



WASHOE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION Meeting Minutes

Planning Commission Members

Jim Barnes
R. Michael Flick
Linda Kennedy
Daniel Lazzareschi – Vice-Chair
Kate S. Nelson
Amy Ownes
Rob Pierce – Chair
Secretary
Trevor Lloyd

Tuesday, February 4, 2025
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, February 4, 2025, 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 Pierce called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. The following Commissioners and staff were present:

Commissioners present: Jim Barnes
R. Michael Flick
Linda Kennedy
Daniel Lazzareschi, Vice Chair
Kate S. Nelson
Rob Pierce, Chair

Commissioners absent: Amy Owens (excused)

Staff present: Trevor Lloyd, Secretary, Planning and Building
Eric Young, Senior Planner, Planning and Building
Courtney Weiche, Senior Planner, Planning and Building
Chris Bronczyk, Senior Planner, Planning and Building
Kat Oakley, Senior Planner, Planning and Building
Jennifer Gustafson, Deputy District Attorney, District Attorney's Office
Adriana Albarran, Office Support Specialist, Planning and Building
Brandon Roman, Recording Secretary, Planning and Building

2. Pledge of Allegiance

Commissioner Barnes led the pledge to the flag.

3. Ethics Law Announcement

Deputy District Attorney Jennifer Gustafson provided the ethics procedure for disclosures.

4. Appeal Procedure

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

5. General Public Comment and Discussion Thereof

Chair Pierce opened the Public Comment period.

Public Comment:

There was no response to the call for public comment.

6. Approval of February 5, 2025, Agenda

Commissioner Flick moved to approve the agenda for the February 5, 2025, meeting as written. Commissioner Kennedy seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of six for, none against, with Commissioner Owens absent.

7. Approval of December 3, 2024, and January 7, 2025, Draft Minutes

Commissioner Kennedy moved to approve the minutes for the December 3, 2024, Planning Commission meeting as written. Vice Chair Lazzareschi seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of six for, none against, with Commissioner Owens absent.

Commissioner Kennedy moved to approve the minutes for the January 7, 2025, Planning Commission meeting as written. Vice Chair Lazzareschi seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of six for, none against, with Commissioner Owens absent.

8. Public Hearings

A. Abandonment Case Number (Bonca Abandonment) [For possible action] – For hearing, discussion, and possible action to approve an abandonment of Washoe County’s interest in 33-foot-wide government patent access easements along all property lines for APN 142-242-16.

- Applicant: Justin & Danielle Bonca
- Property Owner: Bonca Family Trust
- Location: 2465 Trails End Lane
- APN: 142-242-16
- Parcel Size: 2.5 acres
- Master Plan: Suburban Residential and Rural
- Regulatory Zone: HDR 37% / GR 63%
- Area Plan: Southwest Truckee Meadows
- Development Code: Authorized in Article 806, Vacations and Abandonments of Easements or Streets
- Commission District: 2 – Commissioner Clark
- Staff: Eric Young, Senior Planner
- Phone: Washoe County Community Services Department
- E-mail: Planning and Building

Senior Planner Eric Young conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Located at; Vicinity Map; Request; Site Plan - Small Scale (2 slides); Renderings; Evaluation; Reviewing Agencies; Findings; and Possible Motion.

Mr. Young noted this type of abandonment request was common and the Commission should be familiar with them. He explained setbacks were typically measured from easement lines, which would result in a 63-foot setback on this parcel that would be an impediment to its development. This item contemplated only the abandonment of the 33-foot access easement, he emphasized.

Public Comment:

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Discussion by Commission:

There was no discussion.

MOTION: Commissioner Kennedy moved that Abandonment Case Number WAB24-0011 be approved 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.

Commissioner Flick seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of six for,

zero against, with Commissioner Owens absent.

B. Abandonment Case Number WAB24-0012 (Wyatt) [For possible action] – For hearing, discussion, and possible action to approve an abandonment of Washoe County’s interest in a 15-foot-wide drainage easement (approximately 320-feet in length) that bisects the parcel and runs under the existing single-family dwelling.

