

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

TRANSCRIPT MINUTES

CITY OF SPARKS PLANNING COMMISSION  
MEETING

Thursday, July 2, 2020  
6:00 p.m.

This meeting was held virtually  
pursuant to NRS 241.023 and  
State of Nevada Declaration of Emergency Directive 006  
(In-person attendance was not available)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

A P P E A R A N C E S

Commission Members Present:

- Shelley Read, Chair
- Frank Petersen, Vice Chair
- David Blaco
- Scott Carey
- Evan Pritsos
- Mike Rawson
- Dian VanderWell

Staff Present:

- Alyson McCormick  
Assistant City Attorney
- Armando Ornelas  
Assistant Community Services Director
- Sienna Reid, AICP  
Planner Senior
- Casey Martinez  
Office Assistant  
Community Services Department

Other Participants:

- Mike Railey, Christi Corporation
- Blake Smith, Jr., 5 Ridges Development Company
- Blake Smith, Sr., 5 Ridges Development Company
- Bradley Paul Elley (letter)
- Mike Eastman
- Dan Flannagan
- Roc Cole

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

I N D E X

ITEM	PAGE
1. CALL TO ORDER	5
2. ROLL CALL	5
3. PUBLIC COMMENT	6
4. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA (For Possible Action)	6
5. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:	
Review and possible approval of the minutes of the June 2, 2020 Planning Commission Study Session (For Possible Action)	7
Review and possible approval of the minutes of the June 4, 2020 Planning Commission Meeting (For Possible Action)	8
PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS:	
6. PCN19-0040 - Consideration of and possible action on requests for a site 28.81 acres in size within a larger parcel 386.87 acres in size generally located at 555 Highland Ranch Parkway, Sparks, Nevada, to:	10
MPA20-0001 - Amend the Comprehensive Plan land use designation from approximately 13.81 acres of Intermediate Density Residential (IDR) and approximately 15.00 acres of Commercial (C) to 28.81 acres of Multi-Family Residential (MF14) (For Possible Action); and	50
RZ20-0001 - Rezone approximately 13.81 acres from SF6 (Single-Family Residential 6,000 sq. ft. lots) to MF2 (Multi-Family	

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

Residential) and approximately 15.00 acres  
from C2 (General Commercial) to MF2  
(Multi-Family Residential)  
(For Possible Action);

54

7. PCN19-0040 - Consideration of and possible  
action on requests for a site generally located  
at 555 Highland Ranch Parkway, Sparks, Nevada,  
to:

56

DA20-0001 - Amend the Development Agreement  
between City of Sparks, QK, LLC, and 5 Ridges  
Development Company, Inc., to add 34.71 acres  
to a site approximately 386.87 acres in size,  
thereby increasing the size of the site to  
421.58 acres (For Possible Action);

89

ANX20-0002 - Annex into the City of Sparks a  
site 34.71 acres in size. Upon annexation  
the parcel shall convert from a Washoe County  
zoning designation of GR (General Rural) to

a

City of Sparks zoning designation of A-40  
(Agriculture) (For Possible Action);

90

MPA20-0003 - Amend the Comprehensive Plan  
land use designation from approximately 34.71  
acres of Rural (Washoe County Designation) to  
approximately 10.00 acres of Intermediate  
Density Residential (IDR) and 24.71 acres of  
Open Space (OS) (For Possible Action);

92

RZ20-0002 - Rezone approximately 34.71 acres  
from A-40 (Agriculture) to approximately  
10.00 acres SF6 (Single-Family Residential,  
6,000 sq. ft. lots) and 24.71 acres A-5  
(Agriculture) (For Possible Action); and

94

Sponsor an amendment to the 2019 Truckee  
Meadows Regional Plan for a site 34.71 acres  
in size to change the Regional Land  
Designation from RA (Rural Area) to Tier 2  
Land and amend the boundaries of the Truckee  
Meadows Service Area and the City of Sparks

1	Sphere of Influence to include the site. (For Possible Action)	96
2		
3	GENERAL BUSINESS:	
3	There are no General Business items.	99
4	8. PUBLIC COMMENT	99
5	9. ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM STAFF AND COMMISSIONERS	100
6	10. ADJOURNMENT	102
7	SPARKS, NEVADA, THURSDAY, JULY 2, 2020, 6:00 P.M.	
8		
8	-oOo-	
9	CHAIRMAN READ: Okay. I've got 6:00 o'clock.	
10	So I'm going to call the meeting to order.	
11	And, first off, Casey, can you please provide	
12	the call-in information on public comment?	
13	MS. MARTINEZ: Yes. So the telephone number is	
14	1-669-900-8 -- or I'm sorry -- 6833, and the meeting ID	
15	number is 962 4203 7566.	
16	CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you. And can we please	
17	have a roll call?	
18	MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Read?	
19	CHAIRMAN READ: Here.	
20	MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Petersen?	
21	COMMISSIONER PETERSEN: Here.	
22	MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Blaco?	
23	COMMISSIONER BLACO: Here.	
24	MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Carey?	

1 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Present.

2 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Pritsos?

3 COMMISSIONER PRITSOS: Here.

4 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Rawson?

5 COMMISSIONER RAWSON: Present.

6 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner VanderWell?

7 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Here.

8 MS. MARTINEZ: Assistant City Attorney Alyson  
9 McCormick?

10 MS. MCCORMICK: Here.

11 MS. MARTINEZ: Assistant Community Services  
12 Director Armando Ornelas?

13 MR. ORNELAS: Here.

14 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

15 So we're going to open it up for public comment  
16 on any item on or off the agenda.

17 Do we have any callers waiting to comment?

18 MS. MARTINEZ: So if you are calling in, press  
19 star 9 to request to speak.

20 And as of right now, we don't have anybody.  
21 Would we like to read the email now or at the agenda  
22 item?

23 CHAIRMAN READ: Let's, if it's for a specific  
24 agenda item, let's hold off and read it for that item.

1 MS. MARTINEZ: I don't see any other callers  
2 wishing to speak at this time.

3 CHAIRMAN READ: Okay. So let's close public  
4 comment and move on to the approval of the agenda.

5 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Madam Chair,  
6 Commissioner VanderWell. I move to approve the agenda.

7 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

8 COMMISSIONER BLACO: Commissioner Blaco. I'll  
9 second.

10 CHAIRMAN READ: We have a motion by  
11 Commissioner VanderWell and a second by Commissioner  
12 Blaco. Can we do a roll call vote?

13 MS. MARTINEZ: Sorry. Commissioner Read?

14 CHAIRMAN READ: Aye.

15 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Petersen?

16 COMMISSIONER PETERSEN: Aye.

17 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Blaco?

18 COMMISSIONER BLACO: Aye.

19 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Carey?

20 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Aye.

21 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Pritsos?

22 COMMISSIONER PRITSOS: Aye.

23 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Rawson?

24 COMMISSIONER RAWSON: Aye.

1 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner VanderWell?

2 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Aye.

3 CHAIRMAN READ: Okay. Passes unanimously.

4 Next is approval of the minutes. First is the  
5 review and possible approval of the minutes of the  
6 June 2nd, 2020 Planning Commission Study Session.

7 COMMISSIONER BLACO: I'll make a motion.

8 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Madam Chair,  
9 Commissioner VanderWell. I move to approve the minutes  
10 of the June 2nd, 2020 Planning Commission Study Session.

11 COMMISSIONER BLACO: Commissioner Blaco.  
12 Second.

13 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

14 I have a motion by Commissioner VanderWell and  
15 a second by Commissioner Blaco. Can I please have a  
16 roll call vote?

17 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Read?

18 CHAIRMAN READ: Aye.

19 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Petersen?

20 COMMISSIONER PETERSEN: Aye.

21 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Blaco?

22 COMMISSIONER BLACO: Aye.

23 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Carey?

24 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Aye.



1 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Pritsos?  
2 COMMISSIONER PRITSOS: Aye.  
3 MS. MARTINEZ: And Commissioner Rawson?  
4 COMMISSIONER RAWSON: Aye.  
5 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner VanderWell?  
6 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Aye.  
7 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you. Passes unanimously.  
8 Second is the review and possible approval of  
9 the minutes of the June 4th, 2020 Planning Commission  
10 meeting. Can I get a motion?  
11 COMMISSIONER BLACO: I'll make a motion.  
12 Commissioner Blaco. I make a motion to approve the  
13 minutes of the June 4th Planning Commission meeting.  
14 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.  
15 COMMISSIONER RAWSON: Commissioner Rawson will  
16 second it.  
17 CHAIRMAN READ: Okay. We have a motion by  
18 Commissioner Blaco and a second by Commissioner Rawson.  
19 Can we have a roll call vote?  
20 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Read?  
21 CHAIRMAN READ: Aye.  
22 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Petersen?  
23 COMMISSIONER PETERSEN: Aye.  
24 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Blaco?

1 COMMISSIONER BLACO: Aye.  
2 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Carey?  
3 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Aye.  
4 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Pritsos?  
5 COMMISSIONER PRITSOS: Aye.  
6 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Rawson?  
7 COMMISSIONER RAWSON: Aye.  
8 MS. MARTINEZ: And Commissioner VanderWell?  
9 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Aye.  
10 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you. The motion passes  
11 unanimately.

12 Next is our public hearing items. First is  
13 PCN19-0040, consideration of and possible action on two  
14 requests for at site at 555 Highland Ranch Parkway. The  
15 first request is MPA20-0001 to amend the Comprehensive  
16 Plan land use designation. And the second is RZ20-0001,  
17 which is to rezone Single-Family Residential to  
18 Multi-Family Residential and rezone General Commercial  
19 to Multi-Family Residential.

20 MS. REID: All right. Thank you, Madam Chair  
21 and members of the Commission. For the record, Sienna  
22 Reid with the Planning Division presenting the first of  
23 two agenda items associated with the Five Ridges project  
24 tonight.

1           Before I get going, I do want to check in  
2 really quick and just ensure that you can see the full  
3 slides and that the audio, in terms of what you are  
4 hearing, is good.

5           CHAIRMAN READ: Yes, we can see it and hear  
6 you.

7           MS. REID: Okay. Perfect. Well, I'll go ahead  
8 and get going. So before you for consideration as part  
9 of this agenda item are two requests. The first is a  
10 Comprehensive Plan land use amendment, and the second is  
11 a rezoning request.

12           As you're likely familiar, the Five Ridges  
13 project site currently consists of one parcel almost 387  
14 acres in size. It's located northwest of the  
15 intersection of Pyramid Way and Highland Ranch Parkway.  
16 And the Comprehensive Plan land use amendment and  
17 rezoning request for this agenda item are each located  
18 within this larger parcel.

19           In terms of background, development of the site  
20 that was just shown on the previous slide was initially  
21 approved about two years ago, in July of 2018.  
22 Entitlement requests approved at that time included a  
23 development agreement, annexation, Comprehensive Plan  
24 land use amendment, and rezoning requests.

1           The development agreement permitted a minimum  
2 of 1,200 and a maximum of 1,800 dwelling units within  
3 that project area, as well as commercial or multi-family  
4 development along Highland Ranch Parkway.

5           Subsequently, in February of this year, an  
6 amendment to the development agreement was also  
7 approved. Modifications to the agreement at that time  
8 resulted from further analysis of the site and land and  
9 infrastructure plans by the master developer. While  
10 there were various changes made to address ownership,  
11 clarify permitted residential uses, address previously  
12 disturbed land and then further modify the timing and  
13 scope of infrastructure improvements, it's important to  
14 note that the number of permitted residential units did  
15 not change with that first amendment.

16           And so per this current agreement that's in  
17 place, entitlement requests to allow for the development  
18 of duplex or townhome uses do not require an amendment  
19 of that agreement, provided that the total number of  
20 dwelling units complies with the permitted units.

21           At this time, the master developer is seeking  
22 to develop duplex and townhome units and has submitted  
23 Comprehensive Plan use amendment and rezoning requests  
24 that will enable those uses.

1           Moving on, existing and proposed Comprehensive  
2 Plan land use designations are shown on this slide. And  
3 as you can see, on the right-hand portion of the slide,  
4 the Multi-Family Residential 14, or MF14, land use  
5 designation, which is the blue-green color, is proposed  
6 for two areas within the greater Five Ridges project  
7 site; 15 acres located to the north of Highland Ranch  
8 Parkway that are designated Commercial and 13.81 acres  
9 generally within the center of the Five Ridges project  
10 site that are designated Intermediate Density  
11 Residential, or IDR, would change to the proposed MF14  
12 land use designation.

13           And should the Comprehensive Plan land use  
14 amendment be approved, a total of 28.81 acres, which I  
15 placed here approximately 7.4 percent of the current  
16 Five Ridges project area, would be designated MF14. The  
17 remainder of the Five Ridges project area would retain  
18 the existing IDR land use designation that is shown in  
19 beige.

