



WASHOE COUNTY PARCEL MAP REVIEW COMMITTEE Meeting Minutes

Parcel Map Review Committee Members

Rob Pierce, Planning Commission
James English, Health District
Wayne Handrock, Engineering
Roger Pelham, Planning and Building
Dale Way, Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District

Thursday, January 12, 2023
2:00 p.m.

REMOTE TECHNOLOGY MEETING ONLY

The Washoe County Parcel Map Review Committee met in a scheduled session on Thursday, January 12, 2023. This meeting was held via Zoom teleconference.

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

1. Call to Order and Determination of Quorum

Chair Pelham called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. The following Committee members and staff were present:

Departments represented: Community Services Department (CSD)

Wayne Handrock, Engineering
Roger Pelham, Planning and Building

Health District

Wes Rubio

Planning Commission

Rob Pierce

Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District

Dale Way

Members Absent: None

Staff present: Adriana Albarran, Recording Secretary
Trenton Ross, Deputy District Attorney, District Attorney's Office

2. Ethics Law Announcement

Deputy District Attorney Trenton Ross recited the Ethics Law standards.

3. Appeal Procedure

Roger Pelham recited the appeal procedure for items heard before the Parcel Map Review Committee.

4. Public Comment

Chair Pelham informed the committee that Senior Planner, Chris Bronczyk would be appointed Chair of the Parcel Map Review Committee in the near future. With no response to the call for public comment, the public comment period was closed.

5. Approval of January 12, 2023 Agenda

Wes Rubio moved to approve the agenda for the January 12, 2023 meeting as written. The motion, seconded by Dale Way, passed unanimously.

6. Approval of December 8, 2022 Draft Minutes

Wes Rubio moved to approve the minutes for the December 8, 2022 Parcel Map Review Committee meeting as written. The motion, seconded by Dale Way, passed unanimously.

7. Project Review Items

A. Amendment of Conditions Case Number WAC22-0011 for Tentative Parcel Map Case Number WTPM21-0022 (BDF Trust) – For hearing, discussion, and possible action to amend approved Tentative Parcel Map WTPM21-0022, which was finalized and recorded on April 22, 2021, to correct an error in the boundary line along the west side of Parcel 1, being the easterly right-of-way (ROW) of Lemmon Drive. This adjustment reduces the size of Parcel 1 by ±15,149 SF which is included in Lemon Drive ROW. Also, to re-configure the property line between the two parcels. The acreage will change for Parcel 1 from ±18.57 acres to ±18.09 acres and Parcel 2 from ±13.85 acres to ±14.33 acres.

- Applicant/Property Owner: Lemmon Drive Villas Property, LLC
- Location: 650 feet south of Lemmon Dr. & Military Rd.
- APN: 552-210-21 & 552-210-22
- Parcel Size: 18.56 & 13.85 acres
- Master Plan: Null
- Regulatory Zone: Medium Density Suburban (MDS)
- Area Plan: North Valleys
- Development Code: Authorized in Article 606, Parcel Maps
- Commission District: 5 – Commissioner Herman
- Staff: Julee Olander, Planner
Washoe County Community Services Department
Planning and Building Division
- Phone: 775-328-3627
- E-mail: jolander@washoecounty.gov

Planner Olander provided a presentation. Applicant representative, Kevin German was available to answer questions.

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

Wayne Handrock disclosed he had previous discussions with Kevin German on how to proceed with the parcel map application since there was an error on the previous map. However, continued to state, none of it would affect his judgement.

Chair Pelham asked Planner Olander if this application was essentially a cleanup of a previous submission with no major changes to what was previously approved. Planner Olander confirmed.

