



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, February 3, 2026
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, February 3, 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>

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
Daniel Lazzareschi, Chair
Kate Nelson
Amy Owens
Rob Pierce, Vice Chair

Commissioners absent: Linda Kennedy (excused absence)

Staff present: Trevor Lloyd, Secretary, Planning and Building
Eric Young, Senior Planner, Planning and Building
Kat Oakley, Senior Planner, Planning and Building
Julee Olander, Planner, Planning and Building
Elizabeth 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. a. Ethics Law Announcement – **Note: this item was not agendized but was done. It has been added to Agenda Item 3 for the draft minutes.*

Deputy District Attorney Elizabeth Hickman provided the ethics procedure for disclosures.

b. Appeal Procedure [Non-action item]

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

4. General Public Comment and Discussion Thereof

Chair Lazzareschi opened the Public Comment period.

Public Comment:

There was no response to the call for public comment.

5. Approval of February 3, 2026, Agenda

Vice Chair Pierce moved to approve the agenda for the February 3, 2026, meeting as written. Commissioner Flick seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of six for, none against, with Commissioner Kennedy absent.

6. Approval of January 6, 2026, Draft Minutes

Vice Chair Pierce moved to approve the minutes for the January 6, 2026, Planning Commission meeting as written. Commissioner Nelson seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of six for, none against, with Commissioner Kennedy absent.

7. Consent Items [For possible action]

A. Tentative Subdivision Map Extension of Time for Case Number WTM18-001 (Sierra Vista aka Lemon Valley Heights) [For possible action] – For hearing, discussion, and possible action to approve an extension of time request for Tentative Subdivision Map WTM18-001 (now known as Sierra Vista) for two more years to February 22, 2028.

- Applicant/Property Owner: JC Sierra Vista, LLC
- Location: East of E Patrician Drive & Estates Road
- APN: 080-031-01, 02, & 080-730-35
- Parcel Size: ±17.175, ±25.612, & ±26.880 acres
- Master Plan: Rural (R) and Suburban Residential (SR)
- Regulatory Zone: General Rural (GR) and Medium Density Suburban (MDS)
- Planning Area: North Valleys
- Development Code: Authorized in Article 608, Tentative Subdivision Maps and Article 408, Common Open Space Development

- 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

There was no public comment on this item.

Chair Lazzareschi moved that the Consent Agenda be approved.

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

8. Public Hearings [For possible action]

A. Amendment of Conditions Case Number WAC25-0018 (Rock Springs Solar) for WSUP21-0001 [For possible action] – For hearing, discussion, and possible action to approve an amendment of conditions for Special Use Permit Case Number WSUP21-0001 to amend Condition 1(c), which requires building permits to be issued within five years from the date of Washoe County’s approval of the special use permit. The amended condition extends the deadline to obtain building permits for two years, until May 4, 2028.

- Applicant: CED Rock Springs Solar LLC
- Property Owner: CED Rock Springs Solar LLC, Jeffrey Wise, Cheryl J. Lindsley et al, Julie Skeen et al, & Ragnar Kuehnert Living Trust
- Location: Off Fish Springs Road & Rainbow Way
- APN: 074-061-21, 29, 30, 36, 37 & 39 and 074-040-20, 22, 25
- Parcel Size: Total project – 660 acres
- Master Plan: Rural (R)
- Regulatory Zone: General Rural (GR)
- Planning Area: High Desert
- Development Code: Authorized in Article 810, Special Use Permits
- 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 PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles or descriptions: Request; aerial view; Background; Evaluation; Noticing; Reviewing Agencies & Findings; and Possible Motion.

Public Comment:

Via Zoom, Ms. Julie Wardley stated she had expressed concern during the project's first approval that the roads to the site had been torn up severely, resulting in flat tires. Because of that, tow truck companies will not even go to the area anymore. She wondered how the applicant would address that, adding that vehicles traveling there in the winter end up causing ruts in the road. She stated she has video of the damage. She felt the first phase of the project disrupted the peace and quiet in the area.

Discussion by Commission:

Chair Lazzareschi brought up condition of approval 2j, which required a construction haul route plan addressing the impacts of construction traffic on local streets. He wanted an idea of what that would look like in a project like this.

