



WASHOE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION Meeting Minutes

Planning Commission Members

Larry Chesney
Sarah Chvilicek, Vice Chair
Francine Donshick, Chair
R. Michael Flick
Kate S. Nelson
Larry Peyton
Patricia Phillips
Secretary
Trevor Lloyd

Tuesday, April 5, 2022
6:00 p.m.

Washoe County Administrative Complex
Commission Chambers
1001 E 9th Street, Building A
Reno, Nevada 89512

and available via
Zoom Webinar

The Washoe County Planning Commission met in a scheduled session on Tuesday, April 5, 2022, in the Washoe County Commission Chambers, 1001 East Ninth Street, Reno, Nevada and via Zoom teleconference.

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

1. *Determination of Quorum

Chair Donshick called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. The following Commissioners and staff were present:

Commissioners present: Larry Chesney
Sarah Chvilicek, Vice Chair
Francine Donshick, Chair
R. Michael Flick
Kate S. Nelson (via Zoom)
Larry Peyton
Pat Phillips

Staff present: Trevor Lloyd, Secretary, Planning and Building
Chris Bronczyk, Planner, Planning and Building
Julee Olander, Planner, Planning and Building
Katy Stark, Planner, Planning and Building
Jennifer Gustafson, Deputy District Attorney, District Attorney's Office
Lacey Kerfoot, Recording Secretary, Planning and Building
Adriana Albarran, Office Support Specialist, Planning and Building

2. Pledge of Allegiance

Commissioner Peyton led the pledge to the flag.

Recording Secretary Lacey Kerfoot indicated that the audio for Zoom was not on for the initial determination of quorum. Recording Secretary Kerfoot called roll again and all Commissioners were present.

3. Ethics Law Announcement

Deputy District Attorney Gustafson provided the ethics procedure for disclosures.

4. Appeal Procedure

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

5. General Public Comment and Discussion Thereof

Chair Donshick opened the Public Comment period.

Public Comment:

Mark Neumann (Chambers): said he is concerned with all the new development in Sun Valley. There is Five Ridges with 5,000 houses in Highland Ranch. There is Highland Village that is currently being built on Highland Ranch Road. There is development going on in southern Sun Valley. Five other developments are coming in Sun Valley. During peak hours of traffic, it takes 45 minutes to go three miles to get out of the valley. We encourage you to work with NDOT to get road improvements to access and exits into the valley.

William Sanders (Chambers): said he wanted to comment on the development on 8900 Lakeside. It's not our intention to stand in the way of progress, nor do we intend to impede on our neighbor's rights. He spoke for family, friends, and generations before us. He said you need to be responsible stewards of the land; we care about what happens to our neighbors. We don't want to lose our water; our animals depend on it. We want to make sure it's done right. We want to ensure all the studies are done right and that no shortcuts are taken. These are our lives. We've worked on this land. It means a lot to us. Thank you for your consideration.

Kathy Reynolds (Zoom): resident in Sun Valley, said her comment is regarding the Chocolate Group, LLC proposed development on Gepford Parkway for 45.51 acres. My concern is the request to change the zoning. In their 83-page presentation, they discuss the streets that will be used to enter and exit the development, but currently they only have one on West 2nd Street, which is a county road. The rest of the roads that they're considering are private property, dirt roads. My other concern is the police and fire. We only have one fire department. They are considering putting 204 apartments in. We have a low police presence out here. Please look at traffic from Spanish Springs, and you are adding at least 204 more cars. Our schools are overcrowded. There will be a crime burden on the homeowners. There are private roads that the County doesn't maintain which the increased traffic will impact. It will impact us with traffic, police, and fire out here.

