VARIANCE CASE NUMBER: WPVAR19-0002 (Gonowabi Properties LLC)

BRIEF SUMMARY OF REQUEST: Reduce the required front yard setback on the subject site from 20 feet to 6.6 feet to facilitate the construction of a new dwelling with a two-car garage.

STAFF PLANNER: Roger Pelham, Senior Planner  
775.328.3622  
rpelham@washoecounty.us

CASE DESCRIPTION
For possible action, hearing, and discussion to approve a variance to reduce the required front yard setback on the subject site from 20 feet to 6.6 feet to facilitate the construction of a new dwelling with a two-car garage.

Applicant/Property Owner: Gonowabi Properties, LLC
Location: 460 Gonowabi Road, between the road and the shore of Lake Tahoe.
APN: 123-131-04
Parcel Size: ± .33 acres (±14,375 square feet)
Master Plan: Suburban Residential (SR)
Regulatory Zone: Medium Density Suburban (MDS)
Area Plan: Tahoe
Citizen Advisory Board: Incline Village / Crystal Bay
Development Code: Authorized in Article 804, Variances
Commission District: 1 – Commissioner Berkbigler

STAFF RECOMMENDATION
APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS

POSSIBLE MOTION
I move that, after giving reasoned consideration to the information contained in the staff report and information received during the public hearing, the Washoe County Board of Adjustment approve Variance Case Number WPVAR19-0002 for Gonowabi Properties, with the Conditions of Approval included as Exhibit A for this matter, having made all four required findings in accordance with Washoe County Development Code Section 110.804.25.
Variance Definition

The purpose of a variance is to provide a means of altering the requirements in specific instances where the strict application of those requirements would deprive a property of privileges enjoyed by other properties with the identical regulatory zone because of special features or constraints unique to the property involved; and to provide for a procedure whereby such alterations might be permitted by further restricting or conditioning the project so as to mitigate or eliminate possible adverse impacts.

NRS 278.300 (1) (c) limits the power of the Board of Adjustment to grant variances only under the following circumstances:

Where by reason of exceptional narrowness, shallowness, or shape of a specific piece of property at the time of the enactment of the regulation, or by reason of exceptional topographic conditions or other extraordinary and exceptional situation or condition of the piece of property, the strict application of any regulation enacted under NRS 278.010 to 278.630, inclusive, would result in peculiar and exceptional practical difficulties to, or exceptional and undue hardships upon, the owner of the property, the Board of Adjustment has the power to authorize a variance from that strict application so as to relieve the difficulties or hardship, if the relief may be granted without substantial detriment to the public good, without substantial impairment of affected natural resources and without substantially impairing the intent and purpose of any ordinance or resolution.

The statute is jurisdictional in that if the circumstances are not as described above, the Board does not have the power to grant a variance from the strict application of a regulation. Along that line, under WCC Section 110.804.25, the Board must make four findings which are discussed below.

If the Board of Adjustment grants an approval of the variance, that approval is subject to conditions of approval. Conditions of approval are requirements that need to be completed during different stages of the proposed project. Those stages are typically:

- Prior to permit issuance (i.e., a grading permit, a building permit, etc.).
- Prior to obtaining a final inspection and/or a certificate of occupancy on a structure.
- Prior to the issuance of a business license or other permits/licenses.
- Some conditions of approval are referred to as “Operational Conditions.” These conditions must be continually complied with for the life of the business or project.

The conditions of approval for Variance Case Number WPVAR19-0002 are attached to this staff report and will be included with the action order, if approval is granted.

The subject property has a regulatory zone of Medium Density Suburban (MDS). A variance to reduce the required front yard setback on the subject site from 20 feet to 6.6 feet to facilitate the construction of a new dwelling with a two-car garage is permissible upon the appropriate findings of fact by the BOA.
Vicinity Map
Floor Plans
Project Evaluation

The subject site is approximately 1/3 acre in size and is located within an area of similarly-sized parcels of land. Most of the surrounding parcels are developed with single-family dwellings. The subject site is undeveloped at this time but shows evidence of previous development, such as walkways and stone work. The remains of previous development will be removed as part of the proposed development of a single family dwelling.
Approval of a variance is limited to particular circumstances. Those circumstances are: 1) exceptional narrowness, shallowness, or shape of a specific piece of property; or 2) by reason of exceptional topographic conditions; or 3) other extraordinary and exceptional situation or condition of the piece of property. If such a finding of fact can be made the Board must also show that the strict application of the regulation would result in peculiar and exceptional practical difficulties to, or exceptional and undue hardships upon, the owner of the property.

Evaluation of the request to vary standards will follow the criteria as required above.

**Exceptional Narrowness:** The parcel is located within the Medium Density Suburban (MDS) regulatory zone. The minimum lot size in that zone is 12,000 square feet. The subject parcel is approximately 14,375 square feet in size. The minimum lot width in that zone is 80 feet. The subject parcel is approximately 62 feet in average width. The subject parcel is exceptionally narrow.

**Exceptional Shallowness:** The depth of the property from Gonowabi Road to the shore of Lake Tahoe is approximately 221 feet. The subject parcel is not exceptionally shallow.

**Exceptional Shape:** The front property line consists of two line segments that form the shape of a “V” pointing east. This creates a wider area of the public right of way in front of this parcel and limits development closer to the traveled way of Gonowabi Road. This is unique among the parcels of land fronting Gonowabi Road, thus, constitutes an exceptional shape.

**Exceptional Topographic Conditions:** The subject parcel is substantially sloped from Gonowabi Road to the shore of Lake Tahoe. That slope is approximately 33%. The topography of the subject parcel is exceptional and creates substantial difficulty in placing a garage appropriately for safe access. The proposed variance mitigates that hardship.

**Other Extraordinary and Exceptional Situation or Condition of the Piece of Property:** Staff did not identify any other characteristics of the property that create an extraordinary or exceptional situation or condition.

