



WASHOE COUNTY DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE Meeting Minutes

Design Review Committee Members

Principals:

Dan Kovach, ASLA, Chair
Larry Chesney, Vice Chair
Mercedes de la Garza, AIA
Lucia D. Maloney, PMP
Brad Stanley

Alternates:

Alison Cotey-Bourquin
Francine Donshick
John Krmpotic, AICP
Clay Thomas

The Washoe County Design Review Committee was scheduled to meet in regular session on Thursday, July 13, 2017, in the Community Services Department, Planning and Building, Mt. Rose Conference Room, 1001 East Ninth Street, Reno, Nevada.

1. *Determination of Quorum

Chair Kovach called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. The following Members and staff were present.

Members present: Dan Kovach, ASLA, Chair
Larry Chesney, Vice Chair
Mercedes de la Garza, AIA
Brad Stanley
John Krmpotic, AICP
Clay Thomas

Members absent: Lucia D. Maloney, PMP
Alison Cotey-Bourquin
Francine Donshick

Staff present: Trevor Lloyd, Senior Planner, Planning and Building
Kelly Mullin, Planner, Planning and Building
Nathan Edwards, Deputy District Attorney, District Attorney's Office
Kathy Emerson, Recording Secretary, Planning and Building

2. *General Public Comment

Chair Kovach opened public comment. There was no public comment.

3. Approval of Agenda

Vice Chair Chesney moved to approve the agenda for the July 13, 2017 meeting. Ms. de la Garza seconded the motion.

4. Approval of Draft Minutes June 8, 2017 Draft Minutes

Chair Kovach requested that the last two paragraphs at the end of the Design Review Committee Items be moved to General Public Comment.

Vice Chair Chesney moved to approve the June 8, 2017 draft minutes, as amended. Ms. de la Garza seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of six for, none against.

5. Design Review Committee Items

A. Tentative Subdivision Map Case Number WTM16-003 (Bailey Creek Estates) – For possible action and discussion to approve the landscaping and design plans for Bailey Creek Estates. This 56-lot single-family residential subdivision, which was approved by the Washoe County Planning Commission on February 7, 2017 and affirmed by the Washoe County Board of Commissioners on April 11, 2017, is located on two parcels totaling ±28.76 acres. Residential lots will range in size from 14,520 sq. ft. (±0.33-acres) to 21,780 sq. ft. (±0.81-acres) with lot sizes averaging 17,869 sq. ft. (±0.41-acres). The subdivision includes approximately ±0.75-acres of common area for drainage facilities.

- Applicant: Tim Lewis Communities of Nevada, Attn: Rich Balestreri
- Property Owner: Charles Maddox
- Location: Immediately south of the intersection of Geiger Grade Road and Shadow Hills Drive
- Assessor's Parcel Numbers: 017-520-03 and 017-480-02
- Parcel Sizes: 23.63-acres and 5.125-acres
- Area Plan: Southeast Truckee Meadows (SETM)
- Master Plan Categories: Suburban Residential and Rural
- Regulatory Zones: Medium Density Suburban (2 dwelling units per acre in SETM) and General Rural (1 dwelling unit per 40 acres)
- Citizen Advisory Board: South Truckee Meadows/Washoe Valley
- Development Code: Article 608, *Tentative Subdivision Maps* and Article 408, *Common Open Space Development*
- Commission District: 2 – Commissioner Lucey
- Section/Township/Range: Sections 27 and 34, T18N, R20E, MDM, Washoe County, NV
- Prepared by: Kelly Mullin, Planner
Washoe County Community Services Department
Planning and Building Division
- Phone: 775.328.3608
- E-Mail: kmullin@washoecounty.us

Chair Kovach provided a description of the item.

Kelly Mullin provided a brief history of the case. She guided the Design Review Committee (DRC) to look at conditions that were included with the Conditions of Approval, specifically related to signage, exterior lighting, streetlights, fencing, landscaping design, landscaping material and location, the irrigation system, and the separate xeriscape options.