Bruce Baldecchi (Chambers): said he wanted to speak concerning 8900 Lakeside Drive. At the neighborhood meeting on March 9, the main concerns expressed by the homeowners were lack of water and that their wells would run dry. He said he has direct knowledge of this. On Brunswick Mill Road, there is a small development called Forest Hills Estates with 18 lots. He said his well went dry in 2009. He said his well was 395 feet deep and they redrilled to 705 feet. It's working well now. He wanted to go deeper but wasn't sure if he would find water. He said his property is near this planned development. Neighbors have had well issues. He said his neighbors had to drill deeper. He said across the Arroyo to the south is Richard Bunting's development on Shelbourne with three properties on wells. They will be 5-8 more

wells there when it's fully drilled out. Just below that, towards the east near this planned development, there are four homes being built with wells. The development has 24 lots, and 25 wells. This adds up to 58 wells, which doesn't include Bellhaven. All are using 2-acre feet a year. At the March 9th meeting, other impacted homeowners said they also had well issues, mainly on Lonetree and Bellhaven.

Luis Godoy (Chambers): He said he is a scientist. He spoke about Chocolate Drive rezoning. People choose to live in Sun Valley. He said he could live wherever but chose to live in Sun Valley. It's known for open spaces. It's becoming a limited resource. Why not rezone that to open space. He said he doesn't know how it went from BLM to private development. Why can't it be rezoned for open space? There are already proposed developments which have created dangerous traffic. Water is a limited resource. Increasing and building will put a burden on the limited resources. He said he didn't want to see this happen on Chocolate Drive. Please consider the community's concerns. He said he understands progress, but it doesn't have to be destroyed.

Sandra Easley entered Chambers and approached the podium. Ms. Easley started to provide comments, stating that she lives on 4th street off of Chocolate Drive. She doesn't believe that it's a good idea. She is concerned about the lighting associated with development. Ms. Easley was audibly out of breath.

Chair Donshick indicated that Ms. Easley could comment now and during the item but shared that if Ms. Easley would prefer time to catch her breath, she could speak when item 8B was opened for hearing. Ms. Easley gratefully stated that she would come up to speak during the item.

6. Approval of April 5, 2022 Agenda

Chair Donshick announced that item 8D – Tentative Subdivision Map Case Number WTM21-013 and Special Use Permit Case Number WSUP22-0010 (Lakeside Custom Lot Subdivision) was being pulled from the agenda as the applicant's requested a continuance. Staff does not currently know when this item will come back before the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Chvilicek moved to approve the agenda for the April 5, 2022, with the indicated amendments. Commissioner Flick seconded the motion, which passed unanimously with a vote of seven for, none against.

7. Approval of March 1, 2022 Draft Minutes

Commissioner Flick moved to approve the minutes for the March 1, 2022, Planning Commission meeting as written. Commissioner Peyton seconded the motion, which passed unanimously with a vote of seven for, none against.

8. Public Hearings

A. Abandonment Case Number WAB22-0001 (Bailey Govt Tract Abandonment) – For hearing, discussion and possible action to approve an abandonment of Washoe County's interest in 33-foot-wide government patent easements on the north, south and west property lines of parcel 142-241-14 and to approve the reduction of 33-foot-wide utility easements to 15 feet on the north and south property lines of the parcel and to 30 feet on the west property line of the parcel.

- Applicant/ Property Owner: Page and Olivia Bailey
- Location: 0 Whites Creek Lane, Washoe County, NV 89521
- APN: 142-241-14
- Parcel Size: 2.5 acres

- Master Plan Category: 48% Rural Residential & 52% Rural
- Regulatory Zone: 48% High Density Rural (HDR) & 52% General Rural (GR)
- Area Plan: Southwest Truckee Meadows
- Development Code: Authorized in Article 806, *Vacations and Abandonments of Easements or Streets*
- Commission District: 2 – Commissioner Lucey
- Staff: Katy Stark, Planner
Washoe County Community Services Department
Planning and Building Division
- Phone: 775-328-3618
- Email: krstark@washoecounty.gov

Planner Katy Stark provided a presentation. The applicant was available for questions but did not have a presentation.

There was no response to the request for public comment.

There were no questions or discussion among the Commissioners.

