



WASHOE COUNTY PARCEL MAP REVIEW COMMITTEE DRAFT Meeting Minutes

Parcel Map Review Committee Members

Thursday, February 8, 2018
2:00 p.m.

Larry Chesney, Planning Commission
James English, Health District
Tim Simpson, Environmental Engineer
Mike Gump, Engineering
Denise Reynolds, Truckee Meadows Fire Protection
District
Eric Young, Planning and Building

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 8, 2018 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 2:03 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
Wes Rubio (alternate)
Planning Commission
Larry Chesney

Members Absent: Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District
Denise Reynolds

Staff present: Trevor Lloyd, Planning Manager, Planning and Building
Julee Olander, Planner, Planning and Building
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

Greg Dennis, with Palomino Valley GID, asked if item 7A was going to be heard as one item or each individually. Trevor Lloyd noted they would all be heard as one item and there is a request to have it heard after item 7C.

5. Possible action to approve Agenda

Mike Gump moved to approve the agenda of February 8, 2018 with the request for item 7A to follow 7C as the applicant would be arriving late. The motion, seconded by Wes Rubio, passed unanimously.

6. Possible action to approve January 11, 2018 Draft Minutes

Wes Rubio moved to approve the January 11, 2018 draft minutes, as written. The motion was seconded by Mike Gump and passed unanimously.

7. Project Review Items

B. Tentative Parcel Map Case Number WTPM17-0011 (Pardula Living Trust) - For possible action, hearing, and discussion to approve a tentative parcel map dividing one parcel of ±9.01 acres into three parcels. If approved, the three new parcels will be 1.215 acres, ±6.07 acres, and 1.722 acres in size.

- Applicant/Property Owner: Todd & Manuela Pardula
- Location: Timberline Drive, approximately 0.4 miles north of Mt. Rose Highway
- APN: 049-060-57
- Parcel Size: ±9.01 acres
- Master Plan: Suburban Rural (SR) & Rural (R)
- Regulatory Zone: Low Density Suburban (LDS) & General Rural (GR)
- Area Plan: Forest
- Citizen Advisory Board: South Truckee Meadows/Washoe Valley
- Development Code: Authorized in Article 606, Parcel Maps
- Commission District: 1 - Berkgigler
- Section/Township/Range: NW ¼ of Section 34, T18N, R19E, MDM, Washoe County, NV
- Staff: Julee Olander, Planner
Washoe County Community Services
Department
Planning and Building Division
- Phone: 775-328-3627
- Email: jolander@washoecounty.us

Eric Young opened the public hearing. Julee Olander reviewed her staff report dated January 25, 2018. Ms. Olander noted a change, agreed upon by Planning, Engineering, and the applicant, to condition 3(c) removing the requirement of a special use permit and adding that at the recordation of the final map an access road be designed.

Mr. Young opened public comment.

Derek Kirkland with Wood Rodgers, the applicant's representative, said he worked with staff and agree with the changes to condition 3(c).

Mr. Young closed public comment.

Mike Gump requested to add language after “constructed”; “or financial assurance provided”, allowing the applicant to provide financial assurance rather than construct prior to recordation.

Vahid Behmaram, Water Management Planner, confirmed all created parcels would be on municipal water and sewer.

Mike Gump moved that, after giving reasoned consideration to the information contained in the staff report and information received during the public hearing, the Washoe County Parcel Map Review Committee approve Parcel Map Case Number WTPM17-0011 for Pardula Living Trust, subject to the conditions of approval included as Exhibit A with the staff report, and make the determination that the following criteria is or will be adequately provided for pursuant to Washoe County Code Section 110.606.30 with the amendment of condition 3(c). Tim Simpson seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

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.

C. Tentative Parcel Map Case Number WTPM17-0024 (Fritter) - For possible action, hearing, and discussion to approve a tentative parcel map dividing a 4.99 acre parcel into a 2 acre and a 2.99 acre parcel.

