PARCELS LESS THAN \( \frac{1}{3} \) ACRE (14,520 ft\(^2\))

22 PARCELS - ALMOST 40%
Some undevelopable land is not set aside as open space. (Section 1.6)

\[ \frac{1}{3} \text{ acre} = 14,520 \text{ ft}^2 \]

| 1  | 20,206 | 21 | 13,750 | 41 | 13,291 |
| 2  | 17,232 | 22 | 13,750 | 42 | 13,465 |
| 3  | 17,483 | 23 | 13,750 | 43 | 14,478 |
| 4  | 19,631 | 24 | 19,580 | 44 | 14,478 |
| 5  | 19,795 | 25 | 15,447 | 45 | 13,200 |
| 6  | 12,020 | 26 | 13,750 | 46 | 15,212 |
| 7  | 12,049 | 27 | 13,750 | 47 | 31,955 |
| 8  | 25,979 | 28 | 13,750 | 48 | 35,836 |
| 9  | 37,774 | 29 | 13,750 | 49 | 75,597 |
| 10 | 16,666 | 30 | 15,136 | 50 | 35,788 |
| 11 | 15,917 | 31 | 13,750 | 52 | 31,250 |
| 12 | 34,950 | 32 | 15,351 | 53 | 30,985 |
| 13 | 27,969 | 33 | 13,200 | 54 | 64,492 |
| 14 | 23,469 | 34 | 13,245 | 55 | 55,099 |
| 15 | 19,241 | 35 | 13,200 | 56 | 74,441 |
| 16 | 19,225 | 36 | 13,200 | 57 | 69,653 |
| 17 | 22,427 | 37 | 13,200 | 58 | 29,061 |
| 18 | 13,750 | 38 | 13,200 |
| 19 | 13,507 | 39 | 16,684 | *1 |
| 20 | 13,750 | 40 | 21,234 |

22 parcels is 14,520 ft² (almost 40%)
 ADDRESS FINDINGS

1) PLAN CONSISTENCY - THAT THE PROPOSED MAP IS CONSISTENT WITH THE MASTER PLAN AND ANY SPECIFIC PLAN

2) DESIGN OR IMPROVEMENT - THAT THE DESIGN OR IMPROVEMENT OF THE PROPOSED SUBDIVISION IS CONSISTENT WITH THE MASTER PLAN AND ANY SPECIFIC PLAN

SPECIFICALLY - SOUTH VALLEYS AREA PLAN
GOAL TWO - COMMON DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS IN THE SOUTH VALLEYS PLANNING AREA.

... Policy 5V.2.2 - Grading for Residential Purposes

IN APPLICATION APPLICANT STATES:

Item 19 - 230,922 Cuyds Earthwork

Item 20 - All material will be transferred within the project boundary

Picture a football field as a block filled with dirt to a height almost equal to its width. That's how much earthwork.
WHERE IS THIS DIRT GOING?

LAST PAGE OF APPLICATION SHOWS CROSS SECTIONS OF SUBDIVISION AS SHOWN.
THIS IS WHERE THEY GO.

SHOW SLIDE 3.
THESE ARE SUBMITTED CROSS SECTIONS.

THE RED AREAS ARE THE AREAS TO BE FILLED IN WITH DIRT.

* BASICLY THE ENTIRE CENTER OF THE SUBDIVISION IS TO BE LEVELLED WITH INFILL.

DESTROYS NATURAL TOPOGRAPHY, CONTOURS, SLOPES, LANDSCAPE, CHARACTERISTICS, AND EXISTING VEGETATION & GROUND COVER.

WHERE IS THE DIRT COMING FROM?
APPLICANT STATES EARTHWORKS COMING FROM SITE (231,000 CYL).  

SLIDE 4.
THE PURPLE AREAS SHOW WHERE MAJOR CUTS WILL OCCUR. ABOUT 17 AREAS OF SIGNIFICANT DISTURBANCE - NOT JUST LEVELING THE BUILDING PAD - BUT CUTS OR LEVELING OF SLOPES & FEATURES.

