



WASHOE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION Meeting Minutes

Planning Commission Members

Larry Chesney, Chair
Francine Donshick, Vice Chair
James Barnes
Thomas B. Bruce
Sarah Chvilicek
Kate S. Nelson
Trevor Lloyd, Secretary

Tuesday, May 5, 2020
6:30 p.m.

Washoe County Commission Chambers
1001 East Ninth Street
Reno, NV

The Washoe County Planning Commission met in a scheduled session on Tuesday, May 5, 2020, in the Washoe County Commission Chambers, 1001 East Ninth Street, Reno, Nevada.

No members of the public were allowed in the Commission Chambers due to concerns for public safety resulting from the COVID-19 emergency and pursuant to the Governor of Nevada's Declaration of Emergency Directive 006 Section 1 which suspends the requirement in NRS 241.023(1)(b) that there be a physical location designated for meetings of public bodies where members of the public are permitted to attend and participate. This meeting will be held by teleconference only.

The meeting was televised live and replayed on Washoe Channel at: <https://www.washoecounty.us/mgrsoff/Communications/wctv-live.php> also on YouTube at: <https://www.youtube.com/user/WashoeCountyTV>

1. *Determination of Quorum

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

Commissioners present: Larry Chesney, Chair
Francine Donshick, Vice Chair
James Barnes (Remote via Zoom)
Thomas B. Bruce
Sarah Chvilicek
Kate S. Nelson

Staff present: Trevor Lloyd, Secretary, Planning and Building
Dan Cahalane, Planner, Planning and Building
Julee Olander, Planner, Planning and Building
Nathan Edwards, Deputy District Attorney, District Attorney's Office (Remote via Zoom)
Katy Stark, Recording Secretary, Planning and Building
Donna Fagan, Office Support Specialist, Planning and Building

2. *Pledge of Allegiance

Commissioner Nelson led the pledge to the flag.

3. *Ethics Law Announcement

Deputy District Attorney Edwards provided the ethics procedure for disclosures.

4. *Appeal Procedure

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

5. *General Public Comment and Discussion Thereof

Chair Chesney provided an opening statement regarding Zoom procedures. He opened the Public Comment period. There were no requests for public comment; Chair Chesney closed the public comment item.

6. Approval of Agenda

In accordance with the Open Meeting Law, Commissioner Donshick moved to approve the agenda for the May 5, 2020 meeting as written. Commissioner Nelson seconded the motion, which passed unanimously with a vote of six for, none against.

7. Planning Items

A. Tentative Subdivision Map Case Number WTM19-005 (Luxelocker) – For possible action, hearing, and discussion to approve a commercial tentative subdivision map to allow the subdivision of 3.66 acres into 98 commercial condominium lots, for personal storage units, with 2.24 acres of common open space for Luxelocker LLC. The proposal also requests a reduction of the required setbacks to zero on all sides of the lots. If approved, the project will consist of individual storage units within a commercial building that will be available for purchase and ownership by individual owners, as opposed to common ownership and individual unit rentals.

- Applicant: Luxelocker LLC
- Property Owner: Spanish Springs Storage Partnership LLC
- Location: Southeast corner of Ingenuity Ave. & Digital Ct.
- Assessor's Parcel Number: 530-491-13
- Parcel Size: 3.66 acres
- Master Plan Category: Industrial (I)
- Regulatory Zone: Industrial (I)
- Area Plan: Spanish Springs
- Citizen Advisory Board: Spanish Springs
- Development Code: Authorized in Article 406, Building Placement Standards and Article 608, Tentative Subdivision Maps
- Commission District: 4 – Commissioner Hartung
- Prepared by: Julee Olander, Planner Washoe County
Community Services Department
Planning and Building Division
- Phone: 775.328. 3627
- E-Mail: jolander@washoecounty.us

Chair Chesney opened the public hearing. Chair Chesney called for disclosures. There were no Commissioner disclosures.

Julee Olander, Washoe County Planner, provided a staff presentation.

Mr. Lloyd noted setbacks are from internal drive aisles.

Glen Armstrong, Applicant Surveyor, was available to answer any questions.

The Applicant's presentation was shared with the Commissioners. Michael Gordon, Applicant's representative was not present for the meeting. Mr. Lloyd noted what is before the Commission is a tentative subdivision map request; they were granted the building permit. DDA Edwards requested the Applicant's PowerPoint be placed on the website. Mr. Lloyd noted the presentation is being shown in the Chambers which can be viewed on the YouTube channel. The Commission decided to suspend the presentation because not everyone could view it.

Commissioner Chvilicek requested clarification regarding the setback. Mr. Lloyd noted article 406 of Code are Standards for setbacks is based on the regulatory zone. In this case, the regulatory zone is industrial, and the standard setbacks are 15-foot front and 10-foot rear. In this case, the building is already taking place, those setbacks have been met in regard to the public right-a-way from existing adjacent property lines. The proposal here is to allow a setback reduction for the individual units from their internal drive aisles or adjacent units. Mr. Lloyd said this is a unique request for the County. It's fairly common in the country. A few months back, Julee brought forward a code amendment to allow for this type of commercial or industrial use type to be consistent with other jurisdictions around the nation.

