





## REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

Sarah Chvilicek, Chair • Dian VanderWell, Vice-Chair • James Barnes • Larry Chesney • James Fewins • Peter Gower • Mark Johnson • Shelley Read • Kathleen Taylor • Jeremy M. Smith, Interim Director

December 16, 2019

Jeremy Smith  
Interim Director of Regional Planning, and  
Clerk of the Regional Planning Commission  
1105 Terminal Way, Suite 316  
Reno, Nevada 89502

Received by Clerk: 12/16/19 

Emailed: 12/16/19 

Dear Mr. Smith:

On December 11, 2019, the Regional Planning Commission (RPC) held a public hearing and determined that the following matter does not conform with the 2012 Truckee Meadows Regional Plan by a vote of 5-4:

Regional Plan Conformance Review – Washoe County Master Plan amendment (CR19-009) and project of regional significance (CR19-010), Silver Hills– An amendment to the Washoe County Master Plan, North Valleys Area Plan to:

1. Remove four parcels of land totaling  $\pm$  780.32 acres from the Silver Knolls Suburban Character Management Area (SKSCMA); and
2. Create a “Silver Hills Suburban Character Management Area” (SHSCMA) and add the four parcels of land totaling the  $\pm$  780.32 acres to the SHSCMA; and
3. Amend the North Valleys Area Plan Character Management Area map to reflect the removal of four parcels of land totaling the  $\pm$  780.32 acres from the SKSCMA and into the SHSCMA; and
4. Create a character statement for the SHSCMA.
5. Create a new land use policy: NV.1.8 to allow the following regulatory zones in the SHSCMA:
  - a. Public/Semi-public Facilities (PSP)
  - b. Low Density Suburban (LDS 1 – One unit per acre)
  - c. Low Density Suburban-Two (LDS 2 – Two units per acre)
  - d. Medium Density Suburban-Three (MDS 3 – Three units per acre)
  - e. Parks and Recreation (PR)
  - f. Open Space (OS)
  - g. Neighborhood Commercial (NC)
  - h. Specific Plan (SP)
6. Create a new “Goal Seven” within the North Valleys Area Plan for the proposed SHSCMA, to establish a land use pattern, site development guidelines, and architectural guidelines that will implement and preserve the Silver Hills

RPC CONFORMANCE REVIEW, CR19-009  
ACTION LETTER DATED DECEMBER 16, 2019  
PAGE 2

community character as described in the North Valleys Vision and Character Statement, as they are proposed to be amended.

7. Renumber the remainder of the North Valleys Area Plan to allow the insertion of the new Goal Seven.
8. Create Policy NV.7.1 to require that at least 50% of the residential parcels located to the east of Red Rock Road and within the SHSCMA are at least one acre in size.
9. Create Policy NV.7.2 to require a minimum lot size of one-half acre for residential parcels located to the east of Red Rock Road and within the SHSCMA, and to allow a residential density of three dwellings to the acre for the area of the SHSCMA located to the west of Red Rock Road.
10. Create Policy NV.7.3 to require new subdivision established within the SHSCMA to include an open space buffer of at least 50 feet in width adjacent to any dwellings existing prior to the adoption of the SHSCMA and to require that all new parcels within 200 feet of existing parcels match the size of the existing parcels.
11. Create policies NV.7.4 through NV.7.11 to establish development standards within the SHSCMA (similar to policies NV.4.6 through NV.4.10 from the SKSCMA) including: varied building setbacks, varied architectural elevations, "open-fencing", minimum 2-car residential garages, "dark-sky" exterior lighting, new dwellings located adjacent to existing dwellings to be single-story in height, landscaping that emphasizes native vegetation and implementation of these standards through actions by Washoe County.

The reason stated by the commissioners voting for the determination referenced above was that they could not make the following findings (as presented in Policy 4.1.3 and the staff report):

- 1) Consistency of the proposed plan with the regional form and pattern (as defined by the combination of Centers, Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Corridors, residential areas, open space, greenways, and natural features), and with regional projections of population and employment growth
- 3) Compatibility of the proposed plan with goals and policies regarding infill development, housing, and jobs/housing balance
- 4) Compatibility of the proposed plan with existing and planned public service areas, policies, and priorities; availability, timing and phasing of infrastructure; and fiscal analysis of service provision
- 6) Cumulative and indirect effects of the proposed plan

RPC CONFORMANCE REVIEW, CR19-009  
ACTION LETTER DATED DECEMBER 16, 2019  
PAGE 3

This letter has been filed with the Clerk of the RPC on this date. Generally, appeals to the Regional Planning Governing Board ("RPGB") must be filed by a person or entity seeking review of the RPC action or determination pursuant to Sections I.2, I.3, III.7 or IV.11 of the RPGB *Regulations on Procedure*. The applicable filing timeframe for a review of this matter is highlighted in the table on the following page.

Please do not hesitate to contact me at 775-321-8397 if you have any questions on this matter.

Sincerely,



Nate Kusha  
Policy Analyst

CC: File CR19-009  
City of Reno  
City of Sparks  
Washoe County  
Regional Transportation Commission  
Trevor Lloyd, Washoe County Community Services Department Planning Manager (via personal delivery)  
Roger Pelham, Washoe County Senior Planner (via personal delivery)

*\*A paper copy of this letter is available upon request*

| Regional Planning Governing Board Regulations on Procedure, appeals to the RPGB pursuant to statutes and/or regulation:                                                                                                                                                         | Timeframe (business days):                                                                                      |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Appeal of Regional Planning Commission's finding of non-conformance with respect to a Project of Regional Significance ("PRS"). See RPGB Regulations on Procedure I.2 and III.7                                                                                                 | 45 days                                                                                                         |
| Appeal of a finding of non-conformance of a master plan, facilities plan or other similar plan. See RPGB Regulations on Procedure I.2; IV.10 and IV.11                                                                                                                          | 45 days to file objection with RPC;<br>30 days to file appeal to RPGB after<br>RPC's determination of objection |
| Petitions for review of actions of the RPC that are not subject to a specific appeal process, which includes actions of the RPC finding that a PRS or master plan, facilities plan or other similar plan conforms with the Regional Plan. See RPGB Regulations on Procedure I.3 | 10 days                                                                                                         |

