



WASHOE COUNTY PARCEL MAP REVIEW COMMITTEE DRAFT Meeting Minutes

Parcel Map Review Committee Members

Thursday, August 13, 2015
1:30 p.m.

James Barnes, Planning Commission
James English, Health District
John Cella, Utility Services
Mike Gump, Engineering
Eric Young, Planning and Development
Amy Ray, Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District
Grace Sannazzaro, Planning and Development

Washoe County Administration Complex
Building A, Room 275
Mt. Rose Conference Room
1001 East Ninth Street
Reno, NV

The Washoe County Parcel Map Review Committee met in regular session on Thursday, August 13, 2015, at 1:30 p.m., in the Washoe County Mt. Rose Conference Room, 1001 East Ninth Street, Reno, Nevada.

1. Determination of Quorum

Grace Sannazzaro called the meeting to order at 1:45 p.m. The following members and staff were present:

Departments represented:

Community Services Department (CSD)
John Cella, Utility Services
Kimble Corbridge, Engineering, Alternate
Grace Sannazzaro, Planning and Development

Planning Commission
James Barnes

Health District
James English

Absent:

Community Services Department (CSD)
Eric Young, Planning and Development
Mike Gump, Engineering

Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District
Amy Ray, Fire Marshal

Staff present:

Tim Simpson, CSD
Roger Pelham, Planning and Development
Kelly Mullin, Planning and Development
Nathan Edwards, Deputy District Attorney, District Attorney's Office
Donna Fagan, Recording Secretary

3. Appeal Procedure

Ms. Sannazzaro recited the appeal procedure for items heard before the Parcel Map Review Committee.

4. Public Comment

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

5. Approval of Agenda

In accordance with the Open Meeting Law, Kimble Corbridge moved to approve the agenda of August 13, 2015 as written. The motion, seconded by James English, passed unanimously.

6. Approval of March 13, 2014, September 11, 2014, March 12, 2015, and April 9, 2015 Draft Minutes

John Cella moved to approve the March 13, 2014, September 11, 2014, March 12, 2015, and April 9, 2015 draft minutes, as written. The motion was seconded by James Barnes. The motion passed, four in favor, one abstained.

Assistant District Attorney, Nathan Edwards, joined the meeting at 1:50 p.m.

2. Ethics Law Announcement

Assistant District Attorney, Nathan Edwards, recited the Ethics Law standards.

7. Project Review Items

Agenda Item 7A

Parcel Map Case Number PM15-010 (Bengoechea) – Hearing, discussion, and possible action to approve a parcel map dividing a ±0.644 acre parcel (±28,072 square feet) into two parcels each consisting of ±0.322 acres (±14,036 square feet).

- Applicant/Property Owner: Joseph Bengoechea
- Consultant: Randy Meyer
- Location: 347 Brownlee Lane, Sun Valley
- Assessor's Parcel Number: 085-640-38
- Parcel Size: ±0.644
- Master Plan Category: Suburban Residential (SR)
- Regulatory Zone: Medium Density Suburban (MDS)
- Area Plan: Sun Valley
- Citizen Advisory Board: Sun Valley
- Development Code: Authorized in *Article 606, Parcel Maps*
- Commission District: 3 – Commissioner Jung
- Section/Township/Range: Section 19, T20N, R20E, MDM,
Washoe County, NV
- Staff: Grace Sannazzaro, Planner
Washoe County Community Services Department
Planning and Development Division
- Phone: 775-328-3771
- E-mail: gsannazzaro@washoecounty.us

Ms. Sannazzaro opened the public hearing.

Ms. Sannazzaro gave a brief overview of her staff report dated August 3, 2015. Mr. Corbridge noted Engineering's fourteen (14) conditions are listed in the staff report's Conditions of Approval.

Randy Meyer, the applicant's consultant, had a question about adding a fire hydrant to the parcel, per Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District's (TMFPD) conditions. Mr. Meyer said there was an existing fire hydrant on Sidehill Drive and he would contact Ms. Ray with TMFPD after the meeting regarding this condition.