Staff recommends approval of the variance request being able to make the necessary findings of fact including exceptional narrowness, exceptional shape and exceptional topographic conditions as required by both Nevada Revised Statutes and the Washoe County Development Code. Further, approval of a variance in this location does not constitute a special privilege for the applicant as most dwellings on Gonowabi Road are very close to the traveled way.

**Incline Village/Crystal Bay Citizen Advisory Board (IV/CB CAB)**

The proposed project was presented by the applicant’s representative at the regularly scheduled citizen advisory board meeting on January 6. The CAB made no recommendation but forwarded all comments to the Board of Adjustment for their consideration. Most of the discussion at the meeting centered on the probable loss of off-street parking, within the public right-of-way, in front of the subject site. The draft minutes of that meeting are included at Exhibit B, to this report. One CAB member, Sara Schmitz, provided written comments after the meeting, those comments are included at Exhibit F to this report.

**Reviewing Agencies**

The following agencies received a copy of the project application for review and evaluation.

- Washoe County Community Services Department
  - Planning and Building Division
  - Engineering and Capital Projects – Land Development
  - Engineering and Capital Projects - Utilities
- Washoe County Health District
Of the twenty-three above-listed agencies/departments only two provided comments or recommended conditions of approval in response to their evaluation of the project application. A summary of each agency’s comments and/or recommended conditions of approval and their contact information is provided. The conditions of approval document is attached to this staff report and will be included with the action order.

- Washoe County Planning and Building Division provided standard conditions of approval to ensure conformance with the plans submitted with the variance request.
  
  **Contact:** Roger Pelham, 775.328.3622, rpelham@washoecounty.us

- Washoe – Storey Conservation District provided a condition that boulders that are removed during construction be placed elsewhere on the subject site.
  
  **Contact:** Jim Shaffer, 775.857.8500, shafferjam51@gmail.com

**Staff Comment on Required Findings**

Washoe County Development Code Section 110.804.25, Article 804, Variances, requires that all of the following findings be made to the satisfaction of the Washoe County Board of Adjustment before granting approval of the request. Staff has completed an analysis of the variance application and has determined that the proposal is in compliance with the required findings as follows.

1. **Special Circumstances.** Because of the special circumstances applicable to the property, including exceptional narrowness, shallowness or shape of the specific piece of property;
exceptional topographic conditions; extraordinary and exceptional situation or condition of the property and/or location of surroundings; the strict application of the regulation results in exceptional and undue hardships upon the owner of the property.

Staff Comment: The slope of the subject site is an exceptional topographic condition, the parcel is also exceptionally narrow, and exceptionally shaped, the front property line consisting of two line-segments that form the shape of a “V” pointing east. Reduction of the front yard setback allows for a safer and more efficient location for a garage. A garage is required to be included with all new single-family dwellings.

2. No Detriment. The relief will not create a substantial detriment to the public good, substantially impair affected natural resources or impair the intent and purpose of the Development Code or applicable policies under which the variance is granted.

Staff Comment: The reduction of the front yard setback will not create a substantial detriment to the public good, as the garage will be located approximately 40 feet from the edge of the pavement on Gonowabi Road. Neighboring property owners have expressed that location of the dwelling with its driveway in this area will eliminate some of the very limited off-street parking adjacent to Gonowabi Road.

3. No Special Privileges. The granting of the variance will not constitute a grant of special privileges inconsistent with the limitations upon other properties in the vicinity and the identical regulatory zone in which the property is situated.

Staff Comment: The proposed development is consistent with the development pattern in the surrounding area.

4. Use Authorized. The variance will not authorize a use or activity which is not otherwise expressly authorized by the regulation governing the parcel of property.

Staff Comment: A garage is required to be included with all new single-family dwellings.

5. Effect on a Military Installation. Issuance of the permit will not have a detrimental effect on the location, purpose or mission of the military installation.

Staff Comment: There is no military installation in the area required to be noticed for this permit. No detrimental effect will be created for any military installation.

Recommendation

After a thorough analysis and review, Variance Case Number WPVAR19-0002 is being recommended for approval with conditions. Staff offers the following motion for the Board’s consideration.

Motion

I move that, after giving reasoned consideration to the information contained in the staff report and information received during the public hearing, the Washoe County Board of Adjustment approve Variance Case Number WPVAR19-0002 for Gonowabi Properties, with the Conditions of Approval included as Exhibit A for this matter, having made all four required findings in accordance with Washoe County Development Code Section 110.804.25:

1. Special Circumstances. Because of the special circumstances applicable to the property, including exceptional narrowness, shallowness or shape of the specific piece of property; exceptional topographic conditions; extraordinary and exceptional situation or condition of the property and/or location of surroundings; the strict application of the regulation results in exceptional and undue hardships upon the owner of the property;

2. No Detriment. The relief will not create a substantial detriment to the public good, substantially impair affected natural resources or impair the intent and purpose of the Development Code or applicable policies under which the variance is granted;
3. **No Special Privileges.** The granting of the variance will not constitute a grant of special privileges inconsistent with the limitations upon other properties in the vicinity and the identical regulatory zone in which the property is situated;

4. **Use Authorized.** The variance will not authorize a use or activity which is not otherwise expressly authorized by the regulation governing the parcel of property;

5. **Effect on a Military Installation.** Issuance of the permit will not have a detrimental effect on the location, purpose or mission of a military installation.

**Appeal Process**

Board of Adjustment action will be effective 10 calendar days after the written decision is filed with the Secretary to the Board of Adjustment and mailed to the applicant, unless the action is appealed to the Washoe County Board of County Commissioners, in which case the outcome of the appeal shall be determined by the Washoe County Board of County Commissioners. Any appeal must be filed in writing with the Planning and Building Division within 10 calendar days from the date the written decision is filed with the Secretary to the Board of Adjustment and mailed to the applicant.