MOTION: Commissioner Chesney moved that, after giving reasoned consideration to the information contained in the staff report and information received during the public hearing, the Washoe County Planning Commission approve Washoe County's abandonment of its interest in the 33-foot-wide government patent easements on the north, south and west property lines of parcel 142-241-14 as indicated in Abandonment Case Number WAB22-0001 for Page and Olivia Bailey, with the conditions included as Exhibit A to this matter, having made all three findings in accordance with Washoe County Code Section 110.806.20:

- (a) **Master Plan**. The abandonment or vacation is consistent with the policies, action programs, standards and maps of the Master Plan and the Southwest Truckee Meadows Area Plan; and
- (b) **No Detriment**. The abandonment or vacation does not result in a material injury to the public; and
- (c) **Existing Easements**. Existing public utility easements in the area to be abandoned or vacated can be reasonably relocated to provide similar or enhanced service.

Commissioner Flick seconded the motion, which passed unanimously with a vote of seven for, none against.

B. Master Plan Amendment Case Number WMPA22-0003 and Regulatory Zone Amendment Case Number WRZA22-0003 (Chocolate Drive) – For hearing, discussion and possible action to:

1. Approve a master plan map amendment to redesignate one parcel totaling 45.51 acres from Suburban Residential (SR) to 40.64 acres of Urban Residential (UR) and 4.87 acres of Open Space (OS);
2. Initiate and recommend approval of a regulatory zone amendment on one parcel totaling 45.51 acres from Medium Density Suburban (MDS) to 40.64 acres of Medium Density Urban (MDU) and 4.87 acres of Open Space (OS), subject to final approval of the associated Master Plan Amendment by the Washoe County Board of County

Commissioners and a finding of conformance with the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan by regional planning authorities;

3. And, if approved, authorize the Chair to sign resolutions to this effect.

- Applicant / Property Owner: Chocolate Group, LLC
- Location: 0 Gepford Parkway
- APN: 502-250-09
- Parcel Size: 45.51 Acres
- Existing Master Plan: Suburban Rural (SR)
- Proposed Master Plan: Urban Residential (UR) and Open Space (OS)
- Existing Regulatory Zone: Medium Density Suburban (MDS)
- Proposed Regulatory Zone: Medium Density Urban (MDU) and Open Space (OS)
- Area Plan: Sun Valley
- Development Code: Authorized in Article 820, *Amendment of Master Plan*; and Article 821, *Amendment of Regulatory Zone*

- Commission District: 3 – Commissioner Jung
- Staff: Chris Bronczyk, Planner
Washoe County Community Services Department
Planning and Building Division

- Phone: 775-328-3612
- Email: cbronczyk@washoecounty.gov

Chair Donshick called for disclosures. She stated that a presenter contacted her, but there was no discussion of the matter under consideration.

Planner Chris Bronczyk provided a presentation. Ryan Rodgers from Pedcor Investments and Chris Waechter from Kimley-Horn gave a presentation.

Public Comment:

Mark Neumann (Chambers): Resident of Sun Valley. Sun Valley is in rural unincorporated Washoe County. The access is terrible. Right now, it's Low-Density Suburban which is three units per acre. There is a lot of development at the north end of Sun Valley and an apartment unit with 248 units. The development on West 2nd will have an additional 48 and then Five Ridges. Sun Valley Fire Department had 197 calls in one month. There are no plans to expand the Truckee Meadows Fire Department that is out there. Once all the development is completed, it will stress the infrastructure with roads, sheriff, and fire. It takes up to 35 minutes to respond to calls. We need to keep it zoned low-density houses.

Carol Burns (Chambers): Resident of Sun Valley. She quoted the master plan, volume 2 Character Statement of Sun Valley. This project is on the hill and will impact a great number of people on the west side. As Mr. Neumann stated, we already have a large development on the westside. There is a lot of traffic. A lot of people cut over from Pyramid because they don't want to get stuck on Pyramid and McCarran. They will start working on McCarran at Queens Way and everyone will come through Sun Valley. With all the current problems, we ask you to deny this.