Motion: Wes Rubio moved that, after giving reasoned consideration to the information contained in the staff report and information received during the public hearing, that the Washoe County Parcel Map Review Committee approve Amendment of Conditions Case Number WAC22-0011 for Lemmon Drive Villas Property, LLC & BDF Trust, with the conditions included as Exhibit A with the staff report, and make the determination that the following criteria is or will be adequately provided for pursuant to Washoe County Code, Section 110.606.30(e): Dale Way seconded the motion which carried unanimously and considered the following criteria:

- 1) General improvement considerations for all parcel maps including, but not limited to:
 - i. 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;
 - ii. The availability of water which meets applicable health standards and is sufficient for the reasonably foreseeable needs of the parcels of land being created;
 - iii. The availability and accessibility of utilities;
 - iv. The availability and accessibility of public services such as schools, police and fire protection, transportation, recreation and parks;
 - v. Conformity with the zoning ordinances and master plan;
 - vi. General conformity with the governing body’s master plan of streets and highways;
 - vii. The effect of the proposed division of land on existing public streets and the need for new streets or highways to serve the parcels of land being created;
 - viii. Physical characteristics of the land such as floodplain, slope and soil;
 - ix. The recommendations and comments of those entities reviewing the tentative parcel map pursuant to NRS 278.330 and 278.348, inclusive;
 - x. 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;
 - xi. Community antenna television (CATV) conduit and pull wire; and
 - xii. Recreation and trail easements.

B. Tentative Parcel Map Case Number WTPM22-0021 (Duarte) – For hearing, discussion, and possible action to approve a tentative parcel map dividing a 99.23-acre parcel into four parcels of ±69.21 acres, ±10.00 acres, ±10.00 acres, and ±10.00 acres.

- Applicant: Mark Duarte
- Property Owner: Zondra Rose Duarte
- Location: 120 Cobalt Ln., Reno, NV 89508
- APN: 079-371-23
- Parcel Size: 99.23 acres
- Master Plan: Rural Residential
- Regulatory Zone: Low Density Rural (LDR)
- Area Plan: North Valleys
- Development Code: Authorized in Article 606, Parcel Maps
- Commission District: 5 – Commissioner Herman
- Staff: Katy Stark, Planner
Washoe County Community Services Department
Planning and Building Division
- Phone: 775-328-3618
- E-mail: krstak@washoecounty.gov

Planner Stark provided a presentation. Applicants, Mark, and Patty Duarte were available to answer questions and explained that their previous application was in the final mapping stages when they realized it had expired.

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

Wes Rubio wanted to assure that the applicant was aware that a septic system has a five-acre minimum requirement. Mr. Duarte confirmed.

Motion: Wes Rubio moved that, after giving reasoned consideration to the information contained within the staff report and the information received during the public meeting, that the Washoe County Parcel Map Review Committee approve Parcel Map Case Number WTPM22-0021 for Mark Duarte, subject to the conditions of approval included as Exhibit A with the staff report, and make the determination that the following criteria is or will be adequately provided for pursuant to Washoe County Code, Section 110.606.30(e): Rob Pierce seconded the motion which carried unanimously and considered the following criteria:

- 1) General improvement considerations for all parcel maps including, but not limited to:
 - i. 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;
 - ii. The availability of water which meets applicable health standards and is sufficient for the reasonably foreseeable needs of the parcels of land being created;
 - iii. The availability and accessibility of utilities;
 - iv. The availability and accessibility of public services such as schools, police and fire protection, transportation, recreation and parks;
 - v. Conformity with the zoning ordinances and master plan;
 - vi. General conformity with the governing body's master plan of streets and highways;
 - vii. The effect of the proposed division of land on existing public streets and the need for new streets or highways to serve the parcels of land being created;
 - viii. Physical characteristics of the land such as floodplain, slope and soil;
 - ix. The recommendations and comments of those entities reviewing the tentative parcel map pursuant to NRS 278.330 and 278.348, inclusive;
 - x. 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;
 - xi. Community antenna television (CATV) conduit and pull wire; and
 - xii. Recreation and trail easements.

C. Tentative Parcel Map Case Number WTPM22-0022 (Montreux Golf Club PM) – For hearing, discussion, and possible action to approve a tentative parcel map dividing a 56.173-acre parcel into two parcels of 55.96 acres (Parcel 1) and 0.217 acres (Parcel 2). Parcel 2 is being created for the existing well site adjacent to the golf course (Parcel 1).

