



WASHOE COUNTY PARCEL MAP REVIEW COMMITTEE DRAFT Meeting Minutes

Parcel Map Review Committee Members

Thursday, October 12, 2017
2:00 p.m.

James Barnes, Planning Commission
James English, Health District
Tim Simpson, Environmental Engineer
Mike Gump, Engineering
Amy Ray, Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District
Eric Young, Planning and Development

Washoe County Administration Complex
Building A, Room 265
Mt. Rose Conference Room
1001 East Ninth Street
Reno, NV

The Washoe County Parcel Map Review Committee met in regular session on Thursday, October 12, 2017, at 2:00 p.m., in the Washoe County Mt. Rose Conference Room, 1001 East Ninth Street, Reno, Nevada.

1. *Determination of Quorum

Eric Young called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. The following members and staff were present:

Departments represented: Community Services Department (CSD)
Mike Gump, Engineering
Tim Simpson, Environmental Engineer
Eric Young, Planning and Building

Health District
James English

Members Absent: Planning Commission
James Barnes

Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District
Amy Ray, Fire Marshal

Staff present: Kelly Mullin, AICP, Planning and Building
Walt West, Engineering
Donna Fagan, Recording Secretary
Nathan Edwards, Deputy District Attorney, District Attorney's Office

2. *Ethics Law Announcement

Deputy District Attorney Nathan Edwards recited the Ethics Law standards.

3. *Appeal Procedure

Mr. Young recited the appeal procedure for items heard before the Parcel Map Review Committee.

4. *General Public Comment

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

5. Possible action to approve Agenda

In accordance with the Open Meeting Law, Tim Simpson moved to approve the agenda of October 12, 2017, as written. The motion, seconded by Mike Gump, passed unanimously.

6. Possible action to approve August 10, 2017 Draft Minutes

Tim Simpson moved to approve the August 10, 2017 draft minutes, as written. The motion was seconded by Mike Gump and passed unanimously.

7. Project Review Items

A. Tentative Parcel Map Case Number WTPM17-0012 (Furer/Douglas) – For possible action, hearing and discussion to approve a parcel map merging two parcels totaling ±60.07-acres and subsequently dividing them into four new parcels of ±43.90-acres, ±10.47-acres, ±2.91-acres, and ±2.76-acres.

- Applicant: Robert Gurnea
- Property Owner: Furer/Douglas Comm. Prop. Trust
- Location: 11095 Thomas Creek Road, at the southwest corner of its intersection with Johnson Lane
- Assessor's Parcel Numbers: 040-720-16 and 040-750-01
- Parcel Size: ±24.59-acres (APN 040-720-16) and ±35.48-acres (APN 040-750-01)
- Master Plan Category: Rural Residential (RR)
- Regulatory Zone: High Density Rural (HDR)
- Area Plan: Southwest Truckee Meadows
- Citizen Advisory Board: South Truckee Meadows/Washoe Valley
- Development Code: Authorized in Article 606, *Parcel Maps*
- Commission District: 2 – Commissioner Lucey
- Section/Township/Range: Section 13, T18N, R19E, MDM, Washoe County, NV
- Staff: Kelly Mullin, AICP, Planner
Washoe County Community Services Department
Planning and Building Division
- Phone: 775-328-3608
- Email: kmullin@washoecounty.us

Eric Young opened the public hearing. Kelly Mullin reviewed her staff report dated September 22, 2017.

Ryan Cook, Summit Engineering, the applicant's representative, asked for clarification on the following proposed conditions of approval: 2(c) – "Remove structures, poles, fencing and cattle fencing, and large dirt stockpile located along north boundary of property. Obtain Washoe County grading permit for disposal of stockpiled material." Mr. Cook said there were and will continue to be cattle in the field. He asked for clarification on the fencing. Mike Gump asked if the fence will be following the proposed lot lines or meandering through the proposed parcels. Mr. Cook indicated there are currently multiple fences out there which don't follow the proposed boundary lines. The intent is to leave them as-is until one or more parcels are sold. Mr. Cook also asked about the stockpiling of dirt which is under an existing permit. Walt West noted Mr. Cook would need to provide the permit to Engineering. Mr. Cook asked what structures need to be removed. Mr. Gump said condition 2(c) is general language, if there are no structures, it does not apply. Mr. Cook referred to condition 2(f) – "Any access way shall be upgraded to a gravel road that will allow emergency vehicle

travel, issuance of a building permit and take drainage into consideration. Submit plans for review and approval.” saying there were no improvements being made and asked if that should be a note on the map, itself. Mr. Gump said there are two proposed new parcels and they are identifying a new 30-foot roadway which shall support emergency vehicle access with a temporary turn around at the end of it. Mr. Cook said that is the later one but asked if it being upgraded to a gravel road should be stated on the map as they are not proposing to build it now. Mr. West said that was part of the condition for sign off on the final map so it would have to be built. Mr. Gump confirmed, constructed or bonded. Mr. Cook said that would go with condition 2(g) – “All private driveway approaches onto County roadways for two (2) residences or less shall be constructed in accordance with Washoe County Standard Details Drawings.” saying this is referring to the 30-foot private reciprocal access easement. Mr. Cook reiterated, that would not just be an easement on paper but physically a bulb constructed within remainder parcel D. Mr. Gump said, that is correct.