Luis Godoy (Chambers): reiterating what has been said. This is Sun Valley, not a metropolis. He said it should be rezoned to open space. He said he is a scientist and understands how things can change. You have to look at the numbers and look at what is occurring. There are two schools in the Valley. There is already proposed development and a lot of traffic. People don't use the stop signs. By accepting this rezoning, it will allow more people to come through.

The parcel is currently being used for recreation. He said, please listen to what has been said and think about the access burden.

Sandra Ellis (Chambers): Said she bought her property because of the mountain, and nothing would be there except for ATVs and dirt bikes. She said she loves the sky at night and loves looking at the stars, satellites, and constellations. It will be lit up because of the development and cars. What about the animals, the coyotes, rabbits, and lizards. People use the area for recreation and to ride horses. We have people who ride their dirt bikes and ATVs. She said she is concerned with transplants selling drugs. She said there will be 5,000 people there. She said she doesn't understand the water.

Victor Reyes (Zoom): He said a lot is being said about traffic. He said his dad worked for Q&D who used to talk about an additional freeway through Chocolate Drive. He said one of the main concerns is traffic. There isn't enough lighting. With all the traffic coming along, there is a big concern. The developers talk about affordable housing. Are we going to hold them accountable if the development goes through? That's how they all start, and then the housing market and interest rates go up. He asked about the household medium income. There are a lot of questions that need to be asked. Will it be regulated? Are there additional things they can bring to the community, such as lighting and addressing dangerous traffic?

Kathy Reynolds (Zoom): said the developer indicated they have all these access points into the property, which is incorrect. They maybe have access through two streets that the county maintains – West 4th is dirt and private road. They do not have access, as that would come through the landowners. There are other dirt roads that are considered private. Chocolate itself is considered a private road as it is dirt and the county does not maintain it. The garbage trucks don't use it in the winter. The landowners personally pay for maintaining their roads. And then you are adding people who will be using the privately-owned roads since the developer doesn't have access to those. At the neighborhood meeting, the developer also spoke about not fencing off their property. We will be dealing with their traffic going in and out, the lighting for the parking, and the additional crime that comes with low-income or affordable housing. Our main road has no gutters or sidewalks, so people have to walk in the road. Nothing will happen with Truckee Meadows Fire Department until 2040. Please consider not approving this due to access and the magnitude of traffic we are suffering from.

Robert Watley (Zoom): said his concerns are traffic, access, and roads that aren't being maintained. He said there would be a crime issue. It won't be gated because it's low-income. We don't have sidewalks and people go 40 mph without law enforcement. Will there be funds for the sheriff and fire to service the increased population? He said he doesn't have a problem with growth, just a problem with the plan. Suppose they talked about addressing traffic to tie into Bandini to relieve some traffic coming from Golden Valley and Stead. They cut through because of construction traffic. What are they going to do for our roads and pedestrians? It would be irresponsible to move forward. He said he worked with a developer who paid to build a fire station. Are they willing to do that?

Recording Secretary Kerfoot noted for the record that they received one public comment from Carmen Ortiz via email, which has been distributed to the Commission and posted to the website.

Discussion by Commission:

Commissioner Chvilicek said she was on the Regional Parks and Open Space Commission; the Red Hill concept map was brought to us for an open space project. She said she knows there is a protected species near this property. Mr. Bronczyk said that the application was presented to our parks staff and that he is aware of the protected plant species that Ms. Chvilicek referred to. Mr. Bronczyk said he did the Ladera Ranch development directly to the west of this project, which was also impacted by the protected species. He stated that the protected species is not impacted by this project. He added that he did not receive comments

from Parks on this matter. Commissioner Chvilicek stated that the clearing of land would be problematic.

