



WASHOE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION **DRAFT** Meeting Minutes

Planning Commission Members

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

Tuesday, August 6, 2024
6:00 p.m.

Washoe County Administrative Complex
Commission Chambers
1001 E 9th Street, Building A
Reno, Nevada 89512

and available via
Zoom Webinar

The Washoe County Planning Commission met in a scheduled session on Tuesday, August 6, 2024, in the Washoe County Commission Chambers, 1001 East Ninth Street, Reno, Nevada and via Zoom teleconference.

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

1. *Determination of Quorum

Chair Pierce called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. The following Commissioners and staff were present:

Commissioners present: Jim Barnes
R. Michael Flick
Linda Kennedy
Kate S. Nelson
Amy Owens
Rob Pierce – Zoom

Commissioners absent: Daniel Lazzareschi

Staff present: Trevor Lloyd, Secretary, Planning and Building
Chris Bronczyk, Senior Planner, Planning and Building
Jule Olander, Planner, Planning and Building
Tim Evans, Planner, Planning and Building
Jennifer Gustafson, Deputy District Attorney, District Attorney's Office
Adriana Albarran, Office Support Specialist, Planning and Building
Brandon Roman, Recording Secretary, Planning and Building

2. Pledge of Allegiance

Commissioner Nelson led the pledge to the flag.

3. Ethics Law Announcement

Deputy District Attorney Jennifer Gustafson provided the ethics procedure for disclosures.

4. Appeal Procedure

Secretary Trevor Lloyd recited the appeal procedure for items heard before the Planning Commission.

5. General Public Comment and Discussion Thereof

Chair Pierce opened the Public Comment period.

Public Comment:

There was no response to the call for public comment.

6. Approval of August 6, 2024, Agenda

Commissioner Nelson moved to approve the agenda for the August 6, 2024, meeting as written. Commissioner Kennedy seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of six for, none against, with Vice Chair Lazzareschi absent.

7. Approval of July 2, 2024, Draft Minutes

Commissioner Kennedy moved to approve the minutes for the July 2, 2024, Planning Commission meeting as written. Commissioner Flick seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of six for, none against, with Vice Chair Lazzareschi absent.

8. Planning Items

A. Regional Planning Commission (RPC) Alternate List - For review and possible action to recommend that the Board of County Commissioners (Board) set the order of alternates selected to represent the Washoe County Planning Commission (PC) on the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Commission (RPC) in the event the regularly appointed PC members are unavailable to serve. The existing Washoe County Planning Commissioners serving on the Regional Planning Commission are: Michael Flick, Daniel Lazzareschi, and Rob Pierce. The currently proposed order of alternates is as follows: First Alternate, Linda Kennedy; Second Alternate, Amy Owens; Third Alternate, Jim Barnes; Fourth Alternate, Kate Nelson. Once reviewed and a recommendation is made, the Planning Commission is asked to direct the Planning Commission Secretary to transmit the ordered list of recommended alternates to the Board for its decision. After the Board's decision, the Planning Commission Secretary shall transmit the ordered list to the Executive Director of the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency (TMRPA).

Public Comment:

There was no response to the call for public comment.

MOTION: Commissioner Kennedy moved to recommend the following order of alternates to the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Commission: Linda Kennedy, Amy Owens, Jim Barnes, and Kate Nelson. She further moved that the Planning Commission Secretary be directed to transmit the recommended list of alternates to the Washoe County Board of Commissioners for its approval.

Chair Pierce seconded the motion, which passed unanimously with a vote of six for, none against, with Vice Chair Lazzareschi absent.

B. Extension of Time Request for Tentative Subdivision Map Case Number WTM18-002 (Prado Ranch North) – For hearing, discussion, and possible action to approve an extension of time for the approval of the subdivision, for two years, from September 9, 2024, until September 9, 2026. The subdivision was originally approved by the Washoe County Board of County Commissioners on September 11, 2018. 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: Lansing-Arcus, LLC
- Location: Intersection of Lemmon Dr with Nectar St and Chickadee St
- APN: 540-051-01, 080-721-03 & 04
- Parcel Size: 116.9, 40.8, & 44 acres
- Master Plan: Suburban Residential (SR)
- Regulatory Zone: Medium Density Suburban (MDS4-four units per acre)
- Area Plan: North Valleys
- Development Code: Authorized in Article 608 Tentative Subdivision Maps
- Commission District: 5 – Commissioner Herman
- 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 slideshow presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Vicinity Map; Extensions of Time – TM; Extensions of Time – SUP; Background; Request; and Possible Motion.