Ms. Sannazzaro opened public comment. As there was no request to speak, Ms. Sannazzaro closed public comment.

Mr. Corbridge moved to approve Parcel Map Case Number PM15-010 with the conditions outlined in the staff report and the findings were met. Mr. Barnes seconded the motion that carried unanimously and considered the following criteria:

- 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.

Agenda Item 7B

Parcel Map Case Number PM15-011 (Steidley and Levie) – Hearing, discussion, and possible approval of a parcel map to divide a 28.37 acre property into 3 parcels of 2.8 acres each and a remainder parcel of 20 acres.

and,

Parcel Map Case Number PM15-012 (Steidley and Levie) – Hearing, discussion, and possible approval of a second parcel map to divide a 20 acre property into four parcels of 5 acres each.

- Applicant: Washoe Vineyards and Estates LLC
- Property Owner: Duane Steidley and Mary Ann Levie
- Location: 2150 Rhodes Road, Washoe Valley, NV
- Assessor's Parcel Number: 017-390-15
- Parcel Size: 28.37 acres

- Master Plan Category: Rural (R), Rural Residential (RR), and Suburban Residential (SR)
- Regulatory Zone: General Rural (GR), Low Density Suburban (LDS) and Medium Density Rural (MDR)
- Area Plan: South Valleys
- Citizen Advisory Board: South Truckee Meadows/Washoe Valley
- Development Code: Authorized in Article 606 Parcel Map
- Commission District: 2 – Commissioner Lucey
- Section/Township/Range: Section 03, T17N, R20E, MDM, Washoe County, NV
- Staff: Roger Pelham, Senior Planner
Washoe County Community Services Department
Planning and Development Division
- Phone: 775-328-3622
- E-mail: rpelham@washoecounty.us

Ms. Sannazzaro opened the public hearing. Mr. Pelham gave a brief overview of his staff report dated July 23, 2015. He noted that he received Conditions of Approval for both cases from the Engineering Division on August 10, 2015 so they are not contained in the staff report. They were submitted, at this time, for public review.

Mr. Corbridge apologized for the late submission of the Engineering comments and had several additional conditions to add to his submission. Mr. Corbridge said they reviewed this case as a single parcel map so in the conditions for PM15-011 he would like to add the following:

3. The applicant shall submit a letter from a PLS certifying that the roadway improvements are within the documented access and do not exceed a 14% gradient.
4. Any access way shall be upgraded to a gravel road that will allow emergency vehicle travel, issuance of a building permit and take drainage into consideration. Submit plans for review and approval.
5. The drainage and easements, and difference in elevation across some of these parcels appear inappropriate for maximum density on this proposed division. The applicant must submit a two-foot (2') contoured topographical map that will allow appropriate decisions to be made concerning location and density of this proposed division. Construct or bond to construct buildable sites before approval or recordation of this map.
6. Comply with the conditions of the Washoe County technical check for this map.
7. All private driveway approaches onto County roadways for two (2) residences or less shall be constructed in accordance with Washoe County Standard Details Drawings W-5.1, W-5.2, or W-5.3 whichever applies.
8. Grant easements for snow storage and signage along Rhodes Road to the map and owner's certificate.

Mr. English asked Mr. Pelham if he had received the plots where the existing test holes were in comparison to the proposed parcels. The Health Districts concern is whether or not each one of these proposed parcels will be suitable for an individual sewage disposal system. Mr. Pelham said the documents submitted do not appear to show the test holes. Mr. Pelham said a condition of approval could be created and read: "the applicant shall provide satisfactory information regarding test trenches to the Health District prior to recordation of the final map". Mr. English said that as an agency, the Health District would like to request an additional condition be placed on the final map, that the Health District can sign it to make sure that's done and they've been fully evaluated. Mr. Pelham confirmed Mr. English's request for two conditions; 1) the documentation of test holes, and 2) requiring the Health District be signatory

to the final map. Mr. English said that would help meet the Health District's concerns in not knowing today if all seven parcels could have a residence placed on them.

