



WASHOE COUNTY PARCEL MAP REVIEW COMMITTEE DRAFT Meeting Minutes

Parcel Map Review Committee Members

Thursday, October 10, 2019
2:00 p.m.

Larry Chesney, Planning Commission
James English, Health District
Tim Simpson, Environmental Engineer
Wayne Handrock, Engineering
Charles Moore, 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, October 10, 2019, 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)
Wayne Handrock, Engineering
Eric Young, Planning and Building
Health District
Wes Rubio (alternate)
Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District
Charles Moore

Members Absent: Community Services Department (CSD)
Tim Simpson
Planning Commission
Larry Chesney

Staff present: Roger Pelham, Senior Planner, Planning and Building
Chris Bronczyk, Planner, Planning and Building
Sophia Kirschenman, Park 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

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, Charles Moore moved to approve the agenda of October 10, 2019, as written. The motion, seconded by Wayne Handrock, passed unanimously.

6. Possible action to approve September 12, 2019 Draft Minutes

Wes Rubio moved to approve the September 12, 2019 draft minutes, as written. The motion was seconded by Wayne Handrock and passed unanimously.

7. Project Review Items

A. Tentative Parcel Map Case Number WTPM19-0011 (Falcon Ridge PM1) – For possible action, hearing, and discussion to approve a parcel map to divide the remainder parcel No. 1 from Subdivision Tract Map #5302 which is 6,918 sf (0.16 acre) parcel into four lots. Lot 1A will be 1,733 sf; Lot 1B will be 1,733 sf, Lot 1C will be 1,725 sf, and Lot 1D will be 1,725 sf.

- Applicant/Property Owner: Falcon Ridge by Desert Wind LP
- Location: 0 Falcon Rock Lane
- APN: 035-731-21
- Parcel Size: 0.16 Acres (6,918 SF)
- Master Plan: Urban Residential (UR)
- Regulatory Zone: Light Density Urban (LDU)
- Area Plan: Sun Valley
- Citizen Advisory Board: Sun Valley
- Development Code: Authorized in Article 606, Parcel Maps
- Commission District: 3 – Commissioner Jung
- 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 September 24, 2019.

Mr. Bronczyk noted this was a unique tentative parcel map request. It is an existing common open space subdivision that was applied for and approved in 2014, TM14-0003 Falcon Ridge. The applicant came in for an extension and amendment of conditions in 2018. Now there are two remaining parcels within their original TM14-0003. What they are requesting is to subdivide the last remaining parcel into four similarly sized parcels within this common open space development. There is one conditions approved in 2018, condition 1(i), which states the applicant shall construct a traffic signal at the intersection of the project entrance, El Rancho Drive and Moor Park Court to be funded 100% by the developer prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy of the 143rd unit of Falcon Ridge and/or Falcon Ridge IV. Because this is a common open space development there are no minimum lot sizes or minimum lot widths. Mr. Bronczyk also noted there was some discussion with Planning and Engineering requesting a 10,500 sq. foot portion of the northern property line provided to the existing parcel. In doing so, that would create a fifth parcel and kick in subdivision requirements. Another condition was created to alleviate that situation, condition 1(h), the applicant

will be required to do a boundary line adjustment providing the southern property that 10,500 sq. foot common open space to allow for this parcel map to go through.

Eric Young ask Mr. Bronczyk what this parcel is that they are subdividing now. Was this contemplated in December 2018 when Falcon Ridge was done. Mr. Bronczyk opined the intent was an amendment of conditions. However, there was a misunderstanding between the applicant and Washoe County staff. At the time Washoe County didn't get any indication the applicant was going to come forward with these four parcels. In discussion with the engineer and surveyor who did this, they felt they met the requirements of density and common open space area to allow for this without a boundary line adjustment. Roger Pelham added, this is a remainder parcel which was originally intended to probably be a common amenity but it was not a requirement. Later the design changed and they are going to be dividing this into four development parcels instead of common amenity parcels. The additional 10,000 sq. feet of common area needs to be added so the overall density associated with this parcel map is met. Mr. Young asked what the public input at the time the original subdivision was relative to how much open space there would be, where it would be, how many parcels there would be, how much density there would be. Does this change make it significantly different than what was expected at the time this was originally adopted. Mr. Bronczyk said with the 2007, 2014, and 2018 approvals there is no substantial difference in adding these four parcels because the specific plan has put in motion requirements that would kick off the primary concerns that were raised within those development proposals which is the traffic signal. That was the biggest concern related to this development, at that time. Mr. Pelham added, adding the four parcels is about a 3% change of the overall \pm 160 proposed parcels. Mr. Young asked how much the percentage of open space will change. Mr. Pelham said it is roughly the same because of the 10,000 sq. feet being added in Falcon Ridge for the parcels being added at Falcon Ridge north which will be accounted for with the boundary line adjustment. Mr. Young noted the "open space" is not changing with the subsequent changes to the development. DDA Nathan Edwards followed up, he understands from the explanation, this was intended to be a clubhouse or similar and not open field or trails. Mr. Pelham said that was correct. DDA Edwards confirmed, a clubhouse was not required, meaning this was not territory that was supposed to be left open under the tentative map that was approved and now being proposed for further subdivision for new residential structures. Mr. Pelham said that is correct. DDA Edwards asked, in Mr. Pelham's view, is this in conflict with the tentative map that was approved or is it consistent with it. Mr. Pelham said it was consistent. DDA Edwards noted it was unusual to have a stop light in the conditions. Is the developer in agreement or it something they've objected to but is being recommended anyway. Mr. Bronczyk said the developer is aware of the requirement. At first, they objected due to their interpretation of the timing so with discussion between the county and the City of Sparks, who controls that roadway, they believed the best language would be, after the 143rd certificate of occupancy. DDA Edwards asked if the applicant still objects to that. Mr. Bronczyk said he believes they only objected to the timing, not the requirement. They wanted to record these four lots and move forward. Chief Moore asked if the lot size was consistent with the existing lot size. Mr. Bronczyk said yes. Chief Moore asked the size of the unit that could be placed there since the lots are fairly small. Mr. Bronczyk said this is a proposed townhome community so they will fit and be consistent with the remainder of the subdivision. Chief Moore asked if there was any promise of a clubhouse. Mr. Bronczyk said throughout this application there may have been an indication of a clubhouse or open space in this location but nothing requiring a clubhouse. Mr. Pelham added, the clubhouse was a possibility not a requirement. Chief Moore said maybe the applicant can speak to whether they marked the subdivision with the intent of a clubhouse.