20           The associated rezoning requests apply to those  
21 same two areas that you can see on this slide. The 15  
22 acres zoned C2 along Highland Ranch Parkway and the  
23 13.81 acres zoned SF6, generally within the center of  
24 the Five Ridges project site, would each be rezoned to

1 MF2, which supports a maximum of 14 dwelling units per  
2 acre and allows for a wider range of residential uses  
3 compared to single-family zoning districts.

4 This slide gives the Commission a general sense  
5 of the Comprehensive Plan land use amendment and  
6 rezoning requests in relation to the conceptual land  
7 plan for Five Ridges. And this is the land plan dated  
8 November of 2019. The 15-acre portion of the site  
9 adjacent to Highland Ranch Parkway is generally located  
10 within Five Ridges Village 1, and then the 13.81-acre  
11 portion of the site is generally within Village 5 in the  
12 center of the site.

13 Shifting gears here to findings, so findings  
14 for both the Comprehensive Plan land use amendment and  
15 rezoning requests under consideration tonight have been  
16 grouped by topic. These topics include conformance and  
17 consistency, compatibility and public notice.  
18 Conformance and consistency findings address conformance  
19 of the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan and consistency  
20 with the City of Sparks Comprehensive Plan.

21 So first off here, Finding CP1 for the  
22 Comprehensive Plan land use change requires the request  
23 to conform with the land use and intensity designation  
24 in the Regional Plan.

1           Here the entire Five Ridges project site has a  
2 Tier 2 land designation, and it's also located within  
3 the Truckee Meadows Service Area, or TMSA.

4           Residential density for Tier 2 lands is limited  
5 to 30 dwelling units per acre per the Regional Plan.  
6 And the proposed Multi-Family Residential 14 land use  
7 designation allows for a density range of 10 to less  
8 than 14 dwelling units an acre, which is below and  
9 certainly in compliance with the Tier 2 maximum density  
10 standard.

11           In addition, portions of the 28.81 acres  
12 proposed to change the MF14 land use designation are  
13 also identified as development constrained for the  
14 Regional Plan, and this is due to the presence of slopes  
15 of 30 percent or greater. The Comprehensive Plan  
16 encourages preservation of such slopes, and the Sparks  
17 Municipal Code requires a two-to-one ratio of  
18 nonconstrained land be preserved as open space for all  
19 areas with slopes over 30 percent that are developed.  
20 And that is to implement the Regional Plan policies for  
21 development constrained area.

22           Per Finding CP2, the Comprehensive Plan land  
23 use amendment must implement the goals of the  
24 Comprehensive Plan.

1           And then Finding Z1 for the zoning requires the  
2 rezoning request also be consistent with the  
3 Comprehensive Plan.

4           As discussed in previous slides, the request  
5 before you tonight would apply that MF14 land use  
6 designation and MF2 zoning district to a total of 21.81  
7 acres.

8           And the application of this land use and the  
9 zoning district supports high-density single-family and  
10 low-density multi-family housing products such as  
11 townhomes and duplexes commonly referred to as missing  
12 middle housing. These housing types offer alternative  
13 options to detached single-family homes and can provide  
14 home ownership opportunities at lower price points.

15           For these reasons, the Comprehensive Plan land  
16 use amendment and associated rezoning request supports  
17 not only Goal H2 of the Comprehensive Plan, but also  
18 Policies CF8 and H2 that collectively encourage housing  
19 type diversity throughout the City.

20           In response to a question raised by  
21 Commissioner Carey during the Study Session, staff did  
22 go take a further look at the fiscal health analysis  
23 that was prepared for the City in 2019, in regards to  
24 the supply of land for residential uses for which the



1 intermediate, or excuse me, the MF14 land use  
2 designation falls into. And what we found was that this  
3 category falls into a density category that covers 7.27  
4 to 14.5 dwelling units per acre. And all lands  
5 designated IDR are included within that category.

6 And so it's important here to note that such  
7 lands accommodate detached single-family housing rather  
8 than a range of housing types that would be anticipated  
9 under the MF14 land use designation and associated MF2  
10 zoning district.

11 So in terms of that land use and zoning, those  
12 designations certainly more clearly support housing type  
13 diversity with allowed uses that include not only  
14 single-family detached housing, but duplex and  
15 multi-family uses. And then the minimum density of 12  
16 dwelling units per acre that's required per the MF2 zone  
17 also helps to support a higher density and more diverse  
18 housing product.

19 Also, the proposed request would remove the  
20 opportunity for a wide variety of commercial uses to  
21 establish at the entrance of the Five Ridges project  
22 site. However, future commercial use opportunities do  
23 exist in close proximity. These include commercial  
24 designated lands located to the south side of Highland

1 Ranch Parkway and then also within the Kiley Ranch North  
2 planned development on both the west and east sides of  
3 Pyramid Way.

4 Taking a look into that long-term fiscal health  
5 analysis as it relates to employment lands, that  
6 analysis shows a supply for retail uses that exceeds  
7 forecasted land by about 266 acres.

8 So noting this, the proposed request would not  
9 adversely impact the supply of land for commercial uses  
10 and does comply with Policy MG4 that supports an  
11 adequate supply of land for employment generating uses.

12 And then, lastly, in regards to steep slopes,  
13 it is important to note that those are present within  
14 the Five Ridges project site and on portions of the site  
15 where land use and rezoning requests are proposed.

16 And so here the Comprehensive Plan, as briefly  
17 discussed, has encouraged the preservation of slopes and  
18 other unique geological features but could also further  
19 reduce this land area that can be disturbed as that  
20 slope increases. And, further, the development  
21 agreement requires compliance with those regulations for  
22 naturally occurring slopes and limits the total area to  
23 be cleared, graded or otherwise disturbed to 267 acres.

24 Shifting here to the fiscal impact of the

1 requests before you tonight, an updated fiscal impact  
2 analysis was provided with these requests. It is --  
3 request. It was assuming 1,220 residential units and no  
4 commercial space for an expanded site that totals just a  
5 bit over 421 acres. The previous fiscal impact analysis  
6 that was dated June of 2018 assumed 1,223 residential  
7 units, so fairly similar there, but it also assumed a  
8 bit over 141,000 square feet of general commercial  
9 space.

10           So due to the removal of that commercial space  
11 and expansion of the site area, the updated fiscal  
12 impact analysis does increase the length of roadways  
13 that are projected to be dedicated to the City by about  
14 200,000 square feet. Noting those changes, the analysis  
15 estimates the fiscal impact to the City would produce a  
16 positive fiscal impact of approximately \$700,000 over  
17 the 20-year analysis period.

18           With regards to infrastructure and facilities  
19 and those policies in the Comprehensive Plan, the  
20 development agreement specifies the timing and scope of  
21 improvements needed to provide City services at  
22 acceptable service levels. Roadway and intersection  
23 improvements, secondary access, sewer collection, system  
24 improvements, water transmission facilities and

1 improvements, and flood control and drainage  
2 improvements are identified to serve between 1,200 and  
3 1,800 total units.

4           In support of the current request, the  
5 applicant provided an updated trip generation letter as  
6 well as sewer and water studies analyzing development of  
7 the Five Ridges project site was solely residential  
8 development. That trip generation letter finds trips  
9 associated with 1,220 units will result in traffic  
10 impacts of less than or similar to the trips initially  
11 analyzed in 2017. The sewer study finds the existing  
12 sanitary sewer mains, trunk mains and interceptors have  
13 available capacity to serve anticipated residential  
14 units. And that study was taking a specific look at  
15 1,241 units.

16           So here it's important to note that should  
17 development exceed 1,650 equivalent residential units,  
18 the agreement does set forth sanitary sewer collection  
19 system upsizing at that point in time.

20           Also provided was the preliminary water service  
21 study assessing the ability of the Sun Valley General  
22 Improvement District to supply the water to the  
23 Five Ridges project site. That included associated  
24 costs.

1           And here really what's important to note is the  
2 agreement does require the master developer to construct  
3 all on- and off-site water facilities.

4           So with the agreement in place and the updated  
5 fiscal impact analysis, it is staff's view that the  
6 request complies with Policies MG5 and CF1 that address  
7 the fiscal implications to provide public services and  
8 the provision of City services at acceptable service  
9 levels.

10           Moving on with this slide to findings that  
11 relate to compatibility, here we have Finding CP3 for  
12 the Comprehensive Plan land use and Finding Z2 for the  
13 rezoning, each looking at how the requests are  
14 compatible with surrounding land uses.

15           So for the requests associated with the 15  
16 acres located to the north of Highland Ranch Parkway,  
17 the MF14 land use designation would serve as a  
18 transition between commercial designated lands located  
19 to the south and east and the IDR designated lands  
20 located to the north and west. The associated rezoning  
21 from C2 to MF2, noting that it's a conforming zoning  
22 district, would likewise serve as a buffer between  
23 single-family uses in the SF6 zone to the north and  
24 future commercial uses that can establish to the east in

1 the Kiley Ranch North planned development as well as the  
2 C2 zone to the south of Highland Ranch Parkway.

3 For the requests in the center of the Five  
4 Ridges project site, changing the land use and zoning as  
5 proposed is compatible with the surrounding IDR land use  
6 and SF6 zoning with a density range of six to less than  
7 10 dwelling units per acre. The IDR land use supports  
8 the highest density of single-family uses. And while  
9 the MF14 land use designation supports more varied  
10 housing types, the 10 to less than 14 dwelling units per  
11 acre density range is only moderately denser and is  
12 appropriate adjacent to that IDR land use designation.

13 In addition, application of the conforming MF2  
14 zone would, as has been discussed, permit a greater  
15 variety of residential uses than is allowed by the  
16 existing SF6 zoning. However, here it's important to  
17 note that the MF2 zoning is the lowest density  
18 multi-family residential zoning district, and the SF6  
19 zoning district is the highest density single-family  
20 residential zoning district available in the City of  
21 Sparks.

22 So the single-family, duplex and multi-family  
23 building uses permitted in the MF2 zone with that  
24 maximum density of 14 dwelling units per acre are

1 compatible adjacent to single-family uses that are  
2 permitted in the SF6 zone. And those can establish that  
3 that maximum density of 7.3 dwelling units per acre.

4 So here, findings that relate to public  
5 noticing, CP4 and Z3, each were to make sure that  
6 required public notice is given per state law and code.  
7 For both requests, the Planning Commission and City  
8 Council meetings do function as the public hearings.

9 And with the proposed comprehensive land use  
10 amendment, mailed notices for a neighborhood meeting  
11 were provided to all property owners at a minimum within  
12 750 feet of the site. That neighborhood meeting was  
13 conducted by the applicant's representative on June 8th  
14 of this year. And nine people attended that meeting.  
15 Those that did attend expressed concerns about  
16 development of the greater Five Ridges project area,  
17 including development of homes on ridgelines in a manner  
18 that would be visible from unincorporated properties to  
19 the north, traffic impacts, and impacts to groundwater  
20 due to the municipal wells.

21 And then, in addition, for the rezoning, mailed  
22 public notice was also provided at a minimum to all  
23 property owners within 750 feet. And both requests were  
24 published in the Reno Gazette-Journal for that notice by

1 publication.

2           And so, just to wrap it up here, for public  
3 comment, there is one public comment that Casey will  
4 read. It is in opposition to the request. But that is  
5 the only written correspondence that we've received, and  
6 I've received no calls on this particular item.

7           So with that, I'll go ahead and conclude my  
8 presentation and be available for questions at the  
9 appropriate time. Staff is recommending approval of the  
10 requested Comprehensive Plan land use amendment and  
11 rezoning request. And should the Commission need  
12 further slides, those will be available with  
13 recommendations later.

14           CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you, Sienna.

15           Do any of the Commissioners have questions for  
16 staff at this time?

17           Commissioner Carey.

18           COMMISSIONER CAREY: Thank you, Madam Chair. I  
19 had some other questions, but I'll wait till after the  
20 public comment. I just had a technical question.

21           Sienna, thanks for the additional info about my  
22 question from the -- about multi-family from the Study  
23 Session.

24           I think, where I was kind of going with that



1 question, I was more interested in seeing if we have  
2 enough acreage for that multi-family around the 10  
3 dwelling units per acre within the city. I know in the  
4 staff report you justify the recommendation of approval  
5 that there's enough commercial that's planned for within  
6 the City to handle that 20-year period. I was wondering  
7 what you were able to find out in terms of acreages if  
8 there is enough multi-family that is planned for in the  
9 City around that 10 dwelling units per acre.

10           When I looked through the study, it was  
11 something like that that study projected that there was  
12 3,050 units that was the demand, and that would take up  
13 305 acres of multi-family land uses. I was just curious  
14 with if we have enough multi-family land uses in our  
15 Comprehensive Plan.