Mr. Corbridge asked Deputy District Attorney, Nathan Edwards, for counsel. Mr. Edwards said he didn't think it would pose a problem but will continue to review Chapter 278 to see what it says.

Ms. Sannazzaro opened public comment.

Melissa Lindell, the applicant's representative, indicated the Health District's request for the documentation of test holes is already in the Conditions of Approval as 4c. She said there have been a few test holes done but they will do the rest of the test holes. Ms. Lindell said they were in agreement with all the conditions in the staff report but the new conditions by Engineering are a surprise to them. She would like to have an opportunity to review them. Mr. Corbridge indicated the date on the memorandums should be August 10, 2015, not March 18, 2015 as indicated. And on the memorandum referencing PM15-011; the subject should read "1st Parcel Map" not "2nd Parcel Map". Ms. Lindell confirmed there are six new conditions added to the two listed on the memo for the 1st Parcel Map, PM15-011. Mr. Corbridge said the conditions for the 2nd Parcel Map, PM15-012 "are in the packet".

Ms. Lindell noted, the viticulture easement is a unique concept with the large easement in front of each parcel for grapes; kind of a community concept where people who build their custom homes would have grapes and be in the association. She indicated 165' of every frontage will be agricultural use and the easements would be along the frontages. Mr. Corbridge asked what would be allowed in that area. Ms. Lindell answered, no structures just vineyards. Leach fields would be allowed as long as they met the separation requirements of the Health District. Mr. English asked how the developer was going to define the easement and is it going to state leach fields are allowed in there. Ms. Lindell said the document would allow everything but structures. Utilities and driveways would be allowed.

DDA Edwards returned with his opinion regarding the Health District as a signatory on the final map. He believes it is within the power of this Committee to impose that as a condition of approval. NRS 278.462, within the Parcel Map Section discusses the type of requirements that might be imposed by the governing body. Subsection 2 of that Statute refers to things like conditions for water quality, water supply and sewerage provisions as necessary and consistent with the existing use of any land zone. NRS 278.464 invokes the idea of approvals being conditional and conditions are commonly crafted by reviewing agencies. NRS 278.462 Subsection 3 says that a second or subsequent parcel map with respect to a single parcel or contiguous track of land under the same ownership conditions that may be required are; any reasonable improvement but not more than would be required if that parcel were a subdivision. Mr. Edwards suggested asking the applicant if they had any objection to the Health District being a signatory on the final map. If they do, it would make this a moot point.

Patrick Swanstrom asked Mr. Corbridge if the developer would have to show where on the property the home could be built. Mr. Corbridge said yes, because there are so many easements and topographic issues, they want to see where on the property someone could reasonably build a house on the site and meet the requirements of 14% grade to get to the garage. Mr. Swanstrom asked for clarification, on the site map, of easement roads near the borders of his property. He also asked Mr. English what test holes were. Mr. English replied they are trenches placed in the ground to make sure the soils are suitable to install an individual septic system. It is required on each newly created parcel to demonstrate sewage can be discharged on it if there is not a community sewer system, so a residence can be built. Mr. Swanstrom then asked Ms. Lindell about the proposed vineyards on the properties. Ms. Lindell replied, it's a vineyard easement, kind of like a gentleman's farm or gentleman's ranch. There will be seven parcels each will have a vineyard easement where they wouldn't be allowed to build but they would have to put in a vineyard which will be taken care of by a group. It'll be a

vineyard subdivision. There will be a homeowner's association (HOA) that will take care of the private vineyards. Two of the parcels have been sold.

John Crum, homeowner to the northeast, said he had a family owned easement to his properties and wasn't interested in allowing anyone to use his easement. He also had concerns about the grade of Chance Lane, where water drainage would be and how properties were going to be accessed. Mr. Corbridge answered, that is why the condition has been put in that the developer needs to address the drainage and the easements. If Mr. Crum has records of easements, Mr. Corbridge would like to see them as that is part of Engineering's technical check. The developer is supposed to add the easements that are on the properties. Another technical check is to show the access easement and one of the conditions is one of the easements be moved over by one foot so it is clear there is a "no man zone" between Mr. Crum's and the developer's access easements.

