



WASHOE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION **DRAFT** Meeting Minutes

Planning Commission Members

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

Tuesday, September 3, 2024
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, September 3, 2024, 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
Amy Owens
Rob Pierce, Chair

Commissioners absent:

Staff present: Trevor Lloyd, Secretary, Planning and Building
Chris Bronczyk, Senior Planner, Planning and Building
Kat Oakley, Senior Planner, Planning and Building
Tim Evans, Planner, Planning and Building
Katy Stark, 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 Kennedy 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:

Ms. Joni Hammond expressed opposition to Agenda Item 8.D., saying approval of the item would lead to additional traffic, noise, and crime. She indicated the Sheriff's Office agreed there would be an increase in traffic and crime, and she asked the Board to vote no.

6. Approval of September 3, 2024, Agenda

Commissioner Kennedy moved to approve the agenda for the September 3, 2024, meeting as written. Vice Chair Lazzareschi seconded the motion, which passed unanimously with a vote of seven for, none against.

7. Approval of August 6, 2024, Draft Minutes

Commissioner Kennedy moved to approve the minutes for the August 6, 2024, Planning Commission meeting as written. Vice Chair Lazzareschi seconded the motion, which passed unanimously with a vote of seven for, none against.

8. Public Hearings

A. Abandonment Case Number WAB24-0007 (Nugent) [For possible action] – For hearing, discussion, and possible action to approve an abandonment of Washoe County's interest in the offer of dedication for 104.65 SF of the Valais Way access easement for the purpose of constructing a garage addition.

- Applicant: GilanFarr Architecture
- Property Owner: Nugent Family Trust, Kris & Aly
- Location: 1348 Valais Way, Incline Village, NV 89451
- APN: 126-470-11
- Parcel Size: 0.052 acre
- Master Plan: Tahoe – Tyrolian Village
- Regulatory Zone: Tahoe – Tyrolian Village (TA_TV)
- Area Plan: Tahoe
- Development Code: Authorized in Article 806, Vacations and Abandonments of Easements or Streets
- Commission District: 1 – Commissioner Hill
- Staff: Katy Stark, Planner
Washoe County Community Services Department

- Planning and Building
- Phone: 775.328.3618
 - E-mail: KRstark@washoecounty.gov

Planner Katy Stark conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles or descriptions: Project Request; Vicinity Map; Site Plan; Project Evaluation; Tyrolian Village; Project Evaluation; parcel map; Project Evaluation (2 slides); Agency Review; Agency Review – AT&T; Agency Review – NLTFPD (2 slides); Project Evaluation; Public Notice; Findings; Recommendation; and Possible Motion.

Phil GilanFarr, representing the applicant, noted several projects had been completed in the past without obtaining proper abandonments. He did not believe the County would ever dedicate the roads in Tyrolian Village as it had been a private community for 50 years. He indicated he had a letter of support for the project from the Tyrolian Village Homeowners Association, and the applicant was prepared to participate with AT&T on the minor work which needed to be done.

Public Comment:

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Discussion by Commission:

Vice Chair Lazzareschi inquired about the relocation of a transformer.

Mr. GilanFarr replied they were meeting with NV Energy, who was supportive of the change.

MOTION: Vice Chair Lazzareschi moved that Abandonment Case Number WAB24-0007 for the Kris & Aly Nugent 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 Nelson seconded the motion, which passed unanimously with a vote of seven for, zero against.

B. Special Use Permit Case Number WSUP23-0036 (Dodge Flat Solar II) [For possible action] – For hearing, discussion, and possible action to approve a special use permit for: 1) the establishment of a 200MW photovoltaic generation facility and a 200MW battery energy storage system which is an Energy Production, Renewable use; 2) construction of a 345 kV sub-station and a 1-mile 345 kV Gen-tie line connecting the proposed substation to the Olinghouse Substation, which is a Utility Services use; 3) major grading for 1,178 acres of ground disturbance which includes 21,186 cubic yards of cut and 125,634 cubic yards of fill; 4) a request to vary all parking design requirements; 5) a request to vary landscaping design requirements; and 6) a request to vary the maximum height of 35' to allow for structures of 120' in height. This project meets the standard for a project of regional significance because it will generate more than 5 MW of electricity, require construction of a substation, and requires construction of a transmission line that carries 60 kV or more. It will require approval by the regional planning authorities before any approval at the county level would take effect. This project also requires a recommendation to amend the Regional Utility Corridor Map from the Board of County Commissioners to identify the location of the new substation and transmission line. This project will also need to comply with all federal and state approvals before any approval at the county level would take effect.

