

Community Services Department
Planning and Building
APPEAL TO BOARD OF COUNTY
COMMISSIONERS (BCC)
APPLICATION



Community Services Department
Planning and Building
1001 E. Ninth St., Bldg. A
Reno, NV 89512-2845

Telephone: 775.328.6100

Washoe County Appeal of Decision to Board of County Commissioners

Your entire application is a public record. If you have a concern about releasing personal information please contact Planning and Building staff at 775.328.6100.

Appeal of Decision by (Check one)	
Note: Appeals to the Washoe County Board of County Commissioners are governed by WCC Section 110.912.20.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Planning Commission	<input type="checkbox"/> Board of Adjustment
<input type="checkbox"/> Hearing Examiner	<input type="checkbox"/> Other Deciding Body (specify) _____
Appeal Date Information	
Note: This appeal must be delivered in writing to the offices of the Planning and Building Division (address is on the cover sheet) within 10 calendar days from the date that the decision being appealed is filed with the Commission or Board Secretary (or Director) and mailed to the original applicant.	
Note: The appeal must be accompanied by the appropriate appeal fee (see attached Master Fee Schedule).	
Date of this appeal: <u>11 September 2020</u>	
Date of action by County: <u>1 September 2020</u>	
Date Decision filed with Secretary: <u>unknown</u>	
Appellant Information	
Name: Victor Elgohary	Phone: 281-858-0014
Address: 6406 Arcadia Bend Ct	Fax:
	Email: victor@vselgohary.com
City: Houston State: TX Zip: 77041	Cell:
Describe your basis as a person aggrieved by the decision: I own 450 Pahute Road which is seriously harmed by the Commission's abandonment of the end of Pahute Road used for a turnaround.	
Appealed Decision Information	
Application Number: WAB20-0003	
Project Name: Pahute Abandonment	
State the specific action(s) and related finding(s) you are appealing: See Attached	

Appealed Decision Information (continued)	
Describe why the decision should or should not have been made: See Attached	
Cite the specific outcome you are requesting with this appeal: See attached	
Did you speak at the public hearing when this item was considered?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Did you submit written comments prior to the action on the item being appealed?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Appellant Signature	
Printed Name: Victor Elgohary	<small>Digitally signed by Victor Elgohary DN: cn=Victor Elgohary, o, ou, email=victor@vselgohary.com, c=US Date: 2020.09.14 18:03:10 -05'00'</small>
Signature: 	
Date: 11 September 2020	

Law Offices of Victor Elgohary

6406 Arcadia Bend Ct
Houston, Texas 77041

Dear Washoe County Board of Commissioners:

I am filing this appeal of the Washoe County Planning Commission's ("Commission") decision to abandon 1,197 feet of Pahute Road to parcel 123-143-11 located at 425 Pahute Road ("the Subject Property"). Despite both oral and written comments about the significant public harm that would ensue and failure to acknowledge my written comments on the record (Attached as Exhibit A), the Commission granted the Abandonment Request ("Application").

Background

I became familiar with the Subject Property because when it was offered for sale back in 2019, I performed due diligence on the listing and quickly noticed its major title defect. The more recent history from the 2000s forward show that the Subject Property has changed hands a few times, most notably the foreclosure that occurred in 2011 from Mr. Martin to Wells Fargo Bank. At the time of the foreclosure, the Subject Property was in very poor condition according to Mr. Greifenstein, a full time resident and owner of the neighboring property at 440 Pahute Road since 1997. When Ms. Rader (the immediate prior owner) purchased the Subject Property from Wells Fargo in lieu of auction, she undertook extensive and unpermitted renovations of the home that place it in the current condition that it is today. The encroachment of the Subject Property's improvements, as I have personally experienced, is quite problematic since truck deliveries and even towing of small trailers with a passenger vehicle can become virtually impossible, requiring vehicles to either back into or out of the very narrow and twisty Pahute Road. That testimony was presented to the Commission both orally and in writing.

A decision by the Commission is appealable to the County Board of Commissioners ("Board") pursuant to Washoe County Code 110.806.35 and 110.912.20. Without a written record or a copy of the presentations that were presented, this written appeal is presented to the Board based on recollection and notes taken during the hearing. Indeed, the appeal rules are quite unfavorable to anyone other than the Applicant or the Commission since the time and ability to present evidence is extremely limited both in terms of time allowed and calling witnesses.