- Applicant/Property Owner: Joseph and Fran Wyatt Family Trust
- Location: 4189 Plateau Court
- APN: 041-062-79
- Parcel Size: 2.55 acres
- Master Plan: Suburban Residential
- Regulatory Zone: Low Density Suburban
- Area Plan: Southwest Truckee Meadows
- Development Code: Authorized in Article 806, Vacations and Abandonments of Easements or Streets
- Commission District: 1 – Commissioner Hill
- Staff: Courtney Weiche, Senior Planner
Washoe County Community Services Department
Planning and Building
- Phone: 775.328.3608
- E-mail: cweiche@washoecounty.gov

Senior Planner Courtney Weiche conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Vicinity Map; Request; Site Plan with Improvements; Noticing; Reviewing Agencies & Findings; and Possible Motion.

Ms. Weiche explained the single-family dwelling on the parcel was permitted in 2005, though the easement was not identified on the plans at the time. Approving the abandonment would bring the existing residence into conformance with setback requirements. She remarked the remaining easement to the east would provide drainage flow and the portion of the easement requested for abandonment was no longer necessary.

Commissioner Kennedy inquired about potential changes to the County's processes that would prevent this situation from happening again.

Secretary Trevor Lloyd said the presence of easements in the middle of properties was rare and protections against that were already in place. In addition, he believed it would be very difficult to locate the original recorded document showing this easement.

Public Comment:

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Discussion by Commission:

There was no discussion.

MOTION: Vice Chair Lazzareschi moved that Abandonment Case Number WAB24-0012 for Joseph and Fran Wyatt Family Trust be approved 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.

Commissioner Kennedy seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of six for, zero against, with Commissioner Owens absent.

C. Development Code Amendment Case Number WDCA24-0007 (Article 610 – Final Subdivision Maps) [For possible action] - For hearing, discussion and possible action to initiate an amendment to Washoe County Code Chapter 110 (Development Code), Article 610 Final Subdivision Maps, to modify various sections in order to clarify requirements related to final subdivision maps. These amendments include requiring each final map submission to contain a minimum of 5 lots and specifying what type of parcels count toward the 5 lot minimum; updating language to ensure compliance with the Nevada Revised Statutes; adding the requirement for a water supplier certificate on the final map when served by a general improvement district; providing that an acceptable financial assurance document may be utilized in lieu of a faithful performance bond; increasing the number of days for the initial final map submittal from 60 to 120 days prior to the final date to present the map to the Director of Planning and Building for signature; removing the requirement for a phasing plan; further clarifying the timing requirements for the presentation date for the first final map and all successive final maps; and updating the names or titles of public officers and agencies as well as the names or titles of certain reports/studies; and all matters necessarily connected therewith and pertaining thereto.

If the proposed amendments are initiated, the Planning Commission may recommend approval of the proposed ordinance as submitted, recommend approval with modifications based on input and discussion at the public hearing, or deny the amendments. If approval is recommended, the Planning Commission is asked to authorize the Chair to sign a resolution to that effect.

- Development Code: Authorized in Article 818, Amendment of Development Code
- Commission District: All Districts
- Staff: Trevor Lloyd, Planning Manager
Washoe County Community Services
Department
Planning and Building
- Phone: 775.328.3617
- E-mail: tlloyd@washoecounty.gov

Planning Manager Trevor Lloyd conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Overview of Draft Changes; 5 Lot Minimum; Water Supplier Certificate; Increase to 120 Days...; Clarify Timing for Final Map Presentation; Cleanup and Additions to Article 610; Community Workshop; Findings; and Recommended Motion.

Mr. Lloyd said these amendments dealt with a section of Code that had not been updated since minor changes were made in 2010, while most of this section had existed since the 1990s. This Code language dealt with final subdivision maps, the final stage in the review process before subdivision maps were finalized and recorded. He stated the proposed change from 60 to 120 days would only apply for submission of final subdivision maps, not tentative subdivision maps.