Ms. Olander said the purpose of this item was to modify the timeframe and the specific lots included in the project. Haul routes were discussed during the original approval of the project.

Secretary Trevor Lloyd remarked that construction haul route plans vary per project, and there is no typical plan for all projects.

MOTION: Vice Chair Pierce moved that Amendment of Conditions Case Number WAC25-0018 for CED Rock Springs Solar LLC 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 Owens seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of six for, none against, with Commissioner Kennedy absent.

Deputy District Attorney Elizabeth Hickman inquired whether the findings in Section 110.810.35 were also made.

Vice Chair Pierce amended his motion to include that all three findings of Washoe County Code Section 110.810.35 were also made.

Commissioner Owens seconded the amended motion, which passed with a vote of six for, none against, with Commissioner Kennedy absent.

B. Development Code Amendment Case Number WDCA25-0005 (Residential in Commercial) – 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 302 allowed uses and article 406 building placement standards, and creating article 403 residential uses in commercial regulatory zones, to allow multi-family residential use types in commercial regulatory zones with the application of multi-family development standards, to establish standards for mixed-use including a minimum percentage for commercial use-type square footage, a maximum square foot percentage for civic use-types, a ground floor height and façade transparency standards, site development standards for parking, landscaping and other similar standards, a standard for multi-modal and pedestrian safety, and a requirement for municipal water and

waste-water services; 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: 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 (3 slides); Proposed Changes (8 slides); and Contact.

Mr. Young noted that the County had already been considering amending these articles, but in its most recent session the Nevada Legislature mandated that it do so. He explained that the proposed densities for neighborhood commercial (NC) were the same as for high-density suburban, which staff felt had a parallel intensity of use, and the proposed density for both general commercial (GC) and tourist commercial (TC) was the same as the low-density urban designation. He indicated the 25 percent minimum commercial square foot requirement was to ensure viable commercial spaces. He provided brief justifications for the other proposed standards.

Mr. Young remarked that the proposed changes would not apply to the Tahoe Planning Area. Not only was that not a requirement of the mandate, but NC, GC, and TC zones do not exist in that area. He noted that existing five-unit projects in NC zones would be considered non-confirming and would not need to change; these new standards would apply only to new projects. He stressed the importance of ensuring the viability and success of the commercial component of these projects, and the proposed standards were commonly used to help accomplish that.

Mr. Young mentioned that twelve people attended a virtual neighborhood meeting where the project was discussed, and most of the questions revolved around density. He added that some commenters expressed interest in the idea while other comments dealt with potential impacts to infrastructure and curiosity about whether this would work better in commercial zones or residential zones.

Chair Lazzareschi inquired whether the County had standards about ceiling height and transparency of façade for existing commercial uses in commercial zoning.

Mr. Young confirmed the County does not. Staff had been pointed to several failed

mixed-use projects that did not employ those aesthetic and architectural components, and he was tasked with ensuring that did not happen with future mixed-use projects.

Commissioner Flick wondered how this mixed-use idea would work with a three-building apartment complex.

Mr. Young responded that there were a couple of approaches with mixed-use development. One was to apply mixed-use standards to create a mixed-use district with multiple parcels and structures, creating a flow between all the buildings. The other approach, he continued, was vertical mixed use, which permitted mixed uses for each building. The County's proposal focused on the latter option, partially because many of the commercial parcels in Washoe County were not large enough to accommodate large multi-family projects. If a parcel were big enough and applied for a multi-building development, the proposed percentages would apply to the project as a whole.

Commissioner Nelson asked for clarification about why the proposal would not apply to the Tahoe Basin Area.

Mr. Young replied that it was not uncommon for land use legislation to exclude the Tahoe Basin because of the unique approach of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA). Trying to fit this into their complex rules and only on the Nevada side would be too challenging. He acknowledged that California legislation often requires TRPA to figure out how to incorporate new laws, spurring difficult conversations with Nevada.

Commissioner Nelson thought it would be worth considering, given the TRPA's recent push for more workforce housing.

Chair Lazzareschi inquired whether pedestrian analysis reports and circulation plans were required of developments in commercial and residential developments in the county.

Mr. Young stated that pedestrian circulation plans were applied and requested in commercial developments, but until now that had not been codified. He discussed general situations in which circulation or multimodal plans were requested, but he could not give specific examples of times when it was applied.