The Commission Hearing

The Commission Staff's presentation acknowledged the challenges associated with the narrowness of Pahute Road but failed to address basic service issues such as discontinuation or inability for residents of Pahute Road to receive residential delivery services or even snow removal challenges that will be experienced because of the abandonment of this vital turnaround. Those issues go directly to the requirement that there be no material public injury in the abandonment request. But the Commission simply disregarded these critical issues that are a necessary element in arriving at its decision, requiring this appeal. The Commission also failed to address that payment might be required for the property depending on whether Pahute Road was dedicated or not.

The Applicant was also permitted to give a lengthy presentation describing the current conditions and its more detailed plans which were first disclosed at this presentation on 1 September. Those details were not in Mr. Caillier's initial application and the public still does not have any written materials of the presentations from the hearing so appropriate comments can be made for this appeal. Most notably in the presentation, Mr. Caillier claims that he will "improve" the turnaround as part of his new construction which essentially involves placing asphalt on a few square feet of Washoe County property which is not currently paved as part of the existing turnaround. Moreover, without being given the right to build anything, it is quite possible that Mr. Caillier may end up with more land, no approval to rebuild anything, and his neighbors suffering the consequences of not being able to navigate the road or receive deliveries. Indeed, Mr. Caillier apparently sees it fitting to go ahead and use this area as parking for himself and his guests (see Exhibit B), denying his neighbors the ability to even turn around their own passenger vehicles.

The Board of Commissioners Should Overturn the Decision of the Planning Commission

As was explained to the Commission at the 1 September hearing, both the Washoe County Code 110.806.20 and Nevada Revised Statutes 278.480 (5) require that there be no material injury to the public by the proposed abandonment. Here, the Commission disregarded all the evidence presented to it showing the material harm that would be caused by Mr. Caillier's Application as it continues a condition that is detrimental to other owners and service providers to Pahute Road and condones or rewards willful violations of the Washoe County Building Code.

Indeed, Mr. Caillier's structure in the middle of the right of way is clearly a public nuisance under Nevada Revised Statutes 202.450 3(c) and 202.450 (5). Since the hearing, vehicles are now being parked at the end of Pahute Road since this condition gives an appearance that this is not a turnaround but simply part of Mr. Caillier's driveway and Mr. Caillier may believe that his request has been granted and finalized so he is permitted to act to the detriment of his neighbors. Vehicles parked in the manner depicted in Exhibit B make navigation of Pahute Road impossible and a public hazard. Granting the abandonment request makes this kind of public hazard permanent, with no recourse available for those adversely affected.

Finally, as I indicated to the Commission at the hearing, there is the public policy issue and setting of precedent. If Mr. Caillier is successful in having the end of Pahute Road simply deeded to him, the Commission and the Board are indirectly stating to Washoe County residents that it condones and encourages adverse possession of public property. It is also signaling that (i) the Commission and the Board are willing to simply move property lines for those that wrongfully build onto Nevada property and (ii) totally disregard the public interest of those using the public right of way so as to solve a problem created by a land owner's willful disregard of the building code. The Board should decline to continue to open that Pandora's Box.

An Alternative Solution to the Abandonment Request

What Mr. Caillier seeks is the use of the 1,198 square feet of TRPA Code of Ordinances coverage requirements ("Coverage") that was almost certainly built in violation of the Washoe County Building Code as it then existed but predated the TRPA Code of Ordinances. Mr. Caillier needs this existing Coverage that now exists on the Pahute Road public right of way in order to relocate any new structure. Otherwise, under the TRPA's purported current interpretation of the ordinance, he will be forced to purchase (from other lots around the Tahoe Basin) almost all the Coverage necessary to

complete his proposed project, making his whole redevelopment undertaking prohibitively expensive and ultimately economically unfeasible, if it is even possible. Other than this Coverage problem, Mr. Caillier has 11,675 sq. ft. (minus the appropriate existing setbacks) of land to build improvements which is more than adequate to construct a single family home of any reasonable proportion. Other than this abandonment request, Mr. Caillier has made absolutely no formal attempt to try and get plans approved with the TRPA or the Planning Commission without taking any public land. Indeed, even taking over this land does not give any assurance that he will be able to rebuild his current structure. That point was brought up as a question from one of the Commissioners, but the response from Ms. Olander to this question can best be described as non-responsive.