Commissioner Chvilicek also asked for staff's assistance in understanding why urban development next to open space is a good idea. Mr. Bronczyk said that there are multiple area plan policies that recommend a variety of low, medium, and high density; multiple master plan policies that recommend affordable housing and density options. Staff saw this as an area designated for growth based on the character statement, which the Suburban Character Management Area (SCMA) was based on; MDU was allowed within suburban character management and staff moved forward. Commissioner Chvilicek said in terms of Washoe County Regional Open Space and Natural Resources Management Plan, Goal 6.1 strongly discourages high-density development near open space areas and consider the downward transitioning of density next to or near open space areas in order to minimize resource pressure, fire danger and other negative impacts. Mr. Bronczyk said he met with the Parks and Open Space Planner regarding this policy; this policy is what initiated the split zoning related to the open space along the corridor of Red Hill Open Space and the proposed medium density urban to the south along the less steep areas.

Chair Donshick said she is concerned about safety. The Washoe County Emergency Medical Service Oversight program states there may be impacts regarding EMS responses to the area, particularly during peak hours. They also talked about dwelling increasing the region's healthcare system, and the traffic study indicates 109 average daily trips will be generated. As the public expressed it, we all have concerns with emergency response. Mr. Bronczyk said he could not speak on behalf of EMS. Secretary Lloyd said staff did have conversations with EMS, who asked how they could be more involved with the planning application and development review process. Secretary Lloyd stated that staff is looking at how these issues can be mitigated by means of conditions. When looking at these large projects, resources will be taxed, at least initially, until funding becomes available through development. In the short term, there are concerns with the increase in density and the new clients in the community. Unfortunately, with a master plan and regulatory zone amendment request, we don't have an option of conditioning. It's a change of color on a map. We have to determine if it can stand on its own merits without those mitigating conditions. That will be addressed with the tentative map applications where agencies can provide comments and conditions.

Commissioner Flick asked about the availability of facilities, including transportation, streets, recreation, and utilities. He asked if it would be public transportation or streets. Mr. Bronczyk said streets, public transportation, TRC routes, water, and sewer. Commissioner Flick asked when the streets were going to be there. Mr. Bronczyk said we don't have a project before us; when staff receives a project application, it is sent to all applicable reviewing agencies, including Engineering. If there are impacts to streets, the applicant will be required to bring the streets up to County standards. If there are issues related to a development that goes here, Engineering has the ability to require improvements for public easements and roadways.

Commissioner Phillips asked for clarification regarding the zoning change. Mr. Bronczyk said it's a Master Plan Amendment and Regulatory Zone from Medium-Density Suburban, which allows for three dwellings per acre, to Medium-Density Urban, which is 21 units per acre. Currently, it's three dwelling units per acre and the changes would allow for 21 units per acre.

Chair Donshick thanked Mr. Bronczyk and Applicant.

Discussion by Commission:

Commissioner Chvilicek stated she would make a motion, but that she may vote differently than the motion. She asked Legal Counsel if this was okay. Secretary Lloyd indicated that there is no requirement that the maker of the motion vote "aye" on that motion. DDA Gustafson indicated that while not typical, the maker of the motion can vote in opposition to their motion.

MOTION: Commissioner Peyton moved that, after giving reasoned consideration to the information contained in the staff report and information received during the public hearing, the Washoe County Planning Commission adopt the resolution, contained as Exhibit A to this staff report, to amend the Master Plan as set forth in Master Plan Amendment Case Number WMPA22-0003 having made at least three of the five findings required by Washoe County Code Section 110.820.15(d) and Sun Valley Area Plan Policy SUN 13.1. I further move to certify the resolution and the proposed Master Plan Amendments in WMPA22-0003 as set forth in this staff report for submission to the Washoe County Board of County Commissioners and authorize the chair to sign the resolution on behalf of the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Peyton further moved that, after giving reasoned consideration to the information contained in the staff report and information received during the public hearing, the Planning Commission adopt the resolution, contained as Exhibit B to this staff report, recommending adoption of Regulatory Zone Amendment Case Number WRZA22-0003 having made all of the following findings in accordance with Washoe County Code Section 110.821.15. I further move to certify the resolution and the proposed Regulatory Zone Amendment in WRZA22-0003 as set forth in this staff report for submission to the Washoe County Board of Commissioners and authorize the chair to sign the resolution on behalf of the Washoe County Planning Commission.

