



WASHOE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION Meeting Minutes

Planning Commission Members

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

Tuesday, November 4, 2025
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, November 4, 2025, 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 Lazzareschi 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, Chair
- Kate S. Nelson (via Zoom)
- Amy Owens
- Rob Pierce, Vice Chair

Staff present:

- Trevor Lloyd, Secretary, Planning and Building
- Chris Bronczyk Senior Planner, Planning and Building
- Kat Oakley, Senior Planner, Planning and Building
- Julee Olander, 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

Chair Lazzareschi 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 Lazzareschi opened the Public Comment period.

Public Comment:

Mr. Mark Neumann brought up the boards and commissions on which he sat but noted he was speaking as a citizen. He expressed frustration about traffic in Sun Valley and reminded the Commission they did not have to approve the development later in the meeting. More homes were needed, he opined, not more apartments. He believed the developer would sell the property to an out-of-state corporation.

6. Approval of November 4, 2025, Agenda

Vice Chair Pierce moved to approve the agenda for the November 4, 2025, meeting as written. Commissioner Kennedy seconded the motion, which passed unanimously with a vote of seven for, none against.

7. Approval of October 7, 2025, Draft Minutes

Vice Chair Pierce pointed out a set of amended minutes had been distributed to the Commissioners.

Vice Chair Pierce moved to approve the amended minutes for the October 7, 2025, Planning Commission meeting as written. Commissioner Kennedy seconded the motion, which passed unanimously with a vote of seven for, none against.

8. Public Hearings

A. Development Code Amendment Case Number WDCA25-0010 (Iveson DCA) –

For hearing, discussion and possible action to initiate an amendment to Washoe County Code Chapter 110 (Development Code) in Division Two- Area Plan Regulations to establish standards for permanent employee housing in the High Desert Planning Area; to allow permanent employee housing on parcels zoned General Rural (GR) within the High Desert Planning Area at a density of up to 1 dwelling unit per 40 acres as an allowed use; and to allow permanent employee housing on such parcels at a density of up to 1 dwelling unit per 5 acres with approval of a special use permit; 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 deny the proposed ordinance. If approval is recommended, the Planning Commission is asked to authorize the Chair to sign a resolution to that effect.

- Applicant/Property Owner: BRDR Properties, LLC, c/o G. Barton Mowry
- Location: Northern Portion of Washoe County, identified as the High Desert Planning Area
- APN: 066-030-05
- Parcel Size: 320
- Master Plan: Rural
- Regulatory Zone: General Rural
- Planning Area: High Desert (HD)
Gerlach/Empire
- Development Code: Authorized in Article 818, Amendment of
Development Code
- Commission District: 5 – Commissioner Herman
- Staff: Chris Bronczyk, Senior Planner
Washoe County Community Services Department
Planning and Building
- Phone: 775.328.3612
- E-mail: CBronczyk@washoecounty.gov

Planner Chris Bronczyk conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Background; Article 206 General Rural Regulatory Zone Area Modifier (2 slides); Article 206 Permanent Employee Housing; Public Workshop; Findings; and Recommended Motion – Approval.

Dave Snelgrove with Bowman Consulting Group noted this amendment encompasses the entire high desert area. The current standard of one unit per 40 acres is very challenging, he noted. He conducted a slideshow presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Applicable Area; Only Impacted Area; DCA Request; Existing Modifiers – Allowed Uses No SUP; and Why is the Request Made/Anticipated Benefits.

Mr. Snelgrove indicated that concerns over a shortage of housing in Gerlach were raised at the Citizen Advisory Board meeting. He noted this would have no effect on the Spanish Springs or Cold Springs areas. He felt that passing this amendment would be a net positive, not only for their proposal, but for other uses.

Commissioner Owens wondered about the maximum capacity for these employee dwelling units.

Mr. Snelgrove responded that different types of housing – studios, duplexes, and bunkhouses – would allow flexibility for different housing needs in a remote setting.