- Applicant/Property Owner: Robin Fritter
- Location: 330 feet west of Carl Drive, on the south side of Rock Farm Road
- APN: 150-260-33
- Parcel Size: 4.99 Acres
- Master Plan: Rural Residential (RR)
- Regulatory Zone: High Density Rural (HDR)
- Area Plan: South West Truckee Meadows
- Citizen Advisory Board: South Truckee Meadows / Washoe Valley
- Development Code: Authorized in Article 606

- Commission District: 2 – Commissioner Lucey
- Section/Township/Range: Section 26, T18N, R19E, MDM
Washoe County, NV
- Staff: Chris Bronczyk, Planner
Washoe County Community Services
Department
Planning and Building Division
- Phone: 775-328-3612
- Email: cbronczyk@washoecounty.us

Eric Young opened the public hearing. Chris Bronczyk reviewed his staff report dated January 15, 2018.

Mr. Young opened public comment.

Mike Miller, with Alpine Land Surveyors, noted Engineering condition 3(d) “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”. Mr. Miller asked to what extent as these are all dirt roads in that area. What type of plan would be required?

Mr. Young closed public comment.

Mike Gump suggested Mr. Miller work with Walt West on what the “plan” would require. TMFPD needs adequate roadway and access to support their vehicles. Engineering needs something to prove access to the parcels seeing as there is a big swale and to the east there is a big drop-off.

Mike Gump 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 Tentative Parcel Map Case Number WTPM17-0024 for Robin Fritter, subject to the conditions of approval included as Exhibit A with the staff report, and make the determination that the following criteria is or will be adequately provided for pursuant to Washoe County Code, Section 110.606.30. Tim Simpson seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

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 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.

A. Sequential approval of the following Parcel Maps:

Tentative Parcel Map Case Number WTMP17-0015 (Palomino Ranch Estates #1) – For possible action, hearing, and discussion to approve the division of a 67.60 acre parcel into three 2.5 acre parcels and one remainder parcel of 60.10 acres.

Tentative Parcel Map Case Number WTMP17-0017 (Palomino Ranch Estates #2) – For possible action, hearing, and discussion to approve a second division of the newly created 60.10 acre parcel into three parcels of 5.0, 5.03 and 5.01 acres, and a remainder parcel of 45.06 acres.

Tentative Parcel Map Case Number WTMP17-0018 (Palomino Ranch Estates #3) – For possible action, hearing, and discussion to approve a third subsequent division of the newly created 45.06 acre parcel into three 5.0 acre parcels and one remainder parcel of 30.06 acres.

Tentative Parcel Map Case Number WTMP17-0019 (Palomino Ranch Estates #4) – For possible action, hearing, and discussion to approve a fourth subsequent division of the newly created 30.06 acre parcel into three parcels of 5.0, 5.03 and 5.01 acres, and a remainder parcel of 15.02 acres.

Tentative Parcel Map Case Number WTMP17-0020 (Palomino Ranch Estates #5) – For possible action, hearing, and discussion to approve a fifth subsequent division of a newly created 15.02 acre parcel into one 5.0 acre and two 5.01 acre parcels.

- Applicant/Property Owner: LW Land Company, LLC
Attn: Brian Murphy
695 Mile Circle
Reno, NV 89511
- Location: South end of Grass Valley Road,
approximately ½ mile south of Whiskey
Springs Road
- Assessor's Parcel Number: 077-130-23
- Parcel Size: 67.60 acres
- Master Plan Category: Rural Residential (RR)
- Regulatory Zone: High Density Rural (HDR)
- Area Plan: Warm Springs (Specific Plan Area)
- Citizen Advisory Board: Warm Springs/Rural
- Development Code: Authorized in Article 606, Parcel Maps
- Commission District: 5 – Commissioner Herman
- Section/Township/Range: Section 16, T22N, R21E, MDM,
Washoe County, NV
- Staff: Roger Pelham, MPA, Senior Planner
Washoe County Community Services
Department
Planning and Building Division
- Phone: 775-328-3622
- Email: rpelham@washoecounty.us

Eric Young opened the public hearing. Trevor Lloyd reviewed Roger Pelham's staff reports dated October 16, 2017, in Mr. Pelham's absence. Mr. Lloyd recommended an addition to condition 5(i),

adding "if the Palomino Valley GID accepts responsibility for the maintenance of the project's roadways and drainage systems, this condition shall not be required". Mr. Lloyd said the function of the HOA is to ensure maintenance of the roadways and drainage, however, if the Palomino Valley GID accepts responsibility for maintenance of roadways and drainage the condition will not be required.

Mr. Young opened public comment.