Commissioner Bruce asked if any other of these storage units exist in the State of Nevada. Mr. Lloyd said he isn't aware. Commissioner Bruce said he suspects some are in Clark County. He is curious how it's worked out. He asked who regulates these in regard to social distancing in COVID-19. Mr. Lloyd clarified that these are not to be occupied. You cannot stay overnight in these. There is strong language that prohibit staying in there. Commissioner Bruce said he is asking since they have air conditioning and water. He said it's an interesting concept. It may present a lot of problems.

MOTION: Commissioner Donshick moved that, after giving reasoned consideration to the information contained in the staff report and information received during the public hearing, the Washoe County Planning Commission approve, with the conditions included as Exhibit A to this matter, Tentative Subdivision Map Case Number WTM19-005 for Luxelocker LLC, having made all ten findings in accordance with Washoe County Code Section 110.608.25:

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;
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.

Commissioner Chvilicek seconded the motion to approve Tentative Subdivision Map Case Number WTM19-005 for Luxelocker LLC with conditions. DDA Edwards said there were comments popping up on Zoom chat regarding voicemail public comments and how those were addressed. Staff reported there were no voicemails, 311 emails, or any other public comments for this item. Chair Chesney called for the vote. Commissioner Bruce opposed. The motion carried, five in favor, one opposed.

B. Abandonment Case Number WAB20-0001 (Ingenuity Industrial Center) – For possible action, hearing, and discussion to approve the abandonment of a 56ft by 540.5ft portion of the right of way at the north western terminus of Ingenuity Avenue in favor of an access easement and a right of way turn around at the southwestern corner between APN 538-010-11 and 538-161-12. If approved, the abandoned portion of the right of way would become the property of the Ingenuity Industrial Center.

- Applicant: Avenue 55
- Property Owner: Ingenuity Industrial Center
- Location: Approximately 0.5 miles west of the intersection of Pyramid Way and Ingenuity Ave
- Assessor's Parcel Number: 538-010-11
- Parcel Size: 39.53 acres
- Master Plan Category: Industrial
- Regulatory Zone: Industrial
- Area Plan: Spanish Springs
- Citizen Advisory Board: Spanish Springs
- Development Code: Authorized in Article 806
- Commission District: 4 – Commissioner Hartung
- Prepared by: Dan Cahalane, Planner Washoe County
Community Services Department
Planning and Building Division
- Phone: 775.328.3628
- E-Mail: dcahalane@washoecounty.us

Chair Chesney opened the public hearing and called for Commissioner disclosures. There were no disclosures.

Dan Cahalane, Washoe County Planner, provided a staff presentation.

Glen Armstrong, applicant representative, was available to answer any questions.

Staff reported there were no requests for public comment. Chair Chesney closed the public comment period.

MOTION: Commissioner Donshick moved that, after giving reasoned consideration to the information contained in the staff report and information received during the public hearing, the Washoe County Planning Commission approve, with the conditions included as Exhibit A in the staff report, Abandonment Case Number WAB20-0001 for Ingenuity Industrial Center, having made all three findings in accordance with Washoe County Code Section 110.806.20.

1. Master Plan. The abandonment or vacation is consistent with the policies, action programs, standards and maps of the Master Plan and the Spanish Springs Area Plan; and
2. No Detriment. The abandonment or vacation does not result in a material injury to the public; and
3. Existing Easements. Existing public utility easements in the area to be abandoned or vacated can be reasonably relocated to provide similar or enhanced service.

Commissioner Chvilicek seconded the motion to approve Abandonment Case Number WAB20-0001 with conditions. The motion carried unanimously, six in favor, none against.

C. Regulatory Zone Amendment Case Number WRZA20-0004 (Village Parkway Rezone) – For possible action, hearing, and discussion to approve a change of regulatory zoning of ±47.19 acres (±20.04 acres on APN 087-400-23, ±15.67 acres on APN 087-400-24, ±11.456 acres on APN 087-400-11), from Medium Density Suburban (MDS - 3 dwelling units per acre) to High Density Suburban (HDS – 7 dwelling units per acre) on 3 parcels totaling ±124.6 acres. The remaining acreage will remain General Rural. And, if approved, authorize the chair to sign a resolution to this effect.