SLIDE 5. LET'S REVIEW SOUTH VALLEYS POLICY 2.2.
HILLSIDE DEVELOPMENT - DEVELOPMENT CODE ARTICLE

SLIDE 6

ANY UNSUITABLE AREA MUST BE PLACED IN

PERMANENT OPEN SPACE - STEEPER AREAS

WILL GENERALLY BE INCLUDED IN OPEN SPACE.

PLACE DWELLINGS ON NATURAL SLOPE AND

PRESCRIBE THE HILLSIDE

GRADING MUST MIMIC THE NATURAL CONTOUR

OF THE LAND

ARTICLE 408- COMMON OPEN SPACE
Goal Two: Common Development Standards in the South Valleys planning area. Establish development guidelines that will implement and preserve the community character commonly found within the South Valleys planning area.

Policies

SV.2.1 New development should be consistent with Low Impact Development (LID) standards and guidelines. The use of curb and gutter will be discouraged. Pedestrian facilities should utilize alternative design and materials to avoid traditional sidewalk appearance. Proposals for the construction of curb, gutter, or traditional concrete sidewalks must be justified by demonstrating benefit to the health, safety and welfare of the community. Low Impact Development standards for the management of drainage are encouraged. To the greatest extent possible, Washoe County shall employ Best Management Practices that encourage recharge, minimize land disturbance and control erosion as determined by the Washoe County Department of Public Works.

SV.2.2 Whenever possible, grading for residential purposes after the date of final adoption of this plan will:

South Valley Master Plan

a. Minimize disruption to natural topography.

b. Utilize natural contours and slopes.

c. Complement the natural characteristics of the landscape.

d. Preserve existing vegetation and ground coverage to minimize erosion.

e. Minimize cuts and fills.

SV.2.3 Site development plans in the South Valleys planning area must submit a plan for the control of noxious weeds. The plan should be developed through consultation with the Washoe County District Health Department, the University of Nevada Cooperative Extension, and/or the Washoe-Storey Conservation District. The control plan will be implemented on a voluntary compliance basis.

SV.2.4 Applicants required to present their items to the Citizen Advisory Board (CAB) must submit a statement to staff regarding how the final proposal responds to the community input received from the CAB.

SV.2.5 Proposals for residential development projects must include a process for ensuring that potential homeowners in the project area are provided adequate notice regarding the existence of livestock and the potential for accompanying noise and odor throughout the South Valleys planning area.

SV.2.6 During review of tentative maps and other development proposals, the Planning Commission will review the adequacy of the minimum standards established by this plan; and upon a finding that a standard is inadequate to implement these goals, may impose other similar standards as necessary to implement the relevant goal. Said similar standards may include, but are not limited to, perimeter parcel matching and alternative construction materials.

SV.2.7 Any lighting proposed must show how it is consistent with current Best Management Practices "dark-sky" standards. In subdivisions established after the date of final adoption of this Plan, the use of streetlights will be minimized.

SV.2.8 Street lights, security lights and other outdoor lighting should be powered by solar or other renewable energy sources whenever possible.

SV.2.9 Perimeter fencing must be consistent with an "open fencing" concept. The use of block, concrete, or similar material should be limited to posts, pillars and similar uses and not used for panel or wall sections. Perimeter fencing on individual parcels is optional. Plans for the maintenance of perimeter fences will be submitted with tentative map applications or non-residential site plans.
New development should be consistent with Low Impact Development (LID) standards and guidelines. The use of curb and gutter will be discouraged. Pedestrian facilities should utilize alternative design and materials to avoid traditional sidewalk appearance. Proposals for the construction of curb, gutter, or traditional concrete sidewalks must be justified by demonstrating benefit to the health, safety and welfare of the community. Low Impact Development standards for the management of drainage are encouraged. To the greatest extent possible, Washoe County shall employ Best Management Practices that encourage recharge, minimize land disturbance and control erosion as determined by the Washoe County Department of Public Works.

