



WASHOE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION Meeting Minutes

Planning Commission Members

James Barnes, Chair
Sarah Chvilicek, Vice Chair
Larry Chesney
Francine Donshick
Philip Horan
Greg Prough
Carl R. Webb, Jr., AICP, Secretary

Tuesday, December 6, 2016
6:30 p.m.

Washoe County Health District, Bldg B
1001 East Ninth Street
Reno, NV

The Washoe County Planning Commission met in a scheduled session on Tuesday, December 6, 2016, in the Washoe County Administration Complex, Health District, Building B, 1001 East Ninth Street, Reno, Nevada.

1. *Determination of Quorum

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

Commissioners present: James Barnes, Chair
Sarah Chvilicek, Vice Chair (*participated via telephone*)
Larry Chesney
Francine Donshick
Philip Horan
Greg Prough

Staff present: Carl R. Webb, Jr., AICP, Secretary
Roger Pelham, MPA, Senior Planner, Planning and Development
Chad Giesinger, Senior Planner, Planning and Development
Jim Smitherman, Water Resources Program Manager, Western
Regional Water Commission
Vahid Behmaram, Water Management Planner Coordinator, Planning
and Development
Nathan Edwards, Deputy District Attorney, District Attorney's Office
Katy Stark, Recording Secretary, Planning and Development
Kathy Emerson, Administrative Secretary Supervisor, Planning and
Development

2. *Pledge of Allegiance

Commissioner Horan led the pledge to the flag.

3. *Ethics Law Announcement

Deputy District Attorney Edwards provided the ethics procedure for disclosures. He stated he wanted on the record that Vice Chair Chvilicek was participating in the meeting via the telephone and was aware the meeting was being recorded. Vice Chair Chvilicek consented.

4. *Appeal Procedure

Mr. Webb recited the appeal procedure for items heard before the Planning Commission.

5. *Public Comment

Chair Barnes opened the Public Comment period. Kenneth Allen, 5250 Shawna Lane, stated he was present on behalf of his neighbors and himself. He presented a packet to the Commission containing all the issues regarding the building sites that would be heard at the January 3, 2017 meeting. He said the reason he brought it up now was because it would give the Commission the opportunity to read what they had discovered. He noted many of them found that the proposal had faults and before it came before this Commission for consideration, they wanted them to be aware of what they found. He listed a few of their discoveries. He hoped this information would be distributed to the developers also.

Chair Barnes asked if there was anyone else who wished to speak. Hearing none, he closed the Public Comment period.

6. Approval of Agenda

Chair Barnes stated he would like to hear Agenda Item 9D before Agenda Item 8. In accordance with the Open Meeting Law, Commissioner Horan moved to approve the Agenda as amended for the December 6, 2016 meeting. Commissioner Donshick seconded the motion, which carried unanimously with a vote of six for, none against.

7. Approval of November 1, 2016 Draft Minutes

Commissioner Prough moved to approve the minutes for the November 1, 2016, Planning Commission meeting as written. Commissioner Donshick seconded the motion, which carried unanimously with a vote of six for, none against.

The following item was taken out of order per approval by the Commission.

9. Public Hearings

D. Abandonment Case Number AB16-004 (Kessariss Way Parcels) – Hearing, discussion, and possible action to approve the abandonment of multiple access easements on five adjoining properties. The proposed abandonment application will involve the following requests: 1) APN 142-241-51: abandon the southerly 13 feet of the 33 foot easement along the northern boundary and abandon the 33 foot easements along the eastern and southern boundaries; 2) APN 142-241-52: abandon the southerly 13 feet of the 33 foot easement along the northern boundary and the easterly 13 feet of the 33 foot easement along the western boundary and abandon the 33 foot easements along the eastern and southern boundaries; 3) APN 142-241-53: abandon the southerly 13 feet of the 33 foot easement along the northern boundary and abandon the 33 foot easements along the western, eastern and southern boundaries; 4) APN 142-241-54: abandon the 33 foot easements along western, eastern, southern and northern boundaries with the exception of the northerly 20' wide easement along the northern property line that extends approximately 30' in from the eastern edge of the property; and 5) APN 142-241- 61: abandon the easterly 13 feet of the north half ($\pm 160'$) and all 33 feet of the south half of the 33 foot easement along the western boundary and abandon the 33 foot easement along the northern and eastern boundaries.

