



# WASHOE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION **DRAFT** 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, April 7, 2026  
6:00 p.m.

**Washoe County Administrative Complex  
Commission Chambers  
1001 E 9<sup>th</sup> Street, Building A  
Reno, Nevada 89512**

**and available via  
Zoom Webinar**

The Washoe County Planning Commission convened as the Capital Improvements Advisory Committee in a scheduled session on Tuesday, April 7, 2026, 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>.

## 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 (Zoom)  
Daniel Lazzareschi, Chair  
Kate Nelson (Zoom)  
Amy Owens  
Rob Pierce, Vice Chair  
Matthew Robinson, CIAC

Staff present: Trevor Lloyd, Secretary, Planning and Building  
Mishon Reede, Planning Manager  
Beth Hickman, Deputy District Attorney, District Attorney’s Office  
Adriana Albarran, Office Support Specialist, Planning and Building  
Brandon Roman, Recording Secretary, Planning and Building

## **Pledge of Allegiance**

Chair Lazzareschi led the pledge to the flag.

## **Public Comment**

There was no response to the call for public comment.

## **9. Public Hearings**

**A. Recommendation to the Washoe County Board of County Commissioners to adopt the 8th Edition of the Regional Road Impact Fee (RRIF) General Administration Manual (GAM), the 8th Edition of the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and the revised fees. [For possible action]** – For review, discussion, and possible action, pursuant to NRS 278B.150 and Washoe County Code (WCC) 110.706.05, to recommend approval to the Washoe County Board of County Commissioners of amendments to the Regional Road Impact Fee (RRIF) General Administrative Manual (GAM) and the RRIF Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) with revised fees.

- Prepared by: Mitchell Fink, RRIF Administrator  
Washoe County Community Services Department  
Engineering and Capital Projects Division
- Phone: 775.328.2050
- E-mail: MFink@washoecounty.gov

Jeff Wilbrechte with the Reno Transportation Commission conducted a slideshow presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Regional Road Impact Fee (RRIF) Program (3 slides); 8th Edition RRIF Update; Development of RRIF Fees; Development Model for Predicted Growth; Development of RRIF Fees; Travel Demand Model; 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP); Regional Road Impact Fees – Service Areas; RRIF Net Cost Per Service Unit; Proposed 8th Edition Fee Schedule Comparison; Comparison of RRIF 7th Edition to 8th Edition; Business Impact Statement; Key Findings from BIS; and Next Steps for Adoption of 8th Edition.

Mr. Wilbrechte stated the RRIF program has been in place since the mid-1990s. RRIF fees cannot be used to fund non-capacity improvements like cycle tracks. He noted that Nevada Revised Statutes require periodic review of the RRIF program, and he described the makeup of the members of the RRIF Technical Advisory Committee.

Mr. Wilbrechte explained that vehicle miles travelled (VMTs) is a combination of the number of vehicles on the road and the distances travelled. VMTs help prioritize transportation and infrastructure needs, against which projects are then ranked. The RTP, he continued, is a 25-year plan, but the RRIF program only focuses on the first 10 years. He remarked that bigger facilities are able to generate more traffic, and analysis followed the guidelines in the Institute of Transportation Engineers' (ITE) Trip Generation Manual. He pointed out the new rate of change was lower in the 8th edition compared to the 7th,

which helped to ensure costs and impacts growth were normalized to current projections.

Mr. Willbrechte indicated the business impact statement was open to review, but no comments were received from any businesses, chambers of commerce, or local trade organizations. He clarified that the 8th edition is expected to be implemented in June of 2026, not 2025.

Commissioner Flick inquired whether there was a standard used in terms of amenities for determining the cost of highways.

Mr. Willbrechte replied that the \$150 million figure for the total share of RRIF fees was for all capacity-eligible costs identified in the RTP. Some of those projects, however, included elements that were not RRIF-eligible, such as shared-use paths. All projects in the RTP went through a planning-level scoping effort where costs were broken down by certain elements, such as the cost per lane and the cost for rights-of-way. He said increases in inflation are normalized annually over a five-year period, which dictate any increases in fees.

Commissioner Flick asked whether special consideration was given to potential truck traffic on the roads.