Mr. Lloyd clarified the presentation date for final subdivision maps was not the date when the packet was submitted; it would be the final signature date prior to the recordation of the final map. The phasing plan was proposed for removal because the final map already was a phase in the tentative map process. Other examples of financial assurance documents that could be used in place of performance bonds, he remarked, were certificates of deposit, money orders, and cashier's checks. Regarding the public's concern about removing the 10-foot setback requirement from fault lines, he noted that proposal had been eliminated and won't be considered with this set of changes.

Commissioner Flick inquired about turnaround times once final map packages were received by staff.

Mr. Lloyd said that depended on many factors including the complexity of the map and the quality of the submission. A turnaround time of less than six months, he added, was rare.

Senior Licensed Engineer Janelle Thomas broke down the final map submission process and staff's roles in it, ultimately agreeing that six months was a reasonable expectation for the recordation of final maps. She remarked that final map packages needed to be submitted within 120 days of the expiration of the tentative map.

Mr. Lloyd clarified that a developer had four years after approval of the tentative map to address any issues they needed to address and record a final map. They then needed to work backwards from the expiration date to ensure the final map submission would be submitted to Washoe County at least 120 days before that four-year period expired.

Commissioner Kennedy expressed surprise that the County still required cable TV, as cited in Section 110.610.35.

Mr. Lloyd confirmed that was still a requirement, though updating the technology requirements could be a possibility in the future. However, it would not be addressed in this set of changes.

Chair Pierce asked about the timeline for submitting tentative maps.

Mr. Lloyd responded there is no time frame for that.

Public Comment:

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Discussion by Commission:

There was no further discussion.

MOTION: Commissioner Kennedy moved that amendments to the Washoe County Development Code be initiated, and that WDCA24-0007, amending Washoe County Code Chapter 110 (Development Code), Article 610 Final Subdivision Maps, be approved as reflected within the proposed ordinance contained in Exhibit A-1. She further moved that the Chair be authorized to sign the resolution contained in Exhibit A on behalf of the Washoe County Planning Commission, and staff be directed to present a report of this Commission's recommendation to the Washoe County Board of County Commissioners within 60 days of today's date. This recommendation for approval is based on the ability to make all of the four findings set forth in Washoe County Code Section 110.818.15(e).

Chair Pierce seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of six for, zero against, with Commissioner Owens absent.

D. Development Code Amendment Case Number WDCA25-0001 (Housing Package 2.5a) [For possible action] - For hearing, discussion and possible action to initiate an amendment to the Washoe County Code at Chapter 110 (Development Code) by adding and amending various sections in Division Three—Regulation of Uses, Division Four—Development Standards, and Division Nine—General Provisions. These updates include adding various sections to: establish minimum standards for guest quarters, cottage court developments, and employee housing; relocate lot coverage standards from article 306 to article 406; establish required findings for the approval of a common open space development; and establish minimum standards for alleyways. These updates also include amending various sections to: update the table of uses for residential use types to include middle housing, minor accessory dwelling units, guest quarters, multifamily minor, and employee housing; modify allowances in the table for duplexes and multifamily housing within regulatory zones in which those use types are already allowed; and reorganize that table; update the residential use types list to add and define multifamily minor, the middle housing use types of triplex, quadplex, and cottage court, guest quarters, and employee housing, and reorganize the list; update detached accessory structure regulations to reference lot coverage standards rather than enumerate them and to modify deed restriction requirements for connection to water and wastewater facilities; modify attached and detached accessory dwelling unit standards to regulate their use on parcels with middle housing types and specify their mutual exclusivity with guest quarters; modify Table 110.406.05.1 governing regulatory zone development standards to consolidate the separate tables into one table and to make modifications to minimum lot sizes, setbacks, and minimum lot widths for certain regulatory zones; modify the notes in Table 110.406.05.1 to add middle housing and to clarify density

for single-family attached; modify common open space development standards to clarify that detention ponds and drainage facilities cannot be included in common open space; modify off-street parking requirements to add standards for the new housing types and modify the requirements for duplexes; modify landscaping exemptions to include middle housing types; modify residential common open space standards to add dog parks and pocket parks as permissible types of open space and require common open space for all multifamily developments with five or more units; and add or amend various definitions; and all matters necessarily connected therewith and pertaining thereto.

If the proposed amendments are initiated, the Planning Commission may recommend approval of the proposed ordinance as submitted, recommend approval with modifications based on input and discussion at the public hearing, or recommend denial. If approval is recommended, the Planning Commission is asked to authorize the Chair to sign a resolution to that effect.

- Development Code: Authorized in Article 818, Amendment of Development Code
- Commission District: All Districts
- Staff: Chris Bronczyk, Senior Planner and Kat Oakley, Senior Planner
Washoe County Community Services Department
Planning and Building
- Phone: Chris: 775.328.3612; Kat 775.328.3628
- E-mail: cbronczyk@washoecounty.gov;
koakley@washoecounty.gov

Recording Secretary Brandon Roman suggested that, given the amount of material that needed to be covered, more than 15 minutes be given to the presenter.

Chair Pierce indicated Senior Planner Chris Bronczyk could have as much time as he needed for his presentation.

Mr. Bronczyk conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Procedural Background; Amendments do NOT; Strategic & Long-Range Planning; Background; Housing Need (2); Overview; Density; Overview (2); Article 302 – Allowed Uses (2 slides); Changes to support middle housing; Article 306 – Accessory Uses and Structures; Article 313 – Employee and Cottage Court Housing; Article 406 – Building Placement Standards; Community Meetups; Changes Related to Public Input (2 slides); Changes Since WDCA24-0004; Findings; and Recommended Motion – Approval.

Mr. Bronczyk said all middle housing options – duplexes, triplexes, quadplexes, and cottage courts – would be allowed within urban, neighborhood commercial, and high-density suburban regulatory zones, and would all require administrative review within medium-density regulatory zones. Additionally, duplexes and cottage courts would be allowed in low-density suburban regulatory zones with approval of an administrative permit by the Board of Adjustment.

Mr. Bronczyk indicated that removal of certain articles from consideration in this package eliminated changes regarding maximum height in certain planning areas and reduced the overall size of the package. In addition, apartments and multi-family housing would still not be allowed in rural regulatory zones. He noted there would be no impacts to infrastructure needs because there would be no changes to allowable densities. He reviewed the reasons why staff believed all findings could be made.

Commissioner Kennedy praised the proposed changes to the regulatory zone development standards but wondered why lot sizes needed to be reduced if densities were not being modified.

Mr. Bronczyk replied that medium- and high-density urban zone lot sizes were being reduced to match the low-density urban zones, but developers were not required to make lots that small. This provided flexibility for more housing types.

Senior Planner Kat Oakley said restrictive lot width standards were an impediment to developing sites that might otherwise be limited by existing structures or surrounding development. It also allowed lots to be configured in a way so as to reduce infrastructure costs, which could in turn reduce the cost of housing.

Commissioner Kennedy opined these changes would benefit developers and not the public.

Ms. Oakley pointed out that developers would still not be able to develop and sell any more units after the changes than before them.

Commissioner Kennedy echoed her belief that smaller lots were not good for the community.

Vice Chair Lazzareschi asked about the amount of low-, medium-, and high-density urban land in the County that was not within a city's jurisdiction.

Ms. Oakley said the County had no high-density urban regulatory zones and only a few low- and medium-density urban zoning areas.

Public Comment:

Ms. Pat Davison said it was wise to explain the confusion regarding Citizen Advisory Board (CAB) noticing, but she felt CABs should be noticed any time there were Development Code changes. Her goal was to address misunderstandings early. She highlighted some of the elements in the package. The goal she remarked, was to generate additional housing outside of expensive single-family homes. She concurred all four findings could be met and the Planning Commission (PC) should approve the package.

Mr. Matthew Chutter, speaking on behalf of Citizens for Spanish Springs, believed these changes would integrate multi-family homes with single-family homes when those home dwellers were not necessarily compatible. He expressed opposition to

the proposal, saying homeowners' equity would be compromised by it. He believed the housing situation was better off without missing middle housing, and the solution to affordable housing was better education and training. He hoped the County would stop encouraging unchecked growth.