- Applicant/Property Owners: Reichlin Family Trust
Johnson Living Trust
Halstead Family Trust
Alan and Marsha Day
Bruce and Jean Bye
- Location: 14345 & 14415 Bihler Way and 3080, 3145 and 3210 Kessarais Way
- Assessor's Parcel Numbers: 142-241-51, 52, 53, 54 & 61
- Parcel Size: 12.5 acres
- Master Plan Category: Rural Residential (RR)
- Regulatory Zone: High Density Rural (HDR)
- Area Plan: Southwest Truckee Meadows
- Citizen Advisory Commission: South Truckee Meadows/Washoe Valley
- Development Code: Article 806
- Commission District: 2 – Commissioner Lucey
- Section/Township/Range: Section 30, T18N, R20E, MDM, Washoe County, NV
- Prepared by: Trevor Lloyd – Senior Planner
Washoe County Community Services Department
Planning and Development Division
- Phone: 775.328.3620
- E-Mail: tlloyd@washoecounty.us

Mr. Webb stated this item had been requested to be continued to the January 3, 2017 Planning Commission meeting because there was an error in the legal description as it appeared on the Notice Cards and on this Agenda. In order to rectify that error, Staff felt it was prudent to continue this item and allow for proper re-noticing to the neighbors.

Chair Barnes opened the public hearing for public comment. John Fritz, 14400 Bihler Road, stated the proposal would abandon easements that were one mile long in each direction on every single home site. He believed to notify the immediate adjacent neighbors was not enough. The other reason he was present and looking for consideration to turn down this item was that Washoe County required a 60-foot diameter turnaround for subdivisions that were approved. He said if a 66-foot wide easement was reduced to 33 feet or even 40 feet, a fire truck would not be able to turn around. He believed the project did not meet any of the fire code requirements. He said the County Engineer reported some of the easements located out there were not to be abandoned. He said Bihler Road was the main access to get in and out of that area and he felt those easements were pertinent to his property.

Chair Barnes closed the public hearing. Commissioner Chesney moved to continue this item to the January 3, 2017 Planning Commission meeting. Commissioner Donshick seconded the motion, which carried unanimously with a vote of six for and none against.

8. Planning Items

A. Presentation on the Regional Water Plan and Water Resources – Jim Smitherman, Water Resources Program Manager

Mr. Smitherman, Water Resources Program Manager, gave a brief background to the Commission. He stated the Western Regional Water Commission (WRWC) was created in 2007 by the State Legislature; it had a technical advisory committee called the Northern Nevada Water Planning Commission who was charged with developing the Regional Water

Management Plan (Plan). He said the Plan covered water supply, water quality, wastewater, effluent management, and drainage and flood control for the planning area. He said the Plan was revised and updated every five years and they were in the midst of a five-year update right now. They should have a draft out early next year. He said concerns expressed by most folks when they asked for a presentation or an appearance were usually centered on growth and the future water supply, resiliency and sustainability of the water supply. He stated he would cover those concerns.

Mr. Smitherman stated the Plan would catalogue available water resources for the County. They started with the State Engineer's estimates of perennial yield for the groundwater basins. He said they would then layer in water rights, the appropriations that had been made for the water for different uses and then make note of any orders or limitations the State Engineer had issued. Then they would summarize all of that into a Regional Water Baseline Table. He said in addition to the groundwater resources, they would include the Truckee River Operating Agreement (TROA) for the Truckee River, tributaries and associated groundwater. He said there was a TROA yield that was assumed for the Truckee Meadows Area, and that was layered in as well. They would total up all of the potential available water resources, and it should be approximately 180,000 acre feet per year.

Mr. Smitherman stated in 2008 there was a ballot question on the Washoe County Ballot and it had to do with sustainable water resources and a balance with the Regional Land Use Plan. That resulted in a comparison they did every other year with the Water Resources Baseline he mentioned and the calculated 20-year population water demands. He noted they did that just before the approval of the Washoe County Consensus forecast every couple of years. Each time they did the comparison the potentially available water resources were far in excess of what the demands were projected to be 20 years out.

Mr. Smitherman stated the Plan also contained a water balance diagram that would take into account the flow of water supply, wastewater treatment and treated wastewater effluent that was either reclaimed or returned into the environment. He said they broke that down into six sub-areas that coincided with the service areas of the major wastewater treatment plants in the area. He explained the flow diagram was useful for identifying future possible deficits for water supply; surpluses for water supply, and then where a surplus in one area could serve a deficit in another area. He said they coordinated very closely with the Truckee Meadows Water Authority (TMWA) for data and also with the engineers that did the planning for the wastewater treatment facilities and the disposal and reuse of the effluent, and with the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency (TMRPA) to make sure they were in line with the population projections across the region. Mr. Smitherman stated they were working on the update of the Plan and they were looking at creating the flow diagram for projections out to 2035.