- Applicant: Dodge Flat Energy Center, LLC
- Property Owner: United States of America; Dodge Flat Energy Center, LLC; The Fort Churchill Corporation; Cowles 1982 Trust; Robert I. Cowles, Jr.; The Fernandez Trust; Virginia Vierra Trust; Dodge Flat Solar, LLC; New Nevada Lands, LLC; Nathaniel Ray Johnson; Douglas and Denise Larned Family Trust; Jeremy James Hice; Elizabeth Heyer Charitable Trust
- Location: 2505 State Route 447; 0 State Route 447; 2495 State Route 447; 2480 Olinghouse Road; 0 Interstate 80 E; 3505 State Route 447
- APN: 079-150-21; 079-150-20; 079-150-19; 079-150-17; 079-180-14; 079-150-45; 079-180-50; 079-150-08; 079-150-47; 079-150-07; 079-150-06; 079-150-04; 079-150-02; 079-150-01; 084-040-07; 079-150-58
- Parcel Size: 20.00; 80.00; 80.00; 301.20; 38.09; 647.49; 208.07; 640.00; 283.58; 40.00; 80.00; 80.00; 40.00; 40.00; 651.31; 592.20 acres
- Master Plan: Rural (R)
- Regulatory Zone: General Rural (GR)
- Area Plan: Truckee Canyon
- Development Code: Authorized in Article 810, Special Use Permits
- Commission District: 4 – Commissioner Andriola; 5 – Commissioner Herman
- Staff: Tim Evans, Planner
Washoe County Community Services Department
Planning and Building
- Phone: 775.328.2314
- E-mail: tevens@washoecounty.gov

Vice Chair Lazzareschi disclosed he was the construction project manager for the NV Energy substation work that would connect this project, and he foresaw continuing in this capacity as the project continued. It was one of many interconnection projects with which he was involved, but he did not feel he would be materially affected in voting for this item. As such, he saw no reason to recuse himself.

Planner Tim Evans conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: 2505 State Route 447; Vicinity Map; Requests; Site Plan; Photovoltaic Facility; Battery Electrical Storage System; Substation; Grading; Parking & Loading; Landscaping; Wildlife; Cultural Resources; Reviewing Agencies; Public Notice; Findings (2 slides); and Possible Motion.

Mr. Evans indicated the proposal involved 427,383 photovoltaic modules with a maximum height of approximately 14 feet. The paving variance request was because the project would be located in a rural area that was unpaved. One public comment received was from a neighbor with mining claims, but the applicant worked with him to ensure the project would not impact those claims. The other public comment was a general inquiry about the project.

Stuart Baird with Nextera Energy Resources conducted a slideshow presentation on behalf of the applicant and reviewed slides with the following titles: Our Company (2 slides); Washoe County Development; Dodge Flat Solar II; Special Use Permit Submittal Process; and Project Benefits.

Since projects could take 25 to 30 years, Mr. Baird commented, Nextera wanted to become members of the community, adding that they were members of the Reno Sparks Chamber of Commerce and sponsors of the Reno Rodeo.

Public Comment:

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Discussion by Commission:

Vice Chair Lazzareschi inquired about discussions the appellant might have had with the Tribe.

Mr. Baird replied they had a great Tribe outreach plan and were in biweekly contact with them. He stated the Tribe had reached out after the Dodge Flat I project with feedback about improving traffic. In fact, the traffic impact analysis was updated based on that feedback.

Commissioner Flick asked about discrepancies in the amount of cut and fill between what was listed in the presentation and what was in the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency (TMRPA) response.

Mr. Evans acknowledged the discrepancy occurred between the original proposal and the resubmittal in July. The correct numbers were in the staff report, not the TMRPA's response, and he noted the TMRPA had no issues with the new figures.

MOTION: Commissioner Kennedy moved that Special Use Permit Case Number WSUP23-0036 for Dodge Flat Energy Center, LLC, be approved with the conditions included as Exhibit A to this matter, having made all five (5) findings in accordance with Washoe County Code Section 110.810.30 and the additional development of natural resources findings in accordance with Washoe County Code Section 110.810.35. She further moved that development code standard in Table 110.406.05.1 be varied to allow transmission poles up to 120 feet in height, the parking standards of WCC Section 110.410.25(a) and (c)-(g) be waived, and the industrial landscaping standards of WCC Section 110.412.45, the civic landscaping standards of WCC Section 110.412.40, and the parking and loading landscaping standards of WCC Section 110.412.50 be waived.