Public Comment:

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Discussion by Commission:

Commissioner Flick asked why no resolution could be found in six years.

Ms. Olander responded the mediation proposed to address flooding on Lemmon Drive was taking some time, and adjustments had to be made to the Regional Transportation Plan. She said her understanding was that the design elements for the roadway were finalized and improvements would begin. Prado Ranch could not progress until that was complete.

Secretary Trevor Lloyd indicated the applicant met the statutory requirement to have the first final map completed within four years. The two-year extension request was within their rights, though they would need to finalize the map by September of 2026; no further extensions would be allowed after that. He listed some of the reasons why this allowance was permitted under the statute.

Commissioner Flick expressed concern about bureaucracy, saying this should have been resolved.

Mr. Lloyd pointed out some of the larger subdivision maps were active for decades. Smaller subdivisions are often developed much quicker.

MOTION: Commissioner Nelson moved that the two-year Extension of Time Request until September 9, 2026, be approved for Tentative Subdivision Map Case Number WTM18-002 (Prado Ranch North), subject to the conditions of approval, having determined that the final map for TM18-002 has progressed in accordance with NRS 278.360, that the original findings remain valid, and that the circumstances have not appreciably changed since the original approval.

Commissioner Kennedy seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of six for, none against, with Vice Chair Lazzareschi absent.

9. Public Hearings

A. Abandonment Case Number WAB23-0007 (Wolgast Abandonment) – For hearing, discussion, and possible action to approve an abandonment of a fifteen (15) foot drainage easement running roughly north/south on the eastern side of the property located at 5220 Cedarwood Drive and through the properties at 5210 Cedarwood Drive, and 5235 Goldenrod Drive.

- Applicant: Stephen and Jeanne Wolgast Rev. Trust
- Location: 5220 Cedarwood Drive; 5210 Cedarwood Drive; 5235 Goldenrod Drive
- APN: 045-571-38; 045-571-37; 045-571-39
- Parcel Size: 1.27 Acres; 1.32 Acres; 1.15 Acres
- Master Plan: Suburban Residential (SR)
- Regulatory Zone: Low Density Suburban (LDS)
- Area Plan: Forest
- Development Code: Authorized in Article 806, Vacations and Abandonments of Easements or Streets
- Commission District: 2 – Commissioner Clark
- Staff: Chris Bronczyk, Senior Planner
Washoe County Community Services Department
Planning and Building
- Phone: 775.328.3612
- E-mail: Cbronczyk@washoecounty.gov

Senior Planner Chris Bronczyk conducted a slideshow presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles or descriptions: Request; Background; parcel map (2 slides); Evaluation; Noticing; Reviewing Agencies & Findings; and Possible Motion. He explained that a hydrology report showed the 15-foot easement was no longer needed as the adjacent 30-foot drainage easement could handle the runoff for all three properties.

Applicant Stephen Wolgast conducted a slideshow presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Overview; The Issue; Easement Map; Runoff Flow; Approximate Location of Defunct Easement; Survey 2023; Survey Detail; and Closing.

Public Comment:

There was no response to the call for public comment.

MOTION: Commissioner Kennedy moved that Abandonment Case Number WAB23-0007 for Stephen Wolgast 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 with a vote of six for, none against, with Vice Chair Lazzareschi absent.

B. Abandonment Case Number WAB24-0005 (Surjit Family Living Trust Abandonment)

– For hearing, discussion, and possible action to approve an abandonment of Washoe County’s interest in two 33-foot-wide government patent easements for access and public utilities along the west and south property lines of 2100 Whites Creek Lane (APN: 142-241-03).