- Applicant/Property Owner: Lifestyle Homes TND, LLC
- Location: West and Northwest of the intersection of Mudspring Drive and Village Pkwy
- Assessor's Parcel Numbers: 087-400-11, 087-300-23, 087-400-24
- Parcel Size: ±124.6 acres
- Master Plan Category: Suburban Residential (LUT limits density to 5 detached dwellings per acre maximum) and Rural
- Regulatory Zone: Medium Density Suburban (MDS), 3 detached or 5 attached dwelling units per acre maximum; General Rural (GR) 0.25 dwelling units per acre maximum
- Proposed Regulatory Zone: High Density Suburban (HDS) 7 detached or 9 attached dwelling units per acre maximum; General Rural (GR) 0.25 dwelling units per acre maximum
- Area Plan: Cold Springs
- Citizen Advisory Board: North Valleys
- Development Code: Authorized in Article 821
- Commission District: 5 – Commissioner Herman
- Prepared by: Dan Cahalane, Planner Washoe County
Community Services Department
Planning and Building Division
- Phone: 775.328.3628
- E-Mail: dcahalane@washoecounty.us

Chair Chesney opened the public hearing and called for Commissioner disclosures. There were no disclosures.

DDA Edwards noted there are comments in the Zoom chat regarding public comment. For the record, he wanted it stated public comment will take place. Staff reported 311 emails and voicemails will be played and read into the record.

Dan Cahalane, Washoe County Planner, provided a staff presentation.

Mike Railey, Applicant Representative with Christy Corporation, provided a project presentation.

Commissioner Nelson asked about adequate infrastructure and sewer capacity. She asked how much of available sewer capacity would be utilized by the development. Mr. Railey stated he doesn't have the exact numbers but said he has met with County staff and ran the numbers, and it's not taking all the capacity. He said there is ample capacity. Commissioner Nelson said sewer treatment plants that reach 80% capacity are required to start looking at expansions. They are at 50% capacity. She was curious how close it would make them to the 80% capacity. Mr. Railey stated Lifestyle Homes was the number one participant of the construction of that sewer plant knowing that everything was coming on-line. There is buffer available in terms of the capacity. He said the County Engineer didn't raise concerns for the Cold Springs Plant.

Commissioner Chvilicek said this project is in Tier 3 of the Regional Plan which means Tier 1 and Tier 2 need to be built out before Tier 3 could be accessed. Mr. Cahalane said that's not how the Regional Plan is written. He said the Regional Plan prioritizes the density based on the tier. So, Tier 1 and mixed use have in excess of 30 dwelling units per acre down to Tier 2. Tier 3 would be, in this case, Suburban Residential which would be 7 detached units per acre and 9 attached. Commissioner Chvilicek stated the regional land designations are a way of further refine the regional form of prioritizing the area for development. The Regional Plan established regional land designations including mixed use core, Tier 1 land, Tier 2 land, and Tier 3 land in that order. Mr. Cahalane confirmed that is correct. He said prioritization of development is not driven by how applications come in. Commissioner Chvilicek said there has to be justification prior to submitting a plan in a Tier 2 or Tier 3 designation. You are hop scotching over the other areas. Mr. Lloyd thanked Commissioner Chvilicek who is on the Regional Planning Commission. He said such a request falls within the Tier 3 designation because this is not a request to change from Tier 3 into Tier 2. It's under Suburban Residential. Because it's a regulatory zone amendment, this wouldn't be reviewed through Regional Planning. Commissioner Chvilicek said it would be at the tentative map level as it would trigger a regional significance. She said in respect to the Cold Springs Regional plan, she said Mr. Cahalane referenced some parts of the Cold Springs Regional Plan, in terms of division statement of rural heritage, open space and recreation opportunities, and growth kept in balance with infrastructure. She said Mr. Cahalane referenced some parts of the regional plan, but not all parts of the regional plan. The first and foremost is that mission statement to preserve the character of that area. She stated Mr. Cahalane referred to the closest fire station being a half mile away from this development. She asked if that fire station is City of Reno or TMFPD fire station. Mr. Cahalane said it's a TMFPD station. He said TMFPD had no comments on the proposed regulatory zone amendment. She said she thought it was the career station from City of Reno Fire Department. Mr. Lloyd said we can look into that.

Commission Donshick said it was mentioned Parks and Open Space had an issue with access, but in the document, they don't talk about access but rather antelope, sage grass, and mule deer habitat. She said it's in conflict with Resource Management Plan goal 6.1 which they strongly discourage high density development near open space and to consider downward of transitioning

near open space to minimize fire danger. The current proposal is in conflict with these policies as it would encourage high density development near open space area that provides important habitat. She asked how it can go from access concerns to habitat concerns. It's an important conflict to move forward with. Mr. Railey addressed Commissioner Donshick's concerns. He said he doesn't consider this high-density development. It's compatible with what is out there now. It's zoned for development. He said the wildland urban interface concerns get addressed in the next step with tentative map with conditions in order to ensure access to that area is preserved as well as buffers and fire breaks are preserved. It's important that this property has been long slated for development. He said we are not proposing to extend that development boundary any further that what it is today. All of those concerns would be addressed during tentative map process.

