



if that is not sufficient, then please provide direction and we would be happy to do it. Staff is willing to give this a shot. He added there has been in-house training for staff regarding this plan. The community has heard about it for years, and this specific plan for many months. He said they have received comments. He said if it doesn't work, then we will come back to ask you to help us to fix it.

Chair Chesney said this is an excellent starting point. Commissioner Chvilicek complimented staff on their work. She said no matter how new the ink is, it can be reviewed and amended. Vice Chair Donshick commended Eric and staff. She added the detail is extreme. This has had many entities involved. This said this is one of the most extensive she has seen.

DDA Edwards stated that regardless of the action tonight, nothing is approved for final. The master plan goes to the County Commission, then to Regional Planning for conformance, which could be challenged at the governing board. The zoning changes have to go to the County Commission. Zoning and Ordinances are part of the package. There will be more opportunity for the public to speak and provide feedback. He wanted to remind the Commission that this isn't the end.

### **Master Plan Amendment Case Number WMPA19-0007 (Tahoe Area Plan)**

**MOTION:** Vice Chair 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 adopt Master Plan Amendment Case Number WMPA19-0007, per the resolution included as Exhibit B, having made the following five findings in accordance with Washoe County Code Section 110.820.15(d). She further moved to certify the resolution and the proposed Master Plan Amendment in WMPA19-0007 as set forth in this staff report for submission to the Washoe County Board of 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 Changed 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.

## Regulatory Zone Amendment Case Number WRZA19-0007 (Tahoe Area Plan)

**MOTION:** Vice Chair Donshick moved that after giving reasoned consideration to the information contained in the staff report and received during the public hearing, the Washoe County Planning Commission adopt the resolution included as Exhibit C, recommending adoption of Regulatory Zone Amendment Case Number WRZA19-0007 having made all of the following findings in accordance with Washoe County Development Code Section 110.821.15(d). She further moved to certify the resolution and the proposed Regulatory Zone Amendment in WRZA19-0007 as set forth in this staff report for submission to the Washoe County Board of 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 not result in land uses which are incompatible with (existing or planned) adjacent land uses, and will not adversely impact the public health, safety or welfare.
3. Response to Change Conditions; more desirable use. The proposed amendment identifies and 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 amendment.
5. No Adverse Effects. The proposed amendment will not adversely affect the implementation of the policies and action programs of the Washoe County Master Plan.
6. 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.

## Development Code Amendment Case Number WDCA19-0007 (Tahoe Area Plan)

**MOTION:** Vice Chair Donshick moved that after giving reasoned consideration to the information contained in the staff report and received during the public hearing, the Washoe County Planning Commission adopt the resolution included as Exhibit D, recommending adoption of Development Code Amendment Case Number WDCA19-0007 having made all of the following findings in accordance with Washoe County Development Code Section 110.821.15(d). She further moved to certify the resolution and the proposed Development Code Amendment in WDCA19-0007 as set forth in this staff report for submission to the Washoe County Board of Commissioners and authorize the chair to sign the resolution on behalf of the Planning Commission.

1. Consistency with Master Plan. The proposed Development Code amendment is in substantial compliance with the policies and action programs of the Washoe County Master Plan.
2. Promotes the Purpose of the Development Code. The proposed Development Code amendment will not adversely impact the public health, safety or welfare, and will promote

the original purposes for the Development Code as expressed in Article 918, Adoption of Development Code.

3. Response to Changed Conditions. The proposed Development Code amendment responds to changed conditions or further studies that have occurred since the Development Code was adopted by the Board of County Commissioners and the requested amendment allow for a more desirable utilization of land within the regulatory zones.
4. No Adverse Effects. The proposed Development Code amendment will not adversely affect the implementation of the policies and action programs of the Conservation Element or the Population Element of the Washoe County Master Plan.

The motions were seconded by Commissioner Chvilicek. DDA Edwards requested a review of an item prior to vote. He noted, to clarify, references to Regional Planning is TRPA, not Truckee Meadows Regional Planning. Mr. Young asked if the motion for the development code could include his suggestions to expand it from memory care to assisted living. Vice Chair Donshick accepted the amended motion. Commissioner Chvilicek accepted amended motion. The motion passed with a vote of five for, with one against. Commissioner Bruce was opposed.

