



# REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

**MEMBERS**  
Jim Newberg, Chair  
Florence 'Marge' Frandsen, Vice-chair  
Scott Barnes  
Todd Brabbin  
Kendall Mattina  
Christy Magers  
Marvin Moss  
Dennis Romeo  
William Weber  
Rosanna Coombes, Interim Director

**MINUTES**  
**Regional Planning Commission (RPC)**  
**REGULAR MEETING**  
**Wednesday, 6:30 P.M., January 10, 2007**

The Regional Planning Commission met in regular session in the Washoe County Commission Chambers, 1001 East Ninth Street, Reno, Nevada and conducted the following business:

The meeting was called to order by Chair Newberg at 6:35 p.m.

## **1. ROLL CALL**

The clerk called the roll and the following Commissioners were present: Jim Newberg; Marge Frandsen, Scott Barnes, Christy Magers, Kendall Mattina, Tom Lean for Marvin Moss, Dennis Romeo, and Dian VanderWell for William Weber. Commissioners absent: Todd Brabbin, Marvin Moss, and William Weber.

Also present: Rosanna Coombes, TMRPA Interim Director; Norman Azevedo, Legal Counsel; Phil Caterino, TMRPA; Lora Richards, TMRPA; Connie Anderson, TMRPA; and Paige Menicucci, TMRPA.

## **2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Chair Newberg stated that agenda item 5.C would be moved ahead of agenda item 5.A.

COMMISSIONER MATTINA MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE JANUARY 10, 2007, RPC AGENDA, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FRANDSEN. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH EIGHT (8) MEMBERS PRESENT.

## **3. PUBLIC COMMENT**

None

## **4. CONSENT CALENDAR**

- A. PUBLIC HEARING - Regional Plan Conformance Review - Washoe County Comprehensive Plan Amendment, Shaw Family Trust (CR06-033), changing the land use from Public and Semi-Public Facilities to Medium Density Suburban, Low Density Suburban and Public and Semi-Public Facilities on  $\pm 2.65$  acres located on the west side of Cliff View Drive, directly west of the intersection of Cliff View Drive and Nighthawk Circle in the Mogul area.
- B. PUBLIC HEARING - Regional Plan Conformance Review - Washoe County Comprehensive Plan Amendment, Washoe County Department of Regional Parks and Open Space (CR06-034), changing the land use from High Density Rural to Parks and Recreation, on  $\pm 9.87$  acres located 1/5 mile north of the intersection of

Davis Lane and Del Monte Lane, on either side of Del Monte Lane, addressed as 1885 and 2000 Del Monte Lane.

COMMISSIONER MATTINA MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS AS SUBMITTED, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER FRANSDEN. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH EIGHT (8) MEMBERS PRESENT.

## **5. BUSINESS OF THE DAY**

- C. WORKSHOP - Consideration and direction to staff on the 2007 update of the Regional Plan including, but not limited to, follow-up recommendations from the Regional Plan Update Technical Advisory Committee regarding direction from the Regional Planning Commission on December 13, 2006, related to affordable housing, concurrency and natural resource management policies.

Lora Richards, Planning Analyst II, reviewed the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) responses to RPC direction from the December RPC meeting. Ms. Richards asked for feedback on the language the TAC forwarded to the RPC on concurrency.

COMMISSIONER MATTINA MADE A MOTION TO ACCEPT THE LANGUAGE AS SUBMITTED ON THE CONCURRENCY ISSUE FOR THE UPDATE OF THE REGIONAL PLAN, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER ROMEO. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH EIGHT (8) MEMBERS PRESENT.

Ms. Richards stated that the TAC recommended that the preferred recommendation is still to replace Policy 1.1.13 regarding affordable housing with Goal 1.4 and its associated policy. Ms. Richards stated that TAC members are present to testify related to that recommendation.

*[The public hearing was opened.]*

Mark Sullivan, Regional Housing Task Force Chair, stated that he believes that all three local governments are working with a consultant to develop housing plans. There will be quantifiable housing elements in the local master plans and comprehensive plans shortly. The TAC decided not to put a lot of detail specific language on affordable housing in the Regional Plan until those plans were developed. Mr. Sullivan commented that there was an impressive group of participants on the Housing Task Force.

Jodi Royal-Goodwin, Washoe County HOME Consortium, stated that it was not the intention of the Housing Task Force to weaken the goal but to give it strength in terms of enforcing the state statute and to allow a broader depth of programming that will assist in the provision of affordable housing. Ms. Royal-Goodwin also commented on the broad spectrum of participants on the Housing Task Force.