Mr. Smitherman stated the Regional Water Plan did not address individual, residential or commercial developments. He said they kept things at the service territory level for the utilities for which they were charged with compiling plans. The Northern Nevada Water Planning Commission has a function for reviewing for conformance plans for facilities that may come forward but it is limited to facilities that were not contemplated in the Plan or that were of a size or kind that might affect the working of the Plan. He said they did a few in the past but he had not seen a facility plan submitted for conformance review since before the economic downturn in 2009.

Mr. Smitherman said he would take questions at this time.

Commissioner Chesney stated that the Commission would really like to know how many hookups were allocated for residential hookups to date and how many hookups were remaining in the future. He explained the Commission continued to approve hundreds and hundreds of

units in development, yet the Commission had no idea how much sewer capacity was left in the treatment plants. He said the same applied for the water: was there enough water for the units that had already been approved and were in the system and what was projected? He stated that was a lot of water and sewage when you hear the rumor that our treatment plants are close to capacity and the amount they were allowed to discharge into the Truckee River. He said it would help the Commission if they knew what the capacity was.

Mr. Smitherman stated he could answer in generalities. He said they received the population projections for 20 years from TRPA and they also very closely tracked approved yet un-built Planned Unit Developments, subdivisions and such. He knew they had more than enough allocations for building sites to accommodate the population growth out 20 years and beyond. As far as wastewater treatment capacity, some of the wastewater treatment plants were nearing capacity and there was a requirement with the State, who permitted their discharge, once they reached a certain level. They had to demonstrate they had plans to serve beyond 70 to 80 percent of capacity. One of the things they were looking at was the limitation into the future and how to manage the wastewater effluent. Then whatever could not go there would be reused somewhere else. The State was working on regulations that would allow for expanded uses for higher levels of treatment, clean up the effluent even more and use it for other things, which would include some aquifer recharge. He said they were working very hard on developing the plans to manage the effluent for the entire region.

Commissioner Horan said he thought it would be useful to the Commission to have a better statement as to where we were regarding the capacity right now relative to the plans that people were working on to expand the capacity. Mr. Smitherman stated the water balance diagram that he spoke about earlier would demonstrate that. Commissioner Horan asked when that would be available. Mr. Smitherman said he had a draft from their consultant, and it was in review with the service providers to make sure all the numbers balanced. Commissioner Horan stated in 90 days Mr. Smitherman could provide an estimate of where the current capacity was and what the plans were to expand that capacity relative to wastewater. Mr. Smitherman stated he could bring something back to the Commission in 90 days, but the answer was they would not run out of capacity because they were going to implement the plans. Commissioner Horan wanted to know when we would run out without the plans. Mr. Smitherman stated he would have that answer also.

Commissioner Donshick stated she would like to see some solid documentation because she was more concerned about the water reserves. She said you can plan for sanitary and you can build, but we only have so much water and she wanted this Commission to see where we were now with the water and what his estimates were as to where we would get future water. Mr. Smitherman stated he would get that.

Commissioner Prough stated he represented District 4 (Spanish Springs) where the majority of the building was happening. His constituents who are on wells continually state that TMWA was bringing water to the area, but they were concerned it would bring down the aquifers and they could lose their wells. He would like to see a little more enhanced reporting on Spanish Springs specifically with regard to residential hookups and what capacity was it getting to and what the plans were to meet the needs of those new homes.

Commissioner Chvilicek commented she concurred with the other commissioners with regard to impacts on water and sewage treatment on all of these approved but not yet built homes.

There was no action taken on this item.

B. Distribution of development maps for Washoe County showing approved development projects that have not yet been built.

Mr. Webb stated the maps presented to the Commission were available and the request from the Planning Commission was for a graphic showing the unbuilt projects, specifically to the County. There was also a request that as Tentative Subdivision Maps appeared before this Commission in the future that the department provide a graphic that would show approved unbuilt projects in the planning area. He showed the Commission first the approved unbuilt projects residential subdivisions showing out through the entire County. He said that table showed the map was done this month. The second map showed a zoom in to the Spanish Springs area because the Planning Commission would hear two tentative map proposals on this agenda. He said that as each tentative map came forward for approval, this would become a part of the tentative subdivision map process and packet so the Commission would have all the information they requested for reference.