Eric Young opened public comment.

Gary M. Soule, property owner to the east, expressed concern about the 2.5 acre parcel nearest his property. His well is on the front of his property and a septic system on the proposed parcel will be uphill, in a flood plain, from his well. He originally supported the development of property in accordance with the zoning, etc. He understood this 2.5 acre proposed property would eventually be bringing in sewer and water and they might consider going 5-acre zoning. If that was the case, he felt, for the porosity of the soil, 5-acre parcels would probably suffice for a septic systems. Mr. Soule said as a property owner he was not aware of all the intricacies of the County process or of a parcel map being possible to break it into four parcels and he finds it interesting there are two large parcels but happened to end up with two 2.5-acre parcels that can go to wells and septic right across the street from his property. He understands the Engineers may think it will be fine but there are cases where increased septic has caused problems with wells. Mr. Soule's other concern is what the 2.5-acre parcels will be used for. He was unable to get an answer from the property owner.

Andrew Harris, a neighbor on the Maverick Lane side, said he is happy to see the property owners removed an old barn. His concern is the 45-acres and what the plans are for it. He feels he has one of the best views in Reno, of idyllic pastures. He's concerned the plan may increase density. He also wonders if it will change agricultural status and the taxes.

Ann Rodewald, a neighbor on the south end, asked if the County was going to notify the adjacent property owners who were notified of this Tentative Parcel Map (TPM), if there are changes to it vs. the final map. She then asked if the County had a prior configuration of the natural drainage of the land as there has been so much dirt that has been moved around along with the stockpile. Will it be put back for the natural water drainage?

Dennis Sanada, lives kitty-corner to the property, noted all the land is on a flood plain and is part of the alluvial fan that comes down. He opined the septic systems, when built, will be fine if done right. He asked about the plan for parcel B. Mr. Cook said parcel B and C are proposed single family residences. Parcel B would be accessed through parcel C. Along the north side of parcel C is a 30-foot reciprocal easement.

Steve Shields, neighbor next to the Soule's, stated the 43-acre parcel is all wetland. It supports a certain amount of natural wildlife. A lot of water, at time, comes down and rolls across that portion of the property. It is a 100-year flood plain and anything that gets cut up will naturally push the water to our side. He asked when they cut that land, where do they see the water going. He also asked where the access to the property will be, when it is developed. Covering up the wetlands isn't a good answer.

Dave Emmil addressed the 100-year flood plain issues saying; since he bought his property he's been doing research on flood plains and says the flood plain map is not accurate. Back when they were created by the Army Corp of Engineers they just did an alluvial fan and that is not how the water works in this area. He has talked with Engineering and it is a 5-year process and probably wouldn't

get approved because by making the flood plain accurate for that area it creates a flood plain down in the City property below us down by the freeway. It would be a long process and fought process and the County says they have no money to change it. What I was getting at was maybe we homeowners can get together and can pay for the study to have it changed. It'll still be 5 – 10 years to have it done. The County will somewhat resist us but the City will because it is creating more flood zones than there is now.

With no more requests, Mr. Young closed public comment.

Mr. Young asked the Division representatives to respond to the concerns expressed by public comments.

Mr. English said the Health Department allowed the parcels to be divided down to this size for this one map. The protection of the well water is by the seal so that would be the primary way the well is protected from a septic system. They will be making sure all the setbacks are met for any future development on any of the lots. Most likely each one of the systems would have to be engineered and the reason the Health District would be signing the parcel map would be to make sure the test holes are done on each of the created parcels to make sure sewage would be properly discharged and treated on the property before the parcels could actually be parceled. Mr. English added the test trenches are to see where they hit groundwater on each parcel. Mr. Young noted, if anyone had questions regarding this, Mr. English would be available to answer them.

Mr. Gump spoke about access, saying, the access for parcel 2 is being specifically identified on the map. As far as parcel C, when the applicant comes in for a building permit they may be able to have a different access but for parcel B it's the one identified on the submitted map. It wouldn't be anywhere else unless they work with parcel B or C to do something different down the road. The access on the map could be relinquished and record a new private easement in an alternate location.