Stacie Huggins, representative with Wood Rodgers, said that the project is 56 lots, designed with the larger lots out along Geiger Grade and the smaller lots interior to the site, adjacent to the creek. Bailey Creek runs along the southern interior of the project; they are including one small detention area in that location. Mr. Maddox owns that property and/or the HOA owns a

portion of the property through which the creek runs. The project is not proposing to impact the creek in any way. A lot of effort was put into the grading to stay out of the creek and to avoid changing the current drainage or flow of the creek. Ms. Huggins announced the attendance of landscape architect Ryan Hansen, L.A. Studio Nevada, at the meeting.

Chair Kovach called attention to the architecture. He mentioned that they were not specifically looking at the architecture in their review.

Debra Falese, with the Woodley Architectural Group, described the four plans – all single-story, 2100 to almost 2700 square feet, all three-car garages. Ms. Falese described details of the three architectural styles: Spanish Ranch, Sierra Ranch, and Modern Prairie.

Ms. de la Garza asked what drove the material selections and mentioned the high fire location. Ms. Falese said they chose materials for the long run. She said that stucco, Hardie siding, and cultured stone are not very flammable. Ms. de la Garza asked about the foam trim in Scheme 3. Ms. Falese explained that it is a cut piece of foam with a wood grain, rather than wood. Ms. de la Garza asked why not a cementitious material or wood. Ms. de la Garza and Ms. Falese discussed the pros and cons of foam, cementitious material, and wood for durability, long-term maintenance, and flammability.

Ms. de la Garza asked about the reason behind the snout-nose design, with the garage-prominent layout. Ms. Falese said that the client did not want front porches. They felt that people would be living more in the back of the homes. They worked the design with the client, who also requested the three-car garages to accommodate buyer preference.

Ms. de la Garza said that Floorplan 4 completely isolates the garages so that an owner can enter the home and never need to use the front door. The front porch is completely separated from any kind of transportation coming to the house. She asked the reasoning for that. Ms. Falese said that some buyers prefer this.

Ms. de la Garza made a general comment that subdivisions which separate people continue to be made. Homeowners do not have to speak with or see each other, front porches are recessed, and the most prominent thing in these neighborhoods is the garage. According to Ms. de la Garza, this creates isolated pockets of people. She thinks it is a nice aspect if we can encourage people to be able to see each other, to be able to walk from their cars to their front doors, see their front doors, and see their neighbors coming home. This was a general comment. Ms. de la Garza thanked the applicant for using nice materials, beautiful colors, and no river rock.

Chair Kovach asked for details on the fencing and asked what would be happening along Geiger Grade. Ms. Huggins said that the landscaping is on the outside of the fence, with a standard good-neighbor fencing around the entire boundary of the project. The surrounding neighbors have solid wood fences, so the developer is matching what is there currently. Chair Kovach asked if Bailey Creek was going to be a no-man's land between fences. Ms. Huggins confirmed this. Part of the thought process behind providing the solid fence was to accommodate the neighbors adjacent to the project. The fencing should help ease some of the neighbors' concern about people in this subdivision looking directly into their backyard.

Ms. de la Garza asked about wild horses. She comes down Geiger Grade often and has seen horses crossing in this area. She had heard concern of horses not being able to get off Geiger

Grade because of the fencing. Ms. Huggins confirmed discussion about the horses during the Planning Commission meeting and the County Commission meeting. Ms. Huggins said that they do not want to encourage safety issues, but the horses are feral; they are not considered wild. There will still be opportunity for the horses to reach the creek via the access roads, where there is not fencing. Ms. Huggins did not think that encouraging the horses' path across Geiger Grade was a good decision. Ms. de la Garza was concerned that the fencing will conceal the crossing of horses from the sight of vehicles coming down the road. Ms. Huggins said there is a flashing sign that indicates a potential horse crossing. She was unaware of what NDOT has along Geiger Grade to warn of the horses and did not know what else their project could provide.

Mr. Stanley asked the distance between the pavement and the fence along Geiger Grade. Mr. Hansen replied about 50 to 60 feet. Mr. Stanley mentioned that the landscaping outside of the fence might attract the horses. He asked about vegetation or screening that is not horse friendly. Mr. Hansen said that they would look at the tree species selection. Ms. de la Garza said that NDOT has a listing of plants that they use on their highways, and most departments of transportation have listings of animal repellent plants.