Public Comment:

Ms. Pat Davison stated she was excited for the prospect of business owners providing housing for their employees, and she hoped commercial owners would utilize it. She believed staff would address any concerns over the potential loss of neighborhoods serving commercial interests by flagging potential problems during the initial project review phase.

Discussion by Commission:

Chair Lazzareschi expressed appreciation that the State mandated the County to create multi-use standards and that staff had already been pursuing it, but he was hesitant to burden multi-use development with standards which are not applied to

current residential or commercial development. He suggested removing requirements d, e, and h from the proposed standards for Code Section 110.403.15.

Regarding codifying design standards more broadly, Mr. Young opined there could be many commercial buildings and uses for which these standards would not be useful and could even be harmful. The proposed standards were tailored to be effective with multi-family development in the same building or parcel. He noted the Planning Commission (PC) and the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) approved robust standards for multi-family development last year. He pointed out that the County currently has no standards for mixed-use development, and the recommended standards were drawn from other jurisdictions including the TRPA, though that agency's standards were more extensive. He listed some of the jurisdictions that were used as models for vertical mixed-use development design standards.

Mr. Young said the County could absolutely consider whether to implement these standards for other types of zoning and assured the Commission that the changes would meet State's mandate even if the three proposed guidelines were removed. However, it was a common approach to develop standards specific to vertical mixed use. A brief discussion ensued regarding the physical appearance that would be achieved through implementation of the standards. Mr. Young hoped that new development would learn from old development and would not need to be told what to do. The proposed changes were staff's attempt to streamline mixed use concepts.

Chair Lazzareschi spoke about a mixed-use building near his home that would not meet the proposed standards, adding that they had no issues renting out either the commercial or residential space. He expressed concern about preventing residential use by complicating the commercial use aspect.

Mr. Young agreed that staff never wanted to accidentally include disincentives when trying to incentivize mixed-use development. He acknowledged that there were many examples of successful mixed-use buildings that would not comply with these new standards. The PC did not need to follow all of staff's recommendations, he noted.

In response to Commissioner Flick's request for clarification, Mr. Young specified that the percentage requirements would be spread out among all the buildings in a development. Most multi-family housing was in Sun Valley, where there was a 35-foot building height limit, though other NC and GC zones have height limitations of 60 or 80 feet. He felt that if someone wanted to develop a multi-use development on Mount Rose Highway in appropriate NC and GC zoning, some aesthetic development standards should need to be followed. He reminded the Commission that this was triggered by a State mandate.

Commissioner Nelson asked whether Mr. Young thought 60 feet was an appropriate height for mixed-use development in those areas.

Mr. Young responded that the size and type of commercial development varied wildly throughout the county, and the appropriateness of building heights would vary on a case-by-case basis. He felt a blanket height restriction would be inappropriate. He noted that legal staff reviewed the entire discussion that took place at the legislative

session and determined that the Legislature believed multi-use housing should be by right, not require discretionary approval, and not be encumbered by too many restrictions. Any type of height restriction would not be part of the State mandate. Commissioner Nelson suggested including a height restriction with a provision that a special use permit (SUP) could be obtained to reach the maximum allowable height in the specific zoning. She was inclined to leave the standards as recommended and see if the development community thought they were too burdensome.

Chair Lazzareschi reiterated his concern about implementing new standards for mixed-use that were different than those for commercial or residential development.

Further discussion ensued regarding the requirement to meet the State's mandate to allow multi-use development in commercial districts by right while not being too onerous to developers.

If the Commission approved this proposal, Vice Chair Pierce wondered whether staff could return with an amendment modifying the aesthetic standards to look more like residential development. He recognized that the PC's hands were tied.

Responding to that and other Commission questions, Mr. Young confirmed that specific design standards could be included in the PC's recommendation. However, citing a development in Spanish Springs that was required to follow western design standards, he mentioned that everyone had a different interpretation of what western design standards meant. Codifying design standards requires specific numbers, which can be challenging. He said staff could explore the idea, but the County had difficulty in the past with it.

Commissioner Nelson stated that the Code included pictures to illustrate what a terraced development should look like. She thought something similar could be done to ensure that commercial development looked less like tilt-up buildings and more like residential construction. Ensuring that the aesthetics looked more residential and including a SUP option for building height, she summarized, were the two issues that she felt needed to be reconsidered.