Ms. Melody Chutter, also on behalf of Citizens for Spanish Springs, opined these changes did not acknowledge the concerns of the community about compatible uses. She thought government caused the housing shortage, but the market should solve the problem. She noted renters did not gain any equity in their properties by paying rent. The changes would increase density, she contested, and with the dissolution of CABs, the public only had limited opportunities to oppose developments.

Ms. T.R. Rondulait brought up a comment she made before the Commission six months prior and praised the PC for its ability to review all the information supplied to them when making decisions. She spoke about a Truckee Meadows Water Authority meeting during which a representative spoke about water issues, but the meeting was not recorded. She reminded the Commissioners they were expected to uphold a safe and healthy community.

Mr. Russell Byerly expressed support for the measure via Zoom, noting people in isolated communities needed different housing options. He urged the PC to approve the package.

Mr. Jake Starr said he was in the lower-income threshold in the community, and any expansion of housing types, particularly in the missing middle, would benefit middle- and lower-class residents, as well as speculators looking to buy duplexes and triplexes.

Discussion by Commission:

Commissioner Flick asked about the 3,700 square foot minimum lot size.

Ms. Oakley responded that anyone wishing to divide their land or move the boundaries on it would not be able to go smaller than 3,700 square feet. She confirmed the Commissioner's assertion that the land on a 3,700 parcel would be significantly cheaper than the land on an 8,000-square-foot parcel.

Commissioner Flick acknowledged that larger parcels fit in better with the rural atmosphere, but they would not provide affordable housing options.

Ms. Oakley emphasized that the 3,700-square-foot minimums were only in urban regulatory zones; rural standards would remain the same. Typically, the urban zoning districts were aimed at multi-family housing, and the recommended changes were both to provide housing flexibility and to achieve consistency with the urban zoning regulations.

Chair Pierce lauded staff for their work on the package. He reiterated that the PC only needed to make one of the findings to approve the proposal.

Vice Chair Lazzareschi opined staff's proposal created flexibility without increasing

density, which would benefit people wishing to add accessory dwelling units or moving to a parcel that could support duplexes or triplexes.

Commissioner Kennedy said her primary concern was the reduction of lot sizes being proposed in suburban zones.

Vice Chair Lazzareschi pointed out staff only proposed reducing minimum lot widths in those zones, not lot sizes.

Chair Pierce assured Commissioner Kennedy she should not feel pressured into voting a specific way.

MOTION: Vice Chair Lazzareschi moved that amendments to the Washoe County Development Code be initiated, and WDCA25-0001, amending Washoe County Code Chapter 110 (Development Code) within Articles 300, 302, 304, 306, 406, 408, 410, 412, 432, and 902, and to add Article 313, be approved as reflected within the proposed ordinance contained in Exhibit A-1. He further moved that the Chair be authorized to sign the resolution contained in Exhibit A on behalf of the Washoe County Planning Commission, and staff be directed to present a report of this Commission's recommendation to the Washoe County Board of County Commissioners within 60 days of today's date. This recommendation for approval is based on the ability to make at least one of the four findings set forth in Washoe County Code Section 110.818.15(e).

Commissioner Nelson seconded the motion, having been able to make all four findings, which passed with a vote of five for, one against, with Commissioner Kennedy voting no and Commissioner Owens absent.

9. Chair and Commission Items

A. Future agenda items

There were no requests for future agenda items.

B. Requests for information from staff

Chair Pierce requested that the recycling bins be emptied.

10. Director's and Legal Counsel's Items

A. Report on previous Planning Commission items

Secretary Trevor Lloyd brought up an RZA request for Empire previously heard by the Planning Commission, which was scheduled to be heard at the February 11 Board of County Commissioners meeting.

B. Legal information and updates

There were no updates.

11. *General Public Comment and Discussion Thereof

There was no response to the call for public comment.

12. Adjournment

With no further business scheduled before the Planning Commission, the meeting adjourned at 7:31 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Derek Sonderfan, Independent Contractor.

Approved by Commission in session on March 4, 2025.

Trevor Lloyd

Trevor Lloyd

Secretary to the Planning Commission