Public Comment:

Ms. Elisabeth Gambrell stated her comments are her own and not representative of any of the boards on which she sits. She expressed support for the proposal. She pointed out that the name of Squaw Valley Reservoir had been changed to Granite Mountain Reservoir, and that should be reflected where printed.

Discussion by Commission:

Commissioner Flick inquired about the number of units that could be built.

Mr. Bronczyk replied that one unit per five acres would be allowed, but some types of dormitory-style housing could be constructed with a shared kitchen and multiple room configurations. Apartments would not be allowed with this change, only permanent employee housing.

MOTION: Vice Chair Pierce moved that WDCA25-0010 be approved to amend Washoe County Chapter 110 (Development Code) within Article 206 as reflected within the proposed ordinance contained in Exhibit A-1; and that the Chair be authorized to sign the resolution contained in Attachment 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 the following four findings in accordance with 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 Kennedy seconded the motion, which passed unanimously with a vote of seven for, zero against.

B. Development Code Amendment Case Number WDCA25-0008 (Small Housing and Infill Development) – For hearing, discussion and possible action to initiate an amendment to Washoe County Code Chapter 110 (Development Code) in Division Three- Regulation of Uses, Division Four- Development Standards, and Division Nine- General Provisions. These amendments include adding various sections to: establish small lot residential development standards and establish infill residential and commercial standards. These amendments also include amending various sections to: include an example of the multi-family, minor residential use type and allow cottage courts on multiple parcels; modify the maximum size of attached and detached accessory dwelling units from 50% to 80% the size of the main dwelling; modify the maximum floor area from 1,000 square feet to 1,200 square feet for cottage court developments; specify that only one community accessory structure is allowed for every four (4) cottages in a cottage court development; clarify the calculation of setbacks for cottage court developments; modify lot and yard standards for common open space developments; add 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 deny the proposed ordinance. 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: 775.328.3628
- E-mail: CBronczyk@washoecounty.gov;
KOakley@washoecounty.gov

Planner Chris Bronczyk conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Article 302 Use Classification System; Accessory Dwelling Units; Cottage Courts; Small Lot Development Standards; Infill Standards; Infill Incentives; Sun Valley; Verdi; Wadsworth; Gerlach; Common Open Space Development; Definitions; Findings; and Recommended Motion – Approval.

Mr. Bronczyk noted that the 50 percent limit on detached accessory dwelling units (ADUs) is too prohibitive for individuals with smaller homes; increasing it to 80 percent would allow more people to build better-sized ADUs for their loved ones. He pointed out that square footage limits would still be in effect in all regulatory zones.

Commissioner Kennedy requested clarification about infill standards.

Mr. Bronczyk said this proposal contemplates reduced setbacks and lot sizes in infill areas, along with allowing structures to be oriented differently than what is typically acceptable. This allows more flexibility in smaller, constrained lots.

Commissioner Kennedy expressed concern that this proposal seemed to correct things that the Planning Commission only recently approved.

Mr. Bronczyk confirmed that this proposal would clarify portions of the previously-approved development code amendments, but it also includes additional allowances for infill development and small-lot development. Increasing the allowable size for ADUs was also added to this proposal in response to public demand.

Senior Planner Kat Oakley mentioned that the development code package approved in early 2024 focused on permitting requirements for ADUs, though the size limit for ADUs in medium-density suburban (MDS) zoning was changed from 800 square feet to 1,200 square feet. However, based on consistent feedback on size constraints, staff felt it was prudent to reconsider the topic of ADUs. Today's specific consideration was not previously considered by the Commission.

In response to additional questions, Ms. Oakley said there has not been specific feedback regarding the proposed change to the size limit on ADUs. However, there have been questions about developing ADUs on small properties, and when she told the inquirers about the potential increase, the response she received was generally supportive.

Responding to Commissioner Flick's query about the proposed changes to setbacks, Mr. Bronczyk noted the residential setback changes would only impact front yard setbacks. For commercial properties, it would now be five-foot side and rear setbacks. Garages would still need to meet the 20-foot setback threshold. The size of allowed setbacks after the change would depend on the existing zoning in the neighborhood.