Commissioner Flick seconded the motion, which passed unanimously with a vote of seven for, zero against.

6:51 p.m. The Commission recessed.

7:02 p.m. The Commission reconvened with all Commissioners present.

C. Development Code Amendment Case Number WDCA24-0005 (Care of the Infirm) [For possible action] – For hearing, discussion and possible action to initiate an amendment to Washoe County Code Chapter 110 (Development Code), Article 310 Temporary Uses and Structures, to modify the administrative permit application requirements to occupy a travel trailer or recreational vehicle when necessary to temporarily care for the infirm, specifically by allowing nurse practitioners and physician's assistants, in addition to physicians, to sign the required affidavit identifying both the initial and subsequent annual need for on-premise care; 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; Kat Oakley, Senior Planner
Washoe County Community Services Department
Planning and Building
- Phone: Chris: 775.328.3612; Kat: 775.328.3627
- E-mail: cbronczyk@washoecounty.gov;
koakley@washoecounty.gov

Senior Planner Kat Oakley conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Overview; Care of the Infirm Background; Proposed Changes; Redline; Community Meetings; Findings; and Recommended Motion.

Ms. Oakley stated that, given housing challenges in the region, there had been an increase in the number of these applications, which had revealed flaws in the process. The decision to allow a wider range of medical practitioners to sign affidavits was a result of other types of medical providers being the primary providers for many residents in the County.

Public Comment:

There was no response to the call for public comment.

MOTION: Vice Chair Lazzareschi moved that WDCA24-0005 be approved, amending Washoe County Code Chapter 110 (Development Code), Article 310 Temporary Uses and Structures, 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 all four findings set forth in Washoe County Code Section 110.818.15(e).

Chair Pierce seconded the motion, which passed unanimously with a vote of seven for, zero against.

D. Development Code Amendment Case Number WDCA24-0004 (Housing Affordability Package 2.5) [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 residential table of uses to include

middle housing types, 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 the uses in that table; update the residential use type 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 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 as an exemption; modify 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; Kat Oakley, Senior Planner
Washoe County Community Services Department
Planning and Building
- Phone: Chris: 775.328.3612; Kat: 775.328.3627
- E-mail: cbronczyk@washoecounty.gov;
koakley@washoecounty.gov

Chair Piece mentioned the presenter, Senior Planner Chris Bronczyk, would be given more than 15 minutes if needed to complete his presentation.

Commissioner Kennedy disclosed that members of the Spanish Springs community had been emailing her, but she responded only by informing them where this meeting would be held.

In response to public comment received from many residents, Mr. Bronczyk clarified the package would not propose any new development projects anywhere in Washoe County, modify height regulations. expand areas in which multi-family use types would be allowed, or change any zoning designations in the County.

Mr. Bronczyk conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Background (3 slides); Washoe County Strategic Plan; Overview; Middle Housing Use Types; Density; Overview; Article 302 – Allowed Uses (2 slides); Article 304 – Use

Classification System; Article 306 – Accessory Uses and Structures; Article 313 – Employee and Cottage Court Housing; Article 406 – Building Placement Standards; Article 408 – Common Open Space Development; Article 410 – Parking and Loading; Article 412 – Landscaping; Article 432 – Open Space Standards; Article 902 – Definitions; Community Meetings (2 slides); Changes Related to Public Input (2 slides); Findings; and Recommended Motion – Approval.

Mr. Bronczyk noted that, while housing accessibility was an issue across all demographics in the community, it was most pronounced among young people and seniors. He mentioned the duplex type was being moved to a middle housing designation for consistency and clarity. Adding new housing use types to the code, he continued, would allow the County to regulate with more precision, as well as streamline and expand housing types where it made sense while keeping multi-family use types in the appropriate zones.

Public Comment:

Ms. Pat Davison praised the effort to focus on residents who made too much money to qualify for federal programs but still wanted affordable housing. She expressed support for the changes, the addition of triplexes and quadplexes in medium density suburban (MDS) and high density suburban (HDS) zoning, and the inclusion of employers in discussion about employee housing. She provided suggestions about how concerned residents could become involved in housing issues.

Mr. Matthew Chutter indicated he believed the county was becoming an overdeveloped region of concrete and artificial landscapes. He felt mass transit and toll roads would not solve road congestion, and proposals for infill development were the problem. Subsidizing small-footprint homes, he said, would make larger-footprint homes less affordable for big families. He felt poor job opportunities, stagnant wages, and inflation needed to be addressed.