Commissioner Chvilicek seconded the motion, which failed with a vote of one in favor and six opposed.

Commissioners voted as follows:

1. **Commissioner Chesney:** Voted against; unable to make MPA findings 1 and 3; unable to make RZA findings 1, 2, 4 and 5.
2. **Commissioner Chvilicek:** Voted against; unable to make MPA/RZA findings 1, 2; unable to make Sun Valley Area Plan finding SUN.13.1(3).
3. **Commissioner Donshick:** Voted against; unable to make MPA/RZA findings 1 and 2.
4. **Commissioner Flick:** Voted against; unable to make MPA findings 2 and 4.
5. **Commissioner Nelson:** Voted against; unable to make MPA/RZA findings 2, 3 and 4; unable to make Sun Valley Area Plan finding SUN.13.1(3).
6. **Commissioner Peyton:** Voted in favor.
7. **Commissioner Phillips:** Voted against; unable to make MPA findings 2 and 4.

Master Plan Findings

1. **Consistency with Master Plan.** The proposed amendment is in substantial compliance with the policies and action programs of the Master Plan.
2. **Compatible Land Uses.** The proposed amendment will provide for land uses compatible with (existing or planned) adjacent land uses, and will not adversely impact the public health, safety or welfare.
3. **Response to Change Conditions.** The proposed amendment responds to changed conditions or further studies that have occurred since the plan was adopted by the Board of County Commissioners, and the requested amendment represents a more desirable utilization of land.

4. Availability of Facilities. There are or are planned to be adequate transportation, recreation, utility, and other facilities to accommodate the uses and densities permitted by the proposed Master Plan designation.
5. Desired Pattern of Growth. The proposed amendment will promote the desired pattern for the orderly physical growth of the County and guides development of the County based on the projected population growth with the least amount of natural resource impairment and the efficient expenditure of funds for public services.

Sun Valley Area Plan Policy SUN.13.1

1. The amendment will further implement and preserve the Vision and Character Statement.
2. The amendment conforms to all applicable policies of the Sun Valley Area Plan and the Washoe County Master Plan.
3. The amendment will not conflict with the public's health, safety or welfare.

Regulatory Zone Amendment Findings

1. Consistency with Master Plan. The proposed amendment is in substantial compliance with the policies and action programs of the Master Plan and the Regulatory Zone Map.
2. Compatible Land Uses. The proposed amendment will provide for land uses compatible with (existing or planned) adjacent land uses, and will not adversely impact the public health, safety or welfare.
3. Response to Change Conditions; more desirable use. The proposed amendment responds to changed conditions or further studies that have occurred since the plan was adopted by the Board of County Commissioners, and the requested amendment represents a more desirable utilization of land.
4. Availability of Facilities. There are or are planned to be adequate transportation, recreation, utility, and other facilities to accommodate the uses and densities permitted by the proposed amendment.
5. No Adverse Effects. The proposed amendment will not adversely affect the implementation of the policies and action programs of the Washoe County Master Plan.
6. Desired Pattern of Growth. The proposed amendment will promote the desired pattern for the orderly physical growth of the County and guides development of the County based on the projected population growth with the least amount of natural resource impairment and the efficient expenditure of funds for public services.
7. Effect on a Military Installation. The proposed amendment will not affect the location, purpose and mission of the military installation.

The Commission took a brief recess to allow the audience members to exit the chambers.