Greg Dennis, with Palomino Valley GID Board, said the GID has no plans for acceptance in the Warm Springs Specific Plan Area (SPA) roads or access to State Route 445. The roads they are planning on, he believes, are to connect to either Whisky Springs or Ironwood which are maintained by Palomino Valley GID. The Washoe County staff report indicates the roads are paved which is incorrect. The roads are not paved. They are dirt roads for the most part, however, with the increased road traffic they have had to go to a chip seal to just barely maintain the roads, as they are. They are limited, in terms to their life. They are not made to withstand any kind of long term traffic and the parceling, from the County's recommendation, is to accept the access roads to the Palomino Valley GID, who has never had any intention to accept nor was the SPA ever to have roads connecting to the Palomino Valley GID they were to go straight through the SPA to SR445. Mr. Dennis cannot understand how this is going on as well as the serial parceling. The applicant is creating a subdivision by serial parceling the maps. Palomino Valley GID opposes that, as stated in their letter to the Planning Division. Regarding the financial plan, the financial plan is ineffective as there has already been a court hearing where money for this entire project goes back to the people. There is no financial plan, to Mr. Dennis' knowledge. Washoe County needs to step up to the plate in this SPA and begin to fix the problems and work with the developer so the SPA can be developed. The applicant is trying to create a subdivision map that connects to a dirt road with miles between it and SR445. It doesn't make sense and it's not logical. Also, 2.5 acre parcels are not adequate within the Regional Plan.

Mr. Young closed public comment.

Larry Chesney feels the applicant is trying to end run the system by the five different parcel divisions. He doesn't believe it is right and as being the Planning Commission representative he will not support this project. It should be a subdivision map. Mike Gump said Washoe County Code allows serial parceling and the code states serial parceling done with less than five years between them, the County can require subdivision improvements.

Tim Simpson said if they were going to impose subdivision codes to the parcel maps, he's concerned as he doesn't see, in the staff reports, anything from TMFPD on the parcel maps so they won't be taking into account their comments and that is a big concern to him. Wes Rubio was also concerned with not being able to review comments from TMFPD taking into account what they know about the area and its rural nature.

Mr. Young asked Mr. Lloyd to address Greg Dennis' concern regarding the roadways and funding of improvements. Mr. Lloyd summoned Walt West who was working with the developer, to answer questions regarding the roads. Mr. Lloyd reiterated serial parceling is allowed in county code and state law but understands that it is concerning to many individuals. He understands the perception that the serial tentative parcel maps are an end run. It is something that the Planning and Building Division may want to address in the future and it would require an amendment to the county code. In regard to the regulatory zoning, it is High Density Rural in the Truckee Meadows Service Area (TMSA) which allows two acre lot sizes. If it was outside of the TMSA the county would require five acre minimum lot sizes.

Mr. Lloyd indicated he too had concerns with not having comments or conditions from TMFPD. He said the standard TMFPD conditions for development, for the most part, would be to comply with Chapter 60. Mr. Young asked Mr. Lloyd if they should add the TMFPD standard conditions in. Mr. Young said if it was just one tentative parcel map he would be more comfortable adding in the

TMFPD standard comments but seeing as how it's a serial parcel map there could be quite a few issues, ie: water for fire suppression, fire hydrants. These things aren't answered. Mr. Simpson commented he was concerned that TMFPD may require hydrants or sprinklers in the homes, or major improvements would have to be made to the site prior to the map being recorded. Mr. Chesney noted that with 40 acre parcels in that area, they have had several fires and the fire department has to come from Spanish Springs and homes burn down because property didn't have enough water to put the fire out.

Mr. Simpson said as far as the access, he was trying to find the secondary access and what the applicant was proposing. Is there adequate roadway or an easement to provide that access? Mr. Lloyd indicated that was a standard condition for a subdivision. Mr. Simpson asked if the applicant would have to provide secondary access prior to the maps recording. He said he didn't get any sense of where that would be by looking at the plans in front of him. Mr. Lloyd noted condition 5(gg), "A secondary, emergency access easement and roadway shall be provided to provide two points of ingress and egress within 1,500' of any parcel". Mr. Simpson asked if easements had to be acquired to create the access. Jason Gilles with TEC Engineering, the applicant's representative, said the easements had been acquired from neighboring property to access Ironwood. At the time of improvement, they will have to improve that roadway. Mr. Chesney stated the developer is still using private roads to access the project. Ironwood and Whiskey Springs are private roads. They don't belong to the county unless the county wants to take them over. Mr. Gump believes they were offered for dedication on the original land maps which made it a public access. He stated NRS 405.191 basically describes what public access is; if it doesn't identify it as private then it's deemed to be public access. Mr. Young said it doesn't say private on the map.

