



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

Tuesday, September 6, 2011
6:30 p.m.

Washoe County Administration Complex
Commission Chambers
1001 East Ninth Street
Reno, NV

The Washoe County Planning Commission met in regular session on Tuesday, September 6, 2011, in the Washoe County Commission Chambers, 1001 East Ninth Street, Reno, Nevada.

1. Determination of Quorum

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

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

Commissioners absent: None

Staff present: Trevor Lloyd, Senior Planner, Community Development
Sandra Monsalve, AICP, Senior Planner, Community Development
Greg Salter, Esq., Deputy District Attorney
Dawn Spinola, Recording Secretary, Community Development

Chair Cobb asked for a moment of silence in honor of the victims of the shootings in Carson City.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

Commissioner Hartung led the pledge to the flag.

3. Ethics Law Announcement

Deputy District Attorney Salter provided the ethics procedure for disclosures.

4. Appeal Procedure

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

5. Public Comment

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

6. Approval of Agenda

Commissioner Weber moved to approve the agenda for the September 6, 2011, Planning Commission meeting as written. Commissioner Hartung seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

7. Approval of Minutes of August 2, 2011 Meeting

Commissioner VanderWell moved to approve the minutes for the August 2, 2011, Planning Commission meeting as written. Commissioner Weber seconded the motion which carried with a vote of six in favor, zero opposed and Commissioner Hibdon abstaining having not been present at the August meeting.

8. Project Review Items

Item 8A

PUBLIC HEARING: Tentative Subdivision Case No. TM11-001 - Monte Vista at the Estates at Mt. Rose - To develop a 23-lot single-family subdivision on one parcel with common open space as authorized in Article 608.

- Location: North of Mt. Rose Highway/Callahan Road Intersection
- Assessor’s Parcel Number: 150-460-01
- Parcel Size: 82.38 acres
- Regulatory Zone: High Density Rural (HDR) and General Rural (GR)
- Area Plan: Southwest Truckee Meadows
- Citizen Advisory Board: Southwest Truckee Meadows
- Commission District: 2 – Commissioner Humke
- Development Code: Authorized in Article 608 - Tentative Subdivision Maps
- TMSA: Within the Truckee Meadows Service Area
- Section/Township/Range: Section 35, T18N, R19E, MDM
Washoe County, NV
- Staff: Sandra Monsalvè, AICP, Senior Planner
Phone: 775.328.3608
Email: smonsalve@washoecounty.us

Chair Cobb opened the public hearing.

Ms. Monsalvè reviewed her staff report dated August 30, 2011. She explained the following corrections to the Conditions of Approval:

- 1a. The applicant shall demonstrate substantial conformance to the plans approved as part of this ~~special use permit~~ tentative map.

~~1n. The applicant shall submit complete construction plans and building permits shall be issued within four (4) years from the date of approval by Washoe County. The applicant shall complete construction within the time specified by the building permits. Compliance with this condition shall be determined by the Department of Community Development. (Redundant to 1d.)~~

6a through e. Replaced by Conditions 1 through 5 (document attached to minutes).

Pages 10-20 include references to “goats” when in fact every instance of that word should be “goals.”

Applicant’s Representative Dave Snelgrove expounded on Ms. Monsalve’s presentation, noting the project had previously been approved but this portion of the original Phase 3A had expired and therefore the current application had been submitted as a separate application with the area noted as Phase 3B. He addressed concerns raised by neighbors regarding timing, erosion and noise and light pollution explaining how those concerns had been addressed.

Mr. Snelgrove noted Condition Oii limited retaining walls to six feet, and stated the bridge abutments would be higher than that.

Commissioner Weber disclosed he had owned property in this subdivision but felt comfortable making a decision on the case. He noted he had been a member of the Board in 2005 when the subdivision had originally been approved. He pointed out the original case had been quite controversial and opined it was strange that there was no one in the audience to speak against this case. He expressed concern that the affected property owners may not have been properly noticed. Ms. Monsalve stated it had been legally noticed as required by Nevada Revised Statutes and the Citizen’s Advisory Board (CAB) had heard the case.