C. Special Use Permit Case Number WSUP22-0001 and Tentative Subdivision Map Case Number WTM22-001 (Continuum of Care Cottages) – For hearing, discussion and possible action to approve:

1. A special use permit (SUP) for a continuum of care facility for seniors in accordance with Table C-3 of the Spanish Springs Area Plan, a portion of the Washoe County Master Plan, and for major grading to grade 55,000 CY of imported material; and
 2. A common open space tentative subdivision map on ±21.56 acres for 136 lots, ranging in sizes from 2,004 SF to 2,400 SF.
- Applicant: Silverado Homes NV Inc
 - Property Owner: Spanish Springs Associates LP
 - Location: across from 401 Neighborhood Way
 - APN: 532-032-05 & portion of 532-032-16
 - Parcel Size: 20.75 & 0.81 acres
 - Master Plan: Commercial
 - Regulatory Zone: Neighborhood Commercial
 - Area Plan: Spanish Springs
 - Development Code: Authorized in Article 302, *Allowed Uses*; Article 304, *Use Classification System*; Article 408, *Common Open Space Development*; Article 438, *Grading*; Article 608, *Tentative Subdivision Maps*; and, Article 810, *Special Use Permits*

 - Commission District: 4 – Commissioner Hartung
 - Staff: Julee Olander, Planner
Washoe County Community Services Department
Planning and Building Division

 - Phone: 775-328-3627
 - Email: jolander@washoecounty.gov

Planner Julee Olander provided a presentation. Edward Johanson from Silverado Homes gave a presentation.

There was no response to the request for public comment.

Discussion by Commission:

Commission Chesney congratulated the applicant on their forward-thinking, much-needed project for the community; they will fill a niche in the community. Commissioner Chvilicek agreed with Commissioner Chesney and commended the planner and the applicant for bringing this type of development forward. Chair Donshick gave kudos to Julee and the applicant, as this was a new type of application coming in which required a lot of work. Chair Donshick thanked the applicant for the presentation and shared her hopes that the word gets out so that everyone can see the wonderful job that the applicant and staff are doing to help the community.

MOTION: Commissioner Chesney moved that, after giving reasoned consideration to the information contained in the staff report and information received during the public hearing, the Washoe County Planning Commission approve Special Use Permit Case Number WSUP22-0001 & Tentative Subdivision Map Case Number WTM22-001 for

Silverado Homes NV Inc., with the conditions included as Exhibit A to this matter, having made all five findings in accordance with Washoe County Code Section 110.810.30 and all ten findings in accordance with Washoe County Code Section 110.608.25.

Commissioner Flick seconded the motion, which passed unanimously with a vote of seven in favor, none against.

Special Use Permit Findings

- (a) Consistency. That the proposed use is consistent with the action programs, policies, standards and maps of the Master Plan and the Spanish Springs Area Plan;
- (b) Improvements. That adequate utilities, roadway improvements, sanitation, water supply, drainage, and other necessary facilities have been provided, the proposed improvements are properly related to existing and proposed roadways, and an adequate public facilities determination has been made in accordance with Division Seven;
- (c) Site Suitability. That the site is physically suitable for continuum of care facilities, seniors and grading and for the intensity of such a development;
- (d) Issuance Not Detrimental. That issuance of the permit will not be significantly detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare; injurious to the property or improvements of adjacent properties; or detrimental to the character of the surrounding area;
- (e) Effect on a Military Installation. Issuance of the permit will not have a detrimental effect on the location, purpose or mission of the military installation.

Tentative Subdivision Map Findings

- (a) Plan Consistency. That the proposed map is consistent with the Master Plan and any specific plan;
- (b) Design or Improvement. That the design or improvement of the proposed subdivision is consistent with the Master Plan and any specific plan;
- (c) Type of Development. That the site is physically suited for the type of development proposed;
- (d) Availability of Services. That the subdivision will meet the requirements of Article 702, Adequate Public Facilities Management System;
- (e) 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;
- (f) Public Health. That the design of the subdivision or type of improvement is not likely to cause significant public health problems;
- (g) 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;
- (h) Access. That the design of the subdivision provides any necessary access to surrounding, adjacent lands and provides appropriate secondary access for emergency vehicles;
- (i) Dedications. That any land or improvements to be dedicated to the County is consistent with the Master Plan; and
- (j) Energy. That the design of the subdivision provides, to the extent feasible, for future passive or natural heating or cooling opportunities in the subdivision.