Mr. Young asked DDA Nate Edwards to comment on the issue of the Warm Springs SPA funding. There is some confusion on where litigation might lie, whether funding is possible or not, whether the language in the SPA relative to funding is really how it's going to work. DDA Edwards said yes, the plan is in effect at this point. The Court made a decision that the character of the fees that have been paid thus far are 278b impact fees and under those fees statutory scheme there is a refund provision for five years and ten years. What the Court did not decide and why the case is still inviable at this point is whether or not the owners and developers who filed the final parcel maps and paid those fees throughout the course of the life of that plan waive the right to those refunds and that is an issue that has not been decided by the Courts. So, according to the Court they are impact fees and refunds are due after ten years for any of the improvements that are not built unless they waive them. That is the issue that is still on the table. That is set for trial later this year. DDA Edwards said he doesn't anticipate it going to trial because of the lag in discovery that has been going on. The case has been dismissed as to everyone and every piece of property in "the plan" except for the Newell's and 1 five acre parcel that they own in that plan. All the others have been dismissed for either statute of limitations or ripeness grounds. Some of the ripeness plaintiffs may have suits that have come online in the meantime or will be coming online shortly and may wish to rejoin the fight. That is the status of "the plan" itself. DDA Edwards also spoke about sequential mapping as indicated in NRS Chapter 278. DDA Edwards said he thought Mr. Lloyd could rely on TMFPD standard comments to refer to Chapter 60. Mr. Rubio noted, TMFPD comments, whether here or not, will still be approving whatever conditions are going to be required for individual buildings to be built on each parcel. They will be applied at the permitting stage. Mr. Young suggested the developer contact Denise Reynolds with TMFPD to get their requirements as they move down the road.

Mr. Gump noted line #1 has language stating "owner's certificate in dedication...and does hereby offer the area of roadway easements for ingress and egress and public utility purposes". Mr. Chesney said the SPA calls for a road from the SPA to SR445 by the developers, a spine road from the development to SR445. Are we throwing that away? Are we going to allow people who don't contribute to the GID to use those roads and everyone else pays for the maintenance of the roads and the developer gets a free ride. Mr. Gump said there would be discussion between the civil engineer, Walt West, and Jason Gilles. Mr. Gilles said he has had numerous talks with Walt about access to the site; how the County will rigorously enforce the fact they will have to pave roads to their standards and to say it's a free ride, there are existing roadways, in the area, that were built over the

last 20 – 30 years by the other developers has him confused. Mr. Chesney said this development doesn't pay into the GID so that means all the other residents in Palomino Valley who pay into the GID, which maintains and improves those roads are paying for the developer who is not contributing anything to the maintenance of the roads. That is a free ride. Brian Murphy, the applicant, said for each parcel they finalize they will have to pay \$6700+ into a pot and with 15 lots that is \$125000+ the developer is giving to the county. Mr. Chesney said the county doesn't own those roads, they don't maintain them. Mr. Murphy said the SPA that was designed, they are trying to follow those guidelines and if you expect the property owner to bring in a four lane road in for five miles, we can't. The land is worthless. Mr. Chesney reiterated the developer will not be paying towards the maintenance of the roads they will use for access.