Whenever possible, grading for residential purposes after the date of final adoption of this plan will:

- Minimize disruption to natural topography.
- Utilize natural contours and slopes.
- Complement the natural characteristics of the landscape.
- Preserve existing vegetation and ground coverage to minimize erosion.
- Minimize cuts and fills.

Site development plans in the South Valleys planning area must submit a plan for the control of noxious weeds. The plan should be developed through consultation with the Washoe County District Health Department, the University of Nevada Cooperative Extension, and/or the Washoe-Storey Conservation District. The control plan will be implemented on a voluntary compliance basis.

Applicants required to present their items to the Citizen Advisory Board (CAB) must submit a statement to staff regarding how the final proposal responds to the community input received from the CAB.

Proposals for residential development projects must include a process for ensuring that potential homeowners in the project area are provided adequate notice regarding the existence of livestock and the potential for accompanying noise and odor throughout the South Valleys planning area.

During review of tentative maps and other development proposals, the Planning Commission will review the adequacy of the minimum standards established by this plan; and upon a finding that a standard is inadequate to implement these goals, may impose other similar standards as necessary to implement the relevant goal. Said similar standards may include, but are not limited to, perimeter parcel matching and alternative construction materials.

Any lighting proposed must show how it is consistent with current Best Management Practices "dark-sky" standards. In subdivisions established after the date of final adoption of this Plan, the use of streetlights will be minimized.

Street lights, security lights and other outdoor lighting should be powered by solar or other renewable energy sources whenever possible.

Perimeter fencing must be consistent with an "open fencing" concept. The use of block, concrete, or similar material should be limited to posts, pillars and similar uses and not used for panel or wall sections. Perimeter fencing on individual parcels is optional. Plans for the maintenance of perimeter fences will be submitted with tentative map applications or non-residential site plans.
Colleen Morissette <cmorissette@remsa-cf.com>

Tuesday, October 1, 2019 12:41 PM

Nelson, Kate S.

Pelham, Roger

Case WTM19-001 Pleasant valley Estates
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[NOTICE: This message originated outside of Washoe County -- DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.]

Dear Ms. Nelson,

Thank you for your service to the commission.

Please see attached photos of Chance Lane (10/01/19), this is the primary access for the the planned community-WTM19-001 Pleasant valley Estates. Chance Lane is very narrow and it is my understanding from local residents that the road was blasted out of rock (see photos) and any effort at widening will be very difficult.

In addition, I have concern that the project (WTM19-001) does not meet or maintain the rural character of the area, that the density planned is to high and that the cultural heritage of the area is not being protected (Piute Tribe grave marker). I believe the quality of life for the current residents, myself included would be compromised by this project.

I respectfully request that the commission take this and numerous other concerns into into consideration when reviewing the plan. In addition to the vote by the CAB last month to deny the project.

Thank you for your time and attention on this matter.

Colleen Morissette RN
775-313-8011 Mobile
CMorissette@remsa-cf.com

This message (and any associated files) is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is confidential, subject to copyright or constitutes a trade secret. If you are not the intended recipient you are hereby notified that any dissemination, copying or distribution of this message, or file associated with this message, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by calling 775.858.5700 or by replying to the message and deleting it from your computer. Messages sent to us and from us may be monitored. Internet communications cannot be guaranteed to be secured or error-free as information could be intercepted, lost, destroyed, arrive late or incomplete, or contain
viruses. Any views or opinions presented are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of REMSA.
Dear CAB,

My name is Mike Schuler, owner of 2215 Rhodes Road and 145 Ox Yoke Lane. We own roughly 61 acres with 2 homes. Our property is our primary residence and primary consists of raising cattle/hay. Our current home sits roughly 50 lineal feet from Caddy Creek (Hardin Creek) and 6 feet above it. We actually built it roughly 6ft higher than required by the county. See the pictures from the past few years flooding. This particular creek is the natural drainage for said proposed development.