Mr. Bronczyk confirmed Chair Lazzareschi's assertion that the intent of these infill standards is to allow development on lots that would not conform to today's zoning standards.

Public Comment:

Mr. Dave Snelgrove expressed support for this measure, which he described as encouraging affordability by design. He expressed concern that housing prices have surpassed wage growth, and allowing the subdividing of plots will increase the housing supply. He thought this was a proactive attempt to help the housing issue. He spoke about the process of adjusting development codes as needed once they have been put into place.

Ms. Pat Davison provided statistics regarding trends in the number and size of housing units in the MDS regulatory zone. She said adding courtyard apartments would help with overall understanding, and increasing the percentage of allowable ADU sizes should be allowed. She thought the small increase in allowable size for a cottage could make a difference in livability for families, and she lauded the change to allow them to be individually sold. She expressed support for these changes and the focus on small lots and small homes, believing they addressed the expected increase in residents in the future, and she urged the Commission to approve the item.

MOTION: Commissioner Kennedy moved that WDCA25-0008 be approved to amend Washoe County Code Chapter 110 (Development Code) within Articles 304, 306, 313, 404, 408, and 902, as reflected within the proposed ordinance contained in Exhibit A-1. She further moved that 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 at 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.

Chair Lazzareschi seconded the motion, which passed unanimously with a vote

of seven for, zero against.

C. Master Plan Amendment Code Amendment Case Number WDCA25-0008 (Small Housing and Infill Development) – For hearing, discussion, and possible action to:

- (1) Adopt an amendment to the Washoe County Master Plan, Sun Valley Master Plan Land Use Map, to change the master plan land use designation for a ± 17.2 acre parcel (APN: 085-010-52) and ± 1.2 acre parcel (APN: 085-010-53) from Suburban Residential (SR) to Urban Residential (UR) on ± 14 acres and Open Space (OS) on ± 4.4 acres; and if approved, authorize the chair to sign a resolution to this effect. Any adoption by the Planning Commission is subject to approval by the Washoe County Board of County Commissioners and a finding of conformance with the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan by the regional planning authority; and
- (2) Subject to final approval of the associated master plan amendment and a finding of conformance with the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan, recommend adoption of an amendment to the Sun Valley Regulatory Zone Map, to change the regulatory zoning for a ± 17.2 acre parcel (APN: 085-010-52) and ± 1.2 acre parcel (APN: 085-010-53) from Medium Density Suburban (MDS-3 du/acre single family detached; or 5 du/acre single family attached & middle housing) to Low Density Urban (LDU -10 du/acre single family detached; or 14 du/acre for single family attached, multi-family, middle housing; or 12 du/acre mobile home park) on ± 14 acres and Open Space (OS) on ± 4.4 acres; and authorize the chair to sign a resolution to this effect.

- Applicant/Property Owner: Sun Valley 48, LLC
- Location: South of W. 2nd Avenue and west of Whittemore Way
- APN: 085-010-52 & 53
- Parcel Size: ± 17.2 & ± 1.2 acres
- Existing Master Plan: Suburban Residential (SR)
- Proposed Master Plan: Urban Residential (UR)
- Existing Regulatory Zone: Medium Density Suburban (MDS-3 du/acre single family)
- Proposed Regulatory Zone: Low Density Urban (LDU -10 du/acre single family detached; or 14 du/acre for single family attached, multi-family, middle housing; or 12 du/acre manufactured home park) & Open Space (OS)
- Planning Area: Sun Valley
- Development Code: Authorized in Article 820, Amendment of Master Plan and Article 821, Amendment of Regulatory Zone
- Commission District: 3 – Commissioner Garcia
- Staff: Julee Olander, Planner
Washoe County Community Services Department
Planning and Building
- Phone: 775.328.3627

- E-mail: JOlander@washoecounty.gov

Planner Julee Olander conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles or descriptions: Request; area map; Area Characteristics; MPA Request; RZA Request; Background (2 slides); MPA Evaluation; RZA Evaluation – LDU regulatory zoning; RZA Evaluation – OS Regulatory Zoning; Availability of Facilities; Traffic; Neighborhood Meeting & Public Comment; Noticing; Reviewing Agencies & Findings; and Possible Motions. She noted the proposal was conceptual, and more detailed analyses about sewer, water, and traffic would need to be provided if the applicant moves forward with a tentative subdivision map.

Chris Baker with Manhard Consulting conducted a slideshow presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Location; Land Use Designations; Existing Approval; Changes to the Surrounding Area; RTC – Pyramid Highway/US 395 Connect Project; HUD Qualified Census Tract; Existing Infrastructure; Requests; Land Use Designations; and Justification.

Mr. Baker pointed out that the 168-unit conceptual plan was only put together so traffic, water, and sewer scenarios could be established for a study. He recognized that a regional regulatory land designation change would need to occur if this is approved, and this item would return to the Planning Commission (PC) either during the tentative map approval process or for special use permit (SUP) applications if multi-family housing was sought.

Commissioner Owens disclosed that Mr. Baker left her a voicemail message that she did not return, and he made a similar presentation to the Sun Valley Citizens Advisory Board (CAB), on which she sits. However, she did not converse with him at that meeting.

In response to Commissioner questions, Secretary Trevor Lloyd confirmed that, depending on housing type, the applicants could develop up to 92 attached units with the current zoning. Those units could be rental units or fee-simple ownership units, and that would be determined at either the tentative map or SUP phases depending on the type of product the applicant ultimately proposes.

If multi-family housing was desired for this project, Ms. Olander added, the applicant would need to apply for an SUP, which would be considered by the Board of Adjustment.

Public Comment:

Ms. Carol Burns spoke about the rural origins of the Sun Valley community. Though Sun Valley has changed, she opined, its nature is still rural. She expressed concern about the additional traffic generated by the connection to Pyramid Highway, and she thought additional development would only cause more stress and traffic. She felt multiple residential developments should not exist in a rural neighborhood and asked the Commission to deny the amendment.

Mr. Mark Neumann encouraged the Commissioners to observe the traffic on Second

Avenue and Sun Valley Boulevard. He expressed concern that decisions made by the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) have been overturned. He thought cottage developments would be better than apartments, especially for seniors. He expressed frustration at inaccuracies in traffic studies.

Ms. Veronica Cortes discussed her educational and personal background, noting she was a member of the Sun Valley CAB. She expressed frustration that she did not qualify for affordable housing on a lunch lady's salary, and citizens are not ready to go forward with the approval of this project. She spoke about services provided by her nonprofit organization Valley Amigos. She felt traffic needed to be addressed before this project can move forward, adding that her inability to get to work on time due to traffic was why she left her job. She urged the PC not to approve this project.

Discussion by Commission:

Commissioner Owens noted Sun Valley does not currently have a grocery store or a bank, and she did not believe adding 168 more units would be good for the area.

Vice Chair Pierce noted that any talk about selling the development is speculation, and there is no planned development. He did not think traffic in the area was too bad, and the traffic study only anticipated a 3 percent increase. He thought this was a perfect project for this area and he would support it.

Chair Lazzareschi said he had trouble making findings 5 and 6 given the existing density and resource constraints in the area. This project would also increase density on the periphery instead of gradually tapering down toward the open space region.

Commissioner Flick wondered about the feasibility of incorporating cottage courts in this area.

Chair Lazzareschi responded that the overall density for a cottage court would be limited to the underlying zoning density; in this case, that would be either 5 dwelling units per acre if the project were denied or 14 per acre if approved.

Commissioner Flick expressed frustration that the amount of approved development has resulted in an inundation of automobiles.