Mr. Willbrechte replied that the RRIF program does not consider that, only the number of trips. He reminded the Commissioner that RRIF funds cannot be used for maintenance. Only the number of trips out of businesses or residences are considered.

Commissioner Kennedy wondered how RRIF fees could be decreasing when construction costs are increasing.

Mr. Willbrechte pointed out that VMTs have been decreasing. Also, the updated ITE Trip Generation Manual resulted in changes to many land use categories, and he reviewed several of the land use types that saw increases.

Commissioner Kennedy felt that the amount of traffic during school hours increased greatly over the last couple of years after bus service was reduced. She asked whether the statistics reflected that, opining that the increase shown in the presentation was not representative of what was currently happening.

Mr. Willbrechte responded that the program uses information provided by the ITE manual. Additionally, the RRIF program is not permitted to take fees from the Washoe County School District for its facilities. The program identifies growth based on traffic engineering guidelines. He restated how the ITE Trip Generation Manual is a national manual used to identify how much traffic is expected from each use type based on several factors. He disagreed with Commissioner Kennedy's assertion that Nevada may not be relevant to national statistics. The RTC uses site-specific residential data from the region when determining VMTs, but the rest of the data are taken from the ITE manual. He recognized that the program was imperfect, but it was a useful tool to fund capacity improvements in the community.

Responding to Vice Chair Pierce's query about RRIF credits, Mr. Willbrechte replied that the RRIF Program's credit and waiver system was separate from this update process. He provided a brief explanation of the system, noting that they have moved away from the credit system and now operate on a waiver system which is only available for offsite improvements directly attributable to certain developments.

In response to the Vice Chair's question about the ability of developers to request certain roads in the RTP, Mr. Willbrechte stated the RTP process is an independent process, and projects are reviewed based on all of the goals of the RTP. Developers would need to show how their proposals would benefit the community. It was not common practice, he noted, for projects to be removed from RTPs after approval. He said the numbers would need to be revisited if a change were made to the RTP.

Vice Chair Pierce expressed concern about two regulatory zone amendments that were previously approved but no longer appeared on the 2050 RTP.

Mr. Willbrechte stated the calculations were not so sensitive that the removal of small projects would have much impact. All projects in the CIP are included in the RTC's analysis.

Responding to Chair Lazzareschi's query about what RRIF funds are used for, Mr. Willbrechte said the RTC has some indication of what RRIF funds are expected, which helps in planning, but budgeting happens much more tightly. Federal funding is not certain, he added. The availability of other funding sources does not change the amount of RRIF fees.

Public Comment:

There was no response to the call for public comment.

**MOTION: Chair Lazzareschi moved that the Washoe County Capital Improvements Advisory Committee recommend adoption of the 8th Edition of the Regional Road Impact Fee General Administrative Manual, the 8th Edition of the RRIF Capital Improvement Plan, and revised fees for unincorporated Washoe County to the Washoe County Board of County Commissioners, and that the Chair be authorized to sign the resolution on behalf of the CIAC.**

**Commissioner Nelson seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of seven for, one against, with Commissioner Kennedy voting in opposition.**

There was no response to the additional call for public comment.

**6:42 p.m. Chair Lazzareschi adjourned the Capital Improvements Advisory Committee meeting.**

\* \* \* \* \*

**1. \*Determination of Quorum**

Chair Lazzareschi called the Planning Commission meeting to order at 6:43 p.m. The following Commissioners and staff were present:

Commissioners present: Jim Barnes  
R. Michael Flick  
Linda Kennedy (Zoom)  
Daniel Lazzareschi, Chair  
Kate Nelson (Zoom)  
Amy Owens  
Rob Pierce, Vice Chair

Staff present: Trevor Lloyd, Secretary, Planning and Building  
Kat Oakley, Planning Manager  
Eric Young, Senior Planner, Planning and Building  
Tim Evans, Planner, Planning and Building  
Jolene Bertetto, Planner, Planning and Building  
Beth Hickman, 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 Beth Hickman 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:

Via Zoom, Ms. Ellen Neff stated that while Planning staff has said Development Code Amendment Case Number WDCA25-0006 is not intended to apply within the Tahoe Area Plan (TAP), previously adopted provisions were later incorporated into the TAP, and Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Board members said they did not want to object to policies adopted by the County. She suggested adding language exempting the TAP from the amendments. She felt that granting density bonuses in exchange for affordable housing which converted to market rate after nine years would permanently consume development capacity without securing lasting affordability, something especially concerning in the Tahoe basin. She stated other Tahoe jurisdictions require permanent deed restrictions or long-term affordability to preserve affordable housing over time. She noted she provided possible language in her written comments.