One of our concerns for this proposed development is the existing drainage it shall use for flood waters in the hydrology report. Currently all drainage/flooding goes to south side of property through a 24” existing culvert and it eventually heads west under Rhodes Road via Caddy Creek to Steamboat Creek. The mountains to the south also fills the Big Ditch and dumps into Caddy Creek. With the proposed excess lots, this water will sheet off the hillside due to roads, rocks, roofs, concrete driveways and asphalt streets, hard landscaping ect. and NOT allow the ground to absorb water, thus increasing flooding potential to ALL neighbors along the drainage. This includes Rhodes Road, and further west to Cedar Lane (which is constantly under water). Please reference appendix B figure 2 and 3. Caddy Creek also takes on water from Toll Road to Virginia Highlands.

A proposed detention pond on the south side of property may capture some of the water but will NOT prevent the annual flooding our valley has received for the last 4 years or so. Like everyone else, the winter of 16'-17' hit our valley hard. There is NO County storm water system in our valley. Currently the County lets the water flow onto peoples’ property and The Big Ditch. Supposedly an agreement exists to use the Big Ditch for flood waters however no one enforces neighbors to keep their lateral ditches open during flooding and hence many neighbors are forced to take the flood waters. We being one of them with Hardin/Caddy creek. Our valley receives annual flooding, not just the 5 or 100 year flooding the hydrology report indicates. We are becoming the sister of Swan Lake in Lemmon Valley and receive no attention whatsoever from the County. Homes WILL be flooded out in the future with the proposed 58 lots on 42.8 acres. Please check your newscasts from recent years. The county is always dropping sand and sandbags at 2 locations off of Andrew Lane and at Chance Lane so neighbors can re-direct flooding. This development is going to make it worse.

They are also using our valley as their main access and stating it gives a connection to Toll road. We can actually, in an emergency, escape over the east hills now if necessary. This development is delivering a very roundabout way of access to Toll road and bringing many problems to this valley with no benefits on an already crowded Rhodes Road due to numerous large horse, barns/stables. Excess speeding is always an issue along with the numerous feral horses.

In appendix B, preliminary grading plan-sheet 4 of 7, there is a proposed concrete sidewalk on Chance Lane. This is a rural area and there are NO sidewalks in this valley! Neighbors just freely walk down the streets or ride their horses on the road. This sidewalk does NOT complement the neighborhood whatsoever.

The proposal says Chance Lane will be built to County standards. Just what are these standards? Assuming asphalt, the water will sheet down the gutter to Rhodes Road with nowhere to go. Currently when it hits Rhodes it either south, west, or north. If it goes west it’s going into peoples’ driveway. It can’t go south because it will go nowhere and going north the slope is minimal at best and ditch erosion shall occur due to sandy soil.

Regarding Sheriff’s ability to respond to our valley in a timely matter, this is FALSE. We had an incident in which one of our homes was burglarized. They didn’t show up for days, after numerous calls, because they were ‘Too busy fighting fires in Palomino Valley’ last year, so they said.

I feel Mr. Fry and Rubicon Design Group are just dumping their drainage issues on the valley all in an effort increase the mighty profit dollar knowing the County will NOT do anything about it as prior history has reflected. They are building over the hill and then dumping into our valley. We doubt they’ve ever witnessed the flooding that occurs in this valley. The County knows about it but turns their head due to us being rural in nature. Fine but do not bring the effects of this type of development into our valley. If anyone requires further information, or a site visit in the valley, please let me know and I would be happy to escort a tour of drainage issues. There are also many neighbors that can supply pictures. Thank you for your attention.

Mike and Beth Schuler
2215 Rhodes Road
Reno, NV 89521
Mike@renoseven.com
Beth@renoseven.com
March 7, 2019
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(4) LARGE CONCRETE CULVERTS
WEST SIDE OF RHODES ROAD
LOOKING AT LWDA BOEKE'S
HOUSE
2/2018

RHODES RD & CEDAR