Mr. Stanley asked the length of the fencing along Geiger. He asked if it is still anticipated that wild, feral horses will walk between Geiger and the project. Ms. Huggins said that they do not want to encourage any public safety issues, but they cannot control where the horses go. They are not encouraging them, and the fences and the project may discourage them from crossing at that location. It is not a gated community. There is one gate on the emergency access road, but otherwise the horses could get in and get to the creek or walk below the project and get to the creek.

Ms. de la Garza asked, in the spirit of not encouraging the horses, what plantings they will encourage in the front yards of the houses. The horses could find their way into the development because of plantings they enjoy, which would lead people to shoo them out. She has seen horses on the highway when people shoo them out of their neighborhoods. Mr. Hansen said there is a condition on the project that the emphasis is to be on natives.

Mr. Thomas said that if you put up a fence, then you are diverting a problem, rather than solving it. The horses still need to get to Bailey Creek and still need to cross the road somewhere. Chair Kovach asked if there is water in Bailey Creek. Ms. Huggins said that Bailey Creek is dry most of the year, unless there is a storm or runoff. She said that all of the property around this property is developed, except to the west, where horses could get into the creek. They are not trying to encourage the horses to cross the road.

Mr. Stanley asked the locations of the catch basins. Ms. Huggins indicated the detention area and a few common areas that can be utilized for detention. Mr. Stanley and Ms. Huggins discussed migration routes. He asked if there is any way to emphasize the catchment basins on either end of the project, rather than drawing the horses inside for water. He also mentioned the height of plantings outside on the exterior fence and whether or not that will obscure visibility of the horses for drivers.

Chair Kovach asked about fencing where the street Crawford Creek Court is adjacent to Bailey Creek. He asked about the east of the project. Ms. Huggins said they are commercially zoned properties. Chair Kovach asked if there is fencing there. Ms. Huggins said that everything along the highway opens to the highway. There is no landscaping along the highway. Chair

Kovach asked if horses that got into the project would have any way to get out of the project through the project. Ms. Huggins said they would not, due to the fence. Rich Balestreri speculated that fencing is not absolutely necessary at the side of the street.

Mr. Krmpotic asked the purpose of the fence. He asked about the horse population, the migration route, and the relationship with the fence. Ms. Huggins did not know how many horses are out there. She said that County code requires that the lots be fenced; that is a requirement of a new development. They designed the project with the intent of fencing the rear lot lines and the boundary of the project, because that is a requirement of code. They matched the fence across the creek and matched the fence style (solid wood) to the north. They are giving a six-foot-tall good neighbor fence on all of the property boundary sides and rear.

Mr. Chesney said that he thought they were paying too much attention to the horses because they are not wild horses and are not protected; they are feral horses. Ms. de la Garza said that her concern is primarily traffic: it is not safe for the horses, but it is also a public safety concern. Her concern was that the horses might become trapped in the development, feel threatened, and bolt onto the highway; drivers might not see them coming because of the six-foot fence. Mr. Stanley said that feral horses are protected. They are not BLM horses; they are Department of Agriculture horses. There is a contract with a number of horse protection agencies. The danger is the kids and the cars, because they kill people.

DDA Edwards made a couple of legal observations. He and Ms. Mullin discussed that if the developer put one house on the property and did a merger of lots, then they could fence the whole thing. He asked the legal restrictions on the fence height for a building permit. Ms. Mullin said that it would need to meet setback and height requirements, so probably between four and a half feet and six foot, depending on the location. DDA Edwards said that he lives around this area and the horses are definitely an issue. But in terms of the DRC's review, the review needed to focus on meeting code standards and the Conditions of Approval, not focus on potential ways that some people might feel it should be done differently or better. It was a code issue. Ms. de la Garza said that code is about health safety, and she felt that their discussion was seeping over into their responsibility of code and health safety. DDA Edwards said that they were not there to clean up the safety issues on Geiger Grade. They were there to examine whether or not the applicant's submission complied with the County Code provisions and things of that nature in terms of what was submitted for design.