Chair Chesney said he reviewed the layout, and the total acreage of the three parcels with development shown on the flat land. He said he walked the property last week. He said west of the property beyond the developable area, it's mostly hillside and steep grades. If this re-zone gets approved, you aren't putting it on the total acreage. You will condense it in the flat land. It's not really 5 units to the acre when you cram the allowable use in the buildable area. Mr. Railey said no, they are not requesting any density transfer off of the general rural portion of the property. He said we are looking at 47 acres down below. Mr. Railey said that 47 acres are zoned MDS which would yield 47x3, and we are proposing to re-zone that to high density suburban which would be 47x5 or 9, if it was attached.

Public Comment via zoom:

Mr. Lloyd made a statement about public comment. DDA Edwards advised to run the public comment timer.

Nick Weaver via Zoom: Asked what they plan to do with the fire district in this whole area. He said there is only one ALS fire engine and not even an ambulance in the area. He asked how you are going to support that many people with a road coming in and out, car crashes, and not even imagining those with medical aid. It takes 20-30 minutes to get an ambulance out there. He asked what the plan was to increase the staffing at the fire station. He asked what the plan is with funding the fire district out here. He said he doesn't believe there will be enough staffing and there needs to be more public safety before adding more homes. Thank you for your time.

Kristen Wright via Zoom: She said she was born and raised in cold Springs for 33 years and have seen this Valley be completely ruins little by little. She said she currently lives on Georgetown which is directly across from the proposed project. She said her back fence would back up to these proposed homes. She said she is against this. She said her mother's house would also back up to these homes. She said she already has 50 to 60 cars per hour on her street from Georgetown to go to Family Dollar Store and 7-11. She said most of them speed about 50 mph. She said we have had four homes hit; we've had four cars hit; she said her children can't even play on the street. She said we have asked for help from the County, but they will not help us. Now you're talking about putting 400 more homes on the road. She said she is very against it. She said we do not have the infrastructure to handle this. The freeway going into town already takes an hour for a morning commute because you guys won't extend the freeway, only to Stead which doesn't help us. There is no way to get out of this Valley unless you were going over towards Susanville. This is not safe; it's not OK. They need to stop building. She said last time we were hunting there were no antelope and now you're adding more homes going out that way. It's not OK. She said this needs to stop now. She said she hopes they think about the residents who have been out there in this Valley who are sick of seeing it ruined. Thank you.

Public comment via 311 emails:

Email from James and Carmen Jones: We are the Jones family, homeowners since 2001, living in the White Lake Ranch subdivision and one of the property owners that will be impacted by this change. Our property borders the undeveloped acres specified. This regulatory zone change request currently appears to have the approval of the Washoe County Planning Commission staff, and we disagree with your recommendation for approval. Specifically, as stated on page 15 of 17, #2 and #3, this change will adversely affect our health, safety, and welfare. It will impact our quality of life in this rural setting and does not represent a more desirable utilization of land. We chose to live in the Cold Springs area because of the dark night sky with minimal light pollution, mountain views, the smell of the sage, low traffic & noise, and active wildlife – all of which would be impacted by this amendment. In addition, as stated on page 8 of 17, Change of Conditions, the justification to increase this density of further development is to address the decrease of available housing in the region. However, the intent of the regional plan outlining the areas of desired growth is to focus development closer to the region's center. And the decrease of available high-density housing is being addressed with several developments now underway that are much closer to the region's center and already have many services in existence that we in Cold Springs do not. I agree with the Washoe County Parks and Open Space Program, one of the agencies that responded to your request for comment. Please consider their recommendation as clearly detailed in Exhibit F. They consider this area to be located within the wildland urban interface and do not support this amendment. Due to the impacts to the wildlife residing in the area and proximity of the subject site, the importance of minimizing development is emphasized, as identified in the Conservation Element of Washoe County's Master Plan. Additionally, an even stronger recommendation to consider a downward transition of densities is advised by them to minimize resource pressure, fire danger and other negative impacts – not doubling the density, as this zone amendment proposes to allow. In addition, there are other issues that have not yet been addressed, as your staff acknowledges in this report. Why would this expansion be approved without first conducting the necessary evaluations, so the consequences of an increase or reduction of development could be clearly understood? The Availability of Facilities starting on page 9 of 17 (and their supporting Exhibits) identifies many items that need further clarification. Certainly, one of those major negative impacts is the lack of transportation support. The Transportation Facilities, as described on pg. 9 clearly shows inadequate roads and alternative services to support the proposed development. One major issue is Hwy 395 being the only paved transportation in/out of the Cold Springs Valley. It is currently 4-lanes with no near-term expansion or improvements planned. The volume on our only paved access road continues to increase – and will increase further as the building of extensive high-density dwellings is now underway just south of us between Stead and Lemon Valley. With the increase use of our only highway, I expect this poses a greater concern to our safety and welfare in Cold Springs even without approval of this proposed change. An impact study is needed and should be completed before approval is considered. And why is the building plan not included as part of this amendment? We are also concerned about our limited ground water which is why a moratorium has been recently placed on further development. We find it interesting the moratorium is sidestepped by stating that another source of water will be shipped in, although if we interpret this issue correctly, there is no water commitment at this time. Another reason the building plan should be developed that includes all details before this is approved. Going back to the initial statements of this Planning Commission Staff Report, in paragraph 3 of page 3: "Regulatory zones are designed to implement and be consistent with the master plan by ensuring that the stability and character of the community will be preserved for those who live and work in the unincorporated areas of the county." Based on input received, departments that have not provided requested comments, and assessments not yet conducted, and most importantly, approval without a building plan for the building of up to 329 multi-stories dwellings, we oppose approval of this proposed regulatory zone change. As local property owners that will be personally impacted by this, thank you again for allowing input. Sincerely, James and Carmen Jones