- Applicant/Property Owner: Powar Amolak Surjit Family Living Trust
- Location: 2100 Whites Creek Ln.
- APN: 142-241-03
- Parcel Size: 2.5 acres
- Master Plan: Rural Residential (RR)
- Regulatory Zone: 99% High Density Rural (HDR) & 1% General Rural (GR)

- Area Plan: Southwest Truckee Meadows
- Development Code: Authorized in Article 806, Vacations and Abandonments of Easements or Streets

- Commission District: 2 – Commissioner Clark
- 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 slideshow presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles or descriptions: Request; Subject Property; Evaluation (2 slides); site map; Noticing; Reviewing Agencies & Findings; and Possible Motion.

Public Comment:

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Discussion by Commission:

MOTION: Commissioner Kennedy moved that Abandonment Case Number WAB24-0005 for Powar Amolak Surjit Family Living Trust 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 with a vote of six for, none against, with Vice Chair Lazzareschi absent.

C. Master Plan Amendment Case Number WMPA24-0003 and Regulatory Zone Amendment Case Number WRZA24-0005 (York) – For hearing, discussion and possible action to:

- (1) Adopt an amendment to the Washoe County Master Plan, Southwest Truckee Meadows Master Plan Land Use Map, to change the master plan land use designation for a ±13.8-acre portion of a ±14.5-acre parcel (APN: 041-051-59) from Rural (R) to Rural Residential (RR); 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 authorities.

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 Southwest Truckee Meadows Regulatory Zone Map, to change the regulatory zoning for a ±13.8 acre portion of a ±14.5 acre parcel (APN: 041-051-59) from General Rural (GR-1 unit per 40 acres) to ±7.1 acres of High Density Rural (HDR-1 unit per 2.5 acres) and ±6.7 acres of Open Space (OS); and if approved, authorize the chair to sign a resolution to this effect.

- Applicant/Property Owner: Marilyn York
- Location: 70 Bear Mountain Place
- APN: 041-051-59
- Parcel Size: 14.5 acres
- Existing Master Plan: 95% (±13.8 acres) Rural (R) & 5% (±0.72 acres) Suburban Residential (SR)
- Proposed Master Plan: 95% (±13.8 acres) Rural Residential (RR) & 5% (±0.72 acres) Suburban Residential (SR)
- Existing Regulatory Zone: 95% (±13.8 acres) General Rural (GR-1-unit per 40 acres) & 5% (±0.72 acres) Public/Semi-Public Facilities (PSP)
- Proposed Regulatory Zone: 49% (±7.1 acres) High Density Rural (HDR-1 unit per 2.5 acres), 46% (±6.7 acres) Open Space (OS) & 5% (±0.72 acres) Public/Semi-Public Facilities (PSP)
- Area Plan: Southwest Truckee Meadows
- Development Code: Authorized in Article 820, Amendment of Master Plan & Article 821, Amendment of Regulatory Zone
- Commission District: 2 – Commissioner Clark
- 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 slideshow presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Request; Vicinity Map; MPA Request; RZA Request; Evaluation (2 slides); Slope Map; Slope Percentage Map; Availability of Facilities; Neighborhood Meetings & Public Comment; Noticing; Reviewing Agencies & Findings; and Possible Motions.

John Krmpotic with KLS Planning, representing the applicant, conducted a slideshow presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles or descriptions: 70RZA; overhead map; Development Area; Noticing List for Community Meeting; Zoning (E); Zoning (P); Master Plan (E); Master Plan (P); zoning map; TMRPA – Development Constraints Map; slope map; and map and tables.

Public Comment:

Mr. Wayne Baker wondered whether this application would allow for other houses to be built on the parcel beyond the one that was planned. He expressed concern that additional homes could result in heavy traffic from cars and construction trucks, noting he moved there because of its low density. He also wanted to know whether the parcel could be further subdivided.

Ms. Sandra Descher Stevens said her property on Bear Mountain Road had a private gate and a private road, and she wanted it to remain as it had been for more than 20 years. She noted a prior request to divide the subject parcel had been denied. She stated she did not receive notification of this item. She expressed concern about dangerous driving conditions and opposed the application.