Commissioner Prough referred to an "x" on the map at the corner of Calle de la Plata and the Pyramid Highway on the southwest corner. He said that was a blank field but they were putting in streets. On the map it was shown that it was already built out as opposed to an approved project. Mr. Webb stated he was not sure why that was produced that way, but this was vetted through all the Planners. He felt the map was comprehensive, but he would get with the Planner who put the map together for an answer.

Commissioner Horan asked if the map indicated 1,729 unbuilt units in the Spanish Springs vicinity. Mr. Webb stated from Blackstone down to Sugar Loaf they were the units that were approved (1,998) and the units that were remaining to be built were 1,729. Mr. Webb stated Broken Hills showed 170 units were approved; however, there were still 165 that were remaining to be built. He said they created the map with that color legend to give the Commission the numbers of really what was unbuilt because that was the interest expressed by this Commission.

Commissioner Chvilicek stated when they had their original approval date she presumed that was from the Board of County Commissioners (BCC). Mr. Webb stated tentative subdivision maps were final at the Planning Commission level unless appealed, so the dates were final decision dates by the Planning Commission. If the tentative map was appealed to the BCC then that date reflected their decision.

Mr. Webb stated the area Commissioner Prough had referred to was for lots that had been recorded, which meant that once they were recorded they were put in the Assessor's data base and would show up as approved and built. There might not actually be a house on the lot, but they were approved and recorded.

There was no action taken on this item.

9. Public Hearings

A. Amendment of Conditions Case Number AC16-004 for Tentative Subdivision Map Case Number TM13-002 for Spanish Springs Associates (Eagle Canyon Ranch) – Discussion and possible action to approve the relocation of lots numbered 464 and 465 and the removal of lots numbered 450-462 of the previously-approved 465 lot residential subdivision with common open space. The minimum lot size approved is 8,510 square feet (0.19 acres); the maximum lot size approved is 37,591 square feet (0.86 acres); and the average lot size is 11,125 square feet (0.26 acres). The overall density is 3 dwelling units per acre.

- Applicant/Property Owner: Spanish Springs Associates
- Project Name: Eagle Canyon Ranch
- Project Location: Approximately one-half mile north of the Eagle Canyon Drive/Neighborhood Way intersection; and

- Assessor's Parcel Numbers: approximately 1,500 feet southwest of the West Calle de la Plata/Pyramid Highway intersection
532-020-19; 532-020-22; 532-091-10; 532-020-21; and 532-142-06
- Total Project Size: +151 acres
- Master Plan Category: Suburban Residential (SR)
- Regulatory Zone: Medium Density Suburban (MDS)
- Area Plan: Spanish Springs
- Citizen Advisory Commission: Spanish Springs
- Development Code: Article 408, *Common Open Space Development*
Article 608, *Tentative Subdivision Maps*
- Commission District: 4 – Commissioner Hartung
- Section/Township/Range: Sections 26, 27, 34, T21N, R20E, MDM, Washoe County, NV
- Prepared by: Roger Pelham, MPA, Senior Planner
Washoe County Community Services Department
Planning and Development Division
- Phone: 775.328.3622
- E-Mail: rpelham@washoecounty.us

Chair Barnes opened the public hearing. Mr. Webb identified the item for the Commission. Chair Barnes asked if any of the Commissioners had any disclosures to make. Hearing none, he asked the Planner to present his report.

Roger Pelham, Senior Planner, presented his Staff Report. He noted a couple of changes that had been requested by the Applicant, (Exhibit A – Revised). He said the request from the Applicant was for an amendment to the five conditions and those were conditions MM to QQ. The first four simply applied to the area that was being removed and therefore was no longer applicable to the remainder of the subdivision, as did the one that was requested for QQ. That amendment was simply to eliminate the words and proposed lot 464 and 465. Those two lots were going away and moving down to the middle of the block. He suggested the Commission refer to Exhibit A – Revised when they made their motion. He said he recommended approval of the project.

Commissioner Horan stated page 5 showed parcels to be relocated by the proposed amendment; and then on page 6 it showed where they were to be located. He asked if that was correct. Mr. Pelham stated that was correct. Commissioner Horan asked what was in the space now where those would be relocated. Mr. Pelham stated two less parcels were being proposed. He said in that little space about 14 parcels were being proposed; previously it was 12. The overall density remained the same. Commissioner Horan asked how many parcels were being removed by the proposed amendment. Mr. Pelham responded the 16 parcels that were being removed to the other side of the drainage facility were going to be dealt with in a subsequent tentative map next on the agenda. They were simply being removed from this approval and the two from the north were going into that block.