Vahid Behmaram, Water Management Planning, asked if municipal water and sewer were anticipated in the SPA in the future, since they are applying subdivision conditions, would it be appropriate to include a condition; when those services become available that individual lots connect. Mr. Murphy asked if the homeowner would get their two and a half acre-feet of dedicated water back if they connect to municipal water. Mr. Behmaram said the water is dedicated whether they are on domestic or municipal water. There is no refund. Mr. Simpson said there was precedence set by previous parcel map in this area, where that condition was used. The current status of that facility plan is unknown. It makes sense to put that condition on but it brings up another concern which is utilities, water, and wastewater for the valley. Mr. Rubio stated the problem with putting that condition on is who is enforcing the requirement once the utilities go in the ground because then there is a requirement for a connection fee and abandonment of a system that is currently functioning at that time. Typically, with Washoe County Health District regulations, they are only required to connect to sewer upon failure of an existing system and if an existing structure is within 400' of the connection point to municipal services. He cautioned the board about adding comments on a map that were impossible to enforce in the future because the services were not there or services become available. Mr. Rubio suggested meeting with DDA Edwards and Leslie Admirand about how to craft language that would meet their needs, legally. Mr. Simpson voiced his concern that some agency conditions aren't being addressed as the serial parcels need to be treated as a subdivision which need to have specific things worked out. He is struggling to come up with satisfying all the things required by NRS. Mr. Rubio thought that he and Mr. Simpson could come up with a standard comment that would fit and bring it back to planning and make sure it would meet the requirements of all the agencies.

Mr. Chesney told Mr. Young he thought he should abstain from voting on this item. DDA Edwards asked Mr. Chesney for a basis for abstaining. Mr. Chesney said he is a resident of Palomino Valley and pays into the GID; he has a vested interest in what goes on with the maintenance and cost of the roads there. He doesn't believe he can fairly vote on this issue. DDA Edwards suggested Mr. Chesney may have a pecuniary interest because he lives within the boundaries of Palomino Valley GID and pays into them, but DDA Edwards feels Mr. Chesney's commitment in a private capacity is better suited for abstaining from voting as he has personal feelings about the item because he lives there and that gives him trouble approaching the item from an impartial standpoint. DDA Edwards asked Mr. Chesney to leave the room if he was going to recuse himself. Mr. Chesney left the room. DDA Edwards said when there is a legal recusal it reduces the quorum and the votes needed to pass. It is still a majority. There are four members present and the majority would be three.

Mr. Young asked Mr. Simpson what the things are that he is struggling with in regards to NRS requirements. Mr. Simpson said he wasn't fully satisfied with the access; (ie: how the roads are going to be improved) all he sees is what's inside the property boundaries. He'd like to see off-site delineation of how it's going to look finally. The fire; he would really like to have some comments from fire. The water comment; hooking up to municipal water and sewer. He feels they need to be ironed out in order for him to fully support this project.

Mr. Gilles stated he has given Mr. West exhibits that show their access plan. The issues have to be worked out in the development agreement. Mr. Lloyd asked DDA Edwards, seeing as how this still requires a development agreement which is an approval through the county commission, is there any way they can craft a standard condition, to address the concerns that are being raised, with the

approval of a development agreement. DDA Edwards said he would be cautious about that. When imposing conditions, they need to be reasonably understandable at the time they are imposed and not left open to some sort of vacuum in the future. He thinks they could say, "adequate proof of secondary access will be provided on the final map", something like that. You could get specific with something that will happen in the future or needs to happen in the future but cautioned against being vague or leaving the condition open ended.

Mr. Behmaram acknowledged what Mr. Rubio said was true and it also applies to water. When a septic system fails there are regulations in place to compel the property owner, at their expense, to convert. The same is available within the water law. When the well fails the state engineer has the discretion to prevent them from re-drilling or deepening the well and connecting to the water system. Those safety nets are in place but this is a subdivision, what we do here will set a precedence that can affect us for the future as this area gets developed. Mr. Rubio added it is also extremely variable and we must be careful because of the plan that was put in place 20 years ago, will these services ever be there. Under what conditions are we going to require these things to happen. There are distances in regulation for how these things are applied so the wording on the map will have to be choice because if our regulations change then either the map becomes a problem or the regulations becomes a problem, in the future. That may put the onus on the property owner at the time. They are buying into an unknown situation.

