



WASHOE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION DRAFT Meeting Minutes

Planning Commission Members

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

Tuesday, May 5, 2026
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, May 5, 2026, 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 Lazzareschi called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. The following Commissioners and staff were present:

Commissioners present: Jim Barnes
R. Michael Flick
Daniel Lazzareschi, Chair
Kate Nelson
Amy Owens (via Zoom)
Rob Pierce, Vice Chair

Commissioners absent: Linda Kennedy

Staff present: Trevor Lloyd, Secretary, Planning and Building
Chris Bronczyk, Senior Planner, Planning and Building
Julee Olander, Planner, Planning and Building
Elizabeth Hickman, 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

Chair Lazzareschi led the pledge to the flag.

3. Ethics Law Announcement

Deputy District Attorney Elizabeth Hickman 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 Lazzareschi opened the Public Comment period.

Public Comment:

Mr. Cliff Low brought up the previous public comment he made in opposition to the Sierra Reflections development. He thanked the Commissioners for participating on the Planning Commission (PC), which he felt was a challenging position, and for reaching the decision they made on the development. He noted the Board of County Commissioners reversed the PC's decision, and he opined that two of the three who voted to reverse it made their decisions based on irrelevant reasons.

Ms. Tammy Holt-Still cited the Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) section that stated that someone needs to lose twice before a matter can be sent for judicial review. She felt that any PC decisions where the Commission does not specify the NRS being violated will be overturned, and those decisions then cannot be heard by judicial review. She spoke about being sued by a developer. She urged Commissioners to include relevant NRS in its decisions.

With respect to Agenda Item 9.B., Mr. Russ Earle displayed a map of a subject area, saying that the proposed building would be in a flood plain. He believed that the 2.5 feet of fill would negatively impact the surrounding properties, which should allow the Commissioners to make a negative finding. He thought the project would result in negative financial and environmental impacts on businesses in the Stead Industrial Park. He thought the acre footage of water that will be displaced from the grading would negatively impact the Silver Knolls development. She urged the Commission to oppose the matter, adding that homeowners would not be able to obtain flood insurance.

6. Approval of May 5, 2026, Agenda

Vice Chair Pierce moved to approve the agenda for the May 5, 2026, meeting as written. Chair Lazzareschi seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of six for, none against, with Commissioner Kennedy absent.

7. Approval of April 7, 2026, Draft Minutes

Vice Chair Pierce moved to approve the minutes for the April 7, 2026, Planning Commission meeting as written. Commissioner Flick seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of six for, none against, with Commissioner Kennedy absent.

8. Consent Items

Secretary Trevor Lloyd explained that Consent Agenda items are generally heard and approved without presentation, but Commissioners can request that items be removed from the Consent Agenda for discussion if so desired.

A. Extension of Time Case Number TM16-009 (Ascente) – For hearing, discussion, and possible action to approve an extension of time for Tentative Subdivision Map Case Number TM16-009 (Ascente) for two years from May 6, 2026, to May 6, 2028. The Planning Commission may grant an extension of not more than 2 years for the presentation of any final map after the 2-year period for presenting a successive final map has expired, in accordance with NRS 278.360(1)(c).

The applicant and property owner is NNV1 Partners, LLC and the property is located at Desert Ridge Drive and Ascente Crest Trail (APN is 045-252-20). The parcel size is 40.37 acres. The Master Plan designation is Suburban Residential and the property is zoned 94% Low Density Suburban and 6% Open Space. The property is situated in the Southwest Planning Area.

- Applicant/Property Owner: NNV1 Partners, LLC
- Location: Desert Ridge Drive and Ascente Crest Trail
- APN: 045-252-20
- Parcel Size: 40.37
- Master Plan: Suburban Residential
- Regulatory Zone: Low Density Suburban 94%, Open Space 6%
- Planning Area: Southwest
- Development Code: Authorized in Article 806, Tentative Subdivision Maps
- Commission District: 2 – Commissioner Clark

B. Extension of Time Case Number WSUP22-0001 & WTM22-001 (Silverado Village at Eagle Canyon Phase 1 & 2) – For hearing, discussion, and possible action to approve an extension of time request for Special Use Permit Case Number WSUP22-0001 & Tentative Subdivision Map WTM22-001, for two years, from March 15, 2026, until March 15, 2028. The Planning Commission may grant an extension of not more than 2 years for the presentation of any final map after the 2-year period for presenting a successive final map has expired, in accordance with NRS 278.360(1)(c).