Email from: James Demestihias. Please do not approve of any more building in the Cold Springs and Village Parkway areas. Especially high-density apartments, condos, townhouses. There is nowhere near enough infrastructure to support such building. Not enough water, roadways, grocery stores, services (auto/laundry/food/retail), no buses, no doctors, no urgent care, no medical/dental offices and zero entertainment venues (movies, music, family, etc...). Find somewhere else to put the low-income, high density housing. Put it closer to existing infrastructure in Reno like Midtown, or better yet south of Reno. There's a lot more room on the other side of 395 if you absolutely have to in the North Valleys. White Lake and Village Parkway areas already see far more traffic at peaks than they were designed for, especially Crystal Canyon Blvd onto White Lake. White Lake will surely be used to get there as the closer exit will not handle all the volume. Thank you for listening and considering the views of the current residents. Thank you, Residents.

Email from Susan Weiler: Please accept this as my official complaint against building apartments in Woodland Village. We thought this was going to be a housing community! Susan Weiler

Email from Shannon Melrose: HI, My Name is Shannon Monticelli Melrose. I have lived in Cold Springs for 42 years. The same location. I have watched this valley grow and grow. The proposed location is in my back yard. I am completely against condos or higher density anything going into the area. There is so much traffic already and should be considered dangerous due to the fact when you try to cross off of Georgetown to Village Parkway it's almost impossible too much traffic and going too fast. This would not be an area you put 3,000 or more cars a day. Not to mention the crime that would go up due to more people. The schools being overloaded again and the fact that these kids out here already have nothing to do. The wildlife and access to the very little desert left out here where our community enjoys hiking and exploring the little mountainside would be demolished for overgrowth and money, what a shame. What about fires? What about the deer and antelope (all wildlife) and the water that comes off that mountain where is it going to go? When you take the vegetation away, are we going to flood like Lemmon Valley? Every morning it smells like sewage from the treatment plant. How much is enough? Our water is depleted, the traffic is horrendous. We are crowded already we cannot have condos or apartments! Very sad to watch over development. Why can't it be a swim center / community center with access to the trails for the community? Please let's not destroy the little we have left and Cold Springs Community! -Shannon Monticelli Melrose

Email from Dian Merrill: I am a homeowner in Woodland Village who lives approximately 4 blocks from the proposed rezoned parcel. I was very upset to see that the very developer who built the subdivision of single-family homes. I live in, is proposing to disrupt our neighborhood by requesting to build a high-density project immediately adjacent to Woodland Village. First of all, I understand that Reno needs more housing, and probably more affordable housing as well, but this proposal is poorly located and does not offer anything to mitigate for increased traffic that will result from such a project. Simply because Lifestyle Homes owns the parcel, perhaps the last one they own that is available to develop, does not warrant increasing the zoning to high density. It is surrounded by suburban homes with lower density and it should be required to fit in with the existing community. The one benefit of living so far away from grocery stores, shopping centers, restaurants, etc. and having to drive quite a distance out of Reno to live, is that we have a semi-rural, quiet environment. The proposed development will annihilate that uncrowded, country feel. Additionally, if Lifestyle Homes thinks it's a good idea to build more affordable, high-density housing out here, Cold Springs has no public transportation, and this is typically needed for such housing. Since it is not a very large parcel, the units will be crammed into a small area, thus not allowing for much of a setback from the main road. I believe this will not fit into the area and will add to congestion, having residents' cars feed directly onto the two-lane road. The parcel in question is located right on the main, mere two-lane road that all Woodland Village homeowners

use to leave home and return to it (Village Parkway). The idea that up to a 189-unit housing complex located directly on this road will not impact traffic enough to warrant upgrading to a 4-lane road is unacceptable. It is only at the point of development that Planning Commissioners can assess fees to the developer to mitigate the need for road infrastructure improvements, and not have the taxpayers and homeowners of Cold Springs be left holding the bag to pay for such improvements when the development is built and the need becomes obvious. My last comment is that in the past I have been a news reporter covering county planning commissions in California, and my experience has been that commissioners are more responsive to developers and their campaign contributions than to the residents and taxpayers of the community they are supposed to serve. Please take into considerations the concerns of us, the people who live here and pay taxes, and give it more weight than simply enriching the developer. Lifestyle Homes can just as easily build another plot of medium-density homes, and while they will not make quite so much money, it will retain the existing atmosphere that we chose to live in, that we enjoy and wish to preserve, and which was the express intended purpose from the outset. I implore you to deny changing the zoning, and act on behalf of the residents of this community. Sincerely, Dian Merrill