## 6. Approval of April 7, 2026, Agenda

Chair Lazzareschi mentioned that he had rearranged the agenda to hear the Capital Improvements Advisory Committee item first.

Commissioner Owens moved to approve the agenda for the April 7, 2026, meeting as amended. Commissioner Kennedy seconded the motion, which passed unanimously with a vote of seven for, none against.

## 7. Approval of March 3, 2026, Draft Minutes

Commissioner Kennedy moved to approve the minutes for the March 3, 2026, Planning Commission meeting as written. Commissioner Owens seconded the motion, which passed unanimously with a vote of seven for, none against.

## 8. Consent Items

**A. Extension of Time for Case Number WTM20-001 (Ladera Ranch) [For possible action]** – For hearing, discussion, and possible action to approve an extension of time for WTM20-001, for two years, from August 4, 2026 to August 4, 2028. The subdivision was originally approved by the Planning Commission on August 4, 2020. 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: Ladera Ranch LLC
- Location: 0 Unspecified
- APN: 502-250-33
- Parcel Size: 177.298 acres
- Master Plan: Open Space; Rural Residential
- Regulatory Zone: Open Space (OS) (34%); Medium Density Suburban (MDS) (10%); Low Density Suburban (LDS) (21%); High Density Rural (HDR) (35%)
- Planning Area: Sun Valley
- Development Code: Article 408, Common Open Space Development and Article 608, Tentative Subdivision Maps
- Commission District: 3– Commissioner Garcia
- Staff: Tim Evans, Planner  
Washoe County Community Services Department  
Planning and Building
- Phone: 775.328.2314
- E-mail: TEvans@washoecounty.gov
- E-mail: JOlander@washoecounty.gov

Vice Chair Pierce requested that this agenda item be pulled from the Consent Agenda and take place as a public hearing.

Planner Tim Evans stated the applicant was requesting an extension of time from August 4, 2026, to August 4, 2028. There have not been any substantial changes to the original proposed development, a 294-lot common open space development with six phases, and this extension pertains only to phases 2 through 6. One final map has already been recorded, he stated, and this extension relates to a second final map.

Responding to Vice Chair Pierce's questions, Mr. Evans said the reason for the extension was because the applicant had other conditions to address before they could record the second final map. He did not believe any previous extensions had been granted for phases 2 through 6.

Secretary Trevor Lloyd noted that Nevada Revised Statutes permits a one-time two-year extension for these types of developments, which is common, and that was why this item was originally placed on the Consent Agenda.

Public Comment:

There was no response to the call for public comment.

**MOTION: Commissioner Owens moved that the two-year extension of time request until August 4, 2028, for Tentative Subdivision Map Case Number WTM20-001 (Ladera Ranch) be approved, having determined that the final map for TM20-001 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 Flick seconded the motion, which passed unanimously with a vote of seven for, zero against.**

**9. Public Hearings**

**B. Abandonment Case Number WAB26-0002 (3565 Lone Tree Drainage Easement) [For possible action]** – For hearing, discussion, and possible action to approve an abandonment of Washoe County's interest in approximately 280 square feet of a 50-foot-wide drainage easement near the subject parcel's north property line. The partial abandonment of the drainage easement would allow the applicant to build a detached garage.