The applicant and property owner is Silverado Village Eagle Canyon LLC and the property is located at Bethwin Street, off Neighborhood Way. The parcel size is 21.56 acres. The Master Plan designation is Commercial and the Regulatory Zone

is Neighborhood Commercial. The property is situated in the Spanish Springs Planning Area.

- Applicant/Property Owner: Silverado Village Eagle Canyon, LLC
- Location: Bethwin Street, off Neighborhood Way
- APN: See Exhibit B, pages 1 & 2
- Parcel Size: 21.56 total acres
- Master Plan: Commercial
- Regulatory Zone: Neighborhood Commercial (NC)
- Area Plan: Spanish Springs
- Development Code: Tentative Subdivision Maps & Article 810, Special Use Permits
- Commission District: 4 – Commissioner Andriola

There was no response to the call for public comment on the Consent Agenda items.

MOTION: Char Lazzareschi moved that the Consent Agenda be approved.

Commissioner Flick seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of six for, none against, with Commissioner Kennedy absent.

9. Public Hearings

A. WAC26-0003 (Silverado Village at Eagle Canyon Phase 1 & 2) for WSUP22-0001 & WTM22-001 – For hearing, discussion, and possible action to approve an amendment of conditions for Special Use Permit Case Number WSUP22-0001 & Tentative Subdivision Map Case Number WTM22-001 (now known as Silverado Village at Eagle Canyon Phase 1 & 2) to re-designate a 0.81 acre parcel (APN:532-032-19) to common area rather than common open space and to allow construction of a road through the parcel. This application is submitted by Silverado Village Eagle Canyon, LLC. The subject property is located at Bethwin Street off Neighborhood Way (APNs 532-471-01, 532-032-19 & 64 parcels) and consists of approximately 21.56 acres. The site is currently governed by the Commercial Master Plan land use designation and the Neighborhood Commercial (NC) Regulatory Zone zoning district, falling within the boundaries of the Spanish Springs Area Plan.

Planner Tim Evans conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Request; Vicinity Map; Background; Background for Previous Amendments; Evaluation of the Request (2 slides); Site Map; Noticing; and Reviewing Agencies & Findings/Motion.

Commissioner Flick wondered whether the road being requested would be a private or public road and who would perform maintenance on it.

Mike Evans with Silverado Homes said the road approved in phases I and II is a

private road, as would be the road in phase III, which would provide connectivity between the different phases of the development.

Public Comment:

There was no response to the call for public comment.

MOTION: Chair Lazzareschi moved that Amendment of Conditions Case Number WAC26-0003 for Special Use Permit Case Number WSUP22-0001 for Silverado Homes NV Inc. be approved 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.

Commissioner Nelson seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of six for, none against, with Commissioner Kennedy absent.

MOTION: Chair Lazzareschi moved that Amendment of Conditions Case Number WAC25-0019 for Tentative Subdivision Map Case Number WTM22-001 for Silverado Homes NV Inc. be approved with the condition included as Exhibit A to this matter, having made all ten findings in accordance with Washoe County Code Section 110.608.25.

Commissioner Nelson seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of six for, none against, with Commissioner Kennedy absent.

B. Tentative Subdivision Map Case Number WTM26-002 (Osage Road) and Special Use Permit WSUP26-0004 (Osage Road Infrastructure) – For hearing, discussion, and possible action to approve a special use permit for a sewer lift station, which is classified as a utility services use type, and a common open space tentative subdivision map for a 131-lot common open space development, with lots ranging in size from 5,310+/- square feet to 15,515+/- square feet. The project will include grading of 122,158 cubic yards of cut and 92,926 cubic yards of fill. These applications were submitted by Lifestyle Homes TND, LLC. The subject property is located at 10600, 10100, and 10101 Osage Road, and includes a portion of Osage Road (APNs 086-350-37; 086-370-09; 086-370-18; 086-370-10; 086-350-23; 086-962-02), totaling approximately 53.22 acres.