The Commission took a brief recess at 8:40 p.m. and reconvened at 8:47 p.m.

**D. Master Plan Amendment Case Number WMPA19-0009 and Regulatory Zone Amendment Case Number WRZA19-0009 (Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan) –** For possible action, hearing, and discussion:

- (1) Adopt a master plan amendment to the North Valleys Area Plan, a component of the Washoe County Master Plan, to remove all references of the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan (RSCJP) from the North Valleys Area Plan and to sunset the RSCJP, changing all existing RSCJP master plan land use designations on four hundred and sixteen (416) parcels of land, totaling approximately 734.85 acres, from RSCJP designated Medium Density Suburban/Suburban Residential (MDS/SR) & Low Density Suburban/Rural Residential (LDS/RR) to Washoe County master plan category of Suburban Residential (SR); from RSCJP designated High Density Rural (HDR) to Washoe County master plan category of Rural Residential (RR); from RSCJP designated General Rural (GR) to Washoe County master plan category of Rural (R); from RSCJP designated General Commercial (GC) to Washoe County master plan category of Commercial (C); and from RSCJP designated Public & Semi-Public Facilities (PSP) and RSCJP designated Parks and Recreation (PR) to Washoe County master plan category of Open Space (OS). If approved, authorize the chair of the Washoe County Planning Commission and to forward their recommendation on to the Washoe County Commission for possible approval; and
- (2) Subject to final approval and adoption of the associated master plan amendment and a finding of conformance with the 2019 Truckee Meadows Regional Plan, to recommend adoption of an amendment to the North Valley Regulatory Zone Map, changing all existing RSCJP land use designations on four hundred and sixteen (416) parcels of land, totaling approximately 734.85 acres, from RSCJP designated Medium Density Suburban/Suburban Residential (MDS/SR) to Washoe County regulatory zoning of Medium Density Suburban (MDS-3 dwelling units/acre); from RSCJP designated Low Density Suburban/Rural Residential (LDS/RR) to Washoe County regulatory zoning of Low Density Suburban (LDS- 1 dwelling unit/acre); from RSCJP designated High Density Rural (HDR) to Washoe County regulatory zoning of High Density Rural (HDR-1 dwelling unit/2 acres); from RSCJP designated General Rural (GR) to Washoe County regulatory

zoning of General Rural (GR-1 dwelling unit/40 acres); from RSCJP designated General Commercial (GC) to Washoe County regulatory zoning of General Commercial (GC); from RSCJP designated Public and Semi-Public Facilities (PSP) to Washoe County regulatory zoning of Public and Semi-Public Facilities (PSP); and from RSCJP designated Parks and Recreation (PR) to Washoe County regulatory zoning of Parks and Recreation (PR). If approved, authorize the chair to sign a resolution to this effect.

- Applicant: Washoe County
- Property Owners/Parcel Numbers: See Exhibit C, for information for all 416 parcels
- Location: Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan (RSCJP) is location in various areas along portions of US-395, North Virginia Street, Red Rock Road, Lemmon Drive, & Seneca Drive (Horizon Hills)
- Total Acreage of Parcels: 734.85 acres
- Existing Master Plan Categories: Medium Density Suburban/Suburban Residential (MDS/SR), Low Density Suburban/Rural Residential (LDS/RR), High Density Rural (HDR), General Rural (GR), General Commercial (GC), Public and Semi-Public Facilities (PSP), and Parks and Recreation (PR)
- Proposed Master Plan Categories: Suburban Residential (SR), Rural (R), Rural Residential (RR), Commercial (C), and Open Space (OS)
- Existing Regulatory Zones: Medium Density Suburban/Suburban Residential (MDS/SR), Low Density Suburban/Rural Residential (LDS/RR), High Density Rural (HDR), General Rural (GR), General Commercial (GC), Public and Semi-Public Facilities (PSP), & Parks and Recreation (PR)
- Proposed Regulatory Zones: Medium Density Suburban (MDS), Low Density Suburban (LDS), High Density Rural (HDR), General Rural (GR), General Commercial (GC), Public and Semi-Public Facilities (PSP), or Parks and Recreation (PR)
- Area Plan: North Valleys Area Plan
- Citizen Advisory Board: North Valleys
- Development Code: Authorized in Article 820, Amendment of Master Plan and Article 821, Amendment of Regulatory Zone
- Commission District: 5 – Commissioner Herman
- Prepared by: Julee Olander, Planner  
Washoe County Community Services Department  
Planning and Building Division
- Phone: 775.328.3627
- E-Mail: [jolander@washoecounty.us](mailto:jolander@washoecounty.us)

Chair Chesney called for Commissioner disclosures. There were no disclosures by the Commissioners.

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

Vice Chair Donshick stated the new 2019 TMRPA removed joint corridor plan, so it doesn't exist anymore. Ms. Olander said NRS 278.0284 lays out how a joint plan is designated. It needs to be done by regional planning agency. It came about after a discussion if it was needed, and it was decided it wasn't needed. If regional planning doesn't have it in its plan, then it doesn't have a place to live anymore.

Public comment:

Ray Lake noted it's not that we don't necessarily trust the County, it's we don't trust the City of Reno. He said he attended January 13<sup>th</sup> meeting and wasn't convinced that this needs to go away. He said he believes both agencies need to represent the property owners. The purpose of this that there should be an agreement. There are still issues in North Valleys under the purview of the plan. He said we have one Commissioner that stands up for the people in the North Valley. It takes more than just the City annexing a piece of the property and do what they please. City of Reno lets the developments go on through. The joint corridor plan should remain.

Patrick Shea, Golden Valley resident, he said he is the Chair of the North Valleys CAB. He said we voted to deny. He said he enjoyed this presentation tonight. He said presentation was different than what the CAB meeting. He said removing Washoe County from the corridor agreement will impact North Valleys. He spoke about developments that got denied by Washoe County and annexed into Reno and approved. He spoke about massive warehouses with impermeable surfaces which creates runoff into Swan Lake. NV CAB meeting residents expressed opposition to this proposal. We have no voice with City of Reno. He is asking the Commission to deny it to maintain a voice in joint corridor. By having a joint corridor plan, both county and city residents can speak regarding a project. He said he would extend it.

With no further public, Chair Chesney closed the public comment period.

Commissioner Chvilicek stated she has been a Regional Planning member and been involved with the joint corridor plan. She said there are very few parcels that fall under the plan because of the annexations. In response to Commissioner Chvilicek's question, Ms. Olander confirmed there aren't a lot of parcels left. She showed a few pockets on the map. She added NRS doesn't give direction on how to sunset a plan. The plan is no longer sited in the regional plan; there is no longer a mechanism to maintain the joint plan. Commissioner Chvilicek said prior to joint plan being pulled from 2019 plan, Reno and Washoe County staff agreed that the joint plan no longer serve its original intent. Mr. Pelham agreed, and noted both staffs agreed to sunset the plan. He said the parcels in the joint plan are not continuous parcels but checkered.

Commissioner Chvilicek said she represents Washoe County in Regional Plan which was approved in 2019 by all entities. She asked if she is allowed to make a motion. DDA Edwards said it's common for Commissions to sit on other boards in multiple capacities. He advised she isn't limited from participating just because she serves on the regional planning agency.

### **Master Plan Amendment Case Number WMPA19-0009 (Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan)**

**MOTION:** Commissioner Chvilicek moved that, after giving reasoned consideration to the information contained in the staff report and information received during the public hearing, the Washoe County Planning Commission adopt the resolution contained at Exhibit A to this staff report to amend the Master Plan as set forth in Master Plan Amendment Case Number WMPA19-0009 having made the following five findings in accordance with Washoe County Code Section 110.820.15(d) and the required North Valleys Area Plan finding. She further moved to certify the



resolution and the proposed Master Plan Amendments in WMPA19-0009 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.

***Washoe County Development Code Section 110.820.15(d) Master Plan Amendment Findings***

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.

***North Valley Area Plan Required Finding***

Goal Twenty: Amendments to the North Valleys Area Plan will be for the purpose of further implementing the Vision and Character Statement, or to respond to new or changing circumstances. Amendments will conform to the North Valleys Vision and Character Statement. Amendments will be reviewed against a set of criteria and thresholds that are measures of the impact on, or progress toward, the Vision and Character Statement.

