



# WASHOE COUNTY PARCEL MAP REVIEW COMMITTEE **DRAFT** Meeting Minutes

## Parcel Map Review Committee Members

Rob Pierce, Planning Commission  
James English, Health District  
Wayne Handrock, Engineering  
Christopher Bronczyk, Planning and Building  
Dale Way, Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District

Thursday, March 14, 2024  
2:00 p.m.

## REMOTE TECHNOLOGY MEETING ONLY

The Washoe County Parcel Map Review Committee met in a scheduled session on Thursday, March 14, 2024. This meeting was held via Zoom teleconference.

The meeting was televised live and replayed on the Washoe Channel at: <https://www.washoecounty.gov/mgrsoff/Communications/wctv-live.php>, and can also be found on YouTube at: <https://www.youtube.com/user/WashoeCountyTV>.

### 1. Call to Order and Determination of Quorum [Non-action item]

Chair Bronczyk called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. The following Committee members and staff were present:

Departments represented:

- Community Services Department (CSD)  
Wayne Handrock, Engineering  
Christopher Bronczyk, Planning and Building
- Health District  
James English
- Planning Commission  
Rob Pierce
- Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District  
Dale Way

Members Absent: None

Staff present: Adriana Albarran, Recording Secretary  
Jennifer Gustafson, Deputy District Attorney, District Attorney's Office

### 2. Ethics Law Announcement and Instructions for Providing Public Comment via Zoom/Telephone [Non-action item]

Deputy District Attorney Jennifer Gustafson recited the Ethics Law standards and instructions for providing public comment via Zoom/Telephone.

### 3. Appeal Procedure [Non-action item]

Chris Bronczyk recited the appeal procedure for items heard before the Parcel Map Review Committee.

**4. Public Comment [Non-action item]**

With no response to the call for public comment, the period was closed.

**5. Approval of March 14, 2024 Agenda [For possible action]**

Rob Pierce moved to approve the agenda for the March 14, 2024 meeting as written. The motion, seconded by Dale Way, passed unanimously with a vote of 5 to 0.

**6. Approval of February 8, 2024 Draft Minutes [For possible action]**

Rob Pierce moved to approve the minutes for the February 8, 2024 Parcel Map Review Committee meeting as written. The motion, seconded by Wayne Handrock, passed unanimously with a vote of 5 to 0.

**7. Project Review Items [For possible action]**

**A. Tentative Parcel Map Case Number WTPM23-0012 (Phungphiphadhana) [For possible action]** – For hearing, discussion, and possible action to approve a tentative parcel map dividing a 2.01-acre parcel into three (3) parcels of 29,175 square feet (0.67 acres), each.

- Applicant: Terraphase Engineering
- Property Owner: Spencer Phungphiphadhana
- Location: 5275 Leon Drive, Sun Valley, NV 89433
- APN: 085-042-44
- Parcel Size: 2.01 acres
- Master Plan: Suburban Residential
- Regulatory Zone: Medium Density Suburban (MDS)
- Area Plan: Sun Valley
- Development Code: Authorized in Article 606, Parcel Maps
- Commission District: 3 – Commissioner Garcia
- Staff: Katy Stark, Planner  
Washoe County Community Services Department  
Planning and Building Division
- Phone: 775.328.3618
- Email: krstark@washoecounty.gov

Planner Katy Stark provided a presentation.

Applicant representative, Mark Gookin with Terraphase Engineering was available to answer questions.

**Public Comment:**

With no response to the call for public comment, the public comment period was closed.

**Motion:**

James English moved that, after giving reasoned consideration to the information contained within the staff report and the information received during the public meeting, that the Washoe County Parcel Map Review Committee approve Parcel Map Case Number WTPM23-0012 for Spencer Phungphiphadhana, subject to the conditions of approval included as Exhibit A with the staff report, and make the determination that the following criteria is or will be adequately provided for pursuant to Washoe County Code, Section 110.606.30(e): Dale Way seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

The motion carried and considered the following criteria:

- 1) General improvement considerations for all parcel maps including, but not limited to:

- (i) Environmental and health laws and regulations concerning water and air pollution, the disposal of solid waste, facilities to supply water, community or public sewage disposal and, where applicable, individual systems for sewage disposal.
- (ii) The availability of water which meets applicable health standards and is sufficient for the reasonably foreseeable needs of the parcels of land being created.
- (iii) The availability and accessibility of utilities.
- (iv) The availability and accessibility of public services such as schools, police and fire protection, transportation, recreation and parks.
- (v) Conformity with the zoning ordinances and master plan.
- (vi) General conformity with the governing body's master plan of streets and highways.
- (vii) The effect of the proposed division of land on existing public streets and the need for new streets or highways to serve the parcels of land being created.
- (viii) Physical characteristics of the land such as floodplain, slope and soil.
- (ix) The recommendations and comments of those entities reviewing the tentative parcel map pursuant to NRS 278.330 and 278.348, inclusive.
- (x) The availability and accessibility of fire protection including, but not limited to, the availability and accessibility of water and services for the prevention and containment of fires including fires in wild lands.
- (xi) Community antenna television (CATV) conduit and pull wire.
- (xii) Recreation and trail easements.

**B. Tentative Parcel Map Case Number WTPM23-0015 (Pleasant Valley Lift Station) [For possible action]** – For hearing, discussion, and possible action to approve a tentative parcel map dividing a 5.00-acre parcel into two (2) parcels of 4.99 acres and 0.01 acres (480 square feet). The 480 square foot parcel is for public utility purposes and will be dedicated to Washoe County for the purposes of constructing a sewer lift station.

- Applicant/Property Owner: Harry Fry
- Location: 1221 Chance Lane, Reno
- APN: 017-410-69
- Parcel Size: 5.00 acres
- Master Plan: Suburban Residential, Rural Residential
- Regulatory Zone: Medium Density Rural (55%), Low Density Suburban (38%), Medium Density Suburban (7%)
- Area Plan: South Valleys
- Development Code: Authorized in Article 606, Parcel Maps
- Commission District: 2 – Commissioner Clark
- Staff: Tim Evans, Planner  
Washoe County Community Services Department  
Planning and Building Division
- Phone: 775.328.2314
- Email: tevans@washoecounty.gov

Wayne Handrock disclosed he had answered some questions for the engineering department for a parcel map waiver but no further contact.

Planner Tim Evans provided a presentation.

#### **Questions for Planner:**

Rob Pierce asked about the size of the lots that the subdivision is approved for. Planner Evans responded it was about 5-acre parcels. Mr. Pierce confirmed that it would be difficult for the applicant

to return and ask for smaller lots because the lift station would not support it. Planner Tim added the approval for the subdivision was done 3 years ago.

Chair Bronczyk noted the newly created parcel was adjacent to a fairly large private/public utility easement and asked for confirmation that there was no encroachment. Planner Tim confirmed.

Rob Pierce asked about the easement access to the south and whether there was any consideration made to ensure the road would be adequate for future development and for current property owners. Planner Tim noted the prior subdivision took that all into account.

**Public Comment:**

Sonja Cup, neighbor, stated she and other neighbors were concerned about the proposal and the future parcels. She wanted to know why a lift station was better than a septic system.

Elizabeth Schuler, resident of Rhodes Rd stated one of the requirements is adequate road access however, when looking at Rocky Vista Rd and Chance Lane, Chance Lane is an easement and not an actual road. Ms. Schuler also wanted to know why the lift station could not be placed on the utility easement. She noted a concern when it came to erosion stating water comes down and floods that area. She too wanted to know why a septic system was not being used. Ms. Schuler requested a delay in the decision or a "no" by the committee.

Damon Vincent, property owner to the South of the proposed parcel stated his concern was the poor road access, he feared increased traffic would deteriorate it further. He noted the road was subject to bad erosion. Previous construction had further damaged the road already.

Marikah Becken stated she submitted some comments but found out about the meeting that morning. She wanted to know why the subdivision wouldn't use septic as was common for the area, she felt no reasonable assessment was made for why a lift station was preferred. Ms. Becken stated a lift station presented unstated future intention to further subdivide, which could be requested in the future by Mr. Fry. She stated a 5-acre parcel was large enough for a septic system. Lastly, she stated there would be nothing to stop the lift station from being increased in size and density if the Pleasant Valley Estates subdivision was approved.

Laurie Smith, a resident of Rhodes Rd asked if approving the lift station would allow Mr. Fry to subdivide and create more homes. She stated the lift station would not be good for the neighborhood and instead each parcel could have its own septic tank. She wondered if Mr. Fry would be willing to sign an agreement stating he would not build more than 8 homes. Lastly, Ms. Smith mentioned the poor road conditions of Chance Lane and Rhodes Rd.

Rick Blake asked how many sewer hookups the lift station would be able to support and how many hookups Mr. Fry had proposed. He wanted to know the exact number of hookups and that no further hookups would be allowed in the future. He asked if the number of hookups could be increased without county approval. He asked if Mr. Fry would try to further subdivide and create more than the current 8 parcels. Lastly, he asked if there was any conflict of interest for the county to accept the parcel, was that normal or atypical for the county to do.

Robert Floyd stated he was concerned about the situation. He thanked Member Pierce for asking about the size of the lift station. He wondered if it was a conflict of interest for the county to accept the lift station. His other concern was whether Mr. Fry would request further subdivision in the future. He stated Rhodes Rd and Chance Ln could not sustain further traffic. He asked about the bridge crossing steamboat and why it had not been fixed.

Jim Welborn stated the applicant had applied for 1-acre subdivisions in the past. He stated the only reason for a lift station was to subdivide. He stated the roads could not handle any further traffic.

Russ James, a resident of Rhodes Rd, stated the county would be accepting liability. The access road to the property was also very questionable.

Ed Smith, Rhodes Rd resident stated the project should be denied.

Amber Braun, Rhodes Rd resident questioned the access to Mr. Fry's proposed development and requested the committee deny the project until the public's questions had been addressed.

**Member Questions / Discussion:**

Wayne Handrock asked Janelle Thomas, Washoe County engineer who helped review the project to clarify the access to the project. Ms. Thomas stated the access was via the easement, which was requested by Washoe County Engineering. Mr. Handrock asked if road improvement designs were proposed as part of the project, Ms. Thomas stated it was not, the only improvements that would be required would be access to the lift station once it was built. Chair Bronczyk asked if it was an exception for the county to accept the lift station. Ms. Thomas stated she wasn't certain about the acceptance of the future lift station but stated the intent was to enable as many properties as possible to have access to a municipal sewer system rather than constructing individual sewer systems for each property.

James English stated Northern Nevada Public Health reviewed the creation of the new parcel based on its intended use. They specifically reviewed that the single family home would not be negatively affected. They also knew the small parcel could not be further developed.

Wayne Handrock answered Chair Bronczyk's question and stated it was not uncommon for Washoe County to accept lift stations.

Chair Bronczyk asked Planner Evans what the applicant would have to do if they wanted to further subdivide in the future. Planner Evans answered regulatory zone and parcel map review hearings would be required, neighbors would be notified and they would have the opportunity to join and make further public comment at the public hearings. Chair Bronczyk asked what the next steps would be to construct the lift station. Planner Evans said if approved the applicant would begin working with Washoe County Engineering to construct the lift station.

Rob Pierce asked Janelle Thomas to further explain the lift station being only 480 sq ft. and its obvious design for only 5-acre parcels. He asked what it would take for the lift station to further support more parcels. Janelle Thomas stated the utility staff had been working with the applicant to create a lift station to support the 5-acre parcels if further parcels were to be requested in the future it would be addressed then. James English added if further subdivision was requested new building permits would be reviewed.

Wayne Handrock stated denying the lift station project would mean a lot of redesign work for septic alternatives. It would create a hardship for the 8 parcels that had already been created and approved.

**Motion:**

Chair Bronczyk moved that, after giving reasoned consideration to the information contained within the staff report and the information received during the public meeting, that the Washoe County Parcel Map Review Committee approve Parcel Map Case Number WTPM23-0015 for Harry Fry, subject to the conditions of approval included as Exhibit A with the staff report, and make the determination that the following criteria is or will be adequately provided for pursuant to Washoe County Code, Section 110.606.30(e): James English seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

The motion carried and considered the following criteria:

- 2) General improvement considerations for all parcel maps including, but not limited to:
  - (i) Environmental and health laws and regulations concerning water and air pollution, the disposal of solid waste, facilities to supply water, community or public sewage disposal and, where applicable, individual systems for sewage disposal.

- (ii) The availability of water which meets applicable health standards and is sufficient for the reasonably foreseeable needs of the parcels of land being created.
- (iii) The availability and accessibility of utilities.
- (iv) The availability and accessibility of public services such as schools, police and fire protection, transportation, recreation and parks.
- (v) Conformity with the zoning ordinances and master plan.
- (vi) General conformity with the governing body's master plan of streets and highways.
- (vii) The effect of the proposed division of land on existing public streets and the need for new streets or highways to serve the parcels of land being created.
- (viii) Physical characteristics of the land such as floodplain, slope and soil.
- (ix) The recommendations and comments of those entities reviewing the tentative parcel map pursuant to NRS 278.330 and 278.348, inclusive.
- (x) The availability and accessibility of fire protection including, but not limited to, the availability and accessibility of water and services for the prevention and containment of fires including fires in wild lands.
- (xi) Community antenna television (CATV) conduit and pull wire.
- (xii) Recreation and trail easements.

Chair Bronczyk read the appeal procedure.

**8. Reports and Future Agenda Items** [Non-action item]

**A.** Future Agenda Items - None

**B.** Legal Information and Updates - None

**9. Public Comment** [Non-action item]

As there was no response to the call for public comment, the comment period was closed.

**10. Adjournment**

Chair Bronczyk made the motion to adjourn at 3:04 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Adriana Albarran, Recording Secretary

Approved by Committee in session on \_\_\_\_\_, 2024

---

Chris Bronczyk, Chair  
Senior Planner