Recognizing that this ordinance needed to be implemented by March, Chair Lazzareschi said the PC could either remove the design standards it did not like and forward it to the BCC while staff worked on new design standards, or staff could return to the PC with new design standards to be approved at its next meeting.

Mr. Young confirmed the timeline for approval and noted there would not be enough time to rework the proposal for Commission approval and still meet the State's deadline.

In response to Commissioner Flick's follow-up question, Secretary Trevor Lloyd opined that the current draft could be enforced, particularly because it employs clear standards.

Commissioner Nelson inquired about the consequences of failing to meet the March deadline.

Deputy District Attorney Elizabeth Hickman stated it was unclear, but the deadline to adopt the ordinance was March 1, 2026.

MOTION: Chair Lazzareschi moved that guidelines d, e, and h be removed from the proposed code amendment for Section 110.403.15, and that WDCA25-05 be approved to amend Washoe County Chapter 110 (Development Code) within Articles 302, 406, and establishing new Article 403 as amended. 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 of the four findings in accordance with Washoe County Code Section 110.818.15(e).

Commissioner Nelson proposed an amendment for an additional guideline that would set a height limit of 35 feet on mixed-use development, with additional height allowable in applicable zones with a special use permit.

Commissioner Nelson seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of five for, one against, with Vice Chair Pierce voting no and Commissioner Kennedy absent.

Vice Chair Pierce indicated he preferred to retain the guideline related to pedestrian and multi-modal circulation plans.

Chair Lazzareschi agreed and hoped that staff could implement that more generally.

C. Development Code Amendment Case Number WDCA25-0012 (Attainable Housing Expedited Process) – For hearing, discussion and possible action to initiate an amendment and approve a resolution to amend Washoe County Code Chapter 110 (Development Code) in Division Three—Regulation of Uses and Division Nine—General Provisions. These amendments include adding various sections within Article 336 Housing Incentives to establish an expedited review process for attainable housing projects and to establish an expedited process for projects which qualify as Tier 1-5 Affordable Housing. These amendments also include amending Section 110.902.15 to add and delete 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 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, Senior Planner
Washoe County Community Services Department

- Phone: Planning and Building
775.328.3628
- E-mail: KOakley@washoecounty.gov

Senior Planner Kat Oakley conducted a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed slides with the following titles: Background; Article 902 Definitions; Article 336 Housing Incentives (2 slides); Findings; and Motion – Approval. She added that staff previously used staff liaisons to coordinate communication with partnering agencies for large development proposals, and it worked well. Though only one finding needed to be made, she pointed out that staff believed all four could be made.

Public Comment:

Ms. Pat Davison stated she generally did not like state mandates, but she felt both relevant bills could help Washoe County achieve its housing goals. She liked that staff was aware of the potential unintentional consequences of these bills. While she understood the importance of focusing on housing for those under the area median income (AMI) level, she felt those households above that level had been missing from the federal program. She read an excerpt from Assembly Bill 540. The administrative review process, she continued, had a safeguard requiring noticing of citizen advisory boards, homeowners associations, military installations, and property owners within 3,000 feet. Additionally, owners could provide comments, the director could modify the project with conditions, and all director decisions could be appealed. She expressed support for the prioritization of projects catering up to 150 percent AMI and for the proposed changes as a whole.

MOTION: Chair Lazzareschi moved that the Washoe County Planning Commission recommend approval of WDCA25-0012, to amend Washoe County Chapter 110 (Development Code) within Articles 336 and 902 as reflected within the proposed ordinance contained in Exhibit A1. 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 of the four findings in accordance with Washoe County Code Section 110.818.15(e).

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

9. Chair and Commission Items

A. Future agenda items

There were none.

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 indicated that the Board of County Commissioners heard the Iveson Ranch special use permit appeal at its January 13 meeting, and the decision was upheld. The second reading for the Iveson Ranch code amendment was also heard and approved at that meeting, as were WMPA25-0005 and WRZA25-0006 for Sunset Ranch.

B. Legal information and updates

There were none.

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 7:37 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Derek Sonderfan, Independent Contractor.

Approved by Commission in session on March 3, 2026

Trevor Lloyd
Secretary to the Planning Commission