- Applicant: Daniel and Mary Allen
- Property Owner: Dam Allen Trust
- Location: 3565 Lone Tree Lane
- APN: 041-092-01
- Parcel Size: 2.61 acres
- Master Plan: Rural Residential
- Regulatory Zone: High Density Rural (HDR)
- Planning Area: Southwest Truckee Meadows

- Development Code: Authorized in Article 806, Vacations and Abandonments of Easements or Streets
- Commission District: 2 – Commissioner Clark
- Staff: Jolene Bertetto, Planner  
Washoe County Community Services Department  
Planning and Building
- Phone: 775.328.6101
- E-mail: JBertetto@washoecounty.gov

Planner Jolene Bertetto conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles or descriptions: Request; Parcel Background; Drainage Easement; Portion of Drainage Easement to be Abandoned; Evaluation; map; Findings; and Possible Motion. She remarked that abandoning that section of the drainage easement would not affect the culverts on the subject property.

Public Comment:

There was no response to the call for public comment.

**MOTION: Vice Chair Pierce moved that Abandonment Case Number WAB26-0002 for Daniel and Mary Allen 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 Flick seconded the motion, which passed unanimously with a vote of seven for, zero against.**

**C. Special Use Permit Case Number WSUP26-0001 (Enterprise Office) [For possible action]** – For hearing, discussion, and possible action to approve a special use permit for the Automotive Sales and Rentals use type on one parcel located in the Spanish Springs Business Park. The SUP would allow the applicant to operate an Enterprise Rent-A-Car office inside an existing automotive repair shop.

- Applicant: Enterprise Rent-A-Car
- Property Owner: Cameron A. Curtiss Trust
- Location: 155 Ingenuity Ave.
- APN: 530-492-01
- Parcel Size: 2.750
- Master Plan: Industrial
- Regulatory Zone: Industrial (I)
- Planning Area: Spanish Springs
- Development Code: Authorized in Article 810, Special Use Permits
- Commission District: 4 – Commissioner Andriola
- Staff: Jolene Bertetto Planner



Washoe County Community Services  
Department  
Planning and Building

- Phone: 775.328.6101
- E-mail: JBertetto@washoecounty.gov

Planner Jolene Bertetto conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Request; Parcel Background; Proposal; Site Plan; Parking; Traffic; Landscaping; Public Notice; Findings; and Possible Motion.

Ms. Bertetto indicated that the primary customer base for the Enterprise Rent-A-Car facility would be existing Caliber Collision customers who needed rentals while their vehicles were being repaired, but their services would also be available to others in the community. She mentioned that Caliber Collision has an open code violation for its dead trees, but they plan to replace them.

Carlos Pérez Campbell from Enterprise Rent-A-Car reviewed the scope of the project, clarifying that vehicles will be supplied exclusively to Caliber Collision customers. The operation has been designed to remain low impact and fully compatible with surrounding uses. Only a small number of vehicles will be parked on site, he said, so new parking spaces will not be needed. The operation will be operated by one employee during Caliber Collision hours, and all fleet service and maintenance will be done off-site at an established Enterprise support location. He believed the request met all conditions of approval and encouraged the Commission to approve the special use permit.

Public Comment:

There was no response to the call for public comment.

**MOTION: Vice Chair Pierce moved that Special Use Permit Case Number WSUP26-0001 for Enterprise Rent-A-Car be approved with the conditions included as Exhibit A to this matter, having made all five findings in accordance with Washoe County Code Section 110.810.30.**

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

**D. Development Code Amendment Case Number WDCA25-0006 (Attainable Housing Density Bonus) [For possible action]** – For hearing, discussion and possible action to initiate an amendment to Washoe County Code Chapter 110 (Development Code) within Article 336 Housing Incentives, to establish a density bonus for attainable housing that scales to the underlying regulatory zone, providing for higher achievable densities in more intense regulatory zones; to establish a density bonus for attainable senior housing above the bonus for non-age restricted attainable housing; to prohibit the stacking of multiple density bonuses; to set the minimum period of affordability at 30 years for rental projects

and 9 years for sale products; and all matters necessarily connected therewith and relating 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.

- Applicant: Washoe County
- Property Owner: NA
- Location: Unincorporated Washoe County
- APN: NA
- Parcel Size: NA
- Master Plan: NA
- Regulatory Zone: NA
- Planning Area: All
- Citizen Advisory Board: All
- Development Code: Authorized in Article 818, Amendment of Development Code
- Staff: Eric Young, Senior Planner  
Washoe County Community Services Department  
Planning and Building
- Phone: 775.328.3613
- E-mail: EYoung@washoecounty.gov

Senior Planner Eric Young conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Background (6 slides); Attainable Housing Density Bonus; Proposal (7 slides); Discussion (2 slides); and Potential Motion.