Curtis Rowe, the developer, said they bought the project. The previous final map was an apartment, for rent, so they had the clubhouse for apartment goers. They turned it into single family, for sale, so that went away. They haven't closed their first house yet. The reason they requested 142 was because they weren't sure if they wanted to build the streetlight because the base statute says once we get to 143 we are committed to build. When they mapped their first lots this was four parcels that we had originally that we left as a remainder piece. The piece across the north is an approved tentative map. We will end up with about 196 units and would have already had the streetlight built but they got pushed back and forth between Sparks with a jurisdictional issue that took a long time. They didn't care, they would do whatever. They got the final redline. Sparks will take

jurisdiction and Washoe County will own it and by next week should have approval then about 16 – 18 weeks to procure the streetlight. That was a timing issue.

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

DDA Edwards noted, it has been referenced several times this is slightly unorthodoxed, meaning not something we commonly see in tentative parcel map applications but he wanted to point out, for the Committee's consideration, NRS 278.327 does state expressly that approval of any map pursuant to any provisions of NRS 278.010 – 278.630, inclusive, does not itself prohibit further division of the lots, parcels, or lot described but any such division shall conform to the applicable provisions of those sections. In basic terms that statute says, the fact there was a subdivision and tentative map approved does not prohibit further division of the lots within it, in and of itself.

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 Parcel Map Case Number WTPM19-0011 for Falcon Ridge, 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. Charles Moore 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.

B. Tentative Parcel Map Case Number WTPM19-0013 (Hicks) – For possible action, hearing, and discussion to approve a tentative parcel map dividing a ±8.63-acre parcel into two (2) parcels of ±5.6 acres and ±3.03 acres in size.

- Applicant: Christopher J. Hicks
- Property Owner: Hicks Family Trust
- Location: 9200 Timothy Dr., Reno, NV 89511
- APN: 040-640-05

- Parcel Size: ±8.63 Acres
- Master Plan: 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
- Staff: Sophia Kirschenman, Park Planner
Washoe County Community Services Department
Planning and Building Division
- Phone: 775.328.3623
- Email: skirschenman@washoecounty.us

DDA Edwards recused himself as legal advisor on this item as the Hicks family is connected to the head of the DA's office. He contacted the Reno City Attorney's office and cleared the reliance on them to act as counsel for this item. Brian Sooudi, from the Reno City Attorney's office, is present here today and be handling the item. DDA Edwards will be leaving the room for the duration of this item.

Eric Young opened the public hearing. Sophia Kirschenman, park planner, reviewed her staff report dated September 13, 2019.

Wes Rubio submitted conditions that were not available to the planner at the time the staff report was complete. Mr. Rubio said they are standard conditions for the Health District. Prior to the final approval the existing house on parcel 1 has to demonstrate that it meets all the current requirements for septic systems on it. The system needs to be located. If there are not current records or it cannot be identified in the field the applicant will have to show where equal area for repair area is. If the current one does not meet the minimum requirements, that fine, they just need to show the Health District an available area for a new primary and repair. They do not ask you to install anything unless they are trying to cut it off with a parcel line. That is on the existing parcel. Parcel 2 is required to have a test trench. A permit can be obtained at the Health District. That has to be completed and documentation brought forward with the parcel map for a signature.

Larry Hicks, the applicant, said he was interested in Mr. Rubio's comment regarding the septic on the existing home site. He asked what the requirement are, for septic. Mr. Rubio said any time they are changing a lot, from when it was originally developed, they need to know where the septic system is because they are placing a new parcel line on that lot and there are setbacks to the property line for all septic systems. They want to make sure it's not being cut off and placed on a separate parcel. If that is the case, one of two things would have to happen; either the parcel line would have to change or the septic location would have to change, it would have to be abandoned and install a new one. That is meeting the general regulations. Also, they require any new change in the lot size or placement, thereof, requires the current septic system meet requirements of the regulation. With that said, if it was built 40 years ago, it may not meet our current sizing requirements, and that's okay, as long as it is not in a failing status, meaning there is no sewage on the ground. They are asking the applicant to plot a new area, on the lot, for a new primary that meets the size requirements and plot an additional repair area. Washoe County requires a primary system, which is currently installed and being used, and a repair area that is designated to make sure it doesn't get built on because septic systems fail. If it doesn't currently meet requirements we find area enough to make sure you can meet requirements and document it on a plot map.

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

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 Parcel Map Case Number WTPM19-0013 for Christopher J. Hicks, subject to the conditions of approval included as Exhibit A with the staff report, the additional conditions submitted by the Health District, and make the determination that the following criteria is or

will be adequately provided for pursuant to Washoe County Code, Section 110.606.30. Charles Moore 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.

DDA Edwards returned as counsel for the Parcel Map Review Committee.

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 2:42 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna Fagan, Recording Secretary

Approved by Committee in session on _____, 2019

Eric Young, Chair
Senior Planner

DRAFT