Chair Kovach mentioned the approximate 50 feet of space between the fence and the associated landscape and the edge of the road. A horse could use that space to escape off the pavement. Ms. Huggins said that they could look at the type of vegetation that discourages horses. She said that might be something to talk about from the front yard perspective, because there is a condition that they use natives inside, which attract the horses. Chair Kovach said that horses will gravitate toward a certain type of vegetation and that is probably easily figured out and coordinated with the front yard landscape. Ms. de la Garza said that type of landscaping is typically toxic to children and pets, so she does not know if she would advise.

Mr. Thomas asked if the whole area would be fenced and suggested leaving the back side of the project (not bordering Geiger Grade) open. Chair Kovach reminded that the code requires fencing of lots and that the neighbors at the south did not want to see the project. Chair Kovach asked how the trees will be irrigated. Mr. Hansen said they will be drip irrigated. Chair Kovach asked if there will be any common area landscape. Mr. Hansen showed a small area.

Ms. de la Garza asked if the 50 feet is based on the property line. The 50 feet is the existing distance between edge of pavement and property line. It could be developed in the future. Mr. Stanley asked if a cattle guard had been suggested for the entry way off Geiger. They work well and also act as a safety enhancer if they are painted a bright color. Ms. de la Garza felt the cattle guard would trap the horses on the highway.

Chair Kovach asked questions on the overall grading of the project. He asked why revegetation seed was indicated on the landscape plan when Bailey Creek is not being disturbed. Mr. Hansen answered that if there happens to be any disturbance, then it needs to be revegetated. Ms. Mullin clarified that the common area below the actual subdivision is part of a separate subdivision. Ms. Huggins said that all of Bailey Creek is part of the project to the south. It was dedicated as part of the prior approval of Cottonwood Creek. The Bailey Creek Estates project has nothing to do with Bailey Creek except that the project abuts it. They are asking Mr. Maddox, who still owns that parcel, for a small impact in only one corner. Otherwise, they are doing nothing to the creek.

Chair Kovach said that when he looked at the landscape plans, the house appeared to occupy less than half of most of the lots, but when he looked at the grading plan, the entirety of all of the lots is graded, which means disturbed ground and weed growth. He asked if there was a way to lessen that disturbed area and maintain some of the current vegetation. Mr. Hansen said that they designed the homes to live in the backyard. With the quality of home and level of pricing, it is pretty natural for the backyards to become pretty extravagant. Homeowners develop the backyards.

Chair Kovach noted the front yard emphasis on native plant materials and the couple of options for lawn. He asked why. He felt that the small lawn areas in the front yard were not really functional lawn areas, so he discouraged them. Mr. Hansen said the emphasis on native plant material with a few naturalized interspersed was the condition and will give efficiency. They have experienced that some people want some grass in front of their house and some do not. That is why they show the xeriscape and the option with a little bit of lawn. Chair Kovach said that he is hearing a lot about the emerald ash borer being active in this area, and there was some ash on the plant list. The emerald ash borer is an insect that gets into ash. It is currently more preventive in this area: to stop the spread of the ash borer by not planting ash. The availability of ash trees was discussed.

Ms. de la Garza located numerous animal-deflecting plant listings for the state of Nevada.

Mr. Krmptic stated that, having nothing to do with this project, he had heard a lot of very concerning comments about the horse situation. He felt that it needs to be managed on a different macro level. He saw a real potential safety issue with cars, kids, and horses. He did not tie it to this project. Ms. Huggins agreed that the horses are a concern for everybody and require caution. She said that they can do their part by looking at horse-deterrent plants. She felt that it is NDOT's responsibility to put whatever signage is necessary along that highway, and that this developer should not be taxed with having that as a requirement of their project. Mr. Chesney agreed, because this project is not the only development in this area. He felt that developments on both sides of Geiger Grade and up Mount Rose Highway will start pushing more and more wild livestock into smaller and smaller areas. It is too big of an issue to put a condition on one developer. Mr. Krmptic agreed that it was not a project issue. Vice Chair Chesney said that the DRC's job is to make sure that the project meets the County codes and regulations.