Applicant/Owner: Gonowabi Properties, LLC
PO Box 14001-174
Ketchum, ID  83340

Representatives: Midkiff and Associates
Attn: Nick Exline
PO Box 12427
Zephyr Cove, NV  89448
Conditions of Approval
Variance Case Number WPVAR19-0002

The project approved under Variance Case Number WPVAR19-0002 shall be carried out in accordance with the Conditions of Approval granted by the Board of Adjustment on February 6, 2020. Conditions of Approval are requirements placed on a permit or development by each reviewing agency. These Conditions of Approval may require submittal of documents, applications, fees, inspections, amendments to plans, and more. These conditions do not relieve the applicant of the obligation to obtain any other approvals and licenses from relevant authorities required under any other act or to abide by all other generally applicable Codes, and neither these conditions nor the approval by the County of this project/use override or negate any other applicable restrictions on uses or development on the property.

Unless otherwise specified, all conditions related to the approval of this Variance shall be met or financial assurance must be provided to satisfy the conditions of approval prior to issuance of a grading or building permit. The agency responsible for determining compliance with a specific condition shall determine whether the condition must be fully completed or whether the applicant shall be offered the option of providing financial assurance. All agreements, easements, or other documentation required by these conditions shall have a copy filed with the County Engineer and the Planning and Building Division.

Compliance with the conditions of approval related to this Variance is the responsibility of the applicant, his/her successor in interest, and all owners, assignees, and occupants of the property and their successors in interest. Failure to comply with any of the conditions imposed in the approval of the Variance may result in the institution of revocation procedures.

Washoe County reserves the right to review and revise the conditions of approval related to this Variance should it be determined that a subsequent license or permit issued by Washoe County violates the intent of this approval.

For the purpose of conditions imposed by Washoe County, “may” is permissive and “shall” or “must” is mandatory.

Conditions of Approval are usually complied with at different stages of the proposed project. Those stages are typically:

- Prior to permit issuance (i.e., grading permits, building permits, etc.).
- Prior to obtaining a final inspection and/or a certificate of occupancy.
- Prior to the issuance of a business license or other permits/licenses.
- Some “Conditions of Approval” are referred to as “Operational Conditions.” These conditions must be continually complied with for the life of the project or business.

The Washoe County Commission oversees many of the reviewing agencies/departments with the exception of the following agencies.

- The DISTRICT BOARD OF HEALTH, through the Washoe County Health District, has jurisdiction over all public health matters in the Health District.
Any conditions set by the Health District must be appealed to the District Board of Health.

- The RENO-TAHOE AIRPORT AUTHORITY is directed and governed by its own Board. Therefore, any conditions set by the Reno-Tahoe Airport Authority must be appealed to their Board of Trustees.

- The REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION (RTC) is directed and governed by its own Board. Conditions recommended by the RTC may be required, at the discretion of Washoe County.

FOLLOWING ARE CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL REQUIRED BY THE REVIEWING AGENCIES. EACH CONDITION MUST BE MET TO THE SATISFACTION OF THE ISSUING AGENCY.

Washoe County Planning and Building Division

1. The following conditions are requirements of the Planning and Building Division, which shall be responsible for determining compliance with these conditions.

   Contact Name – Roger Pelham, 775.328.3622, rpelham@washoecounty.us

   a. A copy of the action order stating conditional approval of this variance shall be attached to all applications for all permits, including building permits, issued by Washoe County.

   b. The applicant shall demonstrate substantial conformance to the plans approved as part of this variance permit. Modification to the site plan may require amendment to and reprocessing of the variance.

   c. The applicant shall submit construction and grading plans, with all information necessary for a complete and comprehensive review by Washoe County, and building permits shall be issued, within two years from the date of approval by Washoe County. The applicant shall complete construction within the time specified by the building permits. Compliance with this condition shall be determined by Planning and Building.

   d. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the applicant execute Hold Harmless Agreement to the satisfaction of the Engineering and Capital Projects Division for the purposes of road maintenance and snow removal. The applicant shall submit a copy of the executed document to the Planning and Building Division.

   e. The applicant shall install an automatic garage door opener prior the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy or building permit final sign-off.

   f. Prior to submission of a building permit for the approved garage, the front property line shall be surveyed and marked by a surveyor licensed in Nevada. Approval of the variance shall not convey any rights or approval to construct any portion of a structure across the property line, or in the county right-of-way. Neither shall any roof eaves, light fixtures or other structural or architectural elements project over the front property line.

   g. A note shall be placed on all construction drawings and grading plans stating:

   NOTE

   Should any cairn or grave of a Native American be discovered during site development, work shall temporarily be halted at the specific site and the Sheriff’s Office as well as the State Historic Preservation Office of the
Department of Conservation and Natural Resources shall be immediately notified per NRS 383.170.

h. The use of straw bales shall be prohibited during construction of the project. A filter-fabric fence or other acceptable alternative shall be utilized for erosion control.

**Washoe – Storey Conservation District**

2. The following condition is a requirement of the Washoe-Storey Conservation District, which shall be responsible for determining compliance with the condition.

**Contact Name – Jim Shaffer, 775.857.8500, shafferjam51@gmail.com**

a. Any boulders removed during construction shall be relocated on the subject site.

*** End of Conditions ***
Minutes of the Incline Village Crystal Bay Citizens Advisory Board meeting held at Incline Village General Improvement District, 893 Southwood Blvd, Incline Village, NV 89451 on January 6, 2019, 5:30 P.M.

1. *CALL TO ORDER/ PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE –* Pete Todoroff called the meeting to order at 5:30 P.M.

2. *ROLL CALL/DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM -* Pete Todoroff, Judy Miller, Kevin Lyons, Michael LeFrancois, Sara Schmitz (alternate filling in for vacant seats). A quorum was determined.

Absent: Mike Sullivan (excused)

3. *PUBLIC COMMENT –* Wayne Ford said has clients friends who live on Gonowabi who asked him to speak on their behalf. He said their front/side yard variance was approved, and they provided off street parking for guests. He said there is no parking on the road on the County right-a-way. He said this project is missing a main component which is guest parking. He said this could be combined lots. If this was more conventional, it would allow for two parking spots on the deck. He suggested set the home back. Use the code developed for this purpose which would allow for height, and step down the parcel which could be achieved if home was moved over. He said off-street parking is his clients’ main concern. He spoke about fire designation

Robert Goldberg, 459 Gonowabie, the property across from the subject property. He said they are in the middle of constructive dialogue the subject property owner. He said has concerns with obstructing the view corridor, parking and safety. He said there hasn’t been enough time to understand the breadth of the project. He said we need more time to understand this. He said its premature to render recommendation before resolutions can be discussed.

