



# PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

## Planning Commission Members

Dian A. VanderWell, Chair  
Neal Cobb, Vice Chair  
Roger Edwards  
Vaughn Hartung  
Roy H. Hibdon  
William Weber  
D.J. Whittemore  
Kimberly H. Robinson, MUP, Secretary

Wednesday, February 2, 2011  
10:00 a.m.

Washoe County Administration Complex  
Community Development Large Conference Room  
Building A, Room A-265  
1001 East Ninth Street  
Reno, NV

---

The Washoe County Planning Commission met in regular session on Wednesday, February 2, 2011, in the Washoe County Community Development Large Conference Room, 1001 East Ninth Street, Reno, Nevada.

## DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Chair VanderWell called the meeting to order at 10:04 a.m. The following Commissioners and staff were present:

Commissioners present: Dian A. VanderWell, Chair  
Neal Cobb, Vice Chair  
Roger M. Edwards  
Vaughn Hartung  
Roy Hibdon  
William Weber

Commissioners absent: D.J. Whittemore

Staff present: Kimberly Robinson, Planning Manager, Community Development  
Bill Whitney, Senior Planner, Community Development  
Eric Young, Ph.D., Planner, Planner, Community Development  
Nathan Edwards, Esq., Deputy District Attorney  
Sara DeLozier, Recording Secretary, Community Development

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Commissioner Edwards led the pledge to the flag.

## ETHICS LAW ANNOUNCEMENT

Deputy District Attorney Edwards provided the ethics procedure for disclosures.

## APPEAL PROCEDURE

Ms. Robinson recited the appeal procedure for items heard before the Planning Commission.

## **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

In accordance with the Open Meeting Law, Commissioner Edwards moved to approve the agenda for the February 2, 2011 meeting. Commissioner Hartung seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

## **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Commissioner Hartung moved to approve the minutes for the December 7, 2010, Planning Commission meeting as written. Commissioner Edwards seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

Commissioner Edwards moved to approve the minutes for the January 4, 2011, Planning Commission meeting as written. Commissioner Hartung seconded the motion which carried unanimously with Commissioner Weber recusing himself having not been present.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

As there was no one wishing to speak, Chair VanderWell closed the public comment period.

## **CONSENT ITEMS**

### **ITEM A**

Resolution for Accepting Streets (The Estates at Mt. Rose) - Consider and possibly adopt NRS 278.390 resolution accepting streets or roads previously offered for dedication to Washoe County in connection with Tract Map #4649, Document #3388210, The Estates at Mt. Rose, Phase 3A, Section 35, Range 19 east, Township 18 north (Callahan Road, Paris Court, Paris Avenue, Tou Louse Court, Chartreuse Court, Mont PeLier Court, De Maitre Court, and Cevennes Court) adding approximately 1.70 miles of new street. (APN 150-460-04)

There was no interest in moving this item from the Consent agenda for discussion and no member of the public wishing to speak on the item. Commissioner Weber recused himself indicating he was a neighboring property owner. Commissioner Hibdon moved to approve the item, Commissioner Edwards seconded the motion which carried with a vote of five in favor, none opposed, Commissioner Weber abstaining.

### **ITEM ONE**

Presentation: Washoe County Green Team. This presentation will provide an overview of the Washoe County Green Team's purpose, composition, vision and activities.

Bill Whitney provided an informative overview of the Washoe County Green Team. The virtual department was formalized by the Board of County Commissioners in 2008. A greenhouse gas inventory was recently completed and the group was continuing to work toward identified milestones, and though primarily county-focused at present, hoped to expand to become a better resource for the community in the future. The group has been the recipient of several awards and grants and community and national recognition. He provided examples of energy- and money-saving efforts as well as the alternative energy projects and recycling programs the County is involved with. Development Code amendments and updates addressing alternative energy such as wind, geothermal and solar have been a focus of the Community Development Department. He noted past and on-going renewable energy projects and spoke to the Green Team's efforts to increase community education and involvement. He

noted efforts were underway to accommodate electric cars with charging stations and single-stream recycling.

Commissioner Edwards asked if the market for the recycled materials had improved and suggested the County consider a role in the processing of recyclables. When asked about ICLEI, Mr. Whitney indicated it was one of several organizations offering standards and protocols. Commissioner Hartung asked about the availability of the electric car charging stations within the community. Trudy Broussard inquired as to the community-wide availability of the recycling programs noted. Adrian Freund spoke to the transportation costs associated with recycling efforts.

## ITEM TWO

Presentation: Master Plan and Regulatory Zone Amendment Review Process. Community Development staff will provide a brief presentation and facilitate a discussion of the primary considerations when reviewing Master Plan Amendments and Regulatory Zone Amendments, with a focus on the differences between the two amendments.

Eric Young provided an overview of master plan and zoning principles. The Master Plan being typically comprised of plans, policies, and programs; and zoning being a tool that helps to implement those Master Plan components. He described some of the main contributors and users of the tools and each of their roles in the community vision and implementation of the plan and allocation of resources.

Potential changes to the Master Plan may be large or small and impact the community vision, investment direction and planning for resources and infrastructure, or they might amend policies or programs in order to better support the community vision or account for a land use pattern not known or taken into account at the inception of the plan. There are often socio-economic influences at work; Master Plan changes are most often brought forth by staff or another agency. Zoning regulation provides for the specific densities, intensities and standards within the larger Master Plan framework. Requests to amend zoning are typically applicant/market driven. He spoke to the hierarchical relationship between the Master Plan and Regulatory Zone policies noting that they were intended to work together.

When considering each of the types of applications that would now be before the Planning Commission, it is important to think of the larger implications relating to a Master Plan change such as the concepts for infrastructure and land use patterns, the impact on service providers and other agencies, the relationship with or impact on the community vision, and the policies that reside in the rest of the Master Plan documents. For Regulatory Zone requests, consideration of whether or not the change works to implement the goals and policies of the Master Plan is important. He noted the market was a factor for change but was best considered in conjunction with the other planning resources available.

Commissioner Cobb spoke to the need to be in touch with the community that each Commissioner represents. Commissioner Hartung voiced concern with past tendencies to rely upon historical practices which may be outdated and not reflect the best choice for a community.

Chair VanderWell expressed appreciation for the presentation. Commissioner Hibdon spoke of the tough transition to the one-map system. The Area Plan update process was discussed briefly.

## **CHAIR AND COMMISSION ITEMS**

### a. Report on Previous Planning Commission Items

Ms. Robinson noted the Development Code Amendment for Article 406, Building Placement Standards, had been approved by the Board of County Commissioners in January.

### b. Legal Information and Updates

Deputy District Attorney Nathan Edwards, Esq.

None

### c. 2011 Legislative Session

Commissioners were reminded of the County Lobbying Policy.

## **DIRECTOR'S ITEMS**

Ms. Robinson provided a brief budget update indicating the County's preliminary \$33.5 million target reduction and the Community Development Department's preliminary 3.7 percent, \$87,000 reduction target.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Since there was no further business to come before the Planning Commission, the meeting adjourned at 11:23 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Sara DeLozier, Recording Secretary

Approved by Commission in session on March 1, 2011.

---

Kimberly H. Robinson, MUP  
Secretary to the Planning Commission