Mr. Thomas was not adverse to the higher fence on Geiger Grade, and because the people on Cottonwood already have six-foot back fences, he did not know what the issue was. He preferred that anything opening to the common area be either a western fence or a split rail fence to provide the feeling of an open environment.

Without obligating the developer, Ms. Huggins asked if the developer would need to come back to the DRC to get approval if they decided to have open-view fencing along the creek. Mr. Lloyd said that procedurally, if the DRC were to specifically condition a solid fence, then yes they would have to bring it back for modification. DDA Edwards said that the DRC could make a motion to approve it as-is and give the developer the option of exploring that possibility. Mr. Balestreri said that most often people want the privacy of a fence. Neighbors at the Planning Commission meeting wanted the guarantee that they would cut off as much view as possible. However, if they feel that there is a benefit to the homeowner to have open-view fencing, then they will look at it. Mr. Chesney did not feel that homeowners would have interest in the creek and he believed they would want the privacy of the livable backyard for which they are paying.

Chair Kovach called for a motion.

Mr. Stanley asked if the cattle guard could be an option for them. Chair Kovach mentioned that a motion can be crafted with both conditions and recommendations. The cattle guard could be a recommendation. Mr. Stanley felt that more expertise, such as NDOT, might be needed.

There was discussion regarding whether or not the Chair can make a motion. DDA Edwards said that the Chair can make a motion. Chair Kovach listed the conditions he saw, which were to review the landscape vegetation and try to select species that are horse repelling, discussion on no fencing where the road is adjacent to Bailey Creek common space, and a comprehensive revegetation approach, including soil treatment, seed application, mulch, and coordination with grading. The recommendations were to be cautious with ash tree usage, to look at the potential of a cattle guard, and the option to use alternative code-compliant fencing along the rest of the edge along Bailey Creek. Vice Chair Chesney asked if Chair Kovach's list was the motion. Chair Kovach agreed that it was. Vice Chair Chesney seconded the motion. The motion passed with a vote of six for, none against.

Regarding the condition to use mostly native plant species, Mr. Hansen asked if the priority is to use natives or horse-resistant species, particularly if the horse-resistant species turn out to be less of a native pallet. Ms. Mullin said that there is a policy in the Southeast Truckee Meadows Area Plan that specifically requires native vegetation, so the DRC would not be able to override that. DDA Edwards said that the concept is compatible; they can look at things that are less horse friendly, which are also native.

Chair Kovach called for public comment. There was none.

Mr. Krmpotic left the meeting.

6. *Presentation by Frederick Steinmann of the University of Nevada, Reno, on the relationship between housing and supporting services (commercial and transportation connections) for possible future sub-divisions in Washoe County.

Chair Kovach introduced Frederick Steinmann and explained that he had invited Mr. Steinmann in the continuing effort to make the DRC more aware of some of the bigger issues.

Mr. Steinmann introduced himself as an assistant research professor on assignment with the University Center for Economic Development, located in the College of Business at the University of Nevada, Reno. He addressed the big points of trends in the regional housing market and the relationship between planning and housing and financing of public services that have been followed at the University Center for Economic Development since the Great Recession of 2008 through 2010. The first part of the presentation was basic housing and socio-demographic trends for Washoe County. The DRC questioned and discussed why building has not kept up with housing demand.

The second part of Mr. Steinmann's presentation was a general overview of the relationship between planning and housing development. Different types of planning approaches can impact different types of housing development or the level of housing development. There was also discussion about the relationship between infrastructure and housing, as well as the fiscal component to real estate development. There was discussion regarding the difficulty of funding services with the state's fiscal system and our local fiscal system.

7. *General Public Comment

There was no comment from the public.

8. Adjournment

Ms. de la Garza motioned to adjourn. Vice Chair Chesney seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 11:05 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Kathy Emerson, Recording Secretary

Approved by Committee in session on September 14, 2017.



Trevor Lloyd, Senior Planner
Secretary to the Design Review Committee