As all these pre-TRPA homes in Crystal Bay age, this issue will most certainly come up again with such a purported TRPA interpretation of the ordinances. Giving away public right of ways in order to rebuild is simply not workable for the public at large and will lead to numerous lawsuits as these problems continue to arise in the future.

Conclusion

Mr. Caillier's request for an Abandonment of the end of Pahute Road benefits only him while continuing to injure the public. The Board should overturn the Commission's granting of the Application since this abandonment significantly harms the public and encourages violations of section 110 of the Washoe County Development Code.

Regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Victor Elgohary". The signature is written in a cursive, slightly slanted style.

Victor Elgohary

EXHIBIT A

Law Offices of Victor Elgohary

6406 Arcadia Bend Ct
Houston, Texas 77041

Dear Washoe County Planning Commission:

I am writing in regards to the Abandonment Application (“Application”) submitted by Mr. Caillier through his architect Mr. GilanFarr for parcel 123-143-11 located at 425 Pahute Road (“the Subject Property”). I became aware of this Application because I own 450 Pahute Road, just two doors down the road. For the reasons set forth below, I am in opposition to Mr. Caillier’s Application.

Background

I became familiar with the Subject Property because when it was put on the market back in 2019, I performed due diligence on the listing and quickly noticed its major title defect. I decided to purchase 450 Pahute which had had no such title problems when it came on the market a short time later.

Public tax data shows the Subject Property to have been constructed in 1941 with a weighted average year (WAY) of 1952. Given my knowledge and research of the Washoe County tax database, that strongly suggests that there are some Washoe County records that would show an approved or known remodel likely occurring in the 1960s or early 70s, however, I have not been able to find such evidence through my online search.

The more recent history from the 2000s forward show that the Subject Property has changed hands a few times, most notably the foreclosure that occurred in 2011 from Mr. Martin to Wells Fargo Bank. At the time of the foreclosure, the Subject Property was in very poor condition according to Mr. Greifenstein, a full time resident and owner of the neighboring property at 440 Pahute Road since 1997. When Ms. Rader (the immediate prior owner) purchased the Subject Property from Wells Fargo in lieu of auction, she undertook extensive and unpermitted renovations of the home that place it in the current condition that it is today. The encroachment of the Subject Property’s improvements, as I have personally experienced, is quite problematic since heavy truck deliveries and even towing of small trailers with a passenger vehicle can become virtually impossible, requiring vehicles to either back into or out of the very narrow and twisty Pahute Road.

The Application

Reading through the Application that has been presented to the Washoe County Planning Commission (“Commission”), there appears to be quite a few liberties being taken with the facts and circumstances surrounding the Subject Property in order to paint an image most favorable to Mr. Caillier, but ultimately misleads the Commission with regard to the Subject Property’s history and conditions in the neighborhood generally.

To begin, Mr. Caillier, through Mr. GilanFarr, represents to the Commission in the very first paragraph that “like many homes in this neighborhood, the residence at 425 Pahute encroaches into the property’s front setback and a portion of the home is constructed in the Washoe County ROW.” That statement is simply and factually inaccurate. It is true that for those who have followed the rules promulgated both by Washoe County and Tahoe Regional Planning Authority (“TRPA”), variances

have been granted to construct into setbacks for essential structures such as garages. However, Mr. Caillier will be unable to show the Commission that Washoe County or TRPA has *ever* acquiesced or approved a structure to encroach on public right of ways.

Second, Mr. Caillier represents that;

“When visiting the site in person, it does not appear as a turnaround area or cul-de-sac, rather the street essentially dead ends straight into the garage of the existing residence. See photo to right. The home does not share the cul-de-sac with any other residences, and is the only residence serviced by the last 60+ feet of road.

That, too, takes quite a few liberties with the facts. Every resident and regular service provider to Pahute Road knows this area is a difficult turnaround. The current map of this plat with the encroachment makes that abundantly clear. Moreover, the suggestion that Mr. Caillier is all by his lonesome self at the end of a long uninhabited mountain road is quite artful, but profoundly misleading and ultimately untrue. Indeed, when one visits the site, one would see from the photo submitted that panning the camera just a few more degrees to the left would start to show Mr. Greifenstein’s property at 440 Pahute Road.

