



WASHOE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION Meeting Minutes

Planning Commission Members

Francine Donshick
R. Michael Flick
Linda Kennedy
Daniel Lazzareschi, Vice Chair
Kate S. Nelson
Rob Pierce, Chair
Patricia Phillips
Secretary
Trevor Lloyd

Tuesday, May 7, 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, May 7, 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: Francine Donshick
R. Michael Flick
Linda Kennedy - Zoom
Daniel Lazzareschi, Vice Chair
Rob Pierce, Chair
Pat Phillips

Commissioners absent: Kate S. Nelson

Staff present: Kelly Mullin, Director, Planning and Building
Trevor Lloyd, Secretary, Planning and Building
Eric Young, Senior Planner, Planning and Building
Courtney Weiche (Zoom), Senior Planner, Planning and Building
Chris Bronczyk, Senior Planner, Planning and Building
Kat Oakley, Senior Planner, Planning and Building
Katy Stark, Planner, Planning and Building
Tim Evans, 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
Janelle Thomas, Engineer, Washoe County Engineering

2. Pledge of Allegiance

Chair Pierce 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: None

6. Approval of May 7, 2024, Agenda

Chair Pierce indicated Agenda Item 8.A. was pulled from the agenda, and Agenda Item 9.B. would be moved to the end of the public hearings.

Commissioner Donshick moved to approve the agenda for the May 7, 2024, meeting as amended. Vice Chair Lazzareschi seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of six for, none against, with Commissioner Nelson absent.

7. Approval of March 5, 2024, Draft Minutes

Commissioner Donshick moved to approve the minutes for the March 5, 2024, Planning Commission meeting as written. Vice Chair Lazzareschi seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of six for, none against, with Commissioner Nelson absent.

8. Consent Items

B. Extension of Time Request for Tentative Subdivision Map Case Number TM16-005 (The Ridges at Hunter Creek) - For hearing, discussion, and possible action to approve an extension of time for the approval of the subdivision, for two years, from June 28, 2024, until June 28, 2026. The subdivision was originally approved by the Planning Commission on July 5, 2016. 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).

- Applicant: New Edge Living
- Property Owner: Hunter Creek Reno Owner LLC
- Location: 0 Hunter Falls Circle,
Reno, NV 89519
- APN: 041-671-04
- Parcel Size: 91.096 acres
- Master Plan: Rural Residential & Suburban Residential
- Regulatory Zone: 52% High Density Rural (HDR), 18% Low Density
Suburban (LDS) & 30% General Rural (GR)
- Area Plan: Southwest Truckee Meadows
- Development Code: Authorized in Article 608 Tentative Subdivision Maps

- 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

Public Comment:

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Discussion by Commission:

MOTION: Commissioner Donshick moved that the two-year Extension of Time Request until June 28, 2026, for Tentative Subdivision Map Case Number TM16-005 (The Ridges at Hunter Creek) be approved subject to the conditions of approval, as previously amended, having determined that the final map for TM16-005 has progressed in accordance with NRS 278.360, that the original findings remain valid, and that the circumstances have not appreciably changed since the original approval.

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

C. Extension of Time Request for Tentative Subdivision Map Case Number WTM20-005 and Special Use Permit Case Number WSUP20-0021 (Woodland Village Town Center) - For hearing, discussion, and possible action to approve an extension of time for the approval of the subdivision and associated special use permit, for two years, from May 20, 2024, until May 20, 2026. The subdivision was originally approved by the Planning Commission on January 5, 2021. 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).