Ruben Richards, 458 Gonowabie, said he is most directly impacted by this proposal. He thanked the board for their consideration. He echoed Robert and Wayne’s comments. He said we received notice days ago and haven’t had time to understand these adjustments with the parcels. He requested the Board delay the decision until the next meeting.

With no further requests for public, Chair Todoroff closed the public comment period.

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA FOR THE MEETING OF JANUARY 6, 2020 –* Kevin Lyons moved to approve the agenda of JANUARY 6, 2020. Judy Miller seconded the motion to approve the agenda for JANUARY 6, 2020. Motion carried unanimously.

5. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF NOVEMBER 4, 2019 and DECEMBER 12, 2019–
Judy Miller moved to approve the minutes of NOVEMBER 4, 2019. Mike Lefrancois seconded the motion to approve the minutes. Sara Schmitz abstained. Motion carried unanimously.

Mike Lefrancois had the following corrections to the statements he made in the minutes: During his comment, he stated ‘he doesn’t believe TOT alone needs to be used for enforcement.’ ‘BMPs are regulated by TRPA. ‘...afterhours. There needs to be 2 (min) staff members for 7 day coverage.’ Instead of the sentence ‘STR is very specific,’ it should have read ‘STR regulations as proposed are very focused and don’t address overlap of non-STR issues (noise, parking enforcement).

Judy Miller:
On page 2, after Jack Dalton’s public comment, the minutes need to reflect that it is ‘the end of public comment period.’ Judy Miller also added that a sentence after public comment that states Judy Miller wanted to get answers to the questions raised during public comment. Name spelling correction for a public member should be Joy Gumz. On page 3, it should state ‘Judy Miller had prepared a sheet of comments and gave copies to the board and attendees. She wanted to emphasize the definition of residential use types as wholly or primarily non-transient.’ On the last page, last paragraph, Judy said there are a lot of un-permitted second dwelling units.

Kevin Lyon:
During the portion of the minutes where Kevin Lyons asked about break down of compliance – it should read ‘Some of these are possible solutions to problems that are actual problems.’ Additionally, during his comment, it should state public nuisance issues such as parking and noise should be addressed.

Judy Miller moved to approve the minutes of DECEMBER 12, 2019 as corrected. Kevin Lyons seconded the motion to approve the minutes as corrected. Sara Schmidtz abstained. The motion carried unanimously.

6. DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS- The project description is provided below with links to the application or you may visit the Planning and Building Division website and select the Application Submittals page: www.washoecounty.us/comdev

6.A. Variance Case Number WPVAR-0002 (Gonowabie Properties LLC)
- Request for community feedback, discussion and possible action to forward community and Citizen Advisory Board comments to Washoe County staff on a request for a variance to reduce the required front yard setback on the subject site from 20 feet to 6.6 feet to facilitate the construction of a new dwelling with a two-car garage. (for Possible Action)
- Applicant\Property Owner: Gonowabi Properties, LLC
- Location: 460 Gonowabi Rd, between the road and shore of Lake Tahoe
- Assessor’s Parcel Number: 123-131-04
- Staff: Roger Pelham, Senior Planner,; 775-328-3622; rpelham@washoecounty.us
- Reviewing Body: Tentatively scheduled for the Board of Adjustment on February 6, 2020

Roger Pelham, Washoe County Planner, said he was available to answer questions. In response to the public comments, he noted delaying hearing of this item is not an option at this time. He said he can answer code, policy, process questions.
Nick Exline, Midkiff and Associates, Representative, 460 Gonowabi, provided a brief overview of the proposed variance request.

He said the proposed variance is to reduce the required front yard setback on the subject site. He said with this variance, he said they were hoping to put the development closest to Gonowabi instead of using a step down process.

He said a step up height segment process would be ideal on first street level. He said they wanted to bring the property up to the street as far as we could to maintain view corridor for the neighbor, but keep it below the view corridor for the neighbor across the street.

Nick said additional concerns were raised when they walked the site with architect and concerned neighbors. He said parking was a concern. Nick said per code, we would not be afforded the parking requirements off street parking. He said they will look to stake the corners and have another conversation with architect and community before BOA meeting on Feb. 6.

Pete Todoroff said he understands it’s a fire lane, but if you build there, there won’t be off street parking. Nick said we are focusing on the variance request. He said they aren’t afforded the opportunity to include a driveway. Pete asked if they could put a driveway or parking on the lot next door. Pete said this is a major problem with taking away the current off-street parking. That is a major concern.

Sara Schmitz asked what the square footage and number of bedrooms proposed. Nick said it’s proposed to be a single-family, 5,671 square feet with 5 bedrooms. Sara said with 5,671 sq. ft. with 5 bedrooms, off-street parking is needed. She said it’s a fire lane and a snowplow needs to come down that lane. She asked where are these other people going to park; that’s the reason for setbacks. Nick said onsite parking has not changed in the garage and on the bridge.

Mike Lefrancois asked if fire department has reviewed this application. Roger said they had no comments. Mike said the resident concerns are valid. He asked about parking code. Roger said two off-street, one of which should be in an enclosed garage. Both are being created within the garage on the subject site. There will be two spaces on the property.

Judy Miller asked who put the pavers in. A public member said the County installed the paver. She said this proposal will take away the public right-a-way parking for a private development. It doesn’t seem equitable. Nick said that’s not official parking. Kevin said pavers are on public property. Nick stated this property owner is being asked to solve issues in order to develop a single family residence. Nick said this wouldn’t be an acceptable fire lane under current code.