Commissioner Prough stated the amended conditions on page 10 for a pedestrian ramp for the disabled shall be installed on the east side of Sand Dune Drive to the satisfaction of County Engineers was to be stricken. He wondered why that need for a pedestrian ramp was removed. Mr. Pelham stated that area, Sand Dune Drive, was no longer within this tentative subdivision map.

Chair Barnes asked the Applicant to give their presentation. Bob Sader, HawCo Properties, stated he was the representative of the Applicant, Jesse Haw. He said they had no formal presentation because they believed the Staff Report was thorough. He stated they agreed with the recommendation of approval, all of the conditions proposed in the Staff Report and the amendments.

Chair Barnes opened public comment. Hearing none, he closed public comment and opened up discussion to the Commission. Hearing none, Chair Barnes closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Chesney made a motion 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 Amendment of Conditions Case Number AC16-004 for Tentative Subdivision Map Case Number TM13-002 (Eagle Canyon Ranch) for Spanish Springs Associates with the amended Conditions of Approval included as Exhibit A – Revised to this matter, having made all ten findings in accordance with Washoe County Development Code Section 110.608.25: Commissioner Prough seconded the motion, which carried unanimously. **(Vote of 6 in favor, 0 against)**

- 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.

B. Tentative Subdivision Map Case Number TM16-008 (Pyramid Ranch Annex Subdivision) – Hearing, discussion, and possible action to approve a 61-lot single-family

residential subdivision. Lot sizes are proposed to range from a minimum of 12,000 square feet ($\pm .27$ acres) to a maximum of 17,762 square feet ($\pm .40$ acres) with an average of 13,182 square feet ($\pm .30$ acres).

- Applicant / Property Owner: Spanish Springs Associates, LP
Attn. Jesse Haw,
550 W. Plumb Lane, #B-505
Reno, NV 89509
- Location: North and west of the intersection of Sand Dune Drive and Dromedary Road.
- Assessor's Parcel Number(s): 532-091-10 and a portion of 532-091-09
- Parcel Size: ± 5.7 and ± 15.6 (± 21.3 total) acres
- Master Plan Category: Suburban Residential
- Regulatory Zone: Medium Density Suburban
- Area Plan: Spanish Springs
- Citizen Advisory Commission: Spanish Springs
- Development Code: Article 608, Tentative Subdivision Maps
- Commission District: 4 – Commissioner Hartung
- Section/Township/Range: Section 26 and 27, T21N, R20E, MDM, Washoe County, NV
- Prepared by: Roger Pelham, MPA, Senior Planner
Washoe County Community Services Department
Planning and Development Division
- Phone: 775.328.3622
- E-Mail: rpelham@washoecounty.us

Mr. Webb identified the item for the Commission. Chair Barnes asked for any disclosures from the Commission. Hearing none, he opened the public hearing. Mr. Pelham, Senior Planner, presented his Staff Report. He said he had one modification; removal of Condition 2Z, Silent Sparrow Drive, which was not adjacent to this subdivision.

Commissioner Horan asked how the County Parks Department determined if parks were needed or not. Mr. Pelham stated he did not know the answer to that question. Commissioner Horan suggested that be added to their list of information.

Chair Barnes opened the Applicant's presentation. Bob Sader, HawCo Representative, stated they agreed with the Staff Report and all the conditions including the removal of Condition 2Z. He noted HawCo brought to the Commission a zone change on this parcel earlier this year and they presented a letter from the Parks Department stating that 15 acres, which was not subject to this Tentative Map, was no longer needed for a park. He said five acres for an extension of Gator Swamp Park was requested of HawCo and they agreed to donate that to the County. The process was back in 2000 when they Master Planned this whole area, the Parks Department requested they put aside 20 acres for a proposed regional park in this location. As time went on, the Parks Department requested additional park land from them and requested 15 acres for the Eagle Canyon Subdivision. The Parks Department built four parks and after some time they set aside two regional park locations, very close to each other and the Parks Department determined which one they wanted developed and this one became excess. Mr. Sader said the Planning Commission approved rezoning of this unanimously and the BCC approved this unanimously. This Tentative Map was just filling in the blanks of what the houses and the streets would look like and all the conditions to the development.

Chair Barnes opened up questions for the Applicant. Hearing none, he opened up public comment. Hearing none, he opened up questions to the Commission.

Commissioner Prough asked when Mr. Sader expected to have the houses built, sold and occupied. Mr. Sader responded it could be late 2019 when they would commence development. He said they anticipated the 61 lots would be developed all in one final map or alternatively in two smaller final maps. He said the letter from the Washoe County School District stated the school was at 111 percent of capacity at Taylor Elementary. He wondered what that would look like in two years' time when those children started attending those schools. He said those kids that would be transported to other schools at the District's expense. He knew HawCo to be good neighbors but he was just wondering if they would be willing to look at putting in additional portables at the schools as opposed to the County busing children all over the place. He wondered if he could condition the approval of the map asking the developer to supply additional portables. Mr. Sader responded it was their policy to donate school sites, which was required by law to be purchased by the School District. He said it was their company culture to consider a donation to the community with schools and parks. He noted there was a school site across the street at the Harris Ranch which would be donated to the School District when they were ready to develop it. He said they would take a look at how they could support Taylor Elementary and even the prospect of making a donation for portables or other improvements, but they would not support a condition of approval on this tentative map.

Chair Barnes closed the public hearing and opened discussion up for the Commission. Commissioner Chesney stated that now that the School District was taxing everyone to death, he had no sympathy for them on their timing or their ability to provide schools. He said he felt they had sufficient funding and if they used it properly they would not have to bus kids very long. He said he could not support a conditional amendment based on providing anything for the School District.

Chair Barnes called for a motion.

Commissioner Donshick made a motion 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 Tentative Subdivision Map Case Number TM16-008 for Spanish Springs Associates, with the conditions included as Exhibit A, with the addition to remove Condition 2Z, for this matter having made all ten findings in accordance with Washoe County Code Section 110.608.25: The motion was seconded by Commissioner Chesney which carried unanimously. **(Vote of 6 in favor, 0 against)**

- 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.

C. Tentative Subdivision Map Case Number TM16-006 (Silent Sparrow Subdivision) – Hearing, discussion, and possible action to approve a tentative subdivision map to allow the creation of up to 24 lots for single-family residences. The lots are proposed to range in size from 12,000 square feet (±.27 acres) to 17,027 square feet (±.39 acres) with an average size of ±12,391 square feet (±.28 acres).

- Applicant / Owner: Spanish Springs Associates LP
550 W. Plumb Lane #B-505
Reno, NV 89509
- Location: South side of Silent Sparrow Drive adjacent to Lanstar Drive and Avian Drive
- Assessor's Parcel Number: 532-020-12
- Parcel Size: ±8.04-acre portion of a ±22.048-acre parcel
- Master Plan Category: Suburban Residential
- Regulatory Zone: Existing: Public and Semi-Public Facilities;
Proposed: Medium Density Suburban (RZA16-004)
- Area Plan: Spanish Springs
- Citizen Advisory Commission: Spanish Springs
- Development Code: Article 608, Tentative Subdivision Maps
- Commission District: 4 – Commissioner Hartung
- Section/Township/Range: Section 23, T21N, R20E, MDM,
Washoe County, NV
- Prepared by: Roger Pelham, MPA, Senior Planner
Washoe County Community Services Department
Planning and Development Division
- Phone: 775.328.3622
- E-Mail: rpelham@washoecounty.us

Mr. Webb identified the item for the Commission. Chair Barnes asked if there were any disclosures from the Commission. Hearing none, he opened the public hearing and asked Mr. Pelham to present his Staff Report. Mr. Pelham presented his Staff Report.

Chair Barnes opened up questions to the Commission. Hearing none, he asked for an Applicant presentation.

Mr. Sader, HawCo, stated they supported the Staff Report and agreed with the conditions. Chair Barnes opened up questions to the Commission. Hearing none, he opened public comment. Hearing none, Chair Barnes opened up questions to the Commission.

Commissioner Chvilicek commented that as these projects received final approval from the BCC they would be added to the approved but not yet built map which would be a revolving document. Mr. Webb stated that could be done.

Chair Barnes closed the public hearing and brought discussion back to the Commission. Hearing none, he called for a motion.

Commissioner Chesney made a motion 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 Tentative Subdivision Map Case Number TM16-006 for Spanish Springs Associates, with the conditions included in the Staff Report, having made all ten findings in accordance with Washoe County Development Code Section 110.608.25: Commissioner Donshick seconded the motion, which carried unanimously. **(Vote of 6 in favor, 0 against)**

- 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.

E. Development Code Amendment Case Number DCA16-007 (Verizon GRA) – Hearing, discussion, and possible action to recommend approval of an amendment to the

Washoe County Code at Chapter 110 (Development Code), Article 324 *Communication Facilities* at Section 110.324.50(e), to include the General Rural Agricultural regulatory zone among the regulatory zones where wireless communication facility monopole antennas are allowed with a special use permit; to clarify that all new monopole antennas require the approval of a Special Use Permit; and to replace the master plan designations of Rural Residential, Suburban Residential, and Urban Residential with the corresponding regulatory zones of High Density Rural (HDR), Medium Density Rural (MDR), Low Density Rural (LDR), Low Density Suburban (LDS), Medium Density Suburban (MDS), High Density Suburban (HDS), Low Density Urban (LDU), Medium Density Urban (MDU), and High Density Urban (HDU); and, if approved, to authorize the chair to sign a resolution reflecting these amendments.

- **Prepared by:** Chad Giesinger, Senior Planner
Washoe County Community Services Department
Planning and Development Division
- Phone: 775.328.3626
- E-Mail: cgiesinger@washoecounty.us

Mr. Webb identified the item for the Commission. Chair Barnes asked if the Commission had any disclosures to make. Hearing none, he opened the public hearing and asked for staff's presentation. Chad Giesinger, Senior Planner, presented his staff report.

Mr. Giesinger stated he forgot to mention in the Staff Report that this was an applicant driven Development Code Amendment brought forward by Verizon. The initial language they submitted with their application would have resulted in the elimination of the Rural Residential Regulatory zones (HDR, MDR and LDR) from Article 324. He said he reached out to the Applicant as soon as he found out about the proposed language and explained to them what staff wanted to do in terms of the amendment and the Applicant agreed. He said there was also some language in the application about the Warm Springs Specific Plan and this amendment had nothing to do with the Warm Springs Specific Plan. He continued with the Staff Report and stated staff recommended approval.

Chair Barnes opened up questions to the Commission. Commissioner Horan asked if there were any places that cellular towers were not allowed. Mr. Giesinger stated technically no; however, in order to place a new monopole antenna in the Suburban and Urban zones, the applicant would have to demonstrate a finding of significant gap in coverage. If they could meet those standards, they would be allowed to place one in those zones with a Special Use Permit.

Chair Barnes asked the Applicant to make their presentation. Michelle Ellis, Complete Wireless Consulting, representative for Verizon, stated they brought this application forward as a result of some facility development that Verizon requested in Washoe County. In particular her office had two projects in the Warm Springs area and the majority of the area was zoned GRA and was a little more restrictive in the urban areas. She noted that was why they decided to bring the application forward, because they would like to develop facilities in that GRA zone. She said they were more than happy to agree with the language changes recommended by staff.

Commissioner Horan asked if Ms. Ellis was actually the applicant. Ms. Ellis responded Verizon commissioned out their searching to site companies. Commissioner Horan stated her company may have generated the enthusiasm to make this amendment, but he would assume the true applicant would be the County. Mr. Webb explained the Development Code itself provided several methods for amendments and one of them was that an applicant could apply to amend the Code. Commissioner Horan stated the first page of the Staff Report showed the Applicant was listed as the Planning and Development Division and he wondered if it should read Verizon.

Mr. Webb concurred and said the Applicant was actually Verizon and it should have showed that way.

Chair Barnes asked if the Commission had any further questions. Hearing none, he opened up public comment. Hearing none, he opened up questions to the Commission. Hearing none, he closed the public hearing and called for discussion. Hearing none, he called for a motion.

Commissioner Chesney made a motion 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 recommend approval of DCA16-007 to amend the Washoe County Code at Chapter 110 (Development Code), Article 324 *Communication Facilities* at Section 110.324.50(e), to include the General Rural Agricultural regulatory zone among the regulatory zones where wireless communication facility monopole antennas are allowed with a special use permit; to clarify that all new monopole antennas require the approval of a Special Use Permit; and to replace the master plan designations of Rural Residential, Suburban Residential, and Urban Residential with the corresponding regulatory zones of High Density Rural (HDR), Medium Density Rural (MDR), Low Density Rural (LDR), Low Density Suburban (LDS), Medium Density Suburban (MDS), High Density Suburban (HDS), Low Density Urban (LDU), Medium Density Urban (MDU), and High Density Urban (HDU); and, if approved, to authorize the chair to sign a resolution reflecting these amendments. I further move to authorize the Chair to sign the resolution contained in Attachment A on behalf of the Washoe County Planning Commission and to direct staff to present a report of this Commission's recommendation to the Washoe County Commission of County Commissioners within 60 days of today's date. This recommendation for approval is based on all of the following four findings in accordance with Washoe County Code Section 110.818.15(e): Commissioner Donschick seconded the motion, which carried unanimously. **(Vote of 6 in favor, 0 against)**

1. Consistency with Master Plan. The proposed Development Code amendment is in substantial compliance with the policies and action programs of the Washoe County Master Plan;
2. Promotes the Purpose of the Development Code. The proposed Development Code amendment will not adversely impact the public health, safety or welfare, and will promote the original purposes for the Development Code as expressed in Article 918, Adoption of Development Code;
3. Response to Changed Conditions. The proposed Development Code amendment responds to changed conditions or further studies that have occurred since the Development Code was adopted by the Commission of County Commissioners, and the requested amendment allow for a more desirable utilization of land within the regulatory zones; and,
4. No Adverse Affects. The proposed Development Code amendment will not adversely affect the implementation of the policies and action programs of the Conservation Element or the Population Element of the Washoe County Master Plan.

10. Chair and Commission Items

*A. Future agenda items.

Commissioner Horan stated he raised the issue again of how the Parks Department determined to expand their parks in subdivisions and new development and would request that information.

Commissioner Prough asked if the Commission could get the Truckee Meadows Water Authority to address the potential hookups in Spanish Springs. Mr. Webb stated TMWA and staff were present to address those questions tonight. He said that every time a tentative

subdivision map came forward, they were required as part of the conditions and approval to provide the necessary water rights; whether it be groundwater or through a service provider for those hookups. He directed the Commission to the supporting material that came from TMWA and that one of the conditions was the Applicant had to provide a will-serve. He said from TMWA's perspective hookups were required; however, the State Engineer validated the water rights that were being offered. Commissioner Prough agreed they provided information and approval to go forward, but he felt they were always behind the curve a little regarding schools, traffic and water. He said if they were going to put in 1,200 new homes with 1,200 new hookups all he was asking for was that before he saw the next project that wanted to add another 1,200 homes what that capacity might look like. He was concerned the Commission was not being due diligent by just accepting things as written. Mr. Webb stated if the Commission would like to have a presentation he requested strict guidelines about exactly what staff should provide in the context of water. He said TMWA was a service provider and if they agreed to service the subdivision he believed that was TMWA's responsibility as it would be for any other public agency. He said if the Commission as a whole wanted the presentation, he would direct staff. Commissioner Prough stated he would think about what he wanted and address it at the next meeting.

Commissioner Horan stated when they had the question regarding wastewater treatment, would that fall in the same category. Nathan Edwards, Deputy District Attorney, stated he did not want this to become a discussion about wastewater and hookups because this Agenda item was for future Agenda items.

***B.** Requests for information from staff.

Commissioner Horan stated he wanted to make sure the Commission's direction to have the continued item to include responses to the questions brought up in public comment. Mr. Webb stated he made a note to have Planner Lloyd address the comments.

11. Director's and Legal Counsel's Items

***A.** Discussion and possible action to reschedule the July 4, 2017 Planning Commission meeting. Staff proposes to reschedule the meeting since July 4, 2017 is a holiday.

Mr. Webb suggested the meeting be held on July 5, 2017. Commissioner Horan made a motion to move the meeting to July 5, 2017. Commissioner Prough seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

***B.** Report on previous Planning Commission items.

Mr. Webb stated the Regulatory Zone Amendment that was heard at the last meeting on Marango Road would be scheduled for the January 10, 2017 BCC meeting. The Master Plan Amendment and Regulatory Zone Amendment that was heard at the last meeting for USA Parkway Industrial would be scheduled for the January 24, 2017 BCC meeting. He noted at the Commission's next meeting that Ascente would be on, be moved to February 7, 2017. He provided a handout inviting all of the Commission to a potluck.

***C.** Legal information and updates.

Mr. Edwards stated he had nothing to report.


12. *General Public Comment

There was response to the call for public comment.

13. Adjournment

8:19 p.m. Commissioner Donshick made a motion to adjourn the meeting, which was seconded by Commissioner Prough, which carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,



Jaime Deller, Independent Contractor

Approved by Commission in session on January 3, 2017.



Carl R. Webb, Jr., AICP
Secretary to the Planning Commission