Vice Chair Pierce pointed out that cycling and walking are viable options in this area. He compared the traffic in Sun Valley to traffic in Red Rocks where he lives, saying it is bad but not too bad. He reiterated that this is a good project for this location.

Commissioner Kennedy opined that the developer would be the only to benefit from this amendment.

Deputy District Attorney Jennifer Gustafson cautioned the Commission that they should focus on the findings it needs to make. She reminded them that there is no specific project. This item is for a master plan amendment (MPA) and a regulatory zone amendment (RZA). The PC would need to be able to make three of the five

findings to approve the MPA, and because the Effect on a Military Installation finding is not applicable here, it would need to make all six of the other findings to approve the RZA.

MOTION: Commissioner Kennedy moved that Master Plan Amendment Case Number WMPA25-0005 be denied, being unable to make the following findings in accordance with Washoe County Code Section 110.821.15(d): Consistency with Master Plan; Response to Changed Conditions; and Desired Pattern of Growth.

Commissioner Owens seconded the motion, being unable to make the following findings: Compatible Land Uses; Response to Changed Conditions; Availability of Facilities; and Desired Pattern of Growth. The motion failed on a vote of two to five, with Commissioners Barnes, Flick, Nelson, Vice Chair Pierce, and Chair Lazzareschi voting no.

Chair Pierce voted that the resolution contained at Attachment A of the staff report be adopted to amend the Master Plan as set forth in Master Plan Amendment Case Number WMPA25-0005, having made all five of the five findings in accordance with Washoe County Code Section 110.820.15(d). He further moved that the resolution and the proposed Master Plan Amendments in WMPA25-0005 be certified as set forth in the staff report for submission to the Washoe County Board of County Commissioners, and the chair be authorized to sign the resolution on behalf of the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Nelson seconded the motion.

Mr. Lloyd stated that approval of a master plan amendment requires a two-thirds majority of the Commission.

The motion passed with a vote of five for, two against, with Commissioners Kennedy and Owens voting no.

Chair Lazzareschi indicated he could make the following findings: Consistency with the Master Plan; Compatible Land Uses; Response to Changed Conditions; and Availability of Facilities.

MOTION: Vice Chair Pierce moved that the resolution included as Attachment B recommending adoption of Regulatory Zone Amendment Case Number WRZA25-0006 be adopted, having made all of the findings in accordance with Washoe County Code Section 110.821.15(d). He further moved that the resolution and the proposed Regulatory Zone Amendment in WRZA25-0006 be certified as set forth in the staff report for submission to the Washoe County Board of Commissioners, and the chair be authorized to sign the resolution on behalf of the Washoe County Planning Commission.

Commissioner Flick seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of four for, three against, with Commissioners Kennedy, Owens, and Chair Lazzareschi voting no.

Chair Lazzareschi indicated he could not make the Desired Pattern of Growth finding.

Ms. Gustafson pointed out that regulatory zone amendments do not need a supermajority, so this item passes.

9. Chair and Commission Items

A. Future agenda items

Vice Chair Pierce requested an agenda item clarifying the desired pattern of growth in the Sun Valley area.

B. Requests for information from staff

There were none.

10. Director's and Legal Counsel's Items

A. Report on previous Planning Commission items

Secretary Trevor Lloyd stated the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) adopted the Crystal Bay Condominium development code amendment at its October 14 meeting and the Marango Springs regulatory zone amendment at its October 28 meeting. The BCC will consider the first reading for the senior housing code amendments at its November 18 meeting.

Regarding Vice Chair Pierce's request from Agenda Item 9, Mr. Lloyd announced that training for both the Planning Commission (PC) and the Board of Adjustment will take place the second week in January, and that topic could be addressed then.

B. Legal information and updates

Deputy District Attorney Jennifer Gustafson indicated there will be a special meeting of the PC on November 20, and either that or the December meeting will be her last PC meeting.

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 7:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Derek Sonderfan, Independent Contractor.

Approved by Commission in session on November 20, 2025

Trevor Lloyd

Trevor Lloyd

Secretary to the Planning Commission