Finally, Mr. Caillier represents that “We have reason to believe that these listed conditions have existed for a long time and were built legally.” That assertion is also very likely not true. For starters, Ms. Rader (the prior owner of the Subject Property) had a duty to disclose to Mr. Caillier all these unpermitted major renovations to the Subject Property. Even more damaging to Mr. Caillier’s assertion would be found in the title commitment disclosures he received from First American Title back in November 2019. That title commitment and title policy almost certainly highlight this major title defect and were likely excluded from coverage. Indeed, how could one possibly assert that something “existed for a long time and [was] built legally” when there are no permits for any major renovation that would have been disclosed by Ms. Rader? Moreover, who could possibly believe in good faith that the Subject Property was in this condition with absolutely no permitted renovations for a half century? It simply lacks credibility. Mr. Caillier should be asked to produce those title commitment documents to affirm his assertion that the improvements “existed for a long time and [were] built legally”.

Considerations Requiring the Denial of the Application

Both the Washoe County Code 110.806.20 and Nevada Revised Statutes 278.480 (5) require that there be no material injury to the public by the proposed vacation. The Washoe County Planning Commission should make short work of Mr. Caillier’s Application since it is not in the public interest, continues a condition that is detrimental to other owners and service providers to Pahute Road and condones or rewards willful violations of the Washoe County Building Code.

First, in the map plat that was dedicated as part of this planned development, the end of Pahute Road has a turning radius of 25 feet which equates to almost 2,000 square feet of public right of way. Indeed, when this map was dedicated, the 25 foot radius turnaround was not just a random dimension or whim as it took considerable time and resources to carve this road out of the mountainside. The severe encroachment of the Subject Property’s improvements have destroyed more than half of this vital public turnaround area. In its current condition with the major building encroachment onto this

public right of way, typical service vehicles used by UPS Freight, FedEx Freight and numerous other LTL carriers that have over 26 foot box trucks or trailers are required to choose to either back into or out of Pahute Road to service residents on this street. On several occasions, I personally have been unable to receive large freight items to my residence because trucking companies cannot or refuse to navigate Pahute Road. Even Pahute Road residents themselves as well as other members of the public are negatively impacted since turning around at the end of Pahute Road in a passenger vehicle with even a modest U-Haul or other small trailer is challenging, if not impossible at any time of year. Snow season makes that impossibility a certainty. I would invite anyone sitting on the Commission or its staff to bring their personal vehicle with even the smallest trailer and try to navigate in and out of Pahute Road. It is quite an unpleasant experience and is all due to the Subject Property's profound encroachment onto this public right of way.

Second, the request seems to contemplate Washoe County just giving the land to Mr. Caillier. But Nevada Revised Statutes 278.480(8) states that "[i]f the street was not acquired by dedication, the governing body may make its order conditional upon payment by the abutting property owners for their proportionate part of the street of such consideration as the governing body determines to be reasonable." There are considerable public ramifications of Commission just giving away property as evidenced by the recently disputed sales of IVGID land to private individuals. See <https://www.rgj.com/story/news/2017/12/20/fight-over-tahoe-beach-access-leads-questionable-land-sales/966297001/>. In its report, the Commission staff report has completely failed to take into account the required payment for the property if this Application is approved.

Finally, there is the public policy issue and setting precedent. If Mr. Caillier is successful in having the end of Pahute Road simply deeded to him, the Commission is indirectly stating to Washoe County residents that it condones and encourages adverse possession of public property. It is also signaling that (i) the Commission is willing to simply move property lines for those that wrongfully build onto Nevada property and (ii) totally disregard the public interest of those using the public right of way so as to solve a problem created by a land owner's willful disregard of the building code. The Commission should decline to continue to open that Pandora's Box.

The Staff Report is Conclusory and Perfunctory

In a meager two pages of written text which it considers a "thorough analysis and review", the Commission staff concludes that this Application should be granted. It makes little to no effort to explain (i) the detailed history of the Subject Property and its improvements, (ii) the dedication history of Pahute Road, (iii) necessary and obvious references to the Washoe County Master Plan Land Use and Transportation Element, and (iv) even fails to consult with the Washoe County Community Services to understand and explain the implications for snow removal under this Application. Perhaps the Commission staff, in addition to recommending the free transfer of public property, also intends this gift of land to Mr. Caillier to include free Washoe County snow removal to owners of the Subject Property in perpetuity.