Commissioner Weber asked Ms. Monsalve if this was a new subdivision application and she verified it was. She went on to explain the updated phase would require new Conditions, Covenants and Restrictions (CC&Rs) and a new homeowner’s association, separate from the original subdivision. Commissioner Weber noted grading was already under way and surmised that was for Phase 3A, which Ms. Monsalve verified was correct.

Commissioner Weber indicated he was not comfortable with the fact the final location of the fire access and the bridge had yet to be determined. Mr. Snelgrove discussed how much public noticing had been done and explained the bridge had been moved due to the fact they builder had discovered an archaeologically sensitive site at the original intended location. He stated that the questions regarding location of the emergency accesses would be answered prior to building.

Mr. Lloyd pointed out it was a code requirement that the emergency access has to be established and recorded prior to the first final map.

Commissioner Weber noted the letter from Sierra Fire did not reference access. Applicant’s Engineer Steve Strickland noted the determination of the location of the access was a function of timing, as it required coordination with the construction of the subdivision to the west of the project. He explained they were in contact with the Army Corps of Engineers regarding the bridge crossing.

Chair Cobb closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Whittemore asked if there was a possibility that the public lack of interest in the project was a factor of the current economy, and Commissioner Weber stated that was not his opinion, he felt it was lack of information.

Commissioner VanderWell respectfully disagreed with Commissioner Weber, explaining that community was very adept as spreading information.

Chair Cobb asked Ms. Monsalvè to explain legal noticing for a Tentative Map, which she did. She acknowledged the response was quite minimal and said she did not understand why any more than Commissioner Weber did.

Commissioner Whittemore noted the concessions the applicant had made to improve the project since it was originally approved.

Commissioner VanderWell moved that after considering the information contained within the staff report and the information received during the public hearing, the Washoe County Planning Commission approve with conditions Tentative Subdivision Case No. TM11-001 - Monte Vista at the Estates at Mt. Rose, with the staff proposed changes, having made all ten findings in accordance with Washoe County Development Code Section 110.608.25. Commissioner Edwards seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

The motion was based on the following findings:

1. Plan Consistency. That the proposed map is consistent with the Master Plan, and the Southwest Truckee Meadows Area Plan;
2. Design or Improvement. That the design or improvement of the proposed subdivision is consistent with the Master Plan, and the Southwest Truckee Meadows Area Plan;
3. Type of Development. That the site is physically suited for the type of development proposed;
4. Availability of Services. That the subdivision will meet the requirements of Article 702, Adequate Public Facilities Management System
5. Fish or Wildlife. That neither the design of the subdivision nor any proposed improvements is likely to cause substantial environmental damage, or substantial and avoidable injury to any endangered plant, wildlife or their habitat;
6. Public Health. That the design of the subdivision or type of improvement is not likely to cause significant public health problems;
7. Easements. That the design of the subdivision or the type of improvements will not conflict with easements acquired by the public at large for access through, or use of property within, the proposed subdivision;
8. Access. That the design of the subdivision provides any necessary access to surrounding, adjacent lands and provides appropriate secondary access for emergency vehicles;
9. Dedications. That any land or improvements to be dedicated to the County is consistent with the Master Plan; and,

10. Energy. That the design of the subdivision provides, to the extent feasible, for future passive or natural heating or cooling opportunities in the subdivision.

9. Other Items

None

10. Chair and Commission Items

Commissioner Hartung formally relinquished his position on the Design Review Committee. Commissioner Edwards requested to be considered as a replacement and Chair Cobb asked that an item appointing a new member be agendaized for the next meeting.

11. Director's Items

None

12. Public Comment

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

13. Adjournment

Since there was no further business to come before the Planning Commission, the meeting adjourned at 7:16 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dawn Spinola, Recording Secretary

Approved by Commission in session on October 4, 2011.

Kimberly H. Robinson, MUP
Secretary to the Planning Commission