At 2:30 p.m., the Parcel Map Review Committee took a recess.

At 2:32 p.m., the Parcel Map Review Committee reconvened.

Cathy Barcomb, a homeowner to the north, thinks the project will be esthetically pleasing to the area and will help property values. She would like to see the project happen in hopes of having Chance Lane paved, with the added traffic. She supports the project and knowing there will be growth, thinks it is responsible growth.

Jennifer Martin, a homeowner directly east of the project, has concerns that the new homes will have a direct line to her home. She would like to know what type of homes will be built in the area. Ron Bath, the developer, said the homes will be a minimum of 3,000 square-feet and the price of the lots will vary from \$250,000 – \$450,000. Someone who builds a home there will be in the million dollar category. Ms. Martin stated the area is such a nice quiet area and would like the area kept as "upscale" as possible, that will make it pleasant for everyone. Mr. Bath agreed with Ms. Martin and said that is why he chose the site and with the slopes, it's conducive to grape growth.

Sharol Erickson, a neighbor across Rhodes Road from the project, asked if the drainage problem has been addressed. She is concerned that if the land is cleared and planted with vineyards, where the water, when it rains, will run to. Is it going to block Rhodes Road? Currently, when it rains the water runs down Chance Lane and pushes the debris off to the right and plugs the irrigation systems and no one cleans them out. Mr. Bath noted part of the Conditions of Approval speaks to a drainage system to accommodate that situation. He added that there is no irrigation needed for grape growing, it is done by a drip system. Ms. Erickson asked about the condition for Chance Lane, stating, at one time, next to their property Chance Lane was continued so a neighboring homeowner could get to their property. Are the conditions talking about the whole Chance Lane or just the strip beside that property? Mr. Corbridge answered it would be just the strip beside that property.

Ms. Barcomb added finding out the developer, Mr. Bath, and his partner are going to live in the project is pleasing because he has a stake in it as he'll be living there. Ms. Barcomb reiterated that Chance Lane is sloped and the water comes down and crosses Rhodes Road carrying with it mud, dirt, and debris.

Mr. Crum suggested someone get ahold of the Waite's, who are paying taxes on the easement, so they can voice their opinion. The Waite's are paying property tax on Chance Lane, which is a private easement. Ms. Barcomb clarified; when they joined Rhodes Road and Andrew Lane they did a special assessment district to pave where Andrew Lane and Rhodes Road connected. Then, the Waite's dedicated the easement to the County but the County turned down the dedication and said if the Waite's pave it then they would accept it. Mr. Corbridge said the conditions address for PM15-012 address the improvement of Chance Lane

but the improvements would not be to the standards that the County would accept the dedication and take over the maintenance. Mr. Crum asked if the Waite's would continue to pay taxes on Chance Lane. Mr. Corbridge said he's not sure the Waite's are paying taxes on that portion but yes someone would have to pay taxes on it. Ms. Barcomb asked who would have to maintain Chance Lane. Mr. Corbridge said that is a question for the folks who use it. He recommended they get together and form a maintenance association.

Ms. Erickson doesn't believe Chance Lane is a standard width as two vehicles could not pass each other. Will the conditions require it to be made a standard width? Mr. Corbridge the condition states, "An asphalt roadway shall be constructed (per Standard Details from Public Works Construction under "Washoe Drawing No. W-1.4") and provide for two way traffic." Mr. Crum noted that on Chance Lane one property has a driveway coming into Chance Lane and if it is widened it would cut down the driveway. He suggested adding gravel to Chance Lane and using it as an emergency access. Mr. Corbridge spoke to the plan presented to him in that there were many ways to access that particular property but that was up to the developer.