9. Planning Items

A. Neighborhood Meeting Process – Planning Manager, Trevor Lloyd, will brief the Board on the new neighborhood meeting process and will provide an overview of the new GIS HUB web site on the Washoe County Planning web page.

Discussion by Commission:

Commissioner Phillips mentioned that a 750 foot noticing requirement in her neighborhood would only be one. She asked if there was a way to enlarge the noticing area. Mr. Lloyd clarified it's 750 feet or 30 of the closest neighbors, which is the requirement.

Commissioner Chvilicek said in regard to the Chocolate Drive development; she commended staff for finding alternative ways to get input from the community; it's great to have these in our packet to see what the neighbors have to say. She complimented Planning for engaging the community.

Commissioner Chesney said we were briefed about this at a CAB meeting. He said for instance, what happens with Donovan Pit affects what happens in Palomino Valley. If it impacts you, you can attend the meeting and give input. Anyone interested can attend.

Commissioner Chvilicek asked whether the community is responsible for engaging or whether there is a notice that is sent out. Mr. Lloyd stated that the notice card is sent out and community members can also sign up on an email listing to be notified of the neighborhood meetings. Commissioner Chvilicek asked where you could sign up. Commissioner Chesney indicated that you can sign up on the website, and Mr. Lloyd agreed.

Commissioner Flick asked whether the recommendations raised at the neighborhood meeting still have to be within the law; meaning, the citizens can't dictate the project conditions, but they can help shape the project. Chair Donshick said it's a community discussion. There are no open meeting law requirements. The applicant takes notes to prepare for the packets. They can take the concerns expressed by the community and make changes to their plan before putting it out. Mr. Lloyd confirmed that these meetings are not subject to open meeting law, so they are an open forum.

Commissioner Chesney said that he attended one and the developer was excited about the input they received. Often, by the time they get to this level, it's like hitting a brick wall with input from the community.

Chair Donshick said the Chocolate Drive community meeting was well done. They took the questions and comments.

Commissioner Phillips said she would love to see a media blitz to inform the citizens and community in the area about this change and to make them aware they have a voice. She said it's important for citizens and homeowners to be heard. Mr. Lloyd said we are trying to get the word out and inform them of the process.

Mr. Lloyd said Lacey Kerfoot had been a huge part of this as she has been incredibly proactive. She saw the functionality of the GIS HUB website and stepped in to help make it function. Thank you, Lacey.

Ms. Kerfoot noted that Planning staff partnered closely with Communications, the Manager's Office, and the Commissioner Support Teams. When an event is added to the HUB webpage, everyone on the mailing list for that district will get an email announcing that a Neighborhood Meeting has been added. The HUB webpage is live and available for anyone to use. Ms. Kerfoot demonstrated the Project List feature of the HUB, which shows upcoming meetings. Chair Donshick asked if the Commissioners could be added to all of the lists so they can be notified of the meetings. Ms. Kerfoot stated that she could look into it.

Chair Donshick said we need to share it with our neighborhoods to get involved.

10. Chair and Commission Items

A. Future agenda items

None

B. Requests for information from staff

Chair Donshick reiterated that she would like to see "planned, not yet built" maps in every packet, for every project.

11. Director's and Legal Counsel's Items

A. Report on previous Planning Commission items

Secretary Lloyd reported that the Washoe County Board of County Commissioners approved the Highland Village master plan and regulatory zone amendments.

B. Legal information and updates

None

12. *General Public Comment and Discussion Thereof

Recording Secretary Kerfoot indicated that staff had received one emailed public comment from Marianne Merriam for Item 8D – Lakeside Custom Lot Subdivision, which was shared with the Commissioners prior to the meeting and was posted to the County website.

13. Adjournment

With no further business scheduled before the Planning Commission, the meeting adjourned at 8:21 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Misty Moga, Independent Contractor.

Approved by Commission in session on May 3, 2022.

Trevor Lloyd

Trevor Lloyd

Secretary to the Planning Commission