Ms. Melody Chutter expressed concern about the fire danger caused by increased development, remarking that no new fire stations had been built with the new housing. She wanted all new development to come with upfront expenditures and realistic implementation; building first and addressing concerns later should not continue.

Ms. Trista Gomez stated there were residents who were unaware these changes were being discussed. She expressed concern about the recent increase in traffic, the smell of sewage, and uncertainty about whether residents would be informed if wells needed to be dug. She opined the input on which staff based these changes did not come from residents, yet they were the ones paying for necessary infrastructure. Heavy development would not benefit local residents.

Ms. Terri Rondulait pointed out this item encompassed all county districts. She hoped the residents' questions would make the Commissioners consider the issues further. She expressed concern about evacuation routes, adding that there was no evacuation map for North Pyramid Highway. She questioned whether the proposed changes aligned with the character of the area.

Mr. Mark Wray, an attorney representing Citizens for Spanish Springs, stated his clients did not oppose good development, but they did not want to see Spanish Springs urbanized. He mentioned neighborhood commercial (NC) zoning already allowed duplexes, triplexes, and quadplexes with a permit, which they agreed with. He admitted zoning would not change, but approving this would naturally increase density. He presented arguments as to why he felt findings 2, 3, or 4 could not be made.

Mr. Dan Herman was encouraged by the open space changes being proposed but felt developers were responsible for the proposed change of NC to residential zoning. He opposed the prospective changes to the allowance of duplexes and triplexes, as well as changes to setbacks, lot width minimums, and spacing between houses. He thought the process was rushed and urged the Planning Commission (PC) to gather more public input.

Ms. Dawnee Olson said the county was a rural community and thought investment should instead be made in things that would benefit children. She expressed concerns about the planned sewage treatment plant in Palomino Farm, a La Posada Drive toll road, additional crime, and overcrowding in schools.

Mr. Aodhan Downey expressed support for the package on behalf of the Sierra Nevada Realtors, noting that more attainable housing would become available once the amendments were implemented.

Mr. Terry Plys spoke about hyperinflation, saying house prices would not always be high. He saw no need to address that problem when infrastructure needed to be addressed. He stated this was a bad decision, like the one that resulted in a noisy factory being built 40 feet from his property.

Ms. Marilyn Leckband said heavy traffic still existed on Pyramid Highway despite widening the road. She expressed concern about the lack of public transportation and overcrowding in public schools. She discussed the potential impacts by new developments to the existing area wells and the lack of sufficient parking for some new units. She wondered what the lower square footage limits would be for the units with 1,000 square foot maximums.

Mr. Christopher Burke stated why he felt finding 1 could also not be made. He expressed frustration about a lack of transparency and the cherry-picking of data regarding the cost of housing since 2010; he thought the affordability comparisons should have used data from 2004. He thought the statistics and language were disingenuous and he requested that the PC deny the amendments.

Ms. Janet Butcher wondered about the occupancy rate of new apartment buildings, adding that building new, more expensive apartments would raise the price of cheaper ones. She said she purchased her home to get away from high-population areas and felt the addition of housing with more people in the same area would not minimize the impact to roads.

Mr. Alan Loeffler believed rural areas were becoming overdeveloped and the infrastructure needs of the area were not being met. He hoped the PC would consider some of the changes that would be made. He thought things could be drawn from the plan, but it should be denied.

Discussion by Commission:

In response to Commissioner Kennedy's queries, Mr. Bronczyk defined a pocket park as a smaller park associated with residential subdivisions.

Secretary Trevor Lloyd added they were typically maintained by homeowners associations, not the County.

Commissioner Kennedy asked about the proposed changes to lot sizes.

Mr. Bronczyk replied the minimum lot size for medium and high density urban (HDU) zoning would be reduced to match that of low density urban, or 3,700 square feet. The only proposed reductions in setback sizes would be made to rear setbacks in HDU zones.

Commissioner Kennedy wondered how changing a single-family residence to a quadplex would not be an increase in density.

Mr. Bronczyk responded density was based off lot size and regulatory zones. In MDS zoning, for example, three detached, single-family dwelling units or up to five attached dwellings were allowed. The suburban residential master plan designation, he continued, had a maximum density of nine. If the acreage of a parcel would not allow for the density of a quadplex, a quadplex would not be allowed on that parcel. He explained the section regarding lot coverage was being moved from Section 306 to 406, but no language would be changed. However, that section typically covered accessory dwellings.

Vice Chair Lazzarechi asked staff to summarize the feedback provided by the Washoe County School District (WCSD).