Nick spoke about the shape of the property as pie slice. Robert (neighbor) said the property is that shape because the road used to end there. Kevin said it’s a one way road. Robert said there are challenges. He said whether it is permitted or not, it’s the only place to park. He said he and Rube aren’t prepared to support or oppose it. He said he is sympathizes with it, but have ideas to help mitigate issues. This application not ready. He said the applicant has been collaborative to address concerns. We want to come to an agreement but we aren’t ready.
Judy asked if there were conversations with the neighbors prior to notice. Nick said no.

Nick said he is not empowered to make changes now. He said we need to focus on the variance. He said he is empathetic to the parking issues. Nick said they are going above and beyond. He said if we move the property away from the property, it will impact the view corridor more. Ruben said he disagrees.

Sara said she is new to this and has been a home owner for many years and has remodeled. She said the first thing we did before building was to understand the parameters of the lot which included setbacks. She asked why wasn’t this type of approach taken at this location. Nick spoke about the updated area plan and changes to Gonowabi due to challenges. He said garage will be 40-50 set away from property line. This is a unique parcel configuration, steep slopes, and architectural design.

Public Comment:
Wayne Ford said variance request are based on facts. For interior lots in building placement, this has a 15 foot setback, not 20 foot. He asked Roger for his input. Roger Pelham said it does by means of topography, but 20 foot for zoning. Wayne said 15 foot setback due to steepness of property. 5 feet is a big difference. Roger said the description is correct which is required by the zoning. There is a modification based on topography that would apply in this case if not otherwise varied. Wayne said the water quality project with paving was verified. He said he spent time with a Washoe County staff member on the pavers. The pervious pavers are owned by the county. It was legally done. It took a lot of time to stabilize the area. Nick said he would look into it.

Sara Schmitz asked about the easement for utilities. Robert said there is a public access easement between the subject property and Ruben’s property that isn’t indicated on the map. He said when he brought the property, the public easement access showed up on the lot map. He said the owners have been responsive, but give proper time to get a decent outcome.

Roger Pelham, the notice that went out are courtesy notices, but they are not requirement. He said we began sending courtesy notices this 20 years ago. He said the legal notices are sent 10 days before the public hearing. He said we send the courtesy to engage community early in the process. This gives the citizens a better opportunity. Applications come in on 15th, courtesy notices might have been slow over holidays. This is a public forum to gather input.

Sara Schmitz asked about additional access requirements and setback. Roger said it depends on the type of public access easement. He spoke about different access easement. Robert said easements should be reflected in the plans.

Kathy Julian spoke about public access. She asked if someone does a development like this, is there a check if a development eliminates public access. She asked who checks for that. Nick said the property line is reflected on the site plan. The title report reflect the legal description. We showed legal described boundaries in the plans.

Wayne said Ann Nichols and Mark Alexander spent a lot of time researching those access easements and aren’t sure how accessible they are. They don’t show up on the maps except for the originals. They weren’t recorded. There has been challenges with property lines in court in Crystal Bay. Public access was
Robert asked about a property line adjustment. Wayne said that happens a lot. Wayne said new TRPA code allows for height codes. Wayne said the design is great, the only issue is parking.

Robert said we will come to reasonable solution. Ruben said issues can be address if given enough time.

Nick said it’s unique burden to solve off-street parking issues for other owners who have their own parking issues. Pete said you are taking it away.

Mike asked if the property lines have already adjusted. Nick said not yet, surveyor has been out there and provided comments. Mike said the surveyor may provide comments. He spoke about the ability to have a driveway based on your property lines. There is 50 feet curbside. Mike said this can be worked out without changing much. He suggested involving fire and roads department and work it out with the neighbors.

Robert said there is a way through this, but we aren’t there yet. Mike said it’s a parking issue, not a setback issue.

Nick said even if we move it back 10 feet to adhere to the setback, there ultimately is no solution for parking. Robert suggested if you move the house to the north against the other lot line that would solve a problem. Robert said we can solve this before Board of Adjustment meeting.

Robert asked if applicant can ask for a delay. Roger said only the applicant can request a delay.

MOTION: Kevin Lyons moved to forward the comments to Washoe County staff. He wished them good luck. Pete Todoroff seconded the motion. Sara Schmitz opposed. The motion carried.

7. *WASHOE COUNTY COMMISSIONER UPDATE – Commissioner Berkbigler was not present.

8. *CHAIRMAN/BOARD MEMBER ITEMS- This item is limited to announcements by CAB members. (This item is for information only and no action will be taken by the CAB).

Pete requested Election of Officers item be placed on the next agenda to determine Vice President. Judy Miller said the Planning Commission is tomorrow. She asked if Phil Horan is still on the board. Roger said he wasn’t sure if Phil still lived in Washoe County or Reno. Sara said planning commission is 6pm.

9. *GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT AND DISCUSSION THEREOF –

With no requests for public comment, Pete Todoroff closed the public comment period.

ADJOURNMENT – meeting adjourned at 6:38 p.m.

Number of CAB members present: 5
Number of Public Present: 10
Presence of Elected Officials: 0
Number of staff present: 1
Comments from Air Quality.

For reference:

Item 1 – WADMIN19-0022
Item 2 – WPMVAR19-0002
Item 3 – WPVAR19-0003
Item 4 – WSUP19-0023
Item 5 – WSUP19-0028
Item 6 – WSUP19-0029
Item 7 – WSUP19-0030

Donna Fagan
Planning and Building Division | Community Services Department
dfagan@washoecounty.us | Office: 775.323.3616
1001 E. 9th Street, Reno, NV 89521

---

From: Wolf, Mike
Sent: Thursday, December 19, 2019 12:38 PM
To: Fagan, Donna
Subject: RE: December Agency Review Memo

Donna

Items 1-5 AQMD has no input.
Item 6 requires the applicant obtain a dust control permit from AQMD.
Item 7 may require a dust control permit, the applicant needs to come into AQMD with grading plans for us to make this determination.

Have a great holiday

Cheers

Michael Wolf, CEM
Permitting and Enforcement Branch Chief | Air Quality Management Division | Washoe County Health District
mwolf@washoecounty.us | O: (775) 784-7205 | 1001 E. Ninth St., Bldg. B, Reno, NV 89521
Good afternoon Roger,

The EMS Program does not currently have any comments regarding the Variance Case Number WVAR19-0002 (Gonowabie Properties LLC) included in the December Agency Review Memo.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you

Jackie

[NOTICE: This message originated outside of Washoe County -- DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.]