- Applicant/Property Owner: Montreux Golf & Country Club
- Location: 17150 Bordeaux Dr., Reno, NV
- APN: 148-010-55
- Parcel Size: 53.173 acres
- Master Plan: Rural (R)
- Regulatory Zone: Low Density Suburban (50%), General Rural (50%)
- Area Plan: Forest (FO)
- Development Code: Authorized in Article 606, Parcel Maps
- Commission District: 2 – Commissioner Lucey
- Staff: Mitch Markey, Planner
Washoe County Community Services Department
Planning and Building Division
- Phone: 775-328-2722
- E-mail: mmarkey@washoecounty.gov

Planner Markey provided a presentation. Applicant and Land Surveyor, Dan Bigrigg was available to answer questions. Mr. Bigrigg stated the only pushback he had was on any setbacks, stating they would be irrelevant.

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

Wayne Handrock concurred with Mr. Bigrigg regarding not placing any setback conditions on the map, and instead conditioning the building itself.

Motion: Wes Rubio moved that, after giving reasoned consideration to the information contained in the staff report and information received during the public hearing, that the Washoe County Parcel Map Review Committee approve Parcel Map Case Number WTPM22-0022 for Montreux Golf and Country Club, subject to the conditions of approval included as Exhibit A with the staff report, and that the submittal packet for the final map include the an exhibit demonstrating the building meets all current setbacks at the time of recordation, and make the determination that the following criteria is or will be adequately provided for pursuant to Washoe County Code, Section 110.606.30(e): Dale Way seconded the motion which carried unanimously and considered the following criteria:

- 1) General improvement considerations for all parcel maps including, but not limited to:
 - i. 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;
 - ii. The availability of water which meets applicable health standards and is sufficient for the reasonably foreseeable needs of the parcels of land being created;
 - iii. The availability and accessibility of utilities;
 - iv. The availability and accessibility of public services such as schools, police and fire protection, transportation, recreation and parks;
 - v. Conformity with the zoning ordinances and master plan;
 - vi. General conformity with the governing body's master plan of streets and highways;
 - vii. The effect of the proposed division of land on existing public streets and the need for new streets or highways to serve the parcels of land being created;
 - viii. Physical characteristics of the land such as floodplain, slope and soil;
 - ix. The recommendations and comments of those entities reviewing the tentative parcel map pursuant to NRS 278.330 and 278.348, inclusive;
 - x. 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;
 - xi. Community antenna television (CATV) conduit and pull wire; and
 - xii. Recreation and trail easements.

8. Parcel Map Review Committee (PMRC) Meeting Type

Chair Pelham asked the committee members if they would like to continue meeting via Zoom only or change the meetings to in-person. Rob Pierce stated he preferred remote only meetings but was open to a hybrid option as well. Wes Rubio said he recognized that a hybrid option allowed more flexibility with the varied schedules but, he would not be opposed to in-person meetings only. Dale Way said he likes to be in-person at times, but it was a little more difficult for him since he is across town. However, a hybrid or remote only option was fine with him as well. Wayne Handrock stated that keeping the zoom option was a benefit for the public, applicants, and the consultants. Chair Pelham stated he wanted to do away with remote only meetings, he felt they did not provide as much opportunity for communication. Chair Pelham continued to say that remote only meetings were a detriment. Dale Way wanted to add that he would prefer to be in-person as much as possible however,

the time it would take for him to travel to and from the office would take longer than the meeting itself. Wes Rubio asked if the PMRC meeting was held to a 2pm time slot. Chair Pelham informed Mr. Rubio that it was not. Mr. Rubio then suggested holding some meetings in-person and others as remote only, seeing what the attendance rate was, and deciding then. He also suggested a possible time change to the PMRC meetings to allow committee members enough travel time.