Via Zoom, Mr. Bob Berry felt an environmental impact study should be completed, opining that the project could have a negative impact on the habitat for deer, coyotes, and bears. He did not think a large house could be built on the proposed area without significant disruption to the topography. He expressed concern about erosion and congestion caused by people stopping at the scenic outlook area. He thought the area should be preserved.

Discussion by Commission:

Commissioner Flick asked about the contour intervals on the slope map.

Mr. Krmpotic explained the darker contour lines represented 10 feet. Responding to Mr. Berry's question about environmental impacts, he said there were two suitable areas on the parcel for a house footprint that would involve very minimal disturbance. He assured Mr. Baker that the applicant only planned to create one lot. The 6.7 acres of open space would remain open space as it would be impossible to cite a house on slopes that drastic.

Mr. Krmpotic confirmed Commissioner Kennedy's assertion that, as the parcel stood, there could only be one house on it. If the amendment were approved, one additional house could be built on the parcel.

Commissioner Flick asked about the potential for commercial zoning.

Secretary Trevor Lloyd replied the applicant proposed RR Master Plan designation and HDR regulatory zoning; no commercial zoning was requested. Nothing could be built on the OS portion of the parcel.

MOTION: Commissioner Nelson moved 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 WMPA24-0003, having made the five findings in accordance with Washoe County Code Section 110.820.15(d). She further moved that the resolution and the proposed Master Plan Amendments in WMPA24-0003 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 further moved that the resolution included as Attachment B, recommending adoption of Regulatory Zone Amendment Case Number WRZA24-0005, be adopted, having made all of the findings set forth in Washoe County Code Section

110.821.15. She further moved that the resolution and the proposed Regulatory Zone Amendment in WRZA24-0005 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 Washoe County Planning Commission.

Commissioner Kennedy seconded the motions, which passed with a vote of six for, none against, with Vice Chair Lazzareschi absent.

D. Master Plan Amendment Case Number WMPA24-0002 and Regulatory Zone Amendment Case Number WRZA24-0002 (Lockwood) – For hearing, discussion, and possible action to: – For hearing, discussion and possible action to initiate an amendment and approve a resolution to amend Washoe County Code Chapter 110 (Development Code) within Article 220 (Tahoe Area), Section 110.220.275 Wood Creek Regulatory Zone to add "Schools - Kindergarten through Secondary" use type as a permitted use, subject to a special use permit, on those parcels in size equal to, or greater than, three-acres within the Tahoe - Wood Creek Regulatory Zone; and all matters necessarily connected therewith and pertaining thereto.

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.

1. Adopt an amendment to the Washoe County Master Plan, Truckee Canyon Master Plan Land Use Map, to change the master plan land use designation on a 5.65-acre parcel (APN 084-080-15) from Rural to 3.45 acres Industrial and 2.20 acres Open Space; and
2. Recommend adoption of an amendment to the Truckee Canyon Regulatory Zone Map to change the regulatory zone on the same parcel from General Rural (GR) to 3.45 acres Industrial and 2.20 acres Open Space. The regulatory zone amendment is subject to final approval by the Board of County Commissioners of the associated Master Plan Amendment and a finding of conformance with the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan by the regional planning authorities.
3. And, if approved, authorize the chair to sign resolutions to this effect.

- Applicant/Property Owner: Lockwood Development Group LLC
- Location: 10705 Lockwood Drive, Sparks, NV 89434
- APN: 084-080-15
- Parcel Size: 5.65 acres
- Existing Master Plan: Rural (R)
- Proposed Master Plan: Industrial (I) and Open Space (OS)
- Existing Regulatory Zone: General Rural (GR)
- Proposed Regulatory Zone: Industrial (I) and Open Space (OS)
- Area Plan: Truckee Canyon
- Development Code: Authorized in Article 820, Amendment of Master Plan, Article 821, Amendment of Regulatory Zone
- Commission District: Zone
- Staff: 4 – Commissioner Andriola
Tim Evans, Planner
Washoe County Community Services Department
- Phone: Planning and Building
- E-Mail: 775.328.2314
Tevans@washoecounty.gov

Planner Tim Evans conducted a slideshow presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: 10705 Lockwood Drive; Background; Request; Existing Zoning; Proposed MPA/RZA Request; Floodplain; Truckee River (2 slides); Availability of Facilities; Reviewing Agencies; Public Notice; Neighborhood Meeting; Master Plan Amendment Findings; Regulatory Zone Amendment Findings; and Possible Motion.