Indeed, without a detailed written analysis or public policy considerations, the Commission staff offers baseless conclusions to each of the three required findings in 40 words or less. A reviewing body such as the Washoe County Board of Commissioners and especially any Washoe County District judge will find this analysis profoundly lacking by any reasonable standard making any decision based on this analysis arbitrary and capricious.

An Alternative Solution to the Abandonment Request

What Mr. Caillier seeks is the use of the 1,198 square feet of TRPA Code of Ordinances coverage requirements (“Coverage”) that was almost certainly built in violation of the Washoe County Building Code as it then existed but predated the TRPA Code of Ordinances. Mr. Caillier needs this existing Coverage that now exists on the Pahute Road public right of way in order to relocate any new structure. Otherwise, under the TRPA’s purported current interpretation of the ordinance, he will be forced to purchase (from other lots around the Tahoe Basin) almost all the Coverage necessary to complete his proposed project, making his whole redevelopment undertaking prohibitively expensive and ultimately economically unfeasible, if it is even possible. Other than this Coverage problem, Mr. Caillier has 11,675 sq. ft. (minus the appropriate existing setbacks) of land to build improvements which is more than adequate to construct a single family home of any reasonable proportion.

But Mr. Caillier has not formalized *any* detailed plans for his request because according to Mr. GilanFarr, he would like to take less risk by getting approvals first before undertaking the expense of formalizing a plan that may not get approved. He also claims through Mr. GilanFarr that the TRPA (or at least its general counsel) refuses to even entertain the rational solution of simply moving the existing footprint back onto the lot where it belongs. But without the submission of a detailed plan to both this Commission and the TRPA, we have no idea what the official TRPA response actually could be and from which further actions by the affected parties can be contemplated.

The solution going forward is not this meritless and publicly injurious free land transfer. Instead, the Commission should use its resources to help Mr. Caillier with the TRPA so that everyone impacted can benefit. But that also requires that Mr. Caillier give all of us an opportunity to comment on detailed plans rather than these mere vague suggestions. The Commission has an interest in helping Mr. Caillier since it is obligated (and can be compelled) to enforce the building code and recover the necessary public right of way owned by the State of Nevada / Washoe County.

If a calamity like fire or avalanche were to beset the Subject Property, it would be inconceivable that Mr. Caillier could not reconstruct his home without first taking public land and harming his neighbors. Indeed, a denial of an application to this Commission and the TRPA to simply rebuild the Subject Property after a loss would most certainly be an unconstitutional taking of land, a claim which Mr. Caillier would most certainly win in court. The result should be no different if rebuilding is required due to obsolescence. There are plenty of provisions and special exceptions under the TRPA Code of Ordinances to make Mr. Caillier’s vision a reality, but he will need assistance and support from this Commission to bring it to completion. The Commission and the TRPA should help him in that regard, but not in the lazy and publically injurious manner that is being proposed here.

As all these pre-TRPA homes in Crystal Bay age, this issue will most certainly come up again with such a purported TRPA interpretation of the ordinances. Giving away public right of ways in order to rebuild is simply not workable for the public at large and will lead to numerous lawsuits as these problems continue to arise in the future.

Conclusion

Mr. Caillier's request for an Abandonment of the end of Pahute Road benefits only him while continuing to injure the public. The Commission should not grant this Application since it has significant harm to the public and encourages violations of section 110 of the Washoe County Development Code.

If the Commission grants this request in its current form, it will immediately be appealed to the full Washoe County Board of Commissioners. In addition to the appeal, a writ of mandamus will be filed in the Washoe County District Court against the Commission for its blatant failure to enforce the building code and give away critically necessary public property to violators (or their successors in interest) of the Washoe County Building Code. I trust alternate solutions to this unreasonable Abandonment Application and building code violation will receive due consideration so a lawsuit becomes unnecessary.

Regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Victor Elgohary". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, stylized "V" and "E".

Victor Elgohary

EXHIBIT B