The site has a Master Plan designation of Suburban Residential, and the regulatory zones are Medium Density Suburban (MDS).

Vice Chair Pierce disclosed that he has met with this developer since the last time they attended a Planning Commission meeting, though he has not discussed this project with them, and he did not feel it would affect his decision-making ability.

6:28 p.m. The Planning Commission recessed.

6:35 p.m. The Planning Commission reconvened with Commissioner Kennedy absent.

Planner Tim Evans conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Background; Requests; Density; Common Open Space Development (2 slides); Common Open Space/Trails; Grading; Biological Resources; Cultural Resources; Flood; School District; Sheriff/Fire Protection; Sewer and Water; Roadways and Traffic; Reviewing Agencies; Noticing; Tentative Map Findings; Common Open Space Findings; Special Use Permit Findings; and Possible Motions.

Mr. Evans indicated that he had a conversation with a captain at the Sheriff's Office about this project and was told that staffing will remain as it is now and has been for the last three years. He also spoke to a representative from Emergency Services who informed him that the response time for this area should be roughly the same as their standard response time of 15 minutes and 59 seconds. He noted a correction that 13 public comments have been received based on the noticing for this item.

Garrett Gordon with Lifestyle Homes conducted a slideshow presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Location; Current Conditions & Zoning; Requests: Tentative Map & Special Use Permit; Common Open Space Development; Residential Adjacency; Roadway Improvements; Traffic; Onsite Retention; Utilities and Services; Special Use Permit: Sewer Lift Station; and Osage Corner TM & SUP.

Mr. Gordon described the subject site as a transition area between industrial manufacturing buildings to the east and low-density suburban development to the west. He stressed the importance of connecting Echo Avenue to Osage Road both as a second way out of the neighborhood and to provide better access to City of Reno emergency services, reducing response times. He noted that, when he first came to the Commission for approval of a zoning change, he expressed commitment to addressing flooding concerns, and the retention ponds planned in this development will capture 30 percent more water and lower the chance of extreme flooding events for surrounding properties. The developer will pay for the retention ponds and turn them over to the homeowners association (HOA) when the development is complete.

Mr. Gordon pointed out that the trail network will go around the entire development and be open to the public. A sidewalk will also be placed on the north side of Osage Road to increase pedestrian connectivity. He mentioned that Environmental Protection, the Nevada Department of Water Resources, Washoe County Engineering, Northern Nevada Public Health, and Truckee Meadows Planning all approved the proposal, mostly without conditions. He noted that a final hydrology report will be required at the time of final map approval. The extra hydrants proposed for the development, he continued, would increase the area that could be utilized in the event of a fire, benefiting the surrounding areas.

Public Comment:

Ms. Tammy Holt-Still stated water that makes it to the Stead Sewer Plant ultimately goes into Swan Lake. She said Washoe County was not sued in 2019, the City of Reno was, but she said that removing existing floodplain will increase the chance of flooding. She thought residents should approve the subdivision before it is developed. She was unsure whether any County employees were certified as hydrologists, and she opined that the levels in Swan Lake have not receded because of the amount of water being pumped into the aquifer. She questioned the ability of the developer to

follow through on their promises and felt that all developers should be required to have a performance bond.

Mr. Russ Earle expressed opposition to the development based on the accuracy, consistency, and transparency of the assumptions used to justify rezoning in the area. He expressed concern that the timeline for widening Red Rock Road was moved up to 2026 to 2030 when the Commission and the Board of County Commissioners were considering the project but later changed back after approval. The project engineer once stated that the map for the project was not to be approved if the road had not been widened. He thought the lack of consistency undermined public trust and raised questions about the validity of the rezoning approvals. He requested that the Commission pause development approvals that rely on the widening of Red Rock Road and reconsider whether the approvals previously granted were appropriate.