Mr. Evans noted the 300-foot development constraint around the Truckee River pertained specifically to structures, not parking lots or driveways. The One Truckee River Management Plan was not enforced by one agency; rather, multiple agencies were responsible for the plan. Of the two public comments received, he went on, one requested general information and the other was from the Storey County Manager expressing concerns about the project. Addressing concerns from the December 2023 neighborhood meeting, he said the applicant expressed willingness to meet with any agencies to address potential traffic impacts and install landscape screening to address light and noise concerns.

Devin Perry with Phelps Engineering, representing the applicant, conducted a slideshow presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Site History; MPA07007; Truckee River Restoration Project Completion; Surrounding Zone Designations; Proposed MPA/RZA Zoning; Truckee River Corridor Standards; 2040 Master Plan Consistency; Findings for MPA; and Findings for RZA.

Mr. Perry explained that the project supported the 2040 Master Plan in the following ways: the open space buffer would ensure that no development happened in the flood zone, the proposed amendment would establish industrial uses in a property that was largely unused for 30 years, and the open space designation would follow Conservation of Natural and Historical Resources Principles 3.1 and 4.2.

Applicant JS Parker explained Lockwood Development Group purchased the property a year and a half ago with the intent to develop it, but the utility, drainage, and floodplain constraints would exist no matter what zoning was chosen for the parcel. He listed some uses which were allowed in both GR and industrial zoning, though they anticipated using the property for light industrial use. Residential zoning did not seem appropriate given that there was a large amount of industrial zoning surrounding the parcel.

Mr. Parker remarked nobody brought up the conflict between the project and Washoe County Code 110.222.10(b) and (c) until last week, so he did not feel it was an issue. He pointed out a discrepancy on page 22 of the staff report, saying the parcel was currently zoned GR, not residential. Additionally, the traffic study verified that light industrial use would be no more intense than residential land use.

Public Comment:

Mr. Will Adler, representing Storey County, said he did not oppose development of the property, but he felt industrial was not consistent with the current use of the area. He thought increasing the residential density in Storey County would be a profitable use of the land. He spoke about access to Route 80 by the Rainbow Bend community, the flooding of a previously zoned commercial area, and the impacts of additional runoff created by industrial zoning. He offered to meet with the applicant to discuss joining Storey County.

Mr. Paul Scott supported the land being developed and hoped an industrial light use would fit in with a more rural neighborhood. He pointed out that Lockwood Road, which had not been resurfaced in 30 years, needed to be addressed.

Mr. Mitch Andreini, the manager of the Canyon General Improvement District, said his comments were his own. He believed the easement into Lockwood would need to be modified to put any development on the property. He addressed large trucks causing damage to the residential neighborhood when they used those roads during Route 80 closures. He did not believe there were utilities on the north side of the Truckee River. He said the park put in place after a flooding event was an improvement to the neighborhood.

Via Zoom, Ms. Lisa Holloman expressed concern about the appellant's disregard for Storey County and said only six Rainbow Bend residences received notification of this meeting. She expressed concern that the view from the neighborhood would be of a lighted parking lot. She thought Canyon Way would be difficult for trucks to traverse, and it would only get worse with increased traffic. She asked the Commission to deny the request.

Discussion by Commission:

Chair Pierce asked whether a storage yard would be an approved use for that type of zoning.

Mr. Evans confirmed it would be.

Commissioner Flick inquired about the County's liability if the structures it approved within 300 feet of the center line of the Truckee River were flooded.

Deputy District Attorney Jennifer Gustafson said there was no way to answer that type of speculative scenario. However, the Code prohibited any structure from being built within 300 feet of the river, so the County would likely not allow any structures to be built there.