Mr. Bath said he was struggling with developing private property that belongs to someone else by being asked to improve a road that belongs to someone who is paying taxes on it. He thinks there needs to be some research done. Mr. Edwards clarified that Mr. Bath had a legitimate concern regarding the County's condition of approval of the maps is to improve property that is owned by a private citizen or company that individual or company may not want their property improved. Mr. Edwards suggested the condition contain a sub-condition along the lines of, "the condition is sub-conditioned on getting permission of the owner of the easement." It does seem like something an owner would not agree with but the owner's consent cannot be dispensed with. Without the sub-condition, we are at an impasse. Mr. Corbridge agreed to add the sub-condition to condition #2. Mr. Pelham suggested also adding, "somehow on this project, access is provided to the created parcels." Mr. Corbridge agreed.

Ms. Swanstrom asked how long it was going to take to build seven 3,000 square-foot homes and what the current homeowners could expect as far as construction with noise levels and traffic. Mr. Corbridge said there is no time limit on when the properties have to be developed. As conditions allow the parcels would be sold and constructed with no condition on when it has to be done.

Ms. Sannazzaro closed public comment.

Ms. Lindell stated they have no problem with the sign off requested by the Health District because they have to sign off on the perk test. She did ask Mr. Corbridge what he is referring to in condition #3 for PM15-012. Mr. Corbridge said, the other access ways, specifically, "20' reciprocal private access easement granted per the map previous to this one" and "20' reciprocal private access easement granted per the other Parcel Map". They are on the south end of the property and the east side of the property. Ms. Lindell said they were in agreement with that and asked regarding condition #4 for PM15-012, what they are referring to as "the drainage easement." Mr. Corbridge said it's basically the easements. Again, it's the same as on PM15-011. There seems to be a lot of easements, drainage concerns, and topography issues. Ms. Lindell asked if he was referring to the "viticulture easements". Mr. Corbridge said yes. Ms. Lindell confirmed the viticulture easements not the drainage easements. Mr. Corbridge said right. Ms. Lindell asked, now that you know it's a viticulture easement, does that change. Mr. Corbridge said no, because it looks like, on the maps, the viticulture easement is going to be on the low land and the houses will be on the high land and how are you going to get the 14% or less grade to the lots. It's like your consuming the low lands where it would be a good place for a home to be built. Ms. Lindell said, by putting the house envelope on the map would resolve your concerns. Mr. Corbridge said, if you can show how to get to the envelope with less than a 14% grade. Ms. Lindell said ok that's not a problem. Mr. Pelham suggested the applicant look at Washoe County Code Article 438, Grading, as a major grading permit may be necessary on one or more of the parcels. Possibly a Special Use Permit for the grading.

Mr. Corbridge asked Mr. Pelham, if there is going to be an HOA normally the CC&R's are provided and reviewed by the DA's office. Ms. Lindell said this is sort of a voluntary HOA. Mr. Pelham said unless there were requirements within the CC&R's that the County had an interest in, we really don't get involved. We are not requiring CC&R's for this project.

Ms. Sannazzaro reviewed the additional conditions as:

- Washoe County Health District needs to be a signatory on the final map

Mr. Pelham continued, "in addition to the conditions provided with the staff report and the additional two memos received from Engineering, there were five additional technical conditions read into the record by Mr. Corbridge earlier in the meeting and in addition to those five conditions there is one additional condition that the Health District be made a signatory to the final map." Ms. Sannazzaro noted adding the sub-condition to condition #2 for PM15-012, getting approval from the property owner to improve the Chance Lane easement.

Mr. Edwards said the motion could be made for both PM15-011 and PM15-012 in one motion.

Mr. Cella made a motion to accept PM15-011 and PM15-012 with all the addendums as noted and the findings were met as stated in the staff report. Mr. English seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously 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.
- 2) Subdivision improvement considerations for second or subsequent parcel maps pursuant to Section 110.606.30(d) and which are in addition to the criteria listed above.

7. Reports and Future Agenda Items

A. *Legal Information and Updates

None

8. Public Comment

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

9. Adjournment

Mr. Corbridge made the motion to adjourn at 3:04 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna Fagan, Recording Secretary

Approved by Committee in session on _____, 2015

William H. Whitney
Secretary to the Parcel Map Review Committee

DRAFT