Greetings,
NLTFPD has no comment on item 2.

Regards,
Jen

Jennifer Donohue  
Interim Fire Marshal  
Office: 775.831.0351 x6127 | Cell: 775.434.4555  
Email: jdonohue@nltfpd.net  
366 Oracle Way | Incline Village | NV 89451
Date: January 6, 2020

To: Roger Pelham, Senior Planner, Planning and Building Division
From: Leo Vesely, P.E., Engineering and Capitol Projects Division
Re: Variance Case WPVAR19.0002 – Gonowabie Properties LLC
APN 123-131-04

GENERAL PROJECT DISCUSSION

Washoe County Engineering and Capital Project staff has reviewed the above referenced application. The application is for a variance to reduce the required front yard setback on the subject site from 20 feet to 6.6 feet to facilitate the construction of a new dwelling with a two-car garage. The Engineering and Capital Projects Division recommends approval with the following comments and conditions of approval which supplement applicable County Code and are based upon our review of the application prepared by Midkiff & Associates, Inc. The County Engineer shall determine compliance with all the following conditions of approval.

For questions related to sections below, please see the contact name provided.

GENERAL CONDITIONS

Contact Information: Leo Vesely, P.E. (775) 328-2041

There are no general engineering related comments.

DRAINAGE (COUNTY CODE 110.415, 110.420, and 110.421)

Contact Information: Leo Vesely, P.E. (775) 328-2041

There are no Drainage related comments.

TRAFFIC AND ROADWAY (COUNTY CODE 110.436)

Contact Information: Mitchell Fink (775) 328-2050

There are no Traffic related comments.

UTILITIES (Count Code 422 & Sewer Ordinance)

Contact Information: Tim Simpson, P.E. (775) 954-4648

There are no utility related conditions of approval.
January 6, 2020

Washoe-Storey Conservation District

1001 E Ninth Street, Bldg A
Reno, NV 89512

R: WPVAR19-0002 Gunowabie Properties LLC

Dear Roger,

In reviewing Gunowabie Properties the Conservation District has the following comment.

In the document it states the bolders may be removed; if this occurs we will require the bolders be relocated on the site.

Thank you for providing us the opportunity to review the project that may have impacts on our natural resources.

Sincerely,

Tyler-Shaffer
December Agency Review Comments

1-ADMIN19-0022- No Comment
2- WPVAR19-0002 - No Comment
3- WPVAR19-0003 - No Comment
4- WSU019-0023 - No Comment

5-WSUP19-0028-Below

Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District (TMFPD)
1. The following conditions are requirements of the Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District, which shall be responsible for determining compliance with these conditions. Unless otherwise stated, these conditions shall be met prior to the issuance of any building or grading permit or on an ongoing basis as determined by TMFPD.

   Contact Name – Don Coon, 775.326.6077, Dcoon@tmfpd.us

   a. Fire protection of the new structures shall be as required by the current adopted International Fire Code, (IFC) International Wildland Urban Interface Code (IWUIC) 2012 Ed, with amendments and the requirements of the NFPA standard(s).  
   https://codes.iccsafe.org/content/IWUC2012  https://codes.iccsafe.org/content/IFC2012

   b. Based on the change of use and the size of the building a fire sprinkler system may be required. Consult with a State of Nevada Licensed Design Professional. (IFC 102.3 and Table 903.2.1 per the Northern Nevada Amendments to the IFC.

6-WSUP19-0029- NoComment, we have had multiple meeting and phone conversation.

7-WSUP19-0030—No Comment
Public Notice

Pursuant to Washoe County Code Section 110.804.20 public notification consists of notification by mail of at least 30 separate property owners within a minimum 500-foot radius of the subject property. This proposal was noticed within a 500-foot radius of the subject property, noticing 52 property owners.
# Washoe County Development Application

Your entire application is a public record. If you have a concern about releasing personal information, please contact Planning and Building staff at 775.328.6100.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Information</th>
<th>Staff Assigned Case No.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Name:</strong></td>
<td>460 Gonowabie Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Description:</strong></td>
<td>460 Gonowabie setback variance. For additional information please see attached submittal letter and packet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Address:</strong></td>
<td>460 Gonowabie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Area (acres or square feet):</strong></td>
<td>14,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Location (with point of reference to major cross streets AND area locator):</strong></td>
<td>Gonowabie Road, approx. 1 mile south of CA/NV border</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessor's Parcel No.(s):</strong></td>
<td><strong>Parcel Acreage:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123-131-04</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicate any previous Washoe County approvals associated with this application: Case No.(s).

**Applicant Information (attach additional sheets if necessary)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Owner</th>
<th>Professional Consultant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name: Gonowabie Properties, LLC</td>
<td>Name: Midkiff &amp; Associates, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address: P.O. Box 14001-174</td>
<td>Address: P.O. Box 12427, Zephyr Cove, NV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ketchum, ID Zip: 83340</td>
<td>Zip: 89448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: Contact Consultant Fax: Consultant</td>
<td>Phone: 588-1091 Fax: 588-1091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: Consultant</td>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:nick@midkiffandassoc.com">nick@midkiffandassoc.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell: Consultant Other: Consultant</td>
<td>Cell: 775-240-9361 Other:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Person: Contact Consultant</td>
<td>Contact Person: Nick Exline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant/Developer:</td>
<td>Other Persons to be Contacted:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name: Contact Consultant</td>
<td>Name: Contact Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>Address:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zip:</td>
<td>Zip:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone:</td>
<td>Phone:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax:</td>
<td>Fax:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td>Email:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell:</td>
<td>Cell:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>Other:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Person:</td>
<td>Contact Person:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**For Office Use Only**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Received:</th>
<th>Initial:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Commission District:</td>
<td>Master Plan Designation(s):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAB(s):</td>
<td>Regulatory Zoning(s):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*December 2018*
Property Owner Affidavit

 Applicant Name: Genevieve Reports, LLC - David Duffield

The receipt of this application at the time of submittal does not guarantee the application complies with all requirements of the Washoe County Development Code, the Washoe County Master Plan or the applicable area plan, the applicable regulatory zoning, or that the application is deemed complete and will be processed.

STATE OF NEVADA   
COUNTY OF WASHOE

I, David A. Duffield, (please print name)
being duly sworn, depose and say that I am the owner* of the property or properties involved in this application as listed below and that the foregoing statements and answers herein contained and the information herewith submitted are in all respects complete, true, and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief. I understand that no assurance or guarantee can be given by members of Planning and Building.

(A separate Affidavit must be provided by each property owner named in the title report.)

Assessor Parcel Number(s): 123-131-04

Printed Name David A. Duffield

Signed ______________________

Address ______________________

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 15th day of November, 2019.

(Notary Stamp)

Christina M. Sipe
Commission Number: 38061
Notary Public
State of Idaho
My Commission Expires: 07/09/2020

*Owner refers to the following: (Please mark appropriate box.)

☑ Owner
☑ Corporate Officer/Partner (Provide copy of record document indicating authority to sign.)
☑ Power of Attorney (Provide copy of Power of Attorney.)
☑ Owner Agent (Provide notarized letter from property owner giving legal authority to agent.)
☑ Property Agent (Provide copy of record document indicating authority to sign.)
☑ Letter from Government Agency with Stewardship
Variance Application
Supplemental Information
(All required information may be separately attached)

1. What provisions of the Development Code (e.g. front yard setback, height, etc.) must be waived or varied to permit your request?

**Front Yard Setback (110.406.05.1) MDS - 20' Front Yard Setback.**

You must answer the following questions in detail. Failure to provide complete and accurate information will result in denial of the application.

2. What are the topographic conditions, extraordinary or exceptional circumstances, shape of the property or location of surroundings that are unique to your property and, therefore, prevent you from complying with the Development Code requirements?

**Steep slope (33%+) and parcel configuration abutting road.**

3. What steps will be taken to prevent substantial negative impacts (e.g. blocking views, reducing privacy, decreasing pedestrian or traffic safety, etc.) to other properties or uses in the area?

**Garage closer to road will improve views - see submittal letter.**

4. How will this variance enhance the scenic or environmental character of the neighborhood (e.g. eliminate encroachment onto slopes or wetlands, provide enclosed parking, eliminate clutter in view of neighbors, etc.)?

**Scenic, community, health & safety, environment - see submittal letter.**

5. What enjoyment or use of your property would be denied to you that is common to other properties in your neighborhood?

**Enclosed garage require per Washoe County Code - see submittal letter.**

6. Are there any restrictive covenants, recorded conditions or deed restrictions (CC&Rs) that apply to the area subject to the variance request?

☐ Yes  ☐ No  If yes, please attach a copy.

7. How is your current water provided?

**IVGID**

8. How is your current sewer provided?

**IVGID**
December 16, 2019

Washoe County Community Services (Planning)
1001 E. Ninth Street
Reno, NV 89512

GONOWABIE PROPERTIES, LLC – WASHOE COUNTY DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION (VARIANCE APPLICATION), 460 GONOWABIE RD., CRYSTAL BAY, NV, ASSESSOR’S PARCEL NUMBER (APN) 123-131-04.

Dear Washoe County Staff:

The Washoe County Development (Variance) application is being submitted by Midkiff & Associates, Inc. ("the Consultant") on behalf of Gonowabie Properties, LLC ("Property Owner") for the Subject Parcel.

Site Condition

As the attached photo packet represents, the Subject Parcel is a vacant and heavily vegetated with indigenous vegetation including, manzanita and pine. The Subject Parcel maintains a steep slope in excess of 33% and slopes from Gonowabie Road, toward the shoreline of Lake Tahoe. There are intermittent granite boulders onsite.

Project Description

The existing single-family residential parcel is currently zoned Medium Density Suburban (MDS). The Property Owner is seeing a variance to the front yard setback. Washoe County Development Code subsection 110.406.05.1 establishes the MDS front yard setback at 20’.

The Property Owner is proposing to reduce the front yard setback to 0’ for the decking and 6.6’ for the garage to allow for the construction of a two (2) car garage. It is important to note, that although the garage will be 6.6’ from the property line, it will be 40’ to 57’ from Gonowabie Road. The garage will be attached to a new-single family residence on the Subject Parcel. The Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) will review the new-single family dwelling application.

Hardship

As a result of the steep slope and irregular parcel configuration of the Subject Parcel a front setback variance is needed to construct an enclosed, two (2) car garage. Approving the variance and allowing for the construction of a two (2) car garage, will provide scenic, environmental and human health & safety benefits (discussed below).

Steep Slope

The Subject Parcel has slopes in excess of 33%. If the proposed garage adhered to the required 20’ front yard setback it would push the proposed garage further down the slope. When factoring in TRPA height limitations, driveway (bridge) slope allowances, and other regulatory requirements, adhering to the 20’ setback would not be possible with the development of a two (2) car garage.
Parcel Configuration

Unlike the other parcels abutting Gonowabie, the Subject Parcel has a triangle shaped gap that bisects the Subject Parcel from Gonowabie. This triangle shaped gap separates the Subject Parcel from Gonowabie Road by approximately 40’ to 57’ with the approved variance. When you include a 20’ setback, the proposed garage would be approximately 60’ to 87’ from Gonowabie Road.

Variance Benefits

Scenic Benefits

The Subject Parcel is abutting an existing residence to the South and a proposed residence to the north. Both the northerly and southerly abutting parcels do not have the same parcel irregularities, which allowing their garages to be located closer to the road. Both the existing and proposed abutting residences view corridors are directed toward the lake. The further the proposed garage is pushed toward the lake, the more the garage will be located in the existing view corridors. Allowing for the variance, will allow the proposed garage to be located further up the slope and outside of existing view corridors of the abutting residences. As a result of grade difference between the lake and non-lake parcels, the existing residence located across the street view will not be impacted by the granting of the proposed variance.

Environmental Benefit

Allowing for the proposed garage and attached residence to be constructed closer to the road and further away from the Shoreline is a TRPA established environmental benefit.

Human Health & Safety Benefits

An enclosed garage on the Subject Parcel is not only required by Washoe County, but will also provide a human health & safety benefit to the residents. As previously stated, requiring the garage to adhere to a 20’ setback would push the garage downslope, requiring a steep bridge access. Due to Lake Tahoe’s snowy conditions, steep slope driveways are not advisable and depending on degree of slope prohibited by Washoe County Code. The Variance will allow for a flat ingress/egress to the parcel. This flat ingress/egress to the residence constitutes a human health and safety benefit to the future residents.

Community Character

As a result of the topographic realities along Gonowabie, numerous residences have received setback variances to allow for their construction. It was even discussed during a Washoe County Area Plan meeting, that perhaps Gonowabie should be exempt from variances as a result of the inherent need and site realities. Nearly all residences on the lakeside of Gonowabie road maintain a very similar design to what the Applicants are proposing. The common design includes a bridge from Gonowabie accessing a garage at street level with internal access to the residence. The Applicants proposal mimics the design and parking configuration as utilized by nearly all residences along Gonowabie.

No negative impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed variance. The parcels located directly across the street from the Subject Parcel are single-family residential parcels. As a result of the grade
change, the proposed variance will have no impact to the existing views from the residences located across the street.

The abutting parcels to the north (proposed) and south (existing) are single family dwellings. As the attached photo packet represents, the proposed variance will not impact the current enjoyed views by the neighbors. The view corridors for the abutting residence are focused away from the proposed garage and toward the lake. The approval of the variance will ensure that the proposed 460 residence does not block any existing view. If the Applicant was forced to adhere to required setbacks, it would push the garage further down the slope and this would impact the neighboring views. The granting of this variance will ensure that existing view corridors are maintained. In addition, the proposed variance will have no impact on the neighbors’ privacy or have any impact on safety.

Conclusion

As discussed throughout this document, the Subject Parcel maintains a hardship as a result of the steep slope of the parcel and unique parcel configuration. The proposed design of the garage is consistent with nearly all residence along Gonowable Road and will bring the existing residence more into conformance with the character of the area. The proposed variance will ensure that the garage will not be pushed down the slope of the parcel, blocking existing view corridors and will instead maintain the existing view corridors for the abutting parcels

The granting of the proposed variance will allowing for the proposed garage and attached residence to be constructed closer to the road and further away from the Shoreline, which is a TRPA established environmental benefit. The flat ingress/egress that would be achievable by the granting of the variance would provide safer ingress/egress to the residence. Finally, numerous parcels along Gonowable have obtained variances due to the unique nature of the Road. The granting of this variance would align and be consistent with other variance approval on Gonowable. Utilizing this rationale, we would request that Washoe County staff recommend approval of the proposed variance.
I trust the above (and attached) is acceptable. If you require any additional information, or have any further questions/comments, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Nicholas D. Exline  
Senior Planner, AICP

Enc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Original Owner Affidavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Copies Owner Affidavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Original Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Application Copies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Submittal Fee ($1,546)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Title Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Proof of Tax Payment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Plan Set (24&quot; – 36&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Plan Set (8.5&quot; – 11&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Photo Packet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Bill Detail**

**Pay By Check**

Please make checks payable to:  
WASHOE COUNTY TREASURER  

**Mailing Address:**  
P.O. Box 30039  
Reno, NV 89520-3039

**Overnight Address:**  
1001 E. Ninth St., Ste D140  
Reno, NV 89512-2845

**Change of Address**

All requests for a mailing address change must be submitted in writing, including a signature (unless using the online form).

To submit your address change online click here

---

### Washoe County Parcel Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel ID</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Last Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12313104</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>12/9/2019 2:07:59 AM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Current Owner:**  
GONOWABIE PROPERTIES LLC  
PO BOX 14001-174  
KETCHUM, ID 83340

**Situs:**  
460 GONOWABIE RD  
CRYSTAL BAY NV

**Taxing District**  
5200

**Geo CD:**

### Legal Description

Lot 5 Block 13 Range 18 SubdivisionName _UNSPECIFIED Township 16 Section 19

---

### Installments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Tax Year</th>
<th>Tax</th>
<th>Penalty/Fee</th>
<th>Interest</th>
<th>Total Due</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INST 1</td>
<td>8/19/2019</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INST 2</td>
<td>10/7/2019</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INST 3</td>
<td>1/6/2020</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$1,500.70</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1,500.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INST 4</td>
<td>3/2/2020</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$1,500.70</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1,500.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Due: | $3,001.40 |
| Total Due: | $3,001.40 |
Approx. 33% Slope
Parcel Irregularity
Located below existing View corridor Across the Street
The meeting involved a variance request for 460 Gonowabie in Crystal Bay.

Two neighbors spoke during public comments. They requested an extension to allow the neighbors and the parcel owner to discuss issues and potentially reach a compromise. The holiday time did not allow them time to review the plans in detail. The Planner indicated this can not be done and that notices are merely a courtesy. The Planner clarified that only the applicant can request an extension.

The Planner did not explain why this variance created a hardship.

We learned the home is nearly 5800 sq. ft. in size with 5 bedrooms. One of the rooms is a “bunk room”.

The utility easements have not been identified. The public lake access easement was not identified on the plans.

A member of the audience, Wayne Ford, clarified for the Planner that the required setback for this parcel is NOT 20’, but is 15’ because it is an interior lot. This correction should be made before presenting to other Boards. The Planner reluctantly agreed the required setback for this parcel is 15’, not 20’.

I do not view this has a hardship. They driveway and home could be moved back and adhere to the setback of 15’. As stated by the neighbors, there is no negative impact on the neighboring views should the home be located further back on the property.

Had there been a vote, I would have voted against the variance request. If there is an issue with the slope should the home be moved back to adhere to the setback requirement, the home could be reduced in size.