Mr. West, from Engineering, spoke about grading, saying the property had historic topography and the suggestion to remove the stockpile to restore historic elevations does not necessarily need to be done but they do need to develop a grading plan to show where the material is going to go. The County does have historic two-foot contour map for the area, Engineering doesn't know if the applicant is using that or if they have their own. Mr. Cook said they have their own site topography map by doing an on the ground survey around the house. Mr. Young indicated he thought the concern regarding the topography was about the drainage. Mr. West stated that is why the applicant will need a grading permit, that way Engineering can evaluate what is being done with the dirt. One of the conditions of approval states the need for a grading permit. Mr. Gurnea addressed concerns saying, they took down the 30,000-foot non permeable metal building which will help on absorption because it will be reclaimed as pasture. The racetrack that was there made of hard pressed DG has all been top-soiled and reclaimed as pasture. The stockpile is going to come out and not being put anywhere on the property. Everything around the 10-acre parcel hasn't been touched other than to clean up some ditches.

Mr. Young asked to have the concerns regarding the floodplain and their accuracy addressed. Mr. West stated the County doesn't have the money to remap that. He said he doesn't know if the City of Reno would entertain the idea of remapping that area, either. FEMA could be asked to do it but that may be down the road on their schedule, if they ever decide to do it.

Ms. Mullin addressed concerns about wetlands saying, within each Area Plan there is a development suitability map that identifies constraints on various areas within the Area Plan which shows properties and identifies excessive slopes, floodplains, potential wetlands, that sort of thing. The map is not exact but it does identify a portion of the parcel as potentially having wetlands. The larger portion of the property, if it were to get developed or split in the future, it would likely have a condition of approval for that type of request. Ms. Mullin said she would require delineation of that type of request in coordination with the Army Corp of Engineers. Mr. Young noted, delineation of wetlands is a technical term where they are specifically surveyed and the grounds that meet the

definition are specifically identified. Mr. Young said, what Ms. Mullin is suggesting is if the larger parcel is split in a future date, because that is where the wetlands are located, part of the conditions of approval may be to have the wetlands delineated so everyone knows where they are.

Mr. Young addressed use and zoning, saying the zoning on the parcels doesn't change as part of this process. This is strictly the creation of new parcels. The zoning and the allowed uses do not change and he doesn't see any future rezoning in this area. Ms. Mullin added, the property is zoned High Density Rural (HDR) and is generally residential use, sometimes you may see agricultural use. If anyone is interested in finding what uses may be allowed on that property she would be happy to point you to that Code, after the meeting.

Ms. Mullin addressed the question of noticing, say there is a condition of approval that requires substantial compliance of the plans that were submitted with this application. If there were substantial differences they would be required to come back to the Parcel Map Review Committee and require noticing.

Mr. English noted, remainder parcel D, in the future, since the whole area is on septic and wells, would never be allowed to be divided less than 5-acres.

Tim Simpson moved that, after giving reasoned consideration to the information contained within the staff report and the information received during the public meeting, that the Washoe County Parcel Map Review Committee approve Parcel Map Case Number WTPM17-0012, subject to the conditions of approval included as Exhibit A with the staff report, and make the determination that the following criteria are or will be adequately provided for pursuant to Washoe County Code Section 110.606.30. James English seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

The motion carried and considered the following criteria:

- 1) General improvement considerations for all parcel maps including, but not limited to:
 - a) Environmental and health laws and regulations concerning water and air pollution, the disposal of solid waste, facilities to supply water, community or public sewage disposal and, where applicable, individual systems for sewage disposal;
 - b) The availability of water which meets applicable health standards and is sufficient for the reasonably foreseeable needs of the subdivision;
 - c) The availability and accessibility of utilities;
 - d) The availability and accessibility of public services such as schools, police and fire protection, transportation, recreation and parks;
 - e) Conformity with the zoning ordinances and master plan;
 - f) General conformity with the governing body's master plan of streets and highways;
 - g) The effect of the proposed subdivision on existing public streets and the need for new streets or highways to serve the subdivision;
 - h) Physical characteristics of the land such as floodplain, slope and soil;
 - i) The recommendations and comments of those entities reviewing the tentative parcel map pursuant to NRS 278.330 and 278.348, inclusive;
 - j) The availability and accessibility of fire protection including, but not limited to, the availability and accessibility of water and services for the prevention and containment of fires including fires in wild lands;
 - k) Community antenna television (CATV) conduit and pull wire; and
 - l) Recreation and trail easements.

8. *Reports and Future Agenda Items

A. *Legal Information and Updates

None

9. *General Public Comment

As there was no response to the call for public comment, the comment period was closed.

10. Adjournment

Eric Young made the motion to adjourn at 2:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna Fagan, Recording Secretary

Approved by Committee in session on _____, 2017.

Eric Young, Chair
Senior Planner

DRY
FET