Mr. Bronczyk replied the WCSD had no concerns about the code changes, noting school enrollment was trending down. Additionally, the WCSD stated they had sufficient capital funding to accommodate growth.

Mr. Bronczyk confirmed the code changes targeted MDS, not low density suburban (LDS) zoning. He noted most of the proposals would not impact LDS areas, though cottage courts could.

Senior Planner Kat Oakley clarified cottage courts were currently allowed in LDS zones with an administrative permit approved by the Board of Adjustment. Moreover, any proposal could not exceed the maximum allowable density, which was low for LDS. She explained cottage courts were comprised of two to twelve homes, but in LDS zoning, twelve acres would be required to approve a twelve-home cottage court.

Commissioner Flick requested a workshop session to review the impacts so he could feel comfortable voting on the item since the proposal was complex.

Commissioner Kennedy agreed with further study before making a decision.

Mr. Lloyd said individual sessions were held with each Commissioner except Commissioner Flick, who did not respond to a scheduling request. He suggested the Commissioner meet with staff to answer any of his questions.

Commissioner Flick said he was not prepared to vote on the proposal.

Deputy District Attorney Jennifer Gustafson opined any workshop involving a quorum of the PC was subject to Open Meeting Law. She explained the PC could take action today, elect to hold a special meeting before the next PC meeting, or continue this agenda item to the next PC meeting. She opined she saw no legal basis for Commissioner Flick to abstain from voting on the item.

Responding to the Chair's further request for clarification, Ms. Oakley said Housing Package 2.5b would consider density-related amendments in Article 402, but the previously contemplated amendments to the Spanish Springs modifiers would not return as part of that package. Things specific to Spanish Springs, such as height requirements, would remain as they currently were in code.

Chair Pierce believed much of the public's concerns would not be relevant until specific developments were proposed. The changes did not permit developers to do whatever they

wanted to do. He pointed out the changes would impact him directly, and this was a difficult decision. He praised staff for their work. He saw a potential benefit to the community as it could result in more affordable housing, but approval of this package would not automatically result in more apartment buildings. Because he could make at least one finding, he was required to vote in favor of the item.

Vice Chair Lazzareschi thanked both staff and the public for their engagement. With the caveat that state highways did not fall under the County's purview, he felt the PC could work with staff to address concerns with road congestion.

MOTION: Vice Chair moved that amendments to the Washoe County Development Code be initiated and approval of WDCA24-0004 be recommended, amending Washoe County Code Chapter 110 (Development Code) within Articles 300, 302, 304, 306, 406, 408, 410, 412, 432, and 902; and Article 313 be added, 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 the following findings as set forth in Washoe County Code Section 110.818.15(e): Consistency with Master Plan, Promotes the Purpose of the Development Code, Response to Changed Conditions, and No Adverse Effects.

Commissioner Nelson seconded the motion, clarifying she could make the following findings: Consistency with the Master Plan and Response to Changed Conditions.

On a roll call vote, Commissioners Barnes and Owens voted to approve the amendments, having made the following findings: Consistency with Master Plan and Response to Change.

Chair Pierce voted to approve the amendments, having made the Consistency with Master Plan finding.

Commissioners Flick and Kennedy voted no, being unable to make any of the findings.

Recording Secretary Brandon Roman indicated the mover and seconder conveyed their votes and findings in their motion and second.

The motion passed with a vote of five for, two against.

Ms. Gustafson stated there could be no appeal of this approval.

Mr. Lloyd clarified this was a recommendation that would be given to the Board of County Commissioners (BCC). He encouraged residents to appear before the BCC to voice their concerns.

9. Chair and Commission Items

A. Future agenda items

There were no agenda item requests.

B. Requests for information from staff

Vice Chair Lazzareschi requested information about what was in the Planning Commission's purview regarding addressing traffic congestion concerns in Spanish Springs. This information could be conveyed by email.

Chair Pierce added he would like to include congestion in the North Valleys in that request.

10. Director's and Legal Counsel's Items

A. Report on previous Planning Commission items

Secretary Trevor Lloyd noted the ordinance on the grading code was adopted by the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) on August 20, and the short-term rental amendment ordinance would have its second reading at the BCC's September 17 BCC meeting. The RPC alternative list would be heard by the BCC on September 10, and the York MPA/RZA item would be heard at its October 8 meeting.

B. Legal information and updates

There were no requests.

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 8:43 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Derek Sonderfan, Independent Contractor.

Approved by Commission in session on October 1, 2024

Trevor Lloyd
Secretary to the Planning Commission