Eric Novak, Affordable Housing Consultant, stated that the affordable housing language developed by the TAC has been reviewed by the Regional Housing Advisory Committee and they felt that the language would give the local jurisdictions a lot of flexibility in developing their housing elements that are in process right now. Mr. Novak stated that the Nevada Housing Coalition also reviewed and was supportive of the language.

Stacey Crowley, Truckee Meadows Growth Task Force Vice-Chair, stated that affordable housing was one of the five priorities that the task force looked at over the past year and a half.

Ms. Crowley stated that Mr. Novak conducted an affordable housing study which was used for the Housing Task Force. Ms. Crowley stated that the Growth Task Force supports the notion that the three agencies be allowed to use their housing elements to figure out exactly what policies should be put in place and that the Growth Task Force agrees with the language that is put forth in the draft plan.

*[The public hearing was closed.]*

COMMISSIONER MATTINA MADE A MOTION TO ACCEPT THE LANGUAGE AS SUBMITTED BY THE TAC FOR THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING PORTION OF THE UPDATE OF THE REGIONAL PLAN GOAL 1.4 AND POLICY 1.4.1, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER BARNES.

Commissioner Romeo stated that he has a better understanding as to why the TAC wants the wording changed. Commissioner Romeo stated that he does not want this to be just a wording change but that it should be real guidelines and something that is really acted upon. Commissioner Romeo requested that an addition be made to the motion that a report be brought back to the Regional Planning Commission (RPC) receive regular reports as to what progress is being made in regard to affordable housing in this area.

THE MAKER OF THE MOTION AGREED TO THE ADDITION FROM COMMISSIONER ROMEO, THE SECOND CONCURRED. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH EIGHT (8) MEMBERS PRESENT.

- A. Discussion and possible action on sponsoring individual property owner applications to amend the boundaries of the Truckee Meadows Service Areas (TMSA) or the Future Service Areas (FSA).

Ms. Richards stated that the Regional Planning Agency (RPA) has received two applications for the RPC to consider for sponsorship as Regional Plan amendments.

COMMISSIONER BARNES MADE A MOTION TO SPONSOR THE TWO REGIONAL PLAN AMENDMENTS AS DESCRIBED IN TABLE 1 OF THE STAFF REPORT, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER MATTINA. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH EIGHT (8) MEMBERS PRESENT.

Public Comment - J. Douglas Clark stated that he supports the recommendation by Regional Planning staff to sponsor his application.

- B. PUBLIC HEARING - Consideration and possible adoption of proposed amendments to the 2002 Truckee Meadows Regional Plan, including revising the boundaries of the Truckee Meadows Service Areas (TMSA) or the Future Service Areas (FSA) based on applications submitted by the following private property owners:

- 1) Peavine Pines LLC (TMSA 06-001)
- 2) David Bjorkman, Bayfish LLC, and MMC& Son LLC (TMSA 06-002)
- 3) John Rhodes (TMSA 06-003)
- 4) Evans Creek LLC (TMSA 06-004)
- 5) Mark Richardson (TMSA 06-005)
- 6) Sage Community Group LLC (TMSA 06-006)

- 7) Sunny Hills Ranchos LLC (TMSA 06-007)
- 8) Suzanne Larsen (TMSA 06-008)
- 9) Silverwing Development (TMSA 06-009)
- 10) Robert Marshall (FSA 06-010)
- 11) Dolan Properties LLC (TMSA 06-011)

Ms. Richards provided background information on this item. Ms. Richards reviewed the scoring system used by Regional Planning staff in ranking the applications and stated that none of the applications were found in conflict with the Regional Plan. Ms. Richards stated that Regional Planning staff is not advocating any particular decision tonight.

*[The public hearing was opened.]*

Stacie Huggins, Wood Rogers, spoke in support of Bob Marshall's request for FSA inclusion.

David Bjorkman spoke in support of the Peavine Summit and Peavine Pines applications for inclusion in the TMSA.

Bob Marshall spoke in support of the comments by Ms. Huggins and stated that his property would be appropriate for development some time in the future.

Fred Turnier, Sierra Land Solutions, spoke in support of the Reno City Council recommendation to include the Sunny Hills property in the TMSA.

Barron Caronite spoke in support of the Dolan Properties application.

John Rhodes spoke in support of the application for his property to be included in the TMSA.

Gary Duhon spoke in support of the Sage Community application for inclusion in the TMSA. Mr. Duhon expressed concern regarding the rating criteria and suggested expanding the analysis to include points for proximity to areas planned for development.

Trent Averett, President of Peavine Pines, spoke in support of the Peavine Pines application for inclusion in the TMSA.

Kevin Verre spoke in support of Suzanne Larsen's application for inclusion in the TMSA.

Cindy Dawson spoke in support of Suzanne Larsen's application for inclusion in the TMSA.