Email from Danielle Reinie: Hello, as a resident that lives just off of Village Parkway, I do not feel that this should be rezoned. We do not have the infrastructure to facilitate the amount of people this would bring in. We are a rural community and have chosen to live out here because of this. We do not have the schools, stores, gas stations, water, or roadways to support what is being asked for. It will not be a simple flip of a switch to accommodate this request. Our lives will be impacted by this in so many ways, from major construction to try and rebuild a road that wasn't meant to hold this kind of traffic, to restructuring our water that may not to handle this increase in people using it in drought conditions. Not to mention the overcrowding of schools we just got permission to have built we will be back to square one. Please think long and hard about this. Sincerely concerned resident of Cold Springs, Danielle Reinie

Email from Melissa Payette: With respect to the above-referenced matter, as a North Valleys resident, I vehemently oppose more residential building which will further negatively impact commutes on the US-395 Southbound/Northbound. No one has stepped up to deal with the atrocious traffic snarls and commute times from the North Valleys on the US-395, nor will they. However, the addition of thousands more vehicles commuting on the same (only) route will further negatively impact these roads, rendering the highway impassable during peak hours. I understand that the RTC has an agenda that will address these issues several years from now, but the problem is occurring now, and will only get worse if the residential developers aren't required to take part in the payment toward the widening of the highways to increase the throughput of these roadways. Right now (minus the reduced traffic due to COVID-19 stay at home orders), a peak hour commute from the North Valleys can take up to an hour and a half because a single person wrecks somewhere between Lemmon Drive and Oddie (which happens pretty much daily). This isn't improving and isn't going to improve until developers are forced to take part in the solution. Again, I vehemently oppose any additional residential building anywhere in the North Valleys, whether it's Cold Springs or anywhere else, until the biggest problem in the Valleys has a solution that's actively being worked on. Melissa Payette, Lemmon Valley, Nevada

Email from Janet L Pirozzi: I am against this proposal. Seriously? You really think this is a good idea? The new homes and apartments between Lemmon Valley and Stead Are causing all kinds of havoc as it is. How can you justify adding more houses and higher density? The traffic is horrendous. The exit off Lemmon Valley slows traffic down because the exit cannot accommodate all the cars getting off the freeway. Additionally, at Golden Valley, the lanes go from 3 to 2. This causes a slow down to about 10 miles an hour during rush hour traffic. I don't understand how we can even consider high density developments, especially in the North Valleys. We do not have any entertainment up here. We must go into town for a nice dinner, movie, bowling, dancing, etc. The

freeway is backed up almost all the time. Please do not approve this change! Our infrastructure cannot accommodate it!! Thank you. Janet L Pirozzi

Public comment via voicemail:

Solamee Deford said asked where you are going to get the water from out here and why would you want to bring about Section 42 apartments which I'm pretty sure that's what the board would want to do. It just brings more riffraff out here. I didn't want riffraff. If I wanted riffraff, I would've bought a home in Golden Valley, Lemmon Valley, Stead. I chose it out here because it was quiet. You bring all those kids from all those towns into our middle schools and all they do is bully, bully, bully, bully. We have no stores out here, and the stores that we have out here Family Dollar store and what they have is enough for us. Why do you want to build out here. It's because you're greedy that's why.

Shelly Thompson said she is opposed to this project. There is nothing but single-family dwellings in Cold Springs and there isn't any public transportation in Cold Springs. Putting apartments in Cold Springs is a total mistake and they would not be valuable and decrease our value in our homes in Cold Springs.

(No name) I'm calling about case number WRZA20-0004. I don't agree with you wanting to build apartments in my neighborhood where I own a home. It's bullshit.

Raymond Melrose: He said he lives within a few 100 feet of the property that there is looking to develop on. These are now getting schools built to where we could handle the capacity, we already have out here in the Valley and this would greatly overload that scenario. The road going to it which we use regularly would be congested with all kinds of traffic that our road systems aren't built for. Obviously, the water is another scenario. He said he thinks that it's going to bring down his personal property value by entering those kinds of super divisions into this community. He said he is not looking to lose his investment. He said he is objecting to the plan and will be following this closely. Thank you.

(No name) She said she is a resident out here. The new apartments that you want to put up are in her backyard, practically. She said she has lived here for over 40 years and there used to be nothing back there except mountains, now they've already got that the Village Parkway back there. Village Parkway road sounds like a freeway in her back window as it is when she is trying to sleep. It's terrible. She said we do not need more traffic. We do not need more buildings and it's getting bad enough out here with the traffic. It's terrible and the noise is terrible. She said she is just completely against it. Thank you.

Deloris Egbert Palmer said she is totally against putting in apartments. It is way too close to many of these homes. It's going to be almost right across the street from me in my backyard. She said she is against this. They can rezone to put in patio homes or townhomes, but no apartments. Apartments brings crime. She said she will not feel safe. Many of my neighbors said they are going to move if this happens. Thank you.

Stacy said she just wanted to say that that is too congested out here as it is, especially in the morning. We really don't need any more unless they plan on widening the freeway and giving us more amenities out here like stores, etc. She said she is begging you please do not allow this to move forward. It's bringing crime out to our community. We've lived here a long time and just hope you consider what the people want more than the mighty dollar. Thank you.

Kirby Keller said he just want to express his opposition to that. We like it out here the way it is. We like the lower population density. We don't feel like apartments density belongs out here. Thank you.

Dayla Gibson said she is a resident of Cold Springs. She said she is against the argument that was made on the application saying that people are looking for affordable housing. It's is ridiculous. We don't have infrastructure such as buses. She said she doesn't think people want them. We don't have good access for police. We don't have good access for ambulance. To reduce the density of the properties is irresponsible. And so that's going to be devastating to our Valley. They are already adding thousands and thousands of more vehicles. 395 South is already a parking lot. There are thousands and thousands of units going out in Stead. High density doesn't need to be in the small back corner of a Valley. She said she really thinks it would be detrimental to what we would have with increased light pollution, increase crime, increased noise and know that people don't think that that's important, but it is to those of us who live out here. Thank you.

Jerrod Reed said he is calling regarding regulatory zone amendment case number WRZA20-0004 Village Parkway rezone. This is regarding rezoning the area in Cold Springs from medium density suburban with 3 to the acre detached dwelling unit, to high density suburban 7 detached or 9 attached dwelling units per acre maximum. He said he is one of the homeowners that my backyard overlooks this property. Right now, it is a big concern. He said he is hoping that whatever change would not impede the wonderful view. He said he is also concerned about how people will continue to access BLM. If we did this change, as of right now, he said he is not in favor of, to cram in more people. It sounds like it's not a large property. He said he is concerned about what they are going to do with the curve where they're coming in. It's already pretty difficult to see around and concerned about lots of cars or trucks coming in there and it being difficult to see and stop in time for those trucks or cars. He said maybe his concerns might be met tonight. He said he would love to talk to someone about it again. He said generally he is opposed to this change.

Public comment via Zoom: Matthew Martin resident of Cold Springs area. He said he emailed a letter to Washoe 311 last night. He said my letter is in opposition to the proposed zoning change on Village Parkway. He said his property is directly affected by this proposal. He said they purchased their property when they moved from White Pine County with the knowledge that the property adjacent was medium density. The proposed change to high density would negatively impact property values. The development should comply with the character and vision of the Cold Springs Valley. He said this proposed change in zoning will force them to incur previously unanticipated expenses for additional trees and privacy landscaping treatment to prevent the proposed new homes from looking onto our property. He said they feel our privacy is being infringed upon and the Cold Springs Area plan are being violated if this high density would be approved. He said they specifically chose to purchase a home in Cold Springs based upon zoning and rural like appeal. He said if they wanted to live next to 2-3 story homes, they would have purchased in a different location. He said another area of concern is emergency access and wildland fire mitigation and prevention. Peterson mountain and adjacent areas have had several fires in the past years. The current open space allows for firefighters to build fire lines by hand and bulldozers and conduct background operations to deprive the wildland fire before it reaches the existing houses. The residential housing east of Village Parkway is primarily manufactured homes or trailers which are not as fire resistive as stucco sided stick-built homes. Should zoning change to high density would create a significant challenge to firefighters and it would be much more difficult to build fire lines on the steep hillside under emergency conditions versus the current flat open space. Wild land fire bulldozers are limited to the angle of hillside they can operate on under emergency conditions. Also, firefighter response times are significantly impeded if surrounding structured be placed at higher risk due to responding fire crews need to work in a denser space directly against a hillside. The current existing open and flat land allows better access to get to a

fire under control more quickly and provide adequate protection to Cold Springs area. In other words, building high density puts Cold Springs area and its residents at a more significant risk of property damage or loss. What is the plan to ensure appropriate fire breaks and needed emergency access will continue to the high density homes are built?

DDA Edwards said Stacy Dinnon asked in the Zoom chat feature about her comment being submitted to Mr. Cahalane. He asked if that was received and part of the packet. Perhaps we could open the floor to her.

Stacy Dinnon via Zoom: She said she sent a 3-page letter to the County Planner several weeks ago. She said she will reiterate a few of her points here. She said her property is directly affected by this proposal. She said she has lived in her home for 23 years and lived in Cold Springs my whole life. This proposal does not fit the character and vision of cold Springs Valley. High density is not needed in Cold Springs. She said we already have it community of people, and apartments, condos, and townhomes are not necessary. She said she understands the possibility of medium density and would match the existing home. Most people purchase here for the open area. People who want smaller properties should look in the North Valleys, or Reno, Sparks area. This development is not bettering the area; it's only in the best interest of the developer. 47 acres would be easier to develop. It would be more cost effective and profitable as high density development. If the developer would put in medium density housing, it would not have a very profitable area therefore making the proposed development not for profit. Profit should not be a reason this Commission to approve this project. She said she agrees with what has been said about traffic, noise and air pollution. There was a 3-page letter that was supposed to be submitted. Thank you. Mr. Lloyd noted her letter was part of the packet.