While inclusionary zoning and minimum-density zoning have also been included in state statute as options, Mr. Young noted, the County has only chosen to take advantage of density bonuses at this time. He said density bonuses can be used for anything that the governing body feels addresses a social need, though they are most commonly used to incentivize attainable housing. Though the structuring of bonuses can be done in many ways, they are complex, and it is not always clear what can be achieved on any given parcel without significant calculation.

Mr. Young explained that the tier for workforce housing, targeting those making between 120 and 150 percent of the area median income (AMI), was created by the State, though it was not recognized by the federal government. He felt that that highest AMI tier might fit better with Washoe County's existing development character than a traditional multi-family approach. The provisions establishing the affordability term for sale units are intended to incentivize homeowners who have improved their properties, and the term of nine years was used because it was Nevada's average for home tenancy.

Mr. Young noted that urban zones were rare in Washoe County, often because the entitlements for developments were not worth the available density they provided. This proposal both eliminated developers' need to go through the zoning or master plan amendment processes to get higher density, and it avoided entitlement costs. These density bonuses, he was told by developers, might make more projects possible. He said opportunities for low- or high-income multi-family development in unincorporated Washoe County were severely limited, particularly affordable development.

Vice Chair Pierce wondered what would prevent investors from purchasing homes at lower prices.

Mr. Young replied that only people who meet AMI standards and the 30 percent income limit can purchase homes. Large investors could purchase the homes, but anyone who they rent them to would still need to meet those standards. He noted staff met with local developers to ensure that both this proposal and the one covered in Agenda Item 9.E. would be viable, and he believed they were on the edge of viability.

Chair Lazzareschi pointed out that according to County Code, the first sale and any subsequent home sales within the first nine years must be to income-qualified families.

Mr. Young said all homes need to be deed restricted to go to a qualified buyer.

Citing the request for an extension by Ladera Ranch that the Planning Commission just approved, Vice Chair Pierce expressed frustration that developments are being approved but homes are not being built. He wanted to make sure this proposal would actually help the public, not investors.

Mr. Young clarified that the first sale by deed restriction needed to be to a qualified buyer; he did not foresee institutional homebuyers buying homes that employed this density bonus. Developers who go through this program may still request extensions, though, prompted by things like the unavailability of infrastructure or timing issues.

Secretary Trevor Lloyd remarked that the Ladera Ranch developer is making steady progress on the buildout, and a number of homes have already been built.

Public Comment:

Ms. Pat Davison thought this proposal could result in several benefits, including stabilized or reduced rent prices, while providing more housing inventory, the opportunity for more people to become homeowners, and reduced traffic because of the proximity of housing to places of employment. Developers would also see the benefits of achieving increased density without needing to go through regulatory zone or master plan amendment processes, as well as having the ability to sell a portion of their homes at market rates. While increases to local traffic could be substantial, that is an issue with any project, and the Commission has oversight over those matters. She did not expect density bonuses to be used often, but they could be a useful tool, especially in tandem with the other housing changes that the County has already implemented. She urged the Commission to approve the proposal.

Discussion by Commission:

In response to Commissioner Owens' question about potential impacts to the Tahoe area, Mr. Young acknowledged that this proposal would not make sense in Tahoe, which is governed under a different master plan by a different agency. The language in the proposal specifies that it would apply only to the Envision 2040 Master Plan, he pointed out, and the code involved utilizes local zoning districts; there is no low-density or medium-density suburban zoning in Tahoe, for instance.

Chair Lazzareschi appreciated that the proposal employs straightforward entitlement tied to zoning density without changing permitted uses. This, he felt, would reduce administrative burden.

Mr. Young apologized to Ms. Davison for not replying to her most recent email.

**MOTION: Chair Lazzareschi moved that the Washoe County Planning Commission initiate and recommend approval of WDCA25-0006, to amend Washoe County Chapter 110 (Development Code) within Article 336, Housing Incentives. He further moved 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 on the Planning Commission's ability to make all four findings identified in the staff report and in accordance with Washoe County Code Section 110.818.15(e).**

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

**7:50 p.m.            The Planning Commission recessed.**

**8:00 p.m.            The Planning Commission reconvened with all Commissioners present.**

**E. Development Code Amendment Case Number WDCA26-0001 (Small Unit Density Incentive) [For possible action]** – For hearing, discussion and possible action to initiate an amendment to Washoe County Code Chapter 110 (Development Code) within Article 336 Housing Incentives to add small unit density standards allowing for increased density for developments with a maximum unit size of 1,200 square feet and establishing requirements for utilizing the increased density allowance; 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: Kat Oakley, Planning Manager  
Washoe County Community Services Department  
Planning and Building
- Phone: 775.328.3628
- E-mail: KOakley@washoecounty.gov

Planning Manager Kat Oakley stated this is expected to be the last housing package for the foreseeable future. She conducted a slideshow presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Background; Future Trends; Article 336 Housing Incentives; Behind the Numbers – Traffic; Model Neighborhoods; Traffic Generation Methods; Traffic Generation Estimates; Behind the Numbers – Traffic; Behind the Numbers: Building Bulk; Findings; and Motion – Approval.

Public Comment:

Ms. Pat Davison thought this was a flexible approach to motivate developers, and she expressed appreciation for staff’s analysis on traffic and bulk impacts. She liked the prohibition on variances, noting that already approved tentative maps would need new approval if they wanted to use this incentive. She hoped the Commission would support the proposal.

Discussion by Commission:

Chair Lazzareschi expressed appreciation that the proposal would not increase overall traffic or bulk while increasing density. He indicated he would support the item.

**MOTION: Chair Lazzareschi moved that the Washoe County Planning Commission initiate and recommend approval of WDCA26-0001, to amend Washoe County Chapter 110 (Development Code) within Article 336, Housing Incentives, to add small unit density standards allowing increased density for dwelling units with a maximum unit size of 1,200 square feet and establishing requirements for utilizing the increased density; and all matters necessarily connected therewith and pertaining thereto. He further moved 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 on all four findings in accordance with Washoe County Code Section 110.818.15(e).**

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

**F. Master Plan Amendment Case Number WMPA25-0003 (Regional Plan conformance and SOI rollback designations) and Regulatory Zone Amendment WRZA25-0004 (SOI rollback designations) [For possible action]**

– For hearing, discussion, and possible action to initiate and approve resolutions to 1) adopt a series of master plan text amendments to bring the Washoe County Master Plan into conformance with the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan, 2) adopt master plan map amendments to the Cold Springs, North Valleys, Northwest, Southwest Truckee Meadows and Verdi Master Plan Land Use Maps in order to apply the Open Space (OS) master plan category to 40 parcels, which were released from the City of Reno Sphere of Influence, 3) recommend adoption of regulatory zone amendments to the Cold Springs, North Valleys, Southwest Truckee Meadows and Verdi Regulatory Zone maps in order to apply the Open Space regulatory zone to a subset of 20 of those parcels including other parcels that are located outside of the adopted Washoe County regulatory zone map areas; and 4) if approved, authorize the chair to sign Master Plan and regulatory zone amendment resolutions to this effect;

The 40 parcels proposed to receive the Open Space master plan land use category designation are Assessor Parcel Numbers:

003-020-10, 038-150-14, 038-150-21, 038-530-29, 038-530-42, 049-450-06, 049-450-07, 049-450-10, 049-450-59, 049-450-60, 081-010-16, 081-010-20, 081-010-21, 081-023-23, 081-023-25, 081-024-09, 081-024-10, 081-024-11, 081-024-12, 082-180-63, 082-180-64, 082-180-74, 082-180-75, 082-180-76, 082-361-04, 082-361-20, 082-361-23, 087-010-18, 087-010-19, 087-010-30, 087-021-08, 087-340-01, 087-340-05, 087-350-11, 087-350-26, 087-381-04, 087-381-05, 090-030-03, and 234-021-05.

The subset of 20 of the above parcels proposed to receive the Open Space regulatory zone designation are Assessor Parcel Numbers:

082-361-04, 003-020-10, 082-361-20, 082-361-23, 038-150-14, 038-150-21, 038-530-29, 038-530-42, 082-180-63, 082-180-64, 087-350-11, 087-350-26, 090-030-03, 082-180-76, 082-180-75, 082-180-74, 049-450-10, 049-450-06, 049-450-07, and 234-021-05.

- Applicant: Washoe County
- Property Owner: Bureau of Land Management, United States Forest Service, State of Nevada
- Location: Various
- APNs: See above case description
- Parcel Size: Various
- Existing Master Plan: None
- Proposed Master Plan: Open Space
- Existing Regulatory Zone: Various
- Proposed Regulatory Zone: Open Space
- Planning Area: Various
- Development Code: Authorized in Article 820, Amendment of Master Plan and Article 821 Amendment of Regulatory Zone.

- Commission District: All Districts
- Staff: Eric Young, Senior Planner  
Washoe County Community Services  
Department  
Planning and Building
- Phone: 775.328.3613
- E-mail: EYoung@washoecounty.gov

Senior Planner Eric Young conducted a slideshow presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles or descriptions: This Agenda item...; Master plan text amendments...; Scheduled amendments; New Policies (3 slides); Amendments related to the release... (3 slides); chart; and Master Plan Amendment Motion (3 slides).

Mr. Young described the scheduled amendments as administrative fixes to make them contemporary. He spoke about an online regional interactive map created by all three jurisdictions to identify natural resources issues, adding that each jurisdictions would likely use the tool for more than just regional planning matters. He said most of the forty parcels addressed in this item are constrained by slopes, some greater than 30 percent. Each of the parcels fit at least one of the seven conservation goals listed in the presentation. He added that maps are available in the agenda packet for this item, as was an annotated description of the textual changes and where they would be located.

No one attended the public meeting on this matter and no public comments were received, Mr. Young continued, though the public had many questions and concerns. He recognized this item was complex, and he felt future similar items could be written in a more public-friendly manner. Some residents feared this would sell the public lands to developers, but he explained to them that this was about establishing open space on those parcels since they were not suitable for development.

Public Comment:

Ms. Christine Gilbert thanked Mr. Young for explaining this item to her, and she was glad the parcels would go back to being open space. She was unsure whether this would have any budgetary impacts when the new budget was established. She expressed gratitude that the parcels would not be developed as there were already traffic concerns in the North Valleys. She thought the Amazon building should be used for businesses needing warehouses.

Via Zoom, a speaker named Craig wondered whether the subset of 20 parcels would be open to development.

Mr. Young said that was not part of this proposal, and any disposal of these parcels would need to go through the standard disposal process. Nobody has made that proposal at this time. The purpose of this item is to change all 40 parcels to open space for the foreseeable future.

**MOTION:** Chair Lazzareschi moved that the Washoe County Planning Commission adopt the resolution contained as Exhibit A of this staff report to amend the Master Plan as set forth in Master Plan Amendment Case Number WMPA25-0005, having made at least three 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 this 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 Owens seconded the motion, which passed unanimously with a vote of seven for, zero against.

**MOTION:** Chair Lazzareschi moved that Planning Commission adopt the resolution included as Exhibit B, recommending adoption of Regulatory Zone Amendment Case Number WRZA25-0006, 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 this 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 Nelson seconded the motion, which passed unanimously with a vote of seven for, zero against.

#### **10. Chair and Commission Items**

A. Future agenda items

There were none.

B. Requests for information from staff

There were none.

#### **11. Director's and Legal Counsel's Items**

A. Report on previous Planning Commission Items

Secretary Trevor Lloyd noted the Board of County Commissioners heard the appeal on the Sierra Reflections tentative subdivision maps at its March 10 meeting and overturned the Planning Commission's decision by a vote of 3 to 2.

B. Legal Information and Updates

There were none.

#### **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 adjourned at 8:36 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Derek Sonderfan, Independent Contractor.

Approved by Commission in session on April 7, 2026

---

Trevor Lloyd  
Secretary to the Planning Commission