- Applicant/Property Owner: WVC Commercial LLC
- Location: 18705 Village Center Drive,
Reno, NV 89508
- APN: 556-721-01 & 556-390-05
- Parcel Size: 1.367 acres & 4.231 acres
- Master Plan: Commercial & Suburban Residential
- Regulatory Zone: Neighborhood Commercial (NC) & Public/Semi-Public Facilities (PSP)
- Area Plan: Cold Springs
- Development Code: Authorized in Article 608 Tentative Subdivision Maps
- Commission District: 5 – Commissioner Herman
- Staff: Katy Stark, Planner
Washoe County Community Services Department
Planning and Building
- Phone: 775.328.3618
- E-mail: krstark@washoecounty.gov

Public Comment:

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Discussion by Commission:

MOTION: Commissioner Donshick moved that the two-year Extension of Time Request until May 20, 2026, for Tentative Subdivision Map Case Number WTM20-005 and Special Use Permit Case Number WSUP20-0021 (Woodland Village Town Center) be approved subject to the conditions of approval for WTM20005 and WSUP20-0021, having determined that the final map for WTM20-005 and WSUP20-0021 has progressed in accordance with NRS 278.360, that the original findings remain valid, and that the circumstances have not appreciably changed since the original approval.

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

9. Public Hearings [For possible action]

A. Development Code Amendment Case Number WDCA24-0002 (Affordable Housing Package 2) [For possible action] For hearing, discussion and possible action to initiate an amendment and approve a resolution to amend Washoe County Code Chapter 110 (Development Code) by modifying various sections in Division Two- Area Plan Regulations, Division Four- Development Standards, and Division Nine- General Provisions, in order to update regulations related to allowed residential uses in the Spanish Springs planning area, maximum height restrictions in the Sun Valley planning area, multifamily parking minimums, bike parking, turf requirements, common and private open space, and definitions. These updates include deleting a section limiting structures in the Sun Valley planning area to two stories in height and modifying various sections to: remove table C-1 which modifies allowed residential uses in the Spanish Springs planning area; update minimum off-street parking space requirements for multifamily housing; update requirements for bicycle storage by removing requirements for bicycle parking spaces, by adding design standards for short and long-term bicycle storage, by adding design requirements for bicycle racks, and by removing Figure 110.410.15.2 which shows bicycle parking space dimensions; remove the requirement to provide turf areas in multifamily developments of a minimum of fifty (50) percent of the required landscaping area; modify minimum size and dimension requirements for private open space in multifamily developments; add standards for turf areas provided as common open space for multifamily developments; and add definitions for short and long-term bicycle parking; 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, Sr. Planner and Kat Oakley, Sr. Planner
Washoe County Community Services Department
Planning and Building
- Phone: Chris: 775.328.3612; Kat: 775.328.3628
- E-mail: cbronczyk@washoecounty.gov; koakley@washoecounty.gov

Senior Planner Chris Bronczyk conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Overview; Housing – Background (2 slides); Article 216 – Spanish Springs Area; Article 218 – Sun Valley Area; Article 410 – Parking and Loading (5 slides); Article 412 – Landscaping; Article 432 – Open Space Standards (2 slides); Article 902 – Definitions; Community Meetings; Findings; and Recommended Motion.

Mr. Bronczyk stated the purpose of the amendments was to remove barriers to different types of housing while maintaining code requirements. Most of the changes would be county-wide, though the two proposed area plan changes would make those areas consistent with the rest of the county. The proactive changes to multimodal transportation were to facilitate future housing changes.

Public Comment:

Ms. Pat Davison remarked the proposed changes would reduce regulatory barriers to affordable housing and incentivize the construction of smaller units. She believed the proposed changes to the minimums would reduce costs for smaller unit developers, though they could still add amenities. She expressed support for the proposal, though if the Planning Commission (PC) opted to keep the two-story limit in Sun Valley, she suggested they consider allowing three stories if affordable housing goals were met. This would provide more diversity in housing types and benefit the county as a whole. She felt the code needed to be changed to meet the needs of a growing county.

Ms. Heidi Soper, a member of the Sun Valley Community Advisory Board (SVCAB), stated the residents of Sun Valley enjoyed the country spirit and wanted it to remain that way. She opposed removing the two-story restriction from the plan, citing the success of Hobeys' Casino. She opined there were infrastructure issues that needed addressing before more major construction was completed, and she wanted the PC to consider residents' opinions in their decision.

Mr. Mark Neumann listed the boards on which he sat, though he was speaking on his own behalf. He referenced the Chocolate Drive apartment complex which was denied by the PC but approved by the Board of County Commissioners, adding that prefabricated homes could be installed cheaply. He expressed concern about changes to yards, balconies, and the accessibility of common-area amenities. He urged the PC not to vote for this measure.

Ms. Paula Agramon expressed support for removing the two-story limit in Sun Valley because many constituents wanted the area to be developed differently than it currently was. She wished to see the types of amenities offered by the Cities of Reno and Sparks, such as libraries, emergency rooms, and apartments.

Ms. Carol Burns thanked the PC for previously denying the Chocolate Drive complex and stated the Master Plan was thoughtful in its inclusion of the two-story restriction. She noted the Chocolate Drive complex was inappropriate because it did not minimize silhouettes to the skyline. She wanted the height restriction to remain because it was appropriate for the community.

Mr. Dave Snelgrove noted the work on the Ridges of Sun Valley development exposed some of Sun Valley's challenges. He expressed support both for the turf requirement, since abiding by that requirement was challenging with the slopes on the western portion of Sun Valley, and the reduction in balcony sizes, which he said decreased density. He pointed out that any ground floor which was more than 50 percent buried was not counted as a story for that building. Those allowances would allow for the creation of reasonably priced housing. He expressed support for the proposed changes.

Discussion by Commission:

Commissioner Kennedy asked for clarification about the chart on page 10 of the presentation.

Planner Kat Oakley explained the bell curve in that chart showed a shift toward needing fewer vehicles per household. This mirrored the trend toward smaller household sizes.

Commissioner Kennedy stated much of Washoe County did not have access to public transportation and she expressed concern about limiting parking in areas where there were no alternatives to cars.

Ms. Oakley noted the changes would apply to multi-family housing only and not to single-family homes, where existing parking minimums would not change. She said the parking minimums would be in areas where other modes of transportation, such as Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) FlexRIDE, were available.

Commissioner Kennedy asked whether there had been discussions with RTC about expanding service in those areas.

Planner Eric Young replied RTC had attended many CAB meetings to discuss expansion of its FlexRIDE program, but he believed the type of zoning that would require great expansion would not be seen outside a certain few places. RTC was focusing on the FlexRIDE program, though it was being developed in Spanish Springs and Sun Valley, areas that supported this kind of development.

Commissioner Donshick asked about the issues discussed at the SVCAB meeting.

Mr. Young responded there were a couple of people who supported the initiative for affordable housing, but the vast majority expressed concerns about multi-family housing. A few people indicated they would accept removing the story requirement as long as multi-family was not allowed. Some of the concerns included impacts to scenic vistas, the history of the two-story limitation, and multi-family development. Staff did not attempt to sway anyone's mind, only to explain the proposed changes.

Commissioner Kennedy expressed concern about many different issues being grouped together in the approval of this item.

Ms. Oakley responded the items were grouped together because they were all regulatory barriers which existed in the code. The PC could approve the item as written or it could approve it with modifications.

Commissioner Kennedy stated she agreed with most of the conditions but not all of them and wanted to discuss possibly voting on some of the items individually.

Secretary Trevor Lloyd stated the PC was a body that could make a recommendation to support certain parts of the request, which could then be forwarded to the Board of County Commissioners.

Commissioner Flick asked whether changing the height requirement would limit the number of stories or the height of the structure based on topography.

Mr. Young indicated the proposal would remove the section in the Sun Valley modifiers which limited all structures to two stories, so height would be regulated by the underlying zoning. He provided examples of the height limits in different types of zoning. He pointed out the 35-foot

limit was unique to Montreaux and Incline Village; most two-story homes were around 27 feet high. With the proposed height limit, apartment complexes could have three stories. He confirmed there were only a handful of zoned areas in Sun Valley which currently allowed three stories.

Ms. Oakley clarified that multi-family housing and apartment complexes were not allowed uses in the majority of Sun Valley. Currently, those housing types would be limited to two stories in the areas where they were allowed, though that would change to three stories if this item were approved. Much of the zoning along Sun Valley Boulevard was limited to two stories, and removing the restriction would also increase the flexibility for commercial and mixed-use development.

Commissioner Flick stated there was great demand, and he wondered whether the streamlining of restrictions would be a windfall for developers. He noted there were no specifics regarding bicycle racks and asked whether the proposal accommodated electric scooters.

Mr. Young explained the racks were not designed for electric bikes or scooters, though that issue would be more important in Incline Village, so staff would need to consider a more global solution. The inclusion of bike racks in the proposal was simply to start providing for those modes of transportation. Regarding the Commissioner's comments about incentives for developers, he agreed there was a fine line between giving too much to developers and making sure property did not sit undeveloped forever. Staff tried to encourage private investment, he said, adding that many public entities were prepared to make public investment. He remarked private investment along Sun Valley Boulevard was a challenge, and these changes were designed to encourage it.

Vice Chair Lazzareschi inquired whether the proposal created any new multi-family zoning.

Ms. Oakley confirmed it did not, nor would it allow for the construction of anything taller than what was currently allowed. Additionally, there would be no increases in density.

Chair Pierce asked about an affordable housing plan in Sun Valley.

Ms. Oakley said two affordable housing developments were previously approved.

Mr. Bronczyk added they were Bridges at Sun Valley, which was currently under construction, and Chocolate Drive, which had entitled approvals, but construction had not yet begun.

MOTION: Vice Chair Lazzareschi moved that the Washoe County Planning Commission initiate amendments to the Washoe County Development Code and recommend approval of WDCA24-0002, to amend Washoe County Code Chapter 110 (Development Code) within Articles 216, 218, 410, 412, 432, and 902 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 to direct staff to present a report of this Commission's recommendation to the Washoe County Board of County Commissioners within 60 days of today's date. This recommendation for approval is based on the ability to make all of the four findings set forth in Washoe County Code Section 110.818.15(e).

Commissioner Donshick seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of five for, one against, with Commissioner Kennedy voting no and Commissioner Nelson absent.

C. Special Use Permit Case Number WSUP23-0032 (NV Energy) [For possible action]

– For hearing, discussion, and possible action to approve a special use permit for a major public facility use type for NV Energy to construct, operate, and maintain a new 10.8-mile long (11.9 miles including California and Nevada portions – 6.8 miles in Washoe County, 4.1 miles in the City of Reno, and 1.1 miles in California), 120 kV overhead transmission line connecting the California substation near Verdi to the Bordertown substation. The project will entail 53,000 cubic yards of excavation (cut) for access road widening and the applicant is requesting to waive all landscaping and parking requirements and to vary the maximum height of the applicable regulatory zones to allow for pole heights as high as 105'. This project meets the standard for a project of regional significance (PRS) because it entails 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 amendments to the Regional Utility Corridor Map of the 2019 Truckee Meadows Regional Plan to identify the location of the new transmission line. As this project encompasses areas within Washoe County and the City of Reno, the Regional Planning Commission will sponsor the changes to the Regional Utility Corridor Map in one single amendment as opposed to the Washoe County Commission and the City of Reno City Council sponsoring individual amendments. This project will need to comply with all Federal and State approvals before any approval at the County level would take effect.

- Applicant: NV Energy
- Property Owner: Myers 2017 Trust, Raymond A; NV Energy; Emery, Allyn; Lucas, Stan; Churchill Trust et al., David E; USFS; Lifestyle Homes TND LLC; Kronish Trust, Herbert; Inskip et al, Richard R; King, Clinton W
- Location: Traversing parallel to the California-Nevada boundary, north of Highway 80 and south of Highway 395
- APN: 038-822-01; 038-821-20; 038-842-01; 038-042-20; 038-043-05; 038-044-06; 038-045-46; 038-060-37; 038-280-43; 238-320-04; 038-010-07; 038-010-05; 081-170-10; 081-070-06; 081-070-29; 081-050-46; 081-010-01; 081-010-05; 081-010-06; 558-010-06; 081-010-18; 081-110-06; 081-110-05; 081-110-04; 038-550-44; 081-070-20; 081-050-11
- Parcel Size: 3.33, 10.01, 0.07, 0.70, 0.71, 1.03, 1.21, 12.16, 1.22, 59.93, 80.00, 643.88, 320.00, 320.00, 1506.08, 2928.64, 160.00, 80.00, 80.00, 40.21, 474.99, 65.36, 159.20, 56.38, 326.02, 40.00, 40.00 acres
- Master Plan: Suburban Residential, Rural, and Open Space
- Regulatory Zone: Low Density Suburban (LDS), Public Semi-Public Facilities (PSP); General Rural (GR); Open Space (OS)
- Area Plan: Verdi and North Valleys
- Development Code: Authorized in Article 810, Special Use Permits & Article 812 Projects of Regional Significance
- Commission District: 1 – Commissioner Hill; 5 – Commissioner Herman
- Staff: Tim Evans, Planner
Washoe County Community Services Department
Planning and Building
- Phone: 775.328.2314
- E-mail: tevans@washoecounty.gov

Secretary Trevor Lloyd clarified that the Planning Commission was only considering approving the County's section of this item, not the City's portion.

Vice Chair Lazzareschi disclosed he was currently employed on NV Energy's construction team, and though he was not on this project, he recused himself from voting on this action.

7:07 p.m. Vice Chair Lazzareschi left the meeting.

Planner Tim Evans conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Request; Vicinity Map; Site Plan; Site Plan – Verdi Area (2 slides); Evaluation (5 slides); Modifications; Neighborhood Meeting; Reviewing Agencies; Public Notice; Findings; Possible Motion; and Exhibit A – Amended.

Mr. Evans noted there was an existing transmission line in Verdi, so this project would replace that portion of the line. They would remove the existing poles and replace them with fewer than were currently there. He explained the environmental impact statement (EIS) took into account all the proposed transmission line locations, as well as biological and wildlife impacts. These impacts resulted in the path the transmission line was proposed to take. He mentioned the poles in Verdi would not be taller than 35 feet. All the grading involved in the project, he noted, was temporary; it would be returned to its original state after the project was complete. He pointed out staff supported all the variances of code requirements requested for this project.

Dave Snelgrove with CFA Bowman conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Line 1104 Alignment Request; Current Transmission Power Connectivity; City/County Segments... (2 slides); Project Overview; USFS Review of Project; Decision by USFS... (3 slides); Verdi Corridor; Cold Springs/Alturas Corridor; Line North of West Meadows Estates Subdivision (2 slides); Preferred Alignment – Sparse Vegetation; Alignment Topography – Washoe County Portion; and Finding FEIS and FROD.

Mr. Snelgrove stated he was trying to avoid needing to make condition amendments in the future. The proposal would create a redundancy of source, so if something were to happen to one of the power lines, all power in western Reno would not go down. He noted a majority of Washoe County's line would actually be in United States Forest Service (USFS) land, and the landowner provided specific stipulations to staff. He indicated the proposed route was a combination of the Peavine Alternative and the Peavine/Poeville Alternative. Some of the proposed path would go through areas which had previously burned, so there would be less area to burn. There were coloration requirements on the poles, he continued, allowing them to blend into the surrounding environment.

Public Comment:

Mr. Lloyd LeBard stated he was making his comments on behalf of himself, though his children owned the trust for the property abutting the project in the north valleys. He displayed an image comparing the original proposed line with the current proposal, which he believed would increase the cost to those receiving power and have a negative impact on neighboring property owners. He expressed concern about potential environmental impacts, biodiversity impacts, and the number of poles. He said the proposal served the interest of the developer.

Mr. Antone LeBard remarked that the EIS did not show a portion of the proposal, which was added in the last three months. He stated that portion went through forested land and was adjacent to his property line, and it would impact the ecosystem there. He did not know the purpose of the added portion, adding the EIS needed to be reviewed with regard to those changes.

Mr. Warren Lyons felt the lines should be constructed underground given the wildfire history in the area and recent catastrophes west of the area. He did not think the applicant ever provided an estimate of the cost to place the lines underground, nor did the EIS. He urged the Planning Commission (PC) to continue the item or reject the application and ask for additional information justifying the decision to overhead the power lines.

Mr. Ken McNeil also wished for a cost estimate to underground the lines, citing fire concerns. He said some people shot at power line insulators, compromising power lines and potentially causing them to fall down in the wind. Additionally, power companies often shut down overhead power lines during strong wind events, which would not happen if the lines were underground. He wished to see a cost comparison of maintaining overhead lines versus underground ones. He said the public did not want fires.

Ms. Micheline Fairbank, on behalf of the JCJJ & J Trust, stated most of the attention was focused on the southern portion of the lines, and she felt her clients near Cold Springs did not receive adequate notice to provide feedback. She stated the original proposal was more linear and she did not know why there was now a jog in the route. She acknowledged the importance of the project but expressed concern about recent developments with the project's location. She wanted more information about the changes made to the proposal, which she thought went through densely forested areas and adjacent to occupied residential properties, and asked the PC to continue the item until that information was received.

Via Zoom, Ms. Joan Blumenfeld wanted confirmation that the power poles in Verdi would not be more than 35 feet tall. She expressed support for the project for redundancy, though she expressed concern about 105-foot poles near residential development.

Discussion by Commission:

Commissioner Donshick asked about the jog brought up during public comment.

Mr. Snelgrove responded that an abrupt change was in the City of Reno's jurisdiction. The maps were from the EIS, which was approved five years earlier, and he stated he relied on the initial maps when the project was turned in; nothing had changed in the last three months. He reiterated this was on private property.

Mark Sullivan with NV Energy explained the easements were created through negotiation with the property owner prior to December 2019, and they were recorded April 7, 2020.

Mr. Snelgrove confirmed Commissioner Donshick's assertion that the jog was contained within City of Reno property and the PC was only considering Washoe County's portion of the project. He corrected a comment made during staff's presentation that poles taller than 35 feet would not be used in the Verdi corridor; given line separation standards, some poles would be more than 70 feet, and others in that corridor could be more than 100 feet. There were already poles that were taller than 50 feet in that area.

Commissioner Flick opined the information the PC received was misleading regarding where power lines would be placed.

Mr. Snelgrove replied that the information in the aerial maps was from the EIS, and the change made to the original Peavine/Poeville route came about through negotiations with the private property owner. Again, that was in the City of Reno's purview. He acknowledged the concerns of neighboring property owners. He believed the private property owner was the Stonegate development.

Commissioner Phillips asked how the PC could make a decision on a project which was based on an agreement with a private owner and the City of Reno.

Mr. Lloyd responded the City of Reno would need to approve the project as well. The PC was considering the transmission line that went through unincorporated Washoe County. The project would also need regional approval.

Mr. Sullivan clarified 6.8 of the 10.1 miles of the line would be in unincorporated Washoe County, and the changes that were made outside of the public process were due to the involvement of a private landowner. The USFS had no purview over private lands, and the applicant wanted to accommodate the development plan of the private owner.

Chair Pierce asked why the PC was told the poles in the Mogul area would be no taller than 35 feet when that was not the case.

Mr. Evans replied he misspoke and the tower heights in that corridor would be around 50 feet. The information in the staff report was correct.

Chair Pierce asked whether the EIS approved the jog in the route.

Mr. Sullivan said it was not part of the EIS because it went through private property. He stressed the applicant was making a substantial commitment to not hurt any endangered species.

Chair Pierce inquired about public notice.

Mr. Evans confirmed 860 public notices went out multiple times throughout the process, including upon receiving the application and before this public hearing.

MOTION: Commissioner Donshick moved that Special Use Permit Case Number WSUP23-0032 for NV Energy for the construction of 6.8 miles of a 120kV transmission line within unincorporated Washoe County be approved with the conditions included as Exhibit A, as amended, to this matter, having made all five findings in accordance with Washoe County Code Section 110.810.30. She further moved that the development code standard in Table 110.406.05.1 be varied to allow structures up to 105 feet in height, waive the parking standards of Article 410, waive the landscaping standards of Article 412, and the 3:1 slope standard of Article 438 of the Washoe County Development Code.

Chair Pierce seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of four for, one against, with Commissioner Flick voting no, Commissioner Nelson absent, and Vice Chair Lazzareschi recused from voting.

8:09 p.m. The Commission recessed.

8:20 p.m. The Commission reconvened with Commissioner Nelson absent.

B. Development Code Amendment Case Number WDCA24-0003 (Short-Term Rentals)
[For possible action] – For hearing, discussion and possible action to initiate an amendment and approve a resolution to amend Washoe County Code in Article 319 (Short Term Rentals (STRs)) by modifying various sections in order to clarify maximum occupancy limitations associated with an STR permit; limit STRs to one per parcel in the

Tahoe Planning Area; prohibit new STRs in accessory dwellings in the Tahoe Planning Area; clarify when an STR permit must be relinquished; remove requirement for an outdoor fireplace permit from the Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District; allow for an updated STR permit renew date via payment of a pro-rated renewal fee; remove the requirement for a signed notary for STR renewal applications; clarify that a new STR permit is required with each change of parcel ownership; grant a 30 day automatic grace period for renewals with a possible additional 30 day discretionary grace period that may be granted by the Director of Planning and Building; and clarify violation and revocation regulations; and by amending Washoe County Code Chapter 125 (Administrative Enforcement Code) to reduce the appeal period for STR stop activity orders from 30 days to 14 days; 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. Any material modifications that exceed the scope of the amendments being considered at this hearing may require continuation of the hearing for possible action at a future meeting. If approval is recommended, the Planning Commission is asked to authorize the Chair to sign a resolution to that effect.

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

Planning Manager Trevor Lloyd conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Purpose of Amendments; Community Workshops; Proposed Amendments (14 slides); and Possible Motion.

Of the approximately 700 STR permits in Washoe County, Mr. Lloyd stated, most were in the Incline Village/Crystal Bay area. He noted Amendment 9 was proposed because there was a rush of renewal applications from June to September, and this allowed a grace period when renewing a permit. He indicated the removal of the notary requirement in Amendment 11 would only apply to renewals; first-time applicants would still need to have their applications notarized.

Public Comment:

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Discussion by Commission:

Vice Chair Lazzareschi asked whether a property owner could voluntarily rescind their STR permit, hold an event, then reapply for a permit without waiting a year.

Mr. Lloyd confirmed they would not have to wait for a year; the one-year wait period was only for instances where a permit was revoked due to code violations. That was the current practice, and this was intended to clarify that practice.

MOTION: Vice Chair Lazzareschi moved that WDCA24-0003, amending Washoe County Code Chapter 110 (Development Code), Article 319, Short-Term Rentals and Chapter

125, Administrative Enforcement Code, be approved as reflected in the proposed ordinance contained in Attachment A-1. He further moved that the Chair be authorized to sign the resolution contained in Exhibit A on behalf of the Planning Commission and to direct staff to present a report of this Commission's recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners within 60 days of today's date. This recommendation for approval is based on the four findings within Washoe County Code Section 110.818.15(e).

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

10. Chair and Commission Items

A. Future agenda items

Commissioner Donshick requested an update on all approved developments which had not yet been built.

Secretary Trevor Lloyd stated he could provide the Planning Commission with an updated approved/unbuilt map.

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 indicated the Board of County Commissioners heard three items at its April 16, 2024, meeting: the Village Green Code Amendment, the Sutcliffe Master Plan and Regulatory Zone Amendment, and the Makayla Way Master Plan and Regulatory Zone Amendment. The second readings for the first two items would be heard at the May 14, 2024, meeting.

B. Legal information and updates

There were no updates.

12. *General Public Comment and Discussion Thereof

There was no response to the call for public comment.

13. Adjournment

With no further business scheduled before the Planning Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 8:38 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Derek Sonderfan, Independent Contractor.

Approved by Commission in session on June 4, 2024.

Trevor Lloyd

Trevor Lloyd

Secretary to the Planning Commission