DDA Edwards said he wanted to make sure she was afforded the chance to speak if she wanted to. Mr. Martins was in the supplemented materials on the website which is part of the record as well. The other individual in the chat feature was Jacob Montecelli who sent an email this morning which wasn't read. He requested to open the floor to see if he wanted to speak. He said he noticed a letter submitted by a Shannon Montecelli, but not Jacob.

The Commission opened the floor for Jacob Montecelli via Zoom to make a comment. He was unresponsive.

DDA Edwards asked if staff received an email from Jacob Montecelli. Mr. Lloyd said it wasn't part of the packet. Staff indicated they only had one from Shannon Montecelli. DDA Edwards read in the chat that Jacob Montecelli doesn't want to speak. DDA Edwards stated the Commission can move on.

Mr. Lloyd said he wanted to follow up on Commissioner Chvilicek's inquiry earlier regarding the fire station. He stated that it is Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District's Fire Station number 42 which is in close proximity to the proposes site.

With no further requests for public comment, Chair Chesney closed the public comment period.

Commissioner Chvilicek noted in supplemental information Washoe County Health District regarding oversight to review the EMS response time. This project may have impacts with EMS response time. She said we heard previously the TMFPD station has one ALS. She said we are aware most of our emergency calls are medical. She said we do need to be cognizant of wildland fires in the entire North Valleys. There are issues in regard to response times.

Commissioner Barnes had a question for staff regarding traffic. He asked if they consider traffic an issue out there. Mr. Cahalane said traffic is addressed at the tentative map stage which is after the regulatory zone stage. He said we will address that during tentative map.

MOTION: Commissioner Chvilicek moved that after giving reasoned consideration to the information contained in the staff report and information received during the public hearing, the Washoe County Planning Commission DENY Regulatory Zone Amendment Case Number WRZA20-0004 having not been able to make the following findings in accordance with Washoe County Code Section 110.821.15:

2. The proposed amendment will not provide for land uses compatible with (existing or planned) adjacent land uses, and will adversely impact the public health, safety or welfare.
4. There are not or are planned to be adequate transportation, recreation, utility, and other facilities to accommodate the uses and densities permitted by the proposed amendment.
5. The proposed amendment will adversely affect the implementation of the policies and action programs of the Washoe County Master Plan.

Commissioner Bruce seconded the motion to deny Regulatory Zone Amendment Case Number WRZA20-0004. The motion carried unanimously with six in favor, none against.

Chair Chesney asked each Commissioner to state which findings they couldn't make for this case:

Commissioner Nelson stated she couldn't make the following findings: 2, 4, 5

Commissioner Bruce stated he couldn't make the following findings: 2, 4, 5

Commissioner Donshick stated she couldn't make the following findings: 2, 4, 5

Commissioner Barnes stated he couldn't make the following findings: 2, 4, 5

Chair Chesney stated he couldn't make the following findings: 2, 4, 5, 6.

Mr. Lloyd the read the appeal procedure.

8. Chair and Commission Items

***A.** Future agenda items – None

***B.** Requests for information from staff – Commissioner Chvilicek acknowledged staff for getting information regarding the Lands Bill. Mr. Lloyd thanked Jamie Rodriguez in the Manager's office. Commissioner Nelson said she appreciates staff asking more information regarding the sewer capacity issue. She said it would be helpful if we knew how many dwelling units they are requesting and how much capacity that would take up for water, sewer, traffic. It would help as a guideline to know how much capacity is being utilized.

9. Director's and Legal Counsel's Items

***A.** Report on previous Planning Commission items – Mr. Lloyd reported RZA for Highland Village in Sun Valley that was denied by Planning Commission which went to the County Commission. It was neither approved nor denied by the County Commissioners. It was remanded back to this board for recommendation. They would like to see a development agreement to cap the density for lower than what was proposed. This Commission will see this in the near future.

*B. Legal information and updates - DDA Edwards spoke about the Governor's press conference last Thursday; right now, it's Phase 1, soft re-opening on May 15. We don't know if or when the Zoom style meetings will be over and resume normal procedures. He said we will keep you in the loop. DDA Edwards thanked the Staff for juggling a lot of things including IT Staff with YouTube feeds going and Washoe County livestream, 311 voicemails, email, Zoom. It's a fast-moving scenario. Thank you for your help.

10. *General Public Comment and Discussion Thereof

With no requests for public comment, Chair Chesney closed the public comment period.

11. Adjournment

With no further business scheduled before the Planning Commission, the meeting adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Misty Moga, Independent Contractor.

Approved by Commission in session on June 2, 2020

Trevor Lloyd
Secretary to the Planning Commission