Ms. Katherine Yriarte asked whether the HOA would have the ability to amend the bylaws in the future and transfer the responsibility of maintaining the retention ponds. She did not see value in connecting Red Rock Road with a sidewalk since Red Rock does not have its own sidewalks and has minimal shoulders.

Via Zoom, Mr. Kirk Johnson wondered how water would get to the retention ponds if they were flooded, noting that the plans do not demonstrate how water will get to the ponds. He believed the plans showed the emergency overflow area would go into the regular retention ponds, which by that time would already be full.

Discussion by Commission:

Vice Chair Pierce inquired about the need for Red Rock Road to be widened before the tentative map was filed.

Mr. Evans responded that earlier today he spoke with staff at the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) who told him the timeframe for the widening project was expected to be between 2035 and 2050. He added that the RTC was not able to review their past documents when providing him with that answer. He mentioned that the dates in the staff report for the previous regulatory zone amendment were referenced in a traffic impact analysis, and staff never relied on the 2026 to 2030 dates when recommending that the findings be made.

Vice Chair Pierce opined that the White Owl project was approved by the Planning Commission based on the understanding that Red Rock Road would be widened. He thought there would be a problem with this development if the main road were not widened. He noted Red Rock Road had 10,000 approved homes that had not yet been built, and he thought widening needed to be considered for this development.

Mr. Evans indicated he did not discuss potentially moving up the widening timeline during his conversation with RTC. Regarding his discussion with the Sheriff's Office, he clarified he spoke to the commander in control of patrol who told him they have not changed their staffing in that area for three years.

Responding to additional questions by Vice Chair Pierce, Senior Engineer Janelle Thomas stated that staff is currently exploring and analyzing drainage from a higher

subdivision, but that is not tied to this project. She pointed out that the developer has an obligation to analyze the existing conditions and include them in their analysis of the hydrology when presenting the design for development. She stood behind staff's recommendation to approve the application with the conditions included in the staff report.

In response to Commissioner Flick's queries about the lift station, Ms. Thomas stated that any lift station which presented itself as a viable option for sewage disposal would be designed to Washoe County standards and then dedicated to the County for maintenance. The lines leading to that station would be part of a private system. The lift station would need to be on a County easement or parcel in fee simple terms.

Mr. Gordon said the interior streets would stay private and be owned and maintained by the HOA. There will be seven acres of common area that will be maintained as well. Regarding any covenants, conditions, and restrictions (CC&Rs), he said the intent is for the detention basins to be owned and maintained by the HOA, and the County indicated it would not accept attempts made by the HOA to amend its CC&Rs.

With respect to Commissioner Flick's query about the legal process for amending CC&Rs, Deputy District Attorney Elizabeth Hickman pointed to a condition of approval that provides that the common area shall be identified as common area on the final map and must be privately maintained and perpetually funded by the HOA.

Chair Lazzareschi inquired about the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA's) letter regarding the map revision.

Ms. Thomas responded that any application where grading would impact a floodplain identified by FEMA would need a letter of map revision (LOMR) signed by the County. Once the application was accepted, the developer would be obligated to activate the improvements in the LOMR. When the work was complete, the subsequent application for the LOMR would take place, truing up the whole process. She clarified that any grading expected to impact the overall floodplain would result in the floodplain needing to be adjusted. The FEMA conditional letter of map revision would be issued prior to any grading activity and would identify any changes to the floodplain. Washoe County staff will also review the application.

Responding to additional questions from the Chair, Ms. Thomas was unsure whether Osage Road upgrades would include elevation, but she anticipated that the roadway would be appropriately located to manage the floodplain. Areas north of Osage Road that are in the 100-year floodplain will maintain connectivity to facilitate the current storage volume.

Hydrologist Claire Evans indicated that most of the retention ponds do not have berms so as to allow water to empty into them.

Chair Lazzareschi remarked that he previously voted against upzoning the property because he felt it was risky to add residential use in a closed basin. However, the zoning application was approved, and the owner has the right to develop at the requested density, so he felt the current proposal would result in a net positive for

water storage. He said he would support the application as it was a responsive development plan.

Vice Chair Pierce expressed concern with prior regulatory zone amendments being with the assumption that Red Rock Road would be widened. He believed there is an infrastructure safety issue, particularly with 10,000 homes approved above this development.

Chair Lazzareschi recognized the potential for an increase in permeable surfaces in the future but believed the application needed to be considered on its own without considering what someone else might do on the property.

Vice Chair Pierce reiterated that two projects were approved under the impression that Red Rock Road would be widened before they were built. He thought the RTC lost public trust by changing their window for that project. He did not believe he could make the “issuance not detrimental” finding.

Commissioner Flick brought up that many homes were approved in Spanish Springs, yet Pyramid Highway was still a two-lane road in some places. He felt there needed to be coordination between the issuance of permits and the availability of proper infrastructure. He thought County staff and the applicant addressed the issues, and there would be proper wording in the paperwork regarding enforcement. Property owners have the right to develop their property, he opined, and the Planning Commission cannot require a property owner to solve the County’s problems.

Commissioner Nelson thought there was a longstanding disconnect between the approval of projects and the infrastructure needed to service them. Anyone who ultimately lives in this development will need to access the freeway, which they would do from Red Rock Road. She believed the fault was between the County and the RTC.

MOTION: Chair Lazzareschi moved that Special Use Permit Case Number WSUP26-0004 and Tentative Subdivision Map Case Number WTM26-002 for Lifestyle Homes TND, LLC, be approved with the conditions included as Exhibit A to this matter, having made all 20 findings in accordance with Washoe County Code Section 110.408.28, Findings, Article 408, Common Open Space; and Section 110.608.25, Findings, Article 608, Tentative Maps: Article 608, Tentative Subdivision Maps.

Commissioner Owens seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of five for, one against, with Vice Chair Pierce voting no and Commissioner Kennedy absent.

MOTION: Chair Lazzareschi moved that Special Use Permit Case Number WSUP26-0004 for Lifestyle Homes TND, LLC, be approved 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.

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

zero against, with Commissioner Kennedy absent.

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

10. Chair and Commission Items

A. Future agenda items

Vice Chair Pierce wanted an item to discuss instances where the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) changed their timeline for one of their projects only until a development project was approved, then reverted that projected timeline.

Secretary Trevor Lloyd indicated he would attempt to get answers from the RTC.

Commissioner Flick expressed frustration that the Planning Commission (PC) made land use decisions while not having any control over when roads were built. Some major thoroughfares are already experiencing gridlock, he said, and the PC's hands are tied because projects cannot be denied if they comply with all laws. He thought other agencies needed to provide firm dates and commit to them.

B. Requests for information from staff

There were no requests.

11. Director's and Legal Counsel's Items

A. Report on previous Planning Commission items

Secretary Trevor Lloyd announced that it was Office Support Specialist Adriana Albarran's last meeting. He indicated that the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) adopted the attainable housing amendments at its April 14 meeting, and it approved and adopted the Mustang master plan amendment (MPA) and regulatory zone amendment (RZA) at its April 28 meeting. The BCC will hear the second reading of the development code amendment (DCA) regarding residential development in commercial districts at its May 12 meeting, along with the first reading of the small-unit density bonus DCA. Lastly, the BCC will hear the sphere of influence rollback MPA and RZA at its May 26 meeting.

A brief discussion ensued about a public commenter who read from state statute. Deputy District Attorney Elizabeth Hickman said she could not read the statute on the projector but would look into the matter.

B. Legal information and updates

There were no updates.

12. *General Public Comment and Discussion Thereof

Ms. Katherine Yriarte believed there were no County codes requiring developers to consider road development. She suggested adding a finding for zoning amendments or maps ensuring that road development was in line with the proposal or else that finding could not be met.

13. Adjournment

With no further business scheduled before the Planning Commission, the meeting adjourned at 7:49 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Derek Sonderfan, Independent Contractor.

Approved by Commission in session on June 2, 2026

Trevor Lloyd
Secretary to the Planning Commission