Chair Pelham then asked DDA Ross if the committee would be committing an open meeting law violation if they were to discuss PMRC meeting date and time change. DDA Ross informed Chair Pelham that meeting type was on the agenda, to discuss date and time change it would have to be on the next agenda.

Chair Pelham suggested tabling the item until next month, with the additional discussion of a possible date and time change for PMRC meeting.

Public Comment:

Lacey Kerfoot, Washoe County resident, previous Washoe County employee and previous recording secretary for the Parcel Map Review Committee. Ms. Kerfoot asked the email she sent to the PMRC members the night prior be included in the record. Ms. Kerfoot stated she was grateful for the opportunity to join remotely, as it gave her the chance to step away from work and make public comment. Ms. Kerfoot stated she was present to oppose the proposal to revert to in-person meetings only. Her main concerns as stated in her email were accessibility for staff, being the PMRC members or County Staff. Participation by the public. Ms. Kerfoot shared that she spent the evening prior reviewing 4 years of previous PMRC minutes to study how attendance had changed since the meetings became remote only. Her other concerns included transparency and workload. Ms. Kerfoot noted that affected adjacent property owners do not receive notice of the PMRC meetings as early as they would with other boards due to changes in code. Lastly, the workload for Planners and the Planning department has exponentially increased in the last few years, with a smaller workforce to tackle such growth. Travel time to and from the office is time that could be better used to serve the public. Ms. Kerfoot reiterated she would like her email included in the record, thanked the committee for the opportunity to join remotely and encouraged the members to keep the meetings remote if not, at the very least, hybrid, for public participation.

Mitch Markey, Washoe County Planning, wanted to make a quick comment regarding two items. First, using the remote format was advantageous. It made it easier for participation. Applicants have let him know that they prefer the remote option. Secondly, holding meetings via a hybrid option placed a greater burden on admin staff. Admin would be the ones to have to be in-person at every meeting to ensure there is a proper set up for in-person and Zoom participants. Therefore, while a hybrid option did allow more flexibility for some of the members, some staff and the public it would reduce flexibility for admin. He stated that was something to keep in mind moving forward. Mr. Markey thanked the committee for their time and hoped they would continue with the remote route.

DDA Ross stated he would have to leave the meeting; however, another district attorney would be joining the meeting momentarily.

Kat Oakley, Washoe County Planning, stated that the comment that Lacey Kerfoot provided during public comment and her electronic correspondence very articulately captured any point that Ms. Oakley herself would make. She wanted to emphasize that accessibility was an important consideration. If there is an opportunity to make the public process more accessible and easier for the members of the public, she didn't see a reason to sacrifice that unless it was necessary, which she didn't believe it was. She also stated that she has not heard of any member of the public stating

that remote meetings made it difficult for them to participate. She was in favor of a remote meeting, second to that a hybrid option but did note that a hybrid option placed a greater burden on admin staff. Ms. Oakley ended her public comment by stating she was in favor of digital participation.

Chris Bronczyk, Washoe County Planning, wanted to echo what was stated by Lacey Kerfoot, Mitch Markey, and Kat Oatley. He thought the benefit for remote for PMRC meetings outweighed the benefits and time of having the meetings in-person. The Zoom format has worked extremely well for Staff, the public, and the applicants that he's worked with for PMRC cases. He was in support of keeping the meetings digital only, versus in-person meetings.

Motion: Wes Rubio moved to table the item until next month, with the additional discussion of a possible date and time change for the Parcel Map Review Committee meeting and discussion on what a hybrid meeting would look like. Wayne Handrock seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

9. Reports and Future Agenda Items

- A. Future Agenda Items - Possible date and time change for the Parcel Map Review Committee meetings.
- B. Legal Information and Updates - None

10. Public Comment

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

11. Adjournment


Chair Pelham made the motion to adjourn at 2:59 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Adriana Albarran, Recording Secretary

Approved by Committee in session on February 9, 2023.



Roger Pelham, Chair
Senior Planner