**Regulatory Zone Amendment Case Number WRZA19-0009 (Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan)**

**MOTION:** Commissioner Chvilicek moved that after giving reasoned consideration to the information contained in the staff report and information received during the public hearing, the Washoe County Planning Commission adopt the resolution included as Exhibit B, recommending adoption of Regulatory Zone Amendment Case Number WRZA19-0009, having made all of the following findings in accordance with Washoe County Code Section 110.821.15(d). She further moved to certify the resolution and the proposed Regulatory Zone Amendment in WRZA19-0009 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 Washoe County Planning Commission.



## **Washoe County Development Code Section 110.821.35 Regulatory Zone Amendment Findings**

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; more desirable use. 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 amendment.
5. No Adverse Effects. The proposed amendment will not adversely affect the implementation of the policies and action programs of the Washoe County Master Plan.
6. 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.
7. Effect on a Military Installation When a Military Installation is Required to be Noticed. The proposed amendment will not affect the location, purpose and mission of the military installation.

Commissioner Bruce seconded the motion, which passed unanimously with a vote of six for, none against.

### **10. Planning Items**

**A. For possible action to designate a Planning Commissioner to sit on the RRIF/GAM Technical Advisory Committee** – Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) is looking for a volunteer from the Planning Commission to sit on the Regional Road Impact Fee (RRIF)/General Administrative Manual (GAM) Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) – The purpose of the RRIF/GAM TAC is to review and recommend any modifications, additions, or updates to be made to the RRIF GAM and Capital Improvements Plan (CIP). The RRIF/GAM TAC typically meets on an as needed basis. – Trevor Lloyd, Planning Manager, Washoe County Community Services Department, Planning and Building Division

Commissioner Chesney volunteered to sit on the Regional Road Impact Fee (RRIF)/General Administrative Manual (GAM) Technical Advisory Committee (TAC).

**MOTION:** Commissioner Chvilicek moved to appoint Chair Chesney to sit on the advisory committee. The nomination was seconded By Vice Chair Donshick. The motion passed unanimously with a vote of six for, none against.

Public comment:

Alexandra Profant stated she wanted this tabled until the District 1 seat was filled just in case that person would have been interested. She said there is a report of heritage corridors provided by architect institute called AIA report done for this region in 2006; it's comprehensive and informative. She recommended the Commissioners visit that report on the Tahoe Foundation website. She highly recommended visiting that document as it's important for this region.

DDA Edwards advised the Commissioners to recast their vote.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Chvilicek moved to appoint Larry Chesney to sit on the Regional Road Impact Fee/General Administrative Manual Technical Advisory Committee. Vice Chair Donschick seconded the motion, which passed unanimously with a vote of six for, none against.

### **11. Chair and Commission Items**

\*A. Future agenda items - Chair Chesney stated he would like a presentation on the County's land acquisition plan for March.

\*B. Requests for information from staff - none

### **12. Director's and Legal Counsel's Items**

\*A. Report on previous Planning Commission items - none

\*B. Legal information and updates - none

### **13. \*General Public Comment and Discussion Thereof**

Alexandra Profant thanked the board for listening. She said she is passionate about preserving the home she loves which is Nevada and spent many years spending time aboard that teaches preservation planning and architecture conservation to bring back her knowledge. She said it's difficult because rural areas mean a lot of people don't live here and we must wear a lot of hats. She said she has been called an activist. She said she has done this in volunteer capacity for many years. She said as a foundation director, she is hoping to create community curriculum with community management planner to present to you. The topic of preservation planning is broad and deep. She said what gives her anxiety is the enormous advantages if locals establish criterion standard with the owner occupancy. With the short-term rental issue before us, issues that preservation planning looks at land use conversions from residential to commercial. Real estate trusts were vehicles created by preservation planners to incentives development. Anyone can own property collectively with real estate investment trusts. It's a corporate person. Tax incentives ultimately get realize to develop the project and forces the owners out and it has to be rented to be commercial in order to be held in trust. The whole region can be owned collectively. Only way to have control is to take a step forward and own that criterion standard and create protective privacy zone standard for owners to protect property as natural persons in regional plan in our state. She said it's interesting to hear about north valleys; heritage court can create and compete with funding and funding mechanism to us.

With no further requests for public comment, Chair Chesney closed the public comment period.

### **14. Adjournment**

With no further business scheduled before the Planning Commission, the meeting adjourned at 9:27 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Misty Moga, Independent Contractor.

Approved by Commission in session on March 3, 2020

---

Trevor Lloyd  
Secretary to the Planning Commission

DRAFT