*[The public hearing was closed.]*

Commissioner Mattina disclosed that she spoke with Chris Barret and Mark Sullivan and that it will not affect her voting on these items. Commissioner Mattina asked about the scoring process. Ms. Coombes responded that the process was to have three provisions of information on the same criteria that is included in the applications. The first assessment would be done by the applicant. The second level of analysis was that the applications were circulated to the relevant jurisdiction to have them do the same level of analysis on the criteria. Assessment by Regional Planning staff was to provide as much technical information and quantitative information as possible in relation to the criteria. Ms. Coombes stated that the scoring was meant to provide an indicative assessment on behalf of Regional Planning staff as it related to the various criteria. The scoring of the applications was to try and provide the RPC with ways in which the applications would promote the goals and policies of the Regional Plan.

Commissioner Frandsen commented that there was no information provided by the local governments on many of the items on the applications and asked if it was required that they submit information on all the criteria. Ms. Coombes responded that the applications were circulated to the local governments with a request to provide an analysis of the criteria in the application. Regional Planning staff met with the local governments at the time the criteria were developed. The hope was that they would evaluate each of the individual criteria and provide information.

Commissioner Frandsen stated that the lack of information makes it more difficult for staff and the planning commissioners to evaluate the applications.

Commissioner Mattina agreed with Commissioner Frandsen and stated that it is especially difficult where there is no justification as to why certain applications were denied by a governmental entity.

Commissioner Frandsen stated that she does not understand the information provided by Reno staff to the Reno City Council included on page 45 of the meeting packet or the explanation on page 44 of the packet.

Ms. Coombes made the observation that staff from the local jurisdictions were in attendance and could answer questions about their local process.

Commissioner Frandsen asked for an explanation regarding the lack of response from local governments to the criteria that was specified. Commissioner Frandsen stated that the applicants went to great lengths to tell us about their property and Regional Planning staff did the best they could in scoring the properties but local government did not provide information that would be helpful to them or to us.

John Hester, City of Reno, mentioned the timing involved with the request for information and stated that staff did not have time. Mr. Hester stated that they did put together an analysis of whether the application was complete or not. Mr. Hester stated that at the Reno City Council caucus he was asked to take a look at the land constraints and look at how easy it would be for the City versus the County to provide services. That information is provided in the chart on page 45 of the meeting packet. If the percentage constrained was over 50 percent, it was excluded. The chart also includes information regarding whether the County can provide services without going through Reno or another county. If the County could provide services, it was excluded. Properties that received two excludes on the chart were excluded. That excluded Peavine Pines and Peavine Summit. Mr. Hester also stated that these are really applications for TMSA only. There is no land use or facility plans or projects. The best analysis is the analysis using the Regional Plan, which regional planning staff provided.

Adrian Freund, Washoe County, reviewed what Washoe County did with the Larsen and Silverwing applications. The Citizen Advisory Board (CAB) input was in favor of the Silverwing application and not the Larsen application. Staff prepared a report to the Washoe County Planning Commission which addressed a number of aspects that were in the local supplemental questionnaire for each of those applications. The Planning Commission made some advisory recommendations and staff did a BCC staff report with the Planning Commission report attached. Mr. Freund apologized that the RPC did not have those reports in the meeting packet. Mr. Freund stated that Washoe County staff recommendations were for approval or

support of an advisory recommendation to support the additions to the TMSA. As it went through the Washoe County Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners, questions arose on the Larsen application. The question was basically regarding what the individual wants to do with the property. Mr. Freund stated that is a question that cannot be addressed at the stage of TMSA addition. Mr. Freund stated that because of their involvement in Silverwing and also comments that they made regarding the Rhodes property, he does not think that the scoring system that was devised works particularly well for amendments where it is simply a transfer of jurisdiction because they are already in the TMSA.

Commissioner Mattina asked for clarification that the reason they did not like the Larsen application was because they had no ability to find out what the intention was for future use of that land. Mr. Freund responded that the Washoe County Planning Commission was concerned about the surrounding land use on that property, particularly the residential property to the east. They were also concerned that it was potentially too far off the Pyramid Highway corridor. The BCC specifically wanted to know what type of development might take place on the property. Although we are dealing simply with TMSA inclusions here, that to them was of considerable concern and that along with the recommendations of the Planning Commission were reasons that the Board did not support that particular request. Mr. Freund stated that initially the Washoe County staff report was to support for a variety of reasons including the fact that this is within the suburban character management area of the Spanish Springs Area Plan. On that basis, as well as adjacency to existing development, the initial Washoe County staff recommendation was for support. The County Planning Commission and the Board did not agree with the staff analysis.

Commissioner Barnes expressed concerns regarding the RPA analysis. Commissioner Barnes also stated that he is disappointed in the other agencies because it appeared that there was no information or not enough information provided. Some of the comments made tonight did not make it into the evaluation form. Commissioner Barnes suggested that the point scores for each property application factor in whether the City or the County wanted to deny or approve inclusion.

Commissioner Romeo agreed with comments regarding the scoring. Commissioner Romeo stated that he was shocked that the Larsen property has drawn the discussion and controversy that it has. We have been instructed that what development is there does not pertain to the decision to exclude or include a property. This process is going to be fluid and ongoing and it will be fine tuned. Commissioner Romeo stated that he does not want to penalize any of the applicants or delay any of them because of what is perceived as a bad scoring system or bad input or lack of response from local government staff. Commissioner Romeo stated that he does not see any reason not to move any of the applications along. Any development issues could be brought up at that point but this is strictly inclusion in the TMSA or the FSA.

Commissioner Magers agreed with Commissioner Barnes and stated that she is uncomfortable that there is not information from the cities and the County. The RPC still has to make determinations based on the criteria that has been laid out and without the information provided by the entities that would be affected, we are making decisions without substantive information.

Commissioner Lean also expressed concern regarding the lack of information from the local governments and suggested requesting that information before taking action.

Commissioner Mattina stated that one of the issues is the fact that each governmental area is allocated a certain amount of area to grow into. Commissioner Mattina expressed concern regarding the lack of information for why an application would be denied and questioned if the reason was that it would take acres away from something else that they have planned in the future that they want to include. Commissioner Mattina stated that she does not understand why the County needed to know at this point what the future development plans are for the Larsen property.

Chair Newberg stated that the Regional Planning staff has not suggested that any of these properties be denied. Chair Newberg stated that it would just be moving lines. Commissioners Barnes stated that it would also be decreasing capacity and questioned if the only downside is reducing capacity for future projects.

Commissioner Romeo asked Legal Counsel for confirmation that project specific information should not be part of the consideration and that the RPC is under direction not to even consider projects when reviewing the criteria for inclusion in the TMSA. Norm Azevedo, Legal Counsel, responded that project specific should not be considered. Regional Planning staff evaluated each application based on the criteria that the RPC previously adopted. Mr. Azevedo stated that his recommendation is to keep comments and consideration and deliberation on those criteria solely. Mr. Azevedo also stated that the issue of contiguity is not relevant, an issue raised at City of Reno regarding the Rhodes application

Chair Newberg stated that because Regional Planning staff has not recommended denial, the RPC can move forward with all of the applications. The City and County did not provide information regarding why they were against, other than the verbal part right here.

COMMISSIONER ROMEO MADE A MOTION TO RECOMMEND MOVING FORWARD ON THE APPLICATIONS IN THE TMSA (06-009, 06-003, 06-004, 06-008, 06-005, 06-007, 06-001, 06-002, 06-011, AND 06-006), SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER MATTINA. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH EIGHT (8) MEMBERS PRESENT.

COMMISSIONER ROMEO MADE A MOTION TO RECOMMEND MOVING FORWARD ON FSA 06-010 INCLUSION INTO THE RENO FSA, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER MATTINA. THE MOTION CARRIED WITH SEVEN (7) IN FAVOR AND ONE (1) OPPOSITION BY COMMISSIONER FRANDBSEN.

Commissioner Mattina asked Commissioner Frandsen why she opposed the FSA application. Commissioner Frandsen responded that it is simply for the reason that she believes it is premature to be including properties into the FSA at this point.

## **6. DIRECTORS, MEMBERS, AND LEGAL COUNSEL INFORMATION ITEMS**

### **A. Director's reports:**

- 1) Report on actions and agendas of the Regional Planning Governing Board

Ms. Coombes stated that there is a staff report on page 53 of the meeting packet.

Commissioner Frandsen stated that she is pleased to see that we are finally recognizing that there is a need to develop a system to capture, analyze and report on cumulative impacts.

### **B. Legal counsel's report**

None

**7. REQUESTS FOR AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

A. Review of tentative calendar of agenda items

Ms. Coombes reviewed agenda items for future RPC meetings. Ms. Coombes noted that the next three RPC meetings will be in different locations.

**8. WRITTEN CORRESPONDENCE**

None

Commissioner Frandsen asked if the information on private property owners needs to be saved. Ms. Coombes responded no but asked that the commissioners keep the packet of information on the public hearings for the Regional Plan amendments when it is distributed.

**9. ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Newberg adjourned the meeting at 8:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Christine Birmingham.

Reviewed by:

Approved by:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Rosanna Coombes, Interim Director  
Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jim Newberg, Chair  
Regional Planning Commission

**APPROVED BY THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION IN SESSION ON \_\_\_\_\_, 2007.**