Commissioner Nelson asked for confirmation that a parking lot could be built within 300 feet.

Mr. Evans said no structures were allowed within 300 feet, but nothing in the Code specifically prohibited a parking lot from being placed there.

Chair Pierce asked whether a fence could be placed within 300 feet of the center line.

Mr. Evans opined a fence would be considered a structure if a building permit were required to build it.

Secretary Trevor Lloyd clarified a fence was not considered a structure because it did not contain a roof and walls, so it could be allowed.

Commissioner Kennedy moved to deny Master Plan Amendment Case Number WMPA24-0002. Commissioner Nelson seconded the motion.

Ms. Gustafson stated the motion needed to include which findings could not be made.

MPA MOTION: Commissioner Kennedy moved that Master Plan Amendment Case Number WMPA24-0002 be denied, being unable to make the following findings in accordance with Washoe County Code Section 110.820.15(d): Consistency with Master Plan, Compatible Land Uses, Response to Change Conditions, and Availability of Facilities.

Commissioner Nelson seconded the motion, being unable to make the following findings: Consistency with Master Plan, Response to Change Conditions, Availability of Facilities, or Desired Pattern of Growth.

On a roll call vote, Chair Pierce noted the mover and seconder relayed their votes and findings in their motion and second.

Commissioners Flick and Barnes, as well as Chair Pierce voted to deny the amendment, being unable to make the following findings: Consistency with Master Plan, Compatible Land Uses, Response to Change Conditions, and Availability of Facilities.

Commissioner Owens voted to deny the amendment, being unable to make the following findings: Consistency with Master Plan, Compatible Land Uses, Response to Change Conditions, and Desired Pattern of Growth.

Master Plan Amendment Case Number WMPA24-0002 was denied with a vote of six for, zero against, with Vice Chair Lazzareschi absent.

RZA MOTION: Commissioner Nelson moved that Regulatory Zone Amendment Case Number WRZA24-0002 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 Change Conditions, more desirable use, Availability of Facilities, No Adverse Effects, and Desired Pattern of Growth.

Commissioner Kennedy seconded the motion, being unable to make the following findings: Consistency with Master Plan, Response to Change Conditions, more desirable use, Availability of Facilities, and No Adverse Effects.

On a roll call vote, Commissioners Flick, Barnes, and Owens voted to deny the amendment, being unable to make the following findings: Consistency with Master Plan, Response to Change Conditions, more desirable use, Availability of Facilities, and No Adverse Effects.

Secretary Brandon Roman indicated the mover and seconder relayed their votes and findings in their motion and second.

Chair Pierce voted to deny the amendment, being unable to make the following findings: Consistency with Master Plan, Response to Change Conditions, more desirable use, Availability of Facilities, No Adverse Effects, and Desired Pattern of Growth.

Regulatory Zone Amendment Case Number WRZA24-0002 was denied with a vote of six for, zero against, with Vice Chair Lazzareschi absent.

Secretary Trevor Lloyd recited the appeal procedure for items heard before the Planning Commission.

10. Chair and Commission Items

A. Future agenda items

There were no future agenda items.

B. Requests for information from staff

There were no requests.

11. Director's and Legal Counsel's Items

A. Report on previous Planning Commission items

Secretary Trevor Lloyd said the first reading of the grading code took place at the Board of County Commissioner's (BCC's) July 16, 2024, meeting, as were the amendments to the short-term rental ordinance. The second reading of the grading code would be heard at the August 20, 2024, BCC meeting, while the second reading of the short-term rental ordinance would be heard at the September 10, 2024, meeting.

Mr. Lloyd mentioned that the housing package ordinance was approved at the July 16, 2024, BCC meeting. He anticipated the next round of the housing package to come before the Planning Commission at its September meeting.

B. Legal information and updates

There were no updates.

12. *General Public Comment and Discussion Thereof

Ms. Peggy France, resident of Rainbow Bend, thanked the Planning Commission.

13. Adjournment

With no further business scheduled before the Planning Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 8:09 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Derek Sonderfan, Independent Contractor.

Approved by Commission in session on September 3, 2024

Trevor Lloyd
Secretary to the Planning Commission