Mr. Dennis said it was very wise for the Committee to think about avoiding the septic tank problems and water issues that have been coming up around our area. He continued; it seems they are taking the area out of the SPA by connecting the SPA to access roads that are not part of the SPA so how does the committee deal with the infrastructure of all the additional housing and we as a GID have a real hard time maintaining the roads on a shoestring budget. The infrastructure and maintenance costs for the SPA go to the county yet the roads are connected from the SPA to the GID grid. How do we deal with the financials of the GID that really needs, now a paved road when we do a connection to the SPA and the developer is saying they can't afford to buy three to four miles of road and at the same time the GID can't afford more traffic on these chip seal road. It's not even a durable road. It doesn't hold up. We did it as a last ditch effort because we had so many problems out there that we put the chip seal down and almost spent our whole yearly budget trying to keep that maintained. A lot of average daily traffic comes out going back and forth to town and those dirt roads don't work. Mr. Dennis asked the committee to address that issue. Mr. Dennis added, the financial plan that was done in 1996 doesn't begin to address the cost of roads that need to be put in place. Mr. Young answered saying the financial funding set up in the SPA doesn't address the needs and some of those needs are Palomino Valley GID's. Part of the legacy of that plan is that the timing of how they thought it would work is never going to happen so the timing of development and funding has not been as anticipated. We don't have a provision, rules, or code that says we have to compensate the GID even though everything you've said makes sense. Mr. Dennis responded; that is why the GID opposed the SPA connection to the GID roads.

Mr. Simpson explained to Walt West, who arrived at the meeting, that the developer has said they have adequate secondary access for the proposed subdivision. Mr. West said he believed there was a condition requiring a secondary access. Mr. Simpson asked if the developer has satisfied Mr. West requirements regarding documents outlining easements that have been acquired to construct the secondary access. Mr. West asked Mr. Gilles to speak to that. Mr. Gilles said he provided Mr. West with an exhibit that showed alternate means of access, publicly dedicated roads, and easements in the area. They showed three routes that were viable. Mr. Gilles is not sure he shared with Mr. West the easements they've gained as that is a private matter for the owner. They are only required to provide those at the time of recording the map providing improvements. Mr. Gilles said in response to his correspondence with Mr. West, Mr. West provided a letter to Roger Pelham, the planner, and himself amending condition 5(ff). Mr. Young asked Mr. West if he had seen secondary access alternatives that are viable. Mr. Gump said he believed the recorded document to support their access is there. Mr. Simpson asked when a subdivision comes into the county commission for approval do they have to show alternatives for primary and secondary access. Mr. Lloyd said typically if it's not shown it is a condition. Mr. Simpson stated the concern he has is if it's not in the

packet to go out to the reviewing agencies, the agencies don't get to comment or have the knowledge base to make a reasonable decision.

Mr. Rubio crafted the following language regarding municipal water and sewer: "if municipal water and/or sewer become available, the parcel must abandon the existing well or septic system upon failure of the domestic well and/or failure of the existing septic system in accordance with WCHD regulations." That would reinforce how we currently operate and do business regarding any municipal service. This will be a note that is required on the map.

Mr. Simpson reiterated he didn't think he had all the information necessary for him to approve these tentative parcel maps. He felt there was additional information that needed to be gathered and presented.

Mr. Rubio told Mr. Gilles and the applicant that one of his conditions was tentative parcel map WTPM17-0015 record first, if it does not, it will not record at two and a half acres per Washoe County Health District regulations Section 040.030.

Wes Rubio 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 Tentative Parcel Map Case Numbers WTPM17-0015, WTPM17-0017, WTPM17-0018, WTPM17-0019 and WTPM17-0020 for LW Land Company, LLC, subject to the conditions of approval included as Exhibit A with the staff report, and make the determination that the following criteria is or will be adequately provided for pursuant to Washoe County Code, Section 110.606.30, with the addition of the comment on the mylar "if municipal water and/or sewer become available, the parcel must abandon the existing well or septic system upon failure of that domestic well and/or failure of the existing septic system in accordance with WCHD regulations" along with modification of condition 5(i). Mike Gump seconded the motion. The motion passed (three in favor, one against).

- 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.

- 2) Subdivision improvement considerations for second or subsequent parcel maps pursuant to Washoe County Code, Section 110.606.30(d) and which are in addition to the criteria listed above.

Mr. Rubio noted he had been corresponding with Denise Reynolds, with TMFPD, and she indicated there would be no fire hydrants installed in the subdivision as there is no municipal water service in the area. At this point, Mr. Rubio believes, if there is no existing water infrastructure, the home, more than likely will be required to have a sprinkler system. These requirements will be addressed at the time a building permit is issued.

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 3:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna Fagan, Recording Secretary

Approved by Committee in session on _____, 2018.

Eric Young, Chair
Senior Planner