16           MS. REID: Well, to go ahead and respond to  
17 your question, Commissioner Carey, I mean you're correct  
18 in terms of looking at the long-term fiscal health  
19 analysis. I think, what's important to note is that the  
20 10 dwelling units per acre that you're referencing, that  
21 particular density falls within a category in terms of  
22 that analysis that encompasses high-density  
23 single-family and low-density multi-family. So it is  
24 spanning, as I mentioned, 7.27 to 14.5 dwelling units

1 per acre.

2           The other categories that are of higher density  
3 are firmly multi-family. So moderate density gets up to  
4 14.5 to 30, and then higher density is above 30. So we  
5 do have adequate supplies of land designated for those  
6 moderate density multi-family and high density  
7 multi-family categories per the study. But teasing out  
8 kind of the proportion of single-family versus  
9 multi-family within the high-density single-family,  
10 slash, low-density multi-family categories is quite  
11 difficult. And so that's why I really wanted to note,  
12 in kind of responding to your question, that the entire  
13 IDR land use designation is classified in that  
14 particular category.

15           And with zoning districts, SF6 and SF7 that  
16 conform, there's definitely single-family product that  
17 is included in that land supply. And so to the extent  
18 that you have, you know, conforming MF2 zoning to the  
19 MF14 land use, the City does have, you know, some MF2  
20 zoning. There's also a lot of flexibility in the  
21 planned unit development. So it's difficult to say  
22 exactly what is the total supply that's going to  
23 accommodate just multi-family development, because with  
24 that flexibility, you might not be getting multi-family

1 development, you might not be getting a duplex or even a  
2 townhome on that kind of attached single-family side of  
3 things.

4           So even that flexibility, it's difficult to say  
5 exactly what the acreage demand is and isn't. Within  
6 that category, there are 383 net acres identified as  
7 available. But, again, I think, what's important with  
8 the MF2 zoning is that it's standard zoning. It doesn't  
9 necessarily allow for a lack of a minimum density. It  
10 does have that 12 dwelling units per acre. So, you  
11 know, assuming development were to proceed forward under  
12 an MF2 zone, you would actually have a higher density  
13 product, whether that's attached single-family, small  
14 lot single-family or, say, a duplex.

15           COMMISSIONER CAREY: May I have one quick  
16 follow-up, Madam Chair?

17           CHAIRMAN READ: Go ahead, Commissioner Carey.

18           COMMISSIONER CAREY: Thank you.

19           And I appreciate that. And I understand. It's  
20 not an apples-to-apples comparison. I get what you're  
21 saying with the zoning, and it's different than with the  
22 land uses. And how that city kind of broke them out, it  
23 was a little bit weird.

24           So you're generally saying, just so I

1 understand it, that there is enough of this type of  
2 density or type of product that's proposed with this  
3 land use change within our Comprehensive Plan that's on  
4 the books and is out there within the City. I was  
5 just --

6 MS. REID: There's 383 acres identified as  
7 surplus for the density category that spans high-density  
8 single-family and low-density multi-family. There is no  
9 guarantee that you would get a wide range of diverse  
10 housing products given that the lower end of that  
11 density category includes SF6 and SF7 zoning.

12 So I would say that the MF2 zoning, I think,  
13 does support higher density and more diverse housing  
14 types.

15 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Thank you, Sienna. Thank  
16 you, Madam Chair.

17 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

18 Any other questions for staff?

19 All right. Casey, is the applicant on the  
20 call?

21 MS. MARTINEZ: They are. And I will allow them  
22 to speak now.

23 CHAIRMAN READ: Okay.

24 MR. MIKE RAILEY: Good evening. Can you hear

1 me?

2 CHAIRMAN READ: Yes.

3 MR. MIKE RAILEY: Good evening. For the  
4 record, Mike Railey with Christy Corporation. Also on  
5 the call is Blake Smith and Blake Smith, Jr. with  
6 Five Ridges Development company.

7 I think, Sienna did an excellent job going  
8 through the requests and the findings. I know it tends  
9 to sound fairly complicated from an entitlement  
10 perspective, but in reality this is a fairly simple  
11 request just to rezone and redesignate those two, two  
12 areas to the multi-family zoning and designation which  
13 will really allow for some diversification in the  
14 housing types that are offered within Five Ridges, allow  
15 for some increased higher density and attached  
16 single-family uses. So we think it's a fairly simple  
17 request. I know it sounds fairly complicated when you  
18 read through all the literature. But in reality, it  
19 really is fairly simple.

20 So we're happy to address any questions you  
21 might have and are available any time you need us.

22 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you, Mike.

23 Do any of the Commissioners have questions for  
24 the applicant?

1 Commissioner Carey.

2 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Thank you, Madam Chair.

3 Just a quick question, Mike. Why are you  
4 proposing the M2 zoning for this project as opposed to  
5 higher density zoning that's allowed under the MF14 land  
6 use?

7 MR. MIKE RAILEY: So that's a good question.  
8 The M2, if you look at what the minimum density  
9 requirements are, in order to allow for like a duplex or  
10 a townhome-type unit, the M2 is really the best suited  
11 for that in order to make sure that we can meet those  
12 minimum density requirements, rather than set -- for  
13 example, the C2 was a minimum, I believe it's 34 units  
14 per acre. Which there's no way you can meet that  
15 density with a townhome, for example.

16 So it gives us a little bit more flexibility in  
17 providing some attached single-family products.

18 COMMISSIONER CAREY: All right. Thank you,  
19 Madam Chair.

20 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

21 Any further questions for the applicant?

22 Seeing none, I'll open it up for public comment  
23 on this item.

24 Casey, can you please repeat the call-in

1 information, and you can go ahead and read the public  
2 comment email that was received as well.

3 MS. MARTINEZ: The telephone number for call-in  
4 participation is 1-669-900-6833, and the meeting ID  
5 number is 962 4203 7566, and you'll press star 9 to  
6 request to speak.

7 We have one emailed comment for this.

8 MS. MCCORMICK: Madam Chair.

9 CHAIRMAN READ: Of course.

10 MS. MCCORMICK: Before Casey gets started, for  
11 the record, this is Alyson McCormick. This is two  
12 separate items, and each of them does require a separate  
13 public hearing.

14 CHAIRMAN READ: Okay. So. So the first one  
15 will be for the Comprehensive Plan Land Use amendment  
16 request.

17 MS. MCCORMICK: Correct.

18 CHAIRMAN READ: Okay.

19 MS. MARTINEZ: Members of the Sparks Planning  
20 Commission, as a beneficial owner of an adjoining  
21 property, APN08344030, in the legal name of my IRA  
22 account, Equity Trust Company, and on behalf of another  
23 adjoining lot owned by Pyramid West Vistas, LLC,  
24 APN08344031, as its attorney, we oppose the granting of

1 the proposed amendment to the Comprehensive Plan,  
2 MPA20-0001, and the proposed rezoning, RZ20-0001. The  
3 request is inconsistent with the stated purposes of  
4 Title 20 zoning and land use controls of the City of  
5 Sparks Municipal Code.

6 The granting of the application would not be  
7 consistent as applied to this development, which is  
8 really spot zoning. Spot zoning such as this was  
9 prohibited by the Nevada Supreme Court in Enterprise  
10 Citizens vs. Clark County Commissioners, 112 Nevada 649,  
11 918, in 1996. This should be undisputed that the added  
12 congestion in increased density of dwelling units would  
13 be injurious to public health, safety or welfare or  
14 injurious to property, including mine, or improvements  
15 of the vicinity.

16 Common sense dictates that the increase in  
17 population density will bring with it increase in crime,  
18 pollution, noise, sanitation, additional road  
19 congestion, and loss of quality of life in general.  
20 Recall from previous meetings that about the Five Ridges  
21 project that the idea in approving this project was to  
22 avoid another bedroom community by having a mix of  
23 commercial property where the occupants could live and  
24 work rather than adding to the already unsafe traffic



1 for commuters.

2           It cannot be seriously argued that granting the  
3 major deviation is unnecessary for and would be  
4 antiethical to the preservation and enjoyment of a  
5 property right possessed by other property owners in the  
6 same vicinity and land use district, and it is not  
7 denied to the property for which the major deviation is  
8 sought. This is especially true where the adjoining  
9 properties annexed to the City of Sparks, including  
10 mine, have a three-unit per acre subdivision zoning  
11 restriction instead of this much smaller  
12 6,000-square-foot silver lot limitation and now even  
13 greater urban sprawl density of 14 units per acre. Many  
14 adjoining parcels, including mine, have much steeper  
15 slopes than the applicant's.

16           Finally, granting the major deviation would  
17 constitute a spot zoning special privilege inconsistent  
18 with the limitations upon other properties in the  
19 vicinity and land use district in which the property is  
20 located. A planned unit development is an alternative,  
21 could assure maximum build-out of this parcel.

22           Washoe County is in process of, if it has not  
23 already occurred, increasing the zoning for parcels  
24 within the City of Sparks Sphere of Influence to provide

1 for multi-acre residential units rather than the  
2 applicant's already approved shoe box 6,000-square-foot  
3 lots.

4 You have already given this developer much more  
5 than an inch. Now it wants to take the proverbial mile.  
6 It is respectfully requested that the application and  
7 its subparts be denied outright.

8 Thank you.

9 And that's from Bradley Paul Elley.

10 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you. Are there any other  
11 callers for this item?

12 MS. MARTINEZ: We have two requests to speak.  
13 One, the one we're going to start with, has a 707 area  
14 code. And I have allowed them to speak now.

15 MR. MIKE EASTMAN: Can you hear me?

16 CHAIRMAN READ: Yes.

17 MR. MIKE EASTMAN: Okay. Good. My name is  
18 Mike Eastman. I live on the north side of the Ridge  
19 complex.

20 CHAIRMAN READ: Hey, Mike, do you have a --

21 MR. MIKE EASTMAN: And I have two parts --

22 CHAIRMAN READ: You have an echo on your phone.

23 MR. MIKE EASTMAN: Is that better?

24 CHAIRMAN READ: Yes. And we'll give you extra

1 time if you need it.

2 MR. MIKE EASTMAN: This -- I hope you give me  
3 some leeway on a little bit of time, Because I've got  
4 two comments. One of them is, at the very beginning,  
5 Chair Read, you, when your assistant there started the  
6 call-in, gave us the call-in information, the call  
7 information, before I could get called in and get my  
8 item ID number in, we had already moved beyond public  
9 comment.

10 The second part of it would be that you didn't  
11 give us any agenda. So I have no access to an agenda,  
12 so I don't know when we're supposed to speak. On a  
13 previous Planning Commission meeting on Zoom, we  
14 attempted to call in, and there was never later a chance  
15 to call in again.

16 So I tried to get my comments in first, and you  
17 had moved beyond the public comment section before I  
18 could even finish dialing the numbers and punching in  
19 all the numbers applied.

20 The core of my concern, though, is that there's  
21 been no addressing -- if you take any part of this area  
22 and you add and switch from commercial to residential,  
23 and then you also take residential areas and make them  
24 more high density, no one has seemed to suggest how many

1 more, how much greater occupancy the entire land site  
2 can manage.

3           If I remember right, you've already approved  
4 and only approved 12 to 18 hundred units, or 12 to  
5 18 hundred families living in that area. And I don't  
6 see how it's possible that we can increase density on  
7 any one part or any two parts and convert commercial to  
8 residential without a further discussion of the overall  
9 greater numbers that would be allowed in the entire  
10 area. I understand, the developer is not proposing  
11 anything larger yet. But there's no way that he's not  
12 going to.

13           And I don't, I think, the previous caller was  
14 making reference to that as well, that we aren't just  
15 talking about 12 to 18 hundred now, we're trying to get  
16 in a back door for getting a whole lot more higher  
17 density on average than what it first sounded like we're  
18 going to.

19           Many of us on this side, on the north side  
20 remain adamantly opposed to any destruction, any effect  
21 on that ridge whatsoever. And I hope that you will back  
22 up just a little bit and once again consider whether you  
23 even want to destroy that ridge view like this whole  
24 project is going to.

1 Thank you for your time, and I will talk to you  
2 later.

3 CHAIRMAN READ: Okay. Thank you.

4 Do we have another caller for this item?

5 MS. MARTINEZ: We do have another caller. The  
6 first three numbers of their phone number is 376, and I  
7 have allowed them to speak now.

8 MR. DAN FLANNAGAN: Good evening, Commission  
9 members, Madam Chair and staff. My name is Dan  
10 Flannagan. I live not adjacent to the property, within  
11 a quarter mile, which I've lived for about the last 39  
12 years.

13 It didn't take long for this amendment to occur  
14 being that this approval just recently was completed. A  
15 couple questions that I have regarding this is, on item  
16 number one, the amendment to the -- this, the  
17 Comprehensive Plan, wouldn't that also require -- and, I  
18 guess, this is to Sienna -- wouldn't that also require  
19 an amendment to the Regional Plan?

20 Number two is the removal of commercial  
21 development within any area automatically creates more  
22 daily trips within any tributaries or main roads,  
23 because the people within the particular subdivision now  
24 have to travel a certain amount of distance. And has

1 there been any study on the amounts? And there's been  
2 no indication on the documents submitted so far the  
3 amount of timeline that the increased amount of mileage  
4 the people have to travel as opposed to the commercial  
5 development within their subdivision.

6           The other item is, is your required sprinkler  
7 system in, in the particular subdivision, the first  
8 phases, you're increasing the density in these first  
9 phases by these amendments. By increasing the density  
10 of those, doesn't it also require that, number one, that  
11 either the fire station get built, they also have to put  
12 sprinklers in, and/or one or the other. The other item  
13 is, the 650 average daily trips that are triggered by  
14 the increased density of the multi-family, that would  
15 require immediate improvements to Highland Ranch Parkway  
16 and the Pyramid Kiley Ranch, excuse me, Sparks Boulevard  
17 intersection.

18           And I'm very concerned, and I'm very opposed to  
19 the amount of density. Again, I've been out here for  
20 almost 40 years and have watched this kind of  
21 development. If you want to experience it, come out to  
22 our neck of the woods about between 3:30 and 6:00  
23 o'clock, even during the Covid event we're having, and  
24 you come see what the amount of traffic that's going to

1 be generated by an additional increased density of any  
2 part of this subdivision.

3 And my other final question is, is by adding  
4 the 34.71 acres, is the developer also required to  
5 staying within the maximum amount of 1,800 dwelling  
6 units that was originally approved?

7 Again, I oppose this. I believe, the Regional  
8 Plan amendment and the development agreement do not  
9 coincide with this increased density of this that is  
10 proposed under this particular request by the developer.

11 Thank you very much.

12 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

13 Casey, any other callers on the Comprehensive  
14 Plan?

15 MS. MARTINEZ: We do not have any other callers  
16 at this time.

17 CHAIRMAN READ: Okay. So I will close public  
18 comment on the Comprehensive Plan Land Use amendment and  
19 then open public comment for the rezoning request.

20 Do we have any callers for the rezoning  
21 request?

22 MS. MARTINEZ: We do not have any callers at  
23 this time. Ope, I apologize.

24 CHAIRMAN READ: Okay.

1 MS. MARTINEZ: There is one public comment. It  
2 is from the 376 phone number, and -- woops, 365 phone  
3 number. And you are able to speak now.

4 MR. MIKE EASTMAN: Yes, this is Mike Eastman  
5 again. Can you hear me?

6 CHAIRMAN READ: Yes.

7 MR. MIKE EASTMAN: Okay. Good. This is  
8 challenging, because I have to have one device open to  
9 watch you on TV and another device open to be able to  
10 make a phone call, and I've got to turn one off, I  
11 guess.

12 The rezoning is an -- not, I'm sorry, the  
13 rezoning. The addition of the 37 acres is something  
14 that is illusionary to me, because I'm not sure we've  
15 ever seen anything that says exactly what we're going to  
16 do with that. And I would encourage you guys to take a  
17 good look at how that extra 37 acres is going to be used  
18 and how much of that area can be used versus how much it  
19 will be used. I would really like to see a strong  
20 presentation from the developer exactly how that's going  
21 to be, including a map that overlays it. That would be  
22 very helpful.

23 That area that is being zoned is contiguous  
24 with BLM lands. And I want to also know if there's any



1 intention to allow access to that BLM land from their  
2 land right there, which will give a very, very massive  
3 amount of people access to these more pristine lands  
4 and, obviously, attribute to the dumping problems that  
5 were already occurring out there. It would be, seem to  
6 be a far better approach to not allow access to that  
7 area, but I'd like to know that, about that as well, how  
8 much of an impact it's going to be on this access to BLM  
9 lands.

10 That's all for now.

11 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

12 Casey, any other callers?

13 MS. MARTINEZ: We do have one additional  
14 caller, and their phone number begins with 376. And you  
15 are now able to speak.

16 MR. DAN FLANNAGAN: Hi again, folks. This is  
17 Dan. Just real quick. Can you hear me?

18 CHAIRMAN READ: Yes.

19 MR. DAN FLANNAGAN: Thank you.

20 You say on the rezoning -- I'm sorry.

21 Mr. Eastman, he was commenting on the 34 acres, which  
22 was an additional comment, which is lower, under  
23 PCN19-0040. I'm talking about RZ20-001, excuse me,  
24 0001. This is converting the SF6 to the -- it's not M2.

1 It's MF2. Multi-family residential is the correct  
2 titling for that.

3 The planning department and the amount of  
4 traffic study and documents that have been submitted so  
5 far have no indication, there's just a brief letter that  
6 it will be accommodated when this density is obviously  
7 increased substantially. It does not -- the  
8 neighborhood meeting we had, the other documents have  
9 been submitted, have been very insufficient on to  
10 discuss the amount of density changes, modifications,  
11 the road improvements, those other items that I  
12 mentioned earlier under MPA20-0001.

13 I believe, the overall Regional Plan and the  
14 plan amendment that was -- that Sienna mentioned, back  
15 in 2017, of the allowed acres does not pertain to where  
16 we are at today. The development agreement has been a  
17 vague and nebulous agreements that have been modified  
18 without public input. The last meeting we had with the  
19 City Council, Jim Rundle said, stated that there had  
20 been numerous amounts of public meetings and  
21 neighborhood meetings, and he had worked with Washoe  
22 County to amend the Spanish Springs, or West Spanish  
23 Springs area plan. This is simply false, and staff  
24 needs to look into it.

1           We need to, we, as local residents that are  
2 being impacted, we would like, and are respectfully  
3 requesting, the documentation of the notifications that  
4 occurred to the amendments of the West Spanish Springs  
5 area plan. Because I have talked to the County  
6 Commissioners from Washoe County. I've talked -- and,  
7 again, been here for almost 40 years. And I have had  
8 many discussions with everyone that's still been out  
9 here almost as long as I have. And we had no  
10 notification whatsoever to any amendments to the  
11 original plan that protected those ridgelines, as well  
12 as dictated the allotment.

13           I was originally on the subcommittee with  
14 Washoe County that created those designations for  
15 commercial, residential and other types of development  
16 in this area. And we were not notified. That is simply  
17 the cold, hard facts here. And that needs to be  
18 addressed.

19           And, again, thank you very much.

20           CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

21           Any other callers?

22           MS. MARTINEZ: We do have one additional  
23 caller. And the beginning of the phone number is 742.  
24 You are now able to speak.

1 MR. ROC COLE: Hi. My name is Roc Cole. And  
2 just to further the ridgeline discussion, there's some  
3 evidence that you guys have not heard.

4 I bought my parcel 28 years ago. And under the  
5 Sparks, or the Spanish Springs suitability area plan,  
6 the ridgeline was protected. In approximately 1998,  
7 Granite was trying to put a pit in that, in the parcel  
8 we're discussing. And it went through various meetings.  
9 And in the final meeting, one of the conditions were,  
10 and I'm going to read it to you:

11 "Additionally, Condition 14 says ridgelines  
12 shown as those to be protected on the development  
13 suitability map of the Spanish Springs area plan shall  
14 not be disturbed in any way. And in the Spanish Springs  
15 area plan, most of the ridges around this site are  
16 identified as ridges that are visible from Pyramid  
17 Highway and the valley and are not to be disturbed."

18 Then you took the parcel over. And in that, in  
19 2006, the five-year -- and I quote: "The five-year  
20 extension condition for this permit is hereby removed.  
21 This in no way removes the requirement of the hearing to  
22 reporting, review, and operating requirements contained  
23 in the article, aggregate facilities of the Washoe  
24 County development Code under Washoe County

1 jurisdiction. Applicant shall adhere to all  
2 requirements imposed by the City of Sparks when they  
3 assume responsibility for aggregate pit reviews."

4 In approximately a little over two years ago,  
5 when this thing came up as the Quarry, we were advised  
6 of a neighborhood meeting. And in that, in that  
7 document it said that you could call Mike Railey. I  
8 called Mike Railey, and he informed me that, "Don't  
9 worry," was his words, "Don't worry. The ridges and  
10 hillsides are too steep to build on. We're going to be  
11 building down in the bottom. And don't worry about  
12 that," and blah, blah, blah.

13 Over a dozen of my neighbors went to the  
14 meeting at the library. And Chris Darr was also there,  
15 Chris Dare, however you say it. And all of them came  
16 back with the same thing. And now it all came out in  
17 the neighborhood meeting for this a few weeks ago. And  
18 it was stated in the same thing, that the ridgelines,  
19 the hillsides, too steep, wouldn't be built on.

20 In their development agreement with you guys, and  
21 this is in writing, and I quote -- this is Policy  
22 RC23 -- "Require new development to preserve and protect  
23 significant natural amenities, unique features, i.e.  
24 rock outcroppings, drainageways and other natural

1 features." And they state, "The Quarry is unique,  
2 because it can provide for" --

3 (Public comment time limit sound.)

4 MR. ROC COLE: -- "in clay, type of development  
5 pattern that preserves ridgelines and focuses  
6 development in areas that were previously part of the  
7 aggregate quarry and are not suited for development."

8 So that, count them up. That's five times that  
9 we've been promised that this ridgeline would be  
10 protected. If you count your own hillside ordinance and  
11 look at that, it is a -- your own ordinance protects  
12 this.

13 How can you take that away from us? Where is  
14 your morals to do that to us residents, that five times  
15 we've been promised? Now, granted, one of them was just  
16 a spoof at a neighborhood meeting, a lie. But the other  
17 four are in writing and are documented. How can you  
18 take that away from us?

19 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you. Thank you, caller.

20 Casey, do we have any other callers for this  
21 item?

22 MS. MARTINEZ: There are no additional requests  
23 to speak.

24 CHAIRMAN READ: Okay. Thank you.

1           So I will close the public hearing for the  
2 rezoning request and open it up to any other questions  
3 or further discussion.

4           COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Madam Chair,  
5 Commissioner VanderWell. I have a question.

6           CHAIRMAN READ: Go ahead.

7           COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Sienna, I have a  
8 question. If you can please address the ridgeline.  
9 Because it's my understanding that what is before us  
10 tonight has nothing to do with ridgeline development, if  
11 anything.

12           MS. REID: The request before you tonight with  
13 this agenda item is for a Comprehensive Plan land use  
14 amendment and rezoning request. The locations of those  
15 requested changes, one is within the center of the  
16 Five Ridges project site is generality within an area  
17 identified as disturbed per the development agreement.  
18 The other location adjacent to Highland Ranch Parkway,  
19 the 15 acres generally associated with Five Ridges  
20 Village 1, that particular area would be subject to the  
21 development agreement standards, which require  
22 compliance with Sparks Municipal Code for slopes,  
23 hilltops and ridges.

24           Ultimately, this Commission has seen a

1 conditional use permit already for a portion of the  
2 Five Ridges site, and that was that conditional use  
3 permit that we expect to be amended over time to include  
4 other areas.

5           Based on listening in on some of the concerns  
6 expressed during the neighborhood meeting, my general  
7 sense is that there is a concern for ridgelines  
8 generally located to the north of the Five Ridges  
9 project site. And the actual amendment sites before you  
10 tonight are not adjacent to that northern boundary of  
11 the Five Ridges project site.

12           COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Thank you.

13           CHAIRMAN READ: Do you have any other  
14 questions, Commissioner VanderWell?

15           COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: No. I'm good. Thank  
16 you.

17           CHAIRMAN READ: Any other questions?

18           Commissioner Carey.

19           COMMISSIONER CAREY: Thank you, Madam Chair.

20           COMMISSIONER CAREY: Thank you, Madam Chair.

21           Sienna, I had a question. What is the fiscal  
22 impact of the proposed comprehensive land use change by  
23 removing the commercial land uses, what is the fiscal  
24 impact to the Impact Fee Service Area 1? I know we're



1 looking at a land use change. And the IFSA fees are  
2 calculated by service units and not by acres. I was  
3 just curious, by removing this commercial land uses and  
4 the ability to put in future commercial service units,  
5 what does that do to the Impact Fee Service Area?

6 MS. REID: So I'll probably ask Armando Ornelas  
7 to step in and give a little bit more detail. But I did  
8 want to just kind of preface that all of the studies and  
9 land plans that have come forward with Five Ridges have  
10 been in the range of 1,223 to about 1,241 units. And  
11 that is not proposed to change with the documents that  
12 were submitted associated with this current agenda item  
13 and that that number of units is within the development  
14 agreement specified unit range of 1,200 to 1,800.

15 So with that, I'll hand it over.

16 MR. ORNELAS: Commissioner Carey, members of  
17 the Planning Commission, Armando Ornelas, Assistant  
18 Community Services Director.

19 So staff has not looked at a comparison, if you  
20 will, of a hypothetical impact on the Impact Fee Service  
21 Area. That, that process of updating the IFSA to  
22 include Five Ridges is in progress, but it's not reached  
23 a point where, you know, we've completed that process.

24 Any, any previous, any analysis with regard to

1 the commercial uses that might have, you know, gone on  
2 this land had that, were that zoning to remain would be  
3 hypothetical and really would vary greatly depending on  
4 what the use is. So in a location like this, for  
5 example, they discussed there's a possibility of a  
6 self-storage facility. You know, that would have a very  
7 different impact than some more relatively intense  
8 commercial use.

9 So, I think, it would be fair to say that, you  
10 know, staff cannot really address your question,  
11 Commissioner Carey.

12 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Okay. Fair enough. Thank  
13 you.

14 CHAIRMAN READ: Any other questions,  
15 Commissioner Carey?

16 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Yeah, one more for Sienna.  
17 I was curious about the finding about -- I'm sorry, I  
18 have to find my notes here -- the finding about how this  
19 supports Policy MG4, and that's maintain an adequate  
20 supply of land use, of land for employment generating  
21 uses. How does the proposed land use Comprehensive Plan  
22 support that policy when it's eliminating an employment  
23 generating land use and replacing it with residential?

24 MS. REID: Yeah, so really conformance with

1 that policy gets back to taking a look at the land  
2 supply and the long-term fiscal health analysis. It  
3 really documented that there is a surplus of land  
4 devoted to retail. And so just kind of digging into the  
5 numbers there, there's a demand for 114 acres over the  
6 20-year timeframe with a supply of there 379 acres. So  
7 that surplus is 266.

8 Noting that, there are also a fair few  
9 commercial designated lands in very close proximity to  
10 the site. So directly to the south of Highland Ranch  
11 Parkway, you have commercial designated lands. To the  
12 east and west of Pyramid Way and Kiley Ranch North,  
13 there are commercial designated lands.

14 So noting kind of the oversupply documented in  
15 that recent study, plus the proximity of the other  
16 commercial designated lands, staff felt comfortable  
17 noting that the proposed request does comply with Policy  
18 MG4.

19 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Thank you for that  
20 explanation and clarification on the policy. I  
21 appreciate it.

22 No further questions, Madam Chair.

23 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

24 Any other Commissioners have questions?

1 All right. Thank you. So just to let you  
2 know, we will have two motions. And for each of them to  
3 pass, we would have to have a supermajority, which is  
4 five votes on each motion in agreement.

5 The first is the Comprehensive Plan land use  
6 amendment request.

7 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Madam Chair,  
8 Commissioner VanderWell. I'm prepared to make a motion.

9 CHAIRMAN READ: Go ahead.

10 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: I move to approve the  
11 Comprehensive Plan land use amendment, MPA20-0001,  
12 associated with PCN19-0040, based on Findings CP1  
13 through CP4, and the facts supporting these findings as  
14 set forth in the staff report.

15 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

16 COMMISSIONER PRITSOS: I'll second.

17 CHAIRMAN READ: We have a second from  
18 Commissioner Pritsos and a motion by Commissioner  
19 VanderWell. Any discussion before we vote?

20 Okay. Can we have a roll call vote?

21 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Madam Chair, a couple  
22 questions, a comment comments, for the record.

23 CHAIRMAN READ: Oh.

24 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Sorry, I didn't have my

1 hand up fast enough. Thank you. I appreciate that.

2 I just, I have a hard time with this proposed  
3 land use change. I think, you know, from a  
4 Comprehensive Plan standpoint, I'm having a hard time  
5 making finding CP2. And I don't concur with staff's  
6 recommendation that the proposed land use change is  
7 going to implement the goals and policies of the plan.  
8 I agree that it's going to help advance the housing  
9 policies, which is important to meet that missing  
10 middle. I think, that was, staff did a good job at  
11 doing that. But I'm really concerned about how we're  
12 applying this fiscal impact study with the land use  
13 changes.

14 You know, one thing that's important for me  
15 when I'm looking at Comprehensive Plan changes -- I  
16 think, that's a big deal, that's the heart of what we do  
17 here on the Planning Commission -- I really take a hard  
18 look at Policy MG1. And that's have a land use plan  
19 that provides a diverse and integrated mix of  
20 residential and nonresidential land uses.

21 Looking at this proposed land use change,  
22 although it's a small area, we're talking 15 acres of  
23 commercial, completely eliminated it and making the  
24 whole development residential I don't think advances

1 that policy, which is a very important policy, in my  
2 mind.

3           Looking at Policy MG4, and I appreciate the  
4 explanation from staff, and I agree with what they're  
5 saying on that there appears to be a surplus, but, you  
6 know, the proposed land use change is going to eliminate  
7 the only acreage within this development that has  
8 commercial, and it provides the only opportunity for  
9 employment and for commercial services. People within  
10 Five Ridges in the future are going to need a place to  
11 get a gallon of milk, they're going to need a place to  
12 go out to eat, they're going to need a place for an  
13 employment. I just have a hard time removing the  
14 opportunity for any sort of use within this development  
15 that would help provide commercial services.

16           I get what they're saying in terms of the  
17 fiscal impact study and that abundance, but I have a  
18 really hard time with how this big impact, Impact Fee  
19 Service Area 1, and the fees that we as a Commission are  
20 going to have to look at. You know, land use changes  
21 happen all the time. And we've seen it in this  
22 development, we've seen it in other developments within  
23 Impact Fee Service Area 1, that when they change, that  
24 has a big impact on how we charge those fees. And I

1 don't feel comfortable, you know, when we look at  
2 impacts, you know, increasing those, those fees. And, I  
3 think, it's going to hurt us overall when we're looking  
4 at trying to implement the goals and policies of the  
5 Comprehensive Plan.

6 And the last point I would just like to make, I  
7 think, it's important that we provide that jobs-house  
8 mix. We need to have an integrated land use mix and try  
9 to get away from areas in Spanish Springs that just have  
10 one, one type of land use. I think, we need to do a  
11 better job, I think, on this area.

12 And I will not be supporting the motion.

13 Thank you, Madam Chair. I'll get off my high  
14 horse now.

15 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

16 Any other comments before we call for the vote?

17 All right. There's a motion and second. Can  
18 we go ahead and get a roll call vote?

19 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Read?

20 CHAIRMAN READ: Aye.

21 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Petersen?

22 COMMISSIONER PETERSEN: Aye.

23 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Blaco?

24 COMMISSIONER BLACO: Aye.

1 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Carey?  
2 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Nay.  
3 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Pritsos?  
4 COMMISSIONER PRITSOS: Aye.  
5 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Rawson?  
6 COMMISSIONER RAWSON: Aye.  
7 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner VanderWell?  
8 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Aye.  
9 CHAIRMAN READ: Okay. Thank you. Motion  
10 passes six to one. Next --  
11 MS. MCCORMICK: Chair?  
12 CHAIRMAN READ: Yes? You're muted.  
13 MS. MCCORMICK: I'm sorry. I just wanted to  
14 clarify that the rezone only requires a simple majority.  
15 CHAIRMAN READ: Oh, thank you.  
16 MS. MCCORMICK: The Comprehensive Plan land use  
17 amendment is what requires the supermajority.  
18 CHAIRMAN READ: Okay. Thank you for clarifying  
19 that.  
20 So can I get a motion on the rezoning request?  
21 COMMISSIONER BLACO: I'm prepared to make a  
22 motion.  
23 CHAIRMAN READ: Go ahead, Commissioner Blaco.  
24 COMMISSIONER BLACO: I move to forward a



1 recommendation of approval to City Council for the  
2 rezoning request RZ20-0001, associated with PCN19-0040,  
3 based on Findings Z1 through Z3, and the facts  
4 supporting these findings as set forth in the staff  
5 report.

6 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

7 COMMISSIONER PRITSOS: I'll second again.

8 CHAIRMAN READ: All right. We have a motion by  
9 Commissioner Blaco and a second by Commissioner Pritsos.  
10 Any discussion?

11 Commissioner Carey.

12 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Thank you, Madam Chair.

13 I will electively be supporting this motion. I  
14 didn't agree with the comprehensive land use plan  
15 change. But since that MF14 land use is now assigned on  
16 this site, I have no reason other to support the  
17 proposed motion and make all the required findings with  
18 the land use being changed.

19 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

20 Any other discussion?

21 Can we get a roll call vote?

22 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Read?

23 CHAIRMAN READ: Aye.

24 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Petersen?

1 COMMISSIONER PETERSEN: Aye.

2 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Blaco?

3 COMMISSIONER BLACO: Aye.

4 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Carey?

5 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Aye.

6 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Pritsos?

7 COMMISSIONER PRITSOS: Aye.

8 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Rawson?

9 COMMISSIONER RAWSON: Aye.

10 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner VanderWell?

11 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Aye.

12 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you. Motion passes

13 unanimately. Thank you, Sienna, for your presentation.

14 I guess, we'll hear from you soon.

15 All right. Next, we have up PCN19-0040,

16 consideration of and possible action on five requests

17 for the same site at 555 Highland Ranch Parkway.

18 The first request is DA20-0001, which is to

19 amend the development agreement between the City of

20 Sparks, QK, LLC, and 5 Ridges Development Company to

21 increase the site.

22 Next is ANX20-0002, which is an annexation of a

23 site from a Washoe County General Rural zoning to a City

24 of Sparks Agricultural zoning.

1           And then we have MPA20-0003, which is an  
2 amendment to the Comprehensive Plan land use designation  
3 of Rural to Intermediate Density Residential and some  
4 Open Space.

5           And next is RZ20-0002, which is a rezone  
6 request from Agriculture to Single-Family Residential  
7 and some Agriculture.

8           And, finally, a request to sponsor an amendment  
9 to the 2019 Truckee Meadows Regional Plan.

10          MS. REID: So, again, thank you, Madam Chair  
11 and members of the Commission. Sienna Reid with the  
12 Planning Division presenting the second agenda item that  
13 is associated with the Five Ridges project site tonight.

14          Can everybody see the slides before them, or at  
15 least the slide before them currently?

16          CHAIRMAN READ: Yes, we can see and hear you  
17 very well.

18          MS. REID: Perfect. Okay. So, as noted by the  
19 Chair, there are five requests associated with this  
20 particular agenda item. And the first of these,  
21 Amendment Number 2 to the development agreement for the  
22 Five Ridges project site applies to a larger site area  
23 than the annexation Comprehensive Plan land use  
24 amendment, rezoning and Regional Plan amendment

1 sponsorship requests, which are primarily associated  
2 with the property that's proposed to be added to the  
3 Five Ridges project site.

4           So to give you a visual here, the area bound in  
5 red on this slide shows the Five Ridges project site as  
6 proposed for expansion. The parcel that would be added  
7 is shown in black hatching, and it totals 34.71 acres in  
8 size. If this property is added to Five Ridges project  
9 site, that site would ultimately increase to a total of  
10 421.58 acres.

11           The annexation, Comprehensive Plan land use  
12 amendment, rezoning and Regional Plan amendment  
13 sponsorship requests apply only to the property that is  
14 shown in black hatching, and that is currently under  
15 Washoe County jurisdiction.

16           With regards to background for the Five Ridges  
17 project site, much this information was covered with the  
18 previous agenda item. So I'll be brief and note that  
19 the initial entitlements associated with the Quarry, as  
20 the project was known at that time, were approved in  
21 July of 2018. Amendment Number 1 to the Development  
22 Agreement was later processed and approved in February  
23 of 2020.

24           And then, most recently, you'll remember that

1 tentative map and conditional use permit requests for  
2 portions of the Five Ridges project site were considered  
3 by the Commission this April.

4 And collectively, the five requests before you  
5 tonight, they propose to expand the Five Ridges project  
6 site and support single-family development on a portion  
7 of that expansion area.

8 Fair warning. Due to the fact that there are  
9 five requests associated with this item, this  
10 presentation is a bit lengthy. After giving the  
11 Commission an overview of the requests, we'll move on to  
12 the findings analysis. But that findings analysis is  
13 certainly a little bit beefy. We've done our best to  
14 consolidate where possible, and we'll try to move  
15 through the findings as expeditiously as possible. But  
16 there are definitely quite a few to go through.

17 So in terms of project overview, should all  
18 five of the requests be approved, this slide shows the  
19 resulting Five Ridges project that would be governed by  
20 Amendment Number 2 to the development agreement. The  
21 total project area would encompass 421.58 acres, which  
22 includes the 34.71-acre expansion parcel.

23 With regards to permitted uses, the residential  
24 unit number is not proposed to change. A minimum of

1 1,200 and a maximum of 1,800 residential units would  
2 remain permitted. The minimum amount of open space that  
3 must be reserved is 120 acres. And single-family,  
4 duplex, townhomes or multi-family development would be  
5 allowed in accordance with adopted zoning districts.  
6 Commercial uses would also be allowed based on adopted  
7 zoning. However, a limited number of commercial uses  
8 would be allowed based on proposed Comprehensive Plan  
9 land use designations and zoning districts that were  
10 proposed as part of the previous agenda item, and then  
11 also those in association with this agenda item.

12 And, ultimately, the applicant across the  
13 expanded site is seeking a mix of Intermediate Density  
14 Residential, or IDR, Multi-Family Residential 14, or  
15 MF14, and Open Space on the Five Ridges project site,  
16 with conforming zoning districts of SF6, MF2 and A-5.

17 This slide gives the Commission a visual in  
18 terms of existing and proposed Comprehensive Plan land  
19 use designations for the 34.71-acre parcel. Currently,  
20 the property in its entirety is designated Rural in  
21 Washoe County. The applicant is requesting City of  
22 Sparks Comprehensive Plan land use designations of  
23 Intermediate Density Residential, or IDR, for the  
24 eastern 10 acres of the site, and Open Space for the

1 western 24.71 acres.

2 For the zoning, the applicant is requesting to  
3 rezone the site, again on the eastern 10-acre portion of  
4 the site, to SF6, and on the western 24.71-acre portion  
5 to A-5.

6 Looking at the changes included in Amendment  
7 Number 2 to the development agreement, these are mostly  
8 due to the proposed expansion of the Five Ridges project  
9 site. However, there are some additional changes  
10 proposed for clarification and update purposes, as well  
11 as to address comments received by the Nevada Department  
12 of Transportation, or NDOT.

13 In addition to the increased project acres on  
14 this site, you can see changes that would impact  
15 Section 3.1 of the agreement for permitted uses and  
16 density. These would together remove references to  
17 specific zoning districts associated with permitted  
18 uses. And the intent there is really to simplify that  
19 portion of the agreement.

20 Gross density requirements are also proposed to  
21 be modified due to the expanded site area. And those  
22 gross density calculations, as updated, are based on a  
23 minimum of 1,200 and a maximum of 1,800 residential  
24 units. So, again, so requests here to alter the unit

1 parameters in any way.

2           And then, also, within permitted uses and  
3 density, the minimum amount of Open Space that must be  
4 reserved is increased by 20 acres to a total of 120  
5 acres.

6           Also, to address NDOT's comments regarding the  
7 timing of roadway improvements, Section 3.2 is modified  
8 to specify that improvements to the intersection of  
9 Highland Ranch Parkway and Pyramid Way shall occur  
10 concurrently with the widening of Highland Ranch  
11 Parkway. This was the intent of the language, but NDOT  
12 brought up a good clarifying request. And given that  
13 the agreement was open, we wanted to be able to address  
14 that request.

15           So with those improvements occurring  
16 concurrently, what that means is that both improvements  
17 would be triggered prior to the 650 first residential  
18 unit, the segment of Highland Ranch Parkway between the  
19 project entrance and Pyramid Way degrading to Level of  
20 Service D, or the intersection of Highland Ranch Parkway  
21 and Pyramid Way degrading to below Level of Service E.  
22 And that's whichever occurs first. So very similar to  
23 all of the language that you've seen before, just trying  
24 to bring forward additional clarity there.



1           In addition, the allowed disturbance area is  
2 updated based on a revised slope analysis. This results  
3 in a 26-acre increase to a total of 293 disturbed acres  
4 allowed.

5           And the agreement is further updated to reflect  
6 the current project status with regard to land use and  
7 agreement approvals. These include Washoe County's  
8 approval of an emergency access road and Council's  
9 approval of an agreement with the Sun Valley General  
10 Improvement District granting use of the City streets  
11 and roads for water transmission facilities.

12           And then, lastly, changes to the agreement  
13 include a variety of annexation property provisions.  
14 Some address definitions. Others address associated  
15 entitlement requests.

16           The conceptual land plan for Amendment Number 2  
17 to the agreement is shown on this slide. All  
18 anticipated development is residential, with townhomes  
19 identified in Village 1 at the project entrance, as well  
20 as within Village 5 in the center of the site.  
21 Single-family lots comprise the remaining development  
22 shown. And lots located in the expansion area, which is  
23 on the western portion of the site total approximately  
24 19 single-family lots.

1           While Amendment Number 2 would expand the Five  
2 Ridges project site, again, neither the permitted number  
3 of residential units or infrastructure and public  
4 service requirements necessary to serve those units are  
5 proposed to change.

6           In terms of information provided by the  
7 applicant, the indication is that changes to the  
8 agreement are sought to promote better design and  
9 circulation through the project site.

10           To facilitate inclusion of the 34.71-acre  
11 parcel that's proposed for annexation within the  
12 Five Ridges project site, the applicant is also  
13 requesting Council sponsor a Regional Plan amendment.

14           And so this map shows the relationship of the  
15 site, which you can see bound in red, that 34.71-acre  
16 parcel to the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan land  
17 designations as well as the Truckee Meadows Service  
18 Area, which is shown in the thicker black line.

19           As the site currently has a Rural Area regional  
20 land designation, what is being requested is a change to  
21 the Tier 2 land designation, as well as changes to  
22 include this particular area within the Truckee Meadows  
23 Service Area and also within the City of Sparks Sphere  
24 of Influence.

1           And so before City Council can take final  
2 action on the requests that are part of this agenda  
3 item, a Regional Plan amendment to redesignate the site  
4 from that Rural Area to Tier 2 land and amend the  
5 boundaries of the TMSA and City of Sparks SOI is needed.

6           Consistent with past practice, the Commission  
7 reviews these sponsorship requests and provides a  
8 recommendation to Council.

9           All right. So switching gears here and  
10 settling in, to a certain extent, here are the findings  
11 for each of the proposed requests. For brevity, the  
12 findings for the development agreement amendment,  
13 annexation, Comprehensive Plan land use and amendment,  
14 or Comprehensive Plan land use amendment, excuse me, and  
15 rezoning requests have been grouped by topic. These are  
16 the same topic groups that we used in the last  
17 presentation. So conformance and consistency,  
18 compatibility and public notice. The Regional Plan  
19 sponsorship is going to be held out of this topic  
20 grouping, because we do have new review criteria  
21 included as part of the 2019 Truckee Meadows Regional  
22 Plan that need to be discussed.

23           So starting first with conformance and  
24 consistency of the requests, this is going to be with

1 either the Comprehensive Plan, state law or code. And  
2 other than the Regional Plan amendment sponsorship, all  
3 of the requests under consideration tonight must be  
4 consistent with the City of Sparks Comprehensive Plan.

5           So this slide focuses on the consistency of the  
6 development agreement with the City of Sparks  
7 Comprehensive Plan. As has been noted a couple of  
8 times, neither the permitted number of residential units  
9 or infrastructure and public service requirements to  
10 serve that development is proposed to change. To  
11 support the amendment to the agreement and the  
12 associated requests under consideration, the applicant  
13 did provide an updated trip generation letter, as well  
14 as sewer and water studies analyzing development of the  
15 Five Ridges project site with solely residential  
16 development. And those studies did not warrant changes  
17 to the agreement related to infrastructure and services.  
18 And the master developer remains responsible for roadway  
19 and intersection improvements, secondary access, sewer  
20 collection system improvements, water transmission  
21 facilities and improvements, as well as flood control  
22 and drainage improvements.

23           Noting that the agreement continues to specify  
24 how infrastructure and public services would be

1 adequately provided to support development, it is the  
2 opinion the City staff that the proposed changes in  
3 Amendment Number 2 promote the City's goal of providing  
4 adequate services concurrently with the impact of  
5 development while not adversely impacting the  
6 consistency of the agreement with the Comprehensive  
7 Plan. That's in support of policies MG5 and CF1.

8           Looking here at conformance and consistency as  
9 it relates to the annexation, the annexation request  
10 before you tonight must not only conform to the  
11 requirements of Nevada Revised Statutes Chapter 268 per  
12 finding A1, but also the Comprehensive Plan with  
13 location of the annexation property in the City's Sphere  
14 of Influence and the seven-year annexation program  
15 pursuant to Finding A3.

16           Here, Chapter 260 allows for the City to annex  
17 properties that are identified in its annexation  
18 program, as well as properties that is aren't identified  
19 in its annexation program, provided that those types of  
20 annexations, which are often termed voluntary, are  
21 contiguous to City limits and annexation is requested by  
22 100 percent of the property owners. And those, those  
23 criteria are satisfied in this particular instance.

24           The property is not currently located in the

1 City's Sphere of Influence. And the City's annexation  
2 program actually expired in 2016. However, as  
3 discussed, a request to include the property in the  
4 City's Sphere of Influence would be considered through  
5 the Regional Plan amendment process if City Council  
6 sponsors the amendment.

7           Additionally, Finding A2 requires the  
8 annexation request to conform to 10 annexation findings  
9 in Sparks Municipal Code. So these will be covered on  
10 the next few slides, with the first of these, first four  
11 of these findings shown on this slide.

12           So as discussed, the property being considered  
13 for annexation is contiguous to City limits on its  
14 eastern property line side.

15           In terms of utilities, those would be extended  
16 through the existing Five Ridges project site consistent  
17 with the agreement, making the extension of City limits  
18 a logical extension.

19           And then annexation would not create an island,  
20 simply there because the property is already contiguous  
21 to the City's current corporate boundary.

22           And in regard to expansion to accommodate  
23 planned growth, the Five Ridges project site, which  
24 totals almost 387 acres currently, was annexed to the

1 City of Sparks in 2018 to accommodate future housing  
2 needs. And annexation of the 34.71-acre parcel would  
3 support modifications to the land plan that was  
4 previously shown in the presentation that result in  
5 improve circulation and promote development of the  
6 greater Five Ridges project site would be units  
7 anticipated in the development agreement.

8 The three annexation findings on this slide  
9 relate to utilities, community goals in the City's  
10 Comprehensive Plan and the cost-effective provision of  
11 service areas and capital facilities.

12 So in regards to water service, per the  
13 agreement, water service will be provided by the  
14 Sun Valley General Improvement District, or SVGID, and  
15 the developer is responsible for construction of water  
16 transmission infrastructure, as well as dedicating water  
17 rights to serve future development.

18 Sanitary sewer service is to be provided by the  
19 City of Sparks. It would ultimately be provided via the  
20 Northwest Sanitary Sewer Interceptor, which is currently  
21 located east of the project.

22 And, Chair, per the agreement the developer is  
23 responsible for all new on- and off-site sanitary sewer  
24 improvements.

1           Looking at community goals, annexation of the  
2 subject property and approval of the Comprehensive Plan  
3 land use amendment and rezoning requests associated with  
4 this agenda item would ultimately support modifications  
5 to the land plan that result in improved circulation and  
6 promote development of the greater Five Ridges project.

7           And supplemental materials provided by the  
8 applicant and as shown earlier in terms of the land plan  
9 show approximately 19 single-family residences will be  
10 constructed on the site proposed for annexation. This  
11 is a small number of homes. However, annexation of the  
12 site would still continue to support development of the  
13 Five Ridges project site consistent with the agreement.  
14 And that agreement does encourage a strong and diverse  
15 housing market in support of Goal H2 in the City's  
16 Comprehensive Plan.

17           With regards to service areas and capital  
18 facilities, fire service would be provided from Fire  
19 Station Number 4 or through automatic aid with Truckee  
20 Meadows Fire.

21           In addition, the agreement continues to serve  
22 as the applicant's petition to be included in Impact Fee  
23 Service Area Number 1. That update, as stated in the  
24 last agenda item, is currently underway. And if the



1 subject property is ultimately included in that service  
2 area, it would contribute to construction of a fire  
3 station to serve the area, regional storm drain, sewer,  
4 and parks improvements.

5 So provided that Amendment Number 2 to the  
6 agreement is approved, it is staff's view that the  
7 requested annexation complies with Policy CF1 that  
8 requires the provision of City services at acceptable  
9 service levels.

10 Moving on to the fiscal impact of the  
11 annexation, the fiscal impact analysis that was  
12 submitted was discussed a bit already under the previous  
13 agenda item. So I'll try and be brief and note that we  
14 have an assumption of 1,220 residential units, no  
15 commercial space, and an expanded site area and,  
16 ultimately, with the removal of that commercial space  
17 and the increase of roadway area that would be dedicated  
18 to the City, what is estimated as a positive fiscal  
19 impact of approximately \$700,000.

20 In regards to a Washoe County adopted community  
21 management plan, this particular area is located within  
22 the Sun Valley Area Plan, which is an element of the  
23 Washoe County Master Plan. The City has not received  
24 any comments from Washoe County on this topic or the

1 other requests, either.

2           In addition to other factors, here it's just  
3 appropriate to note that the applicant has requested  
4 that City Council sponsorship of a Regional Plan  
5 amendment to include the subject property within the  
6 City's Sphere of Influence. And so, ultimately, should  
7 the City Council sponsor that requested Regional Plan  
8 amendment, that would be heard by the Regional Planning  
9 Commission and the Regional Planning Governing Board  
10 prior to any City Council consideration of the  
11 annexation request before you tonight.

12           Moving on to another aspect of conformance and  
13 consistency, here relating to the Comprehensive Plan  
14 land use amendment and rezoning, Finding CP1 requires  
15 the Comprehensive Plan land use amendment conform to the  
16 Regional Plan land use and intensity designations. And  
17 as I just discussed on the previous slide, the applicant  
18 is seeking that Regional Plan amendment to redesignate  
19 the site from Rural Area to Tier 2 land and then, also,  
20 to amend the boundaries of the TMSA and City of Sparks  
21 Sphere of Influence.

22           As proposed, the Intermediate Density  
23 Residential, or IDR, Comprehensive Plan land use  
24 designation allows for a density range of six to less

1 than 10 dwelling units per acre, and it complies with  
2 the maximum density standard of 30 dwelling units for  
3 Tier 2 land set forth in the Regional Plan.

4 In addition, the proposed Open Space  
5 designation is also consistent with that Tier 2 land  
6 designation, because it provides for passive and active  
7 open space rather than suburban development.

8 And, lastly, here on this slide, portions of  
9 the site are also designated development constrained by  
10 the Regional Plan, and this is due to the presence of  
11 slopes of 30 percent or greater. This is a small area  
12 of the overall 34.71-acre site. And not only does the  
13 Comprehensive Plan encourage preservation of steep  
14 slopes, but, again, we have the Sparks Municipal Code  
15 that requires that two-to-one ratio of open space if  
16 there is a disturbance of slopes of 30 percent or  
17 greater. And, again, that is the Regional Plan.

18 Looking here at Finding CP2, the Comprehensive  
19 Plan amendment must implement the goals of the  
20 Comprehensive Plan.

21 And then Finding Z1 for the rezoning then  
22 requires that request be consistent with the  
23 Comprehensive Plan.

24 Application of the IDR and Open Space land uses

1 and then conforming SF6 and A-5 zoning districts would  
2 support single-family housing development on the site  
3 and support more broadly the development of the  
4 residential units consistent with the development  
5 agreement. Really they are promoting diverse housing  
6 through the City of Sparks.

7           As has been previously discussed, the  
8 development agreement specifies the timing and scope of  
9 improvements needed to provide City services at  
10 acceptable service levels. And with that agreement in  
11 place and the updated fiscal impact analysis that was  
12 provided, it is staff's view that the requests comply  
13 with policies MG5 and CF1 of the Sparks Comprehensive  
14 Plan, that address fiscal implications to provide public  
15 services, and the provision of City services at  
16 acceptable service levels.

17           And, lastly, here on this slide, in regards to  
18 natural features, there are steep slopes. As I've  
19 noted, in addition to the 30 percent, there are slopes  
20 that range between 15 and 30 present on the site as  
21 well. And here to manage development on those folks are  
22 our Comprehensive Plan policies, as well as our Code,  
23 that requires development in terms of disturbed area be  
24 reduced as slopes increase. And, again, we have further

1 the development agreement stating that there is a  
2 maximum disturbed area that can be cleared, graded or  
3 otherwise disturbed, and that is increased to 293 acres,  
4 as was previously discussed through Amendment Number 2  
5 to the agreement.

6 All right. Moving on to compatibility, which  
7 is a new topic in terms of the findings analysis, the  
8 findings on display each focus on compatibility with  
9 surrounding land uses, Finding CP3 for the Comprehensive  
10 Plan land use and Finding Z2 for the rezoning.

11 Here, federally or homeowners association owned  
12 vacant land is located to the north, south and west of  
13 the site. These vacant lands have a Rural Washoe County  
14 master plan land use designation. And as proposed, the  
15 Open Space comprehensive land use designation would be  
16 applied to that western 24.71 acres of the site. And  
17 that Open Space designation is compatible with the  
18 surrounding unincorporated lands that are designated  
19 Rural.

20 On the eastern portion of the site, the IDR  
21 Comprehensive Plan land use is proposed to encompass 10  
22 acres. And that's compatible with adjacent land to the  
23 east that is already designated IDR.

24 And noting that the rezoning request from A-40

1 to A-5 for the western portion of the subject site is  
2 consistent with the proposed open space zoning pieces  
3 further consistent with vacant properties zoned Open  
4 Space by Washoe County. And similar to the Washoe  
5 County Open Space zoning district, it is important to  
6 note that the A-5 zone proposed allows for agricultural  
7 and recreation uses by right and requires discretionary  
8 review for a limited number of industrial and utility  
9 uses. So they are very similar.

10 In terms of the rezoning request from A-40 to  
11 SF6 on that eastern portion of the site, this is very  
12 much consistent with future single-family uses in the  
13 adjacent SF6 zone immediately east of the site.

14 In terms of findings regarding public noticing,  
15 public notice is required for the annexation,  
16 Comprehensive Plan land use amendment and rezoning  
17 requests with the Planning Commission and City Council  
18 meetings functioning as public hearings. Notice of the  
19 public hearing for the annexation and rezoning were  
20 provided at a minimum to all owners of property within  
21 750 feet of the subject properties. And, also, public  
22 notice was provided in the Reno Gazette-Journal.

23 For the Comprehensive Plan land use amendment,  
24 mailed notices for a neighborhood meeting were provided

1 to all property owners, again here at a minimum within  
2 750 feet of the subject site. That neighborhood meeting  
3 was conducted also on June 8th with the same number of  
4 attendees. As I mentioned in the last item, nine  
5 attendees noting concern regarding development of homes  
6 on the ridgelines in a manner that would be visible from  
7 properties located to the north of the Five Ridges  
8 project site, traffic impact, and impacts to groundwater  
9 due to municipal wells.

10 All right. So moving on to what I will say is  
11 the last kind of set of slides as it relates to  
12 findings, here we have actual review criteria that come  
13 from the 2019 Truckee Meadows Regional Plan. And so  
14 given that there are three requests associated with the  
15 Regional Plan amendment, we have three sets of specific  
16 review criteria for each.

17 So on this slide, what you can see are the  
18 first three of six review criteria associated with the  
19 requested Tier 2 land designation.

20 The first here is proximity to Tier 2 land.  
21 The site is immediately adjacent to existing Tier 2  
22 land. We also have compliance with applicable density  
23 requirements. This has been discussed as it relates to  
24 compliance of the IDR land use with the Regional Plan

1 land designations. And as requested, should the Tier 2  
2 designation be approved, the IDR land use is certainly  
3 less dense from a residential density perspective than  
4 the maximum of 30 dwelling units per acre.

5 And then, in addition, or looking at enhanced  
6 potential for land use diversity and a mix of housing  
7 types, including the site in the Tier 2 land designation  
8 would support its addition to the Five Ridges project  
9 site. And provided that the associated development  
10 agreement amendment, annexation, Comprehensive Plan land  
11 use amendment and rezoning requests are approved, the  
12 agreement would allow for a mix of single-family,  
13 duplex, multi-family and townhome housing types,  
14 supporting overall housing type diversity.

15 Looking at infrastructure availability and  
16 connectivity to existing or planned multimodal  
17 transportation opportunities, the addition of the  
18 subject site to the Tier 2 land designation would  
19 further allow for the extension of infrastructure and  
20 public facilities that will be coming through the  
21 existing Five Ridges project site. And that would  
22 include sidewalks and multiuse paths that are required  
23 to be constructed by the developer.

24 In regards to other multimodal transportation



1 opportunities here, the Five Ridges project site is not  
2 identified in the 2040 Regional Transportation Plan from  
3 a transit service provision perspective. So the mean  
4 multimodal improvement would be sidewalks and multiuse  
5 paths.

6 As proposed, approximately 10 acres of the site  
7 would be designated IDR, and the remainder would be  
8 designated Open Space. Noting that that is a relatively  
9 small amount of acreage, substantive impacts to other  
10 priority lands, as designated in the Regional Plan, are  
11 not anticipated if the proposed Regional Plan amendment  
12 were to be approved.

13 Here, shifting to the second aspect of the  
14 Regional Plan amendment sponsorship, which is expansion  
15 of the Truckee Meadows Service Area, or TMSA, to include  
16 the almost 35-acre site, the first four review criteria  
17 that you can see on the slide were already discussed as  
18 part of the review criteria for Tier 2 land.

19 So really just regarding the last bullet, which  
20 focuses on regional need for additional land, uses or  
21 purposes, application materials indicate that the  
22 addition of the site to the TMSA will support better  
23 design and circulation for the Five Ridges project,  
24 which will facilitate development at the project and

1 assist in meeting regional housing needs.

2           And, lastly, here we have the review criteria  
3 for requests seeking to amend the City of Sparks Sphere  
4 of Influence that are shown on this slide. Changed  
5 conditions in the vicinity of the request include not  
6 only the proposed amendment to the agreement, but also  
7 associated entitlement requests for the current  
8 Five Ridges project site, which is adjacent to the  
9 annexation parcel.

10           And amending the boundary of the Sphere of  
11 Influence to include the site allows for the absorption  
12 of what would be an otherwise largely undevelopable  
13 parcel into the adjacent Five Ridges project site.

14           The residential units that are permitted in the  
15 agreement are anticipated to assist in meeting demand  
16 for additional housing in the region that is due to  
17 population growth. And as proposed, the proposed  
18 Regional Plan amendment request would support the  
19 development of these residential units.

20           In regards to conferring with Washoe County  
21 staff on the SOI boundary change, City of Sparks staff  
22 discussed all of the requests before the Commission  
23 tonight, as well as what the ultimate Regional Plan  
24 amendment process would be, with Washoe County staff.

1 And that was done verbally. And then, in addition, all  
2 of the requests were distributed for Washoe County for  
3 review and comment. And no comments have been received  
4 by City of Sparks staff.

5 In regards to this agenda item, I did not  
6 receive any calls or emails as of today.

7 And with that, I'll conclude this presentation.  
8 Staff is recommending approval of each of the five  
9 requests for consideration as part of this agenda item.

10 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you, Sienna. That was a  
11 very comprehensive presentation. I really got to hand  
12 it to you, you hung in there.

13 Do any of the Commissioners have questions for  
14 staff on this item?

15 All right. Moving on, do we have the applicant  
16 that would like to provide any additional information or  
17 comment?

18 MS. MARTINEZ: Mike Railey is able to speak  
19 now.

20 MR. MIKE RAILEY: Good evening, everyone.  
21 Again, for the record, Mike Railey with Christy  
22 Corporation representing 5 Ridges Development Company.

23 Yeah, I don't think there's much I could add to  
24 Sienna's presentation. She did a great job, was very

1 thorough.

2           Once again, this is a kind of a cumbersome  
3 entitlement process for what really boils down to a  
4 fairly simple change and request. As you can see, the  
5 majority of the site, about two-thirds of it, will  
6 remain as permanent dedicated open space and really just  
7 allows for a little bit of better circulation and layout  
8 within the project itself.

9           The property is under common ownership with 5  
10 ridges. It has very limited access and availability of  
11 infrastructure should it remain outside of the project.  
12 But with Five Ridges, it's essentially all the  
13 infrastructure is being extended to the front door, so  
14 to speak.

15           So, I think, it's a logical request. And we're  
16 here to answer any questions that you might have.

17           CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you, Mike.

18           Do any Commissioners have questions for the  
19 applicant?

20           Seeing none, let's open up for public comment.  
21 And I'm assuming that we will need public comment for  
22 each item separately.

23           MS. MCCORMICK: That's correct, Madam Chair.

24           CHAIRMAN READ: Okay. Thank you.

1           So we'll open up public comment for the  
2 development agreement first.

3           And, Casey, can you please repeat the call-in  
4 information?

5           MS. MARTINEZ: The telephone number for call-in  
6 participation is 1-669-900-6833, and the meeting ID  
7 number is 962 4203 7566. And you'll press star 9 to  
8 request to speak.

9           I do have one caller already wanting to speak.  
10 And their phone number begins with 376. You are now  
11 able to speak.

12           MR. DAN FLANNAGAN: Greetings, again, folks.  
13 Dan Flannagan here listening to the presentation.  
14 Sienna, very well done. However, I have some questions  
15 regarding your vote you're about to take to support or  
16 to present this in front of the Regional Plan.

17           And it's very interesting, because I can't sit  
18 and question any of you. I am talking to, basically, a  
19 screen with you in the background. We can't convey or  
20 have our questions answered. And it doesn't appear that  
21 you are addressing anything we're saying anyway.

22           So that being said, a couple items that you  
23 said was about the trip generation letter. This creates  
24 a substantial impact. And just a letter instead of a

1 reanalysis of the traffic impact is interesting and  
2 inappropriate. You don't reference Sparks Section  
3 20.04.011, which Karen Melby and I had worked very  
4 closely to amend. And that was basically retired when  
5 she retired.

6 The issue of mining water where you're taking  
7 from the SVGID water supply and then taking the sewer  
8 distribution through the City of Sparks is  
9 inappropriate.

10 The other item is an IDR designation all by  
11 itself is very interesting. The IDR designation seems  
12 to cover anything and everything that you don't want to  
13 designate as anything else, and has no development  
14 restrictions. I don't see anything in the codes where  
15 that, you simply put it in a designation that is  
16 comfortable that'll match your comprehensive area and  
17 amendment plans.

18 And I'd like to know who you contacted at  
19 Washoe County for comments on this proposed agenda item,  
20 because we'd like to contact them. So at least us, who  
21 is in Washoe County, have the ability to vote them out  
22 of office, unlike we can do in the City of Sparks.

23 And a fairly simple development, interesting  
24 comment that was made by the developer's representative,

1 fairly simple, that's fine, but you know as well as I do  
2 that none of you would allow the type of development  
3 push through on a major impact in this area if it was  
4 anywhere adjacent to where you lived.

5 And, obviously, you're not going to comment on  
6 my comments. So everybody have a good evening. Thank  
7 you very much.

8 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you, caller.

9 Do we have any additional public comment on  
10 this item?

11 MS. MARTINEZ: I do not see any additional  
12 requests to speak. Oh, I am sorry. One additional  
13 request came up. Caller beginning in 742, you are now  
14 able to speak.

15 MR. ROC COLE: Hi. Roc Cole here. I know  
16 you're tired of hearing this. And, quite frankly, I  
17 know that all the wheels have been greased. And this  
18 thing was approved a long time ago.

19 This is just like a kangaroo court for a little  
20 caring for us people out here that mean nothing to you.  
21 Of course, if you lived out here, it would be different.  
22 But I'm sure that you could care less.

23 Except for you, Scott, I will give you. At  
24 least you ask questions and present commentary. The

1 rest of you sit there like drones. When you ask for  
2 comment or questions, it's like crickets in the  
3 background. What's wrong with you people? You call  
4 yourself planners? Why don't you call yourself an  
5 approval committee, because that's what you are. All  
6 you do is approve. It's really a joke. I'm ashamed of  
7 all of you, again with one exception.

8           You know, in this world, there's such thing as  
9 karma. And you guys could care less about us. And so  
10 could the developer. Because it's all about money. All  
11 you care about is money. City of Sparks for their tax  
12 revenues and the developer for his money. At what point  
13 is enough? Shame on all of you. Shame on all of you.

14           I'm done.

15           CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

16           Casey, any additional callers?

17           MS. MARTINEZ: I do not have any additional  
18 requests to speak at this time.

19           CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

20           So with that, I will close the public comment  
21 for the development agreement and open public comment  
22 for the annexation petition.

23           Do we have any callers on the annexation  
24 petition?



1 MS. MARTINEZ: I do not see any requests to  
2 speak.

3 CHAIRMAN READ: Okay. I will go ahead and  
4 close public comment on the annexation and open public  
5 comment for the Comprehensive Plan land use amendment  
6 request.

7 Do we have any callers?

8 MS. MARTINEZ: There are no requests to speak.

9 CHAIRMAN READ: All right. Thank you.

10 Let's close public comment on the Comprehensive  
11 Plan land use amendment and open public comment for the  
12 rezoning requests.

13 Do we have any public comment?

14 MS. MARTINEZ: No requests to speak.

15 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

16 So let's close the public comment for rezoning  
17 requests and open public comment for the Truckee Meadows  
18 Regional Plan amendment sponsorship request.

19 Do we have any public comment?

20 MS. MARTINEZ: I do have one request to speak.  
21 The phone number beginning in 742, you are now able to  
22 speak.

23 MR. ROC COLE: This is Roc again. And I'm sure  
24 you guys are just thinking, look, I hope this guy shuts

1 up so we can get to dinner.

2 But I would like to say one thing. We were  
3 told in the appeal process with the City Council that  
4 there was over 10 meetings and public notices sent out  
5 on the demise of our ridgeline. You know what, I want  
6 proof of that. And, I think, you owe us proof that this  
7 ridgeline was deemed not protected, or how, I don't know  
8 how you can take that away without giving us some proof.  
9 Shouldn't you have to uphold what is in place? With the  
10 swipe of a pen, it just goes away?

11 And in the neighborhood meeting of this, the  
12 developer stated that there was over a hundred acres of  
13 developable land that was not being developed. Why  
14 can't you take that hundred acres, take all the homes  
15 off the ridgeline, offset them down to where we don't  
16 have to look at them, and everybody else in this valley  
17 that you care nothing about because it's not your  
18 precious city, and put them in that hundred acres? It's  
19 a win-win-win. It's a win for the City of Sparks. You  
20 get your tax dollars. It's a win for the developer  
21 'cause he gets his homes, although he doesn't get the  
22 view lot. And it's a win for us, because we get  
23 something that was promised to us five times.

24 Please take that into consideration. I know

1 you will, Scott. I was at the Quarry meeting back when  
2 we could go to the meetings. Do you know you even  
3 had -- and I don't even know her name, but she was  
4 sitting on the left. Do you know, she didn't even know  
5 what a detention basin was? A detention basin. Isn't  
6 that a little embarrassing for a planning commission?

7 I rest my case.

8 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you, caller.

9 Casey, do we have any other callers?

10 MS. MARTINEZ: We have no additional requests  
11 to speak.

12 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

13 So I will close public comment for the Truckee  
14 Meadows Regional Plan amendment. And that ends our  
15 public comment. And we will bring it back to the  
16 Commission for discussion. Any additional questions  
17 from the Commissioners?

18 Seeing none, we have five motions. And,  
19 Alyson, for clarification, can you tell me which ones  
20 will require a supermajority?

21 BOARD MEMBER VANDERWELL: Madam Chair, before  
22 we start, I have some clarifications. From one of the  
23 speakers -- and I apologize. It was on the first, it  
24 was on our first agenda item. But they had spoken about

1 fire and a fire station and things like that. And I  
2 would just like to point out that on page 16 of this  
3 report, in the third paragraph, in the third bullet  
4 point, and I will read it. I apologize.

5 It states "equipping all dwelling units and  
6 commercial structures intended for or used for human  
7 occupancy with fire suppression systems."

8 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you, Commissioner  
9 VanderWell, for that clarification.

10 Anything else from the other Commissioners?

11 Okay. So go ahead, Alyson, on the motions.  
12 You were going to tell me which ones will require the  
13 supermajority.

14 MS. MCCORMICK: Thank you, Madam Chair. Only  
15 the Comprehensive Plan land use amendment, MPA20-0003,  
16 requires a supermajority. The other items are less than  
17 full majority.

18 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you for that  
19 clarification.

20 So we will have five motions. The first is the  
21 request for the development agreement. I'll take any  
22 motion.

23 COMMISSIONER BLACO: I'll go ahead and make a  
24 motion.

1 CHAIRMAN READ: Go ahead.

2 COMMISSIONER BLACO: I move to find Amendment  
3 Number 2 to the development agreement, DA18-0001,  
4 associated with PCN19-0040, consistent with the Sparks  
5 Comprehensive Plan and to forward a recommendation of  
6 approval to the Sparks City Council.

7 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

8 Do we have a second?

9 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Commissioner  
10 VanderWell. Second.

11 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

12 We have a motion by Commissioner Blaco and a  
13 second by Commissioner VanderWell. Any discussion?

14 Seeing none, can we please have a roll call  
15 vote?

16 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Read?

17 CHAIRMAN READ: Aye.

18 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Read?

19 CHAIRMAN READ: Aye.

20 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Petersen?

21 COMMISSIONER PETERSEN: Aye.

22 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Blaco?

23 COMMISSIONER BLACO: Aye.

24 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Carey?

1 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Aye.

2 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Pritsos?

3 COMMISSIONER PRITSOS: Aye.

4 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Rawson?

5 COMMISSIONER RAWSON: Aye.

6 MS. MARTINEZ: And Commissioner VanderWell?

7 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Aye.

8 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you. Motion passes  
9 unanimately.

10 Next is the request for the annexation  
11 petition. Can I get a motion?

12 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Madam Chair --

13 COMMISSIONER BLACO: I'll try.

14 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: -- Commissioner  
15 VanderWell. I move to forward a recommendation of  
16 approval to the City Council for the annexation request,  
17 ANX20-0002, associated with PCN19-0040, based on  
18 Findings A1 through A4, and the facts supporting these  
19 findings as set forth in the staff report.

20 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

21 COMMISSIONER PRITSOS: Second.

22 CHAIRMAN READ: Okay. We have a motion by  
23 Commissioner VanderWell and a second by Commissioner  
24 Pritsos. Any discussion?

1           COMMISSIONER CAREY: Madam Chair, a couple  
2 comments for the record, if I may.

3           CHAIRMAN READ: Go ahead.

4           COMMISSIONER CAREY: Thank you.

5           I concur with staff's recommendation on this  
6 annexation request. And I believe that I can make the  
7 required findings.

8           I agree that this proposed annexation is a  
9 logical extension of the City limits. And I think that  
10 it will help support Goal H2 and Policy CF1 of our  
11 Comprehensive Plan.

12           Thank you.

13           CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you, Commissioner Carey.  
14 Any other discussion?

15           Can we go ahead and do a roll call vote?

16           MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Read?

17           CHAIRMAN READ: Aye.

18           MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Petersen?

19           COMMISSIONER PETERSEN: Aye.

20           MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Blaco?

21           COMMISSIONER BLACO: Aye.

22           MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Carey?

23           COMMISSIONER CAREY: Aye.

24           MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Pritsos?

1 COMMISSIONER PRITSOS: Aye.

2 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Rawson?

3 COMMISSIONER RAWSON: Aye.

4 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner VanderWell?

5 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Aye.

6 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you. Passes unanimously.

7 The next is the Comprehensive Plan land use  
8 amendment request. Do I have a motion?

9 COMMISSIONER BLACO: Commissioner Blaco. I'll  
10 make a motion.

11 CHAIRMAN READ: Go ahead.

12 COMMISSIONER BLACO: Move to approve the  
13 Comprehensive Plan land use amendment, MPA20-0003,  
14 associated with PCN19-0040, based on Findings CP1  
15 through CP4, and the facts supporting these findings as  
16 set forth in the staff report.

17 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

18 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Commissioner  
19 VanderWell. Second.

20 CHAIRMAN READ: Okay. We have a motion by  
21 Commissioner Blaco and a second by Commissioner  
22 VanderWell. Any discussion before we vote?

23 Commissioner Carey.

24 COMMISSIONER CAREY: I'm going to support the



1 proposed comprehensive land use change. I do have some  
2 reservations about adding additional residential land  
3 uses in this area. You know, I would prefer that there  
4 would be a better mix of land uses. I think, in my  
5 comments on the previous agenda item kind of outline  
6 why.

7           However, in this instance, I think that the  
8 requested IDR land use change is very minor. And it is  
9 consistent with generally what the planned land uses are  
10 in this development. Overall, I think that the proposed  
11 Open Space and IDR land use changes are very minor in  
12 nature and, therefore, consistent with the goals and  
13 policies of our plan and the land use for this area.

14           But, I think, overall, we need to do a much  
15 better job of integrating land uses and getting and  
16 locating services and employment near residential,  
17 particularly in the Spanish Springs Valley.

18           Thank you.

19           CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you, Commissioner Carey.  
20 Any further discussion?

21           With that, can we please do a roll call vote?

22           MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Read?

23           CHAIRMAN READ: Aye.

24           MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Petersen?

1 COMMISSIONER PETERSEN: Aye.

2 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Blaco?

3 COMMISSIONER BLACO: Aye.

4 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Carey?

5 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Aye.

6 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Pritsos?

7 COMMISSIONER PRITSOS: Aye.

8 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Rawson?

9 COMMISSIONER RAWSON: Aye.

10 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner VanderWell?

11 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Aye.

12 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you. The motion passes  
13 unanimately.

14 And the fourth motion is for the rezoning  
15 request.

16 COMMISSIONER BLACO: I'll go ahead and make a  
17 motion.

18 CHAIRMAN READ: Go ahead.

19 COMMISSIONER BLACO: I move to forward a  
20 recommendation of approval to the City Council for the  
21 rezoning request, RZ20-0002, associated with PCN19-0040,  
22 based on Findings Z1 through Z3, and the facts  
23 supporting these findings as set forth in the staff  
24 report.

1 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

2 Second?

3 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Commissioner  
4 VanderWell. Second.

5 CHAIRMAN READ: We have a motion by  
6 Commissioner Blaco and a second by Commissioner  
7 VanderWell. Any discussion before?

8 Commissioner Carey.

9 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Thank you, Madam Chair. I  
10 concur with staff's recommendation of approval and can  
11 make the required findings on this rezone request.

12 I just wanted to express my appreciation to our  
13 staff and the applicant for going for the A-5 zoning in  
14 this particular area. I agree that it's compatible with  
15 the zoning of our neighbors in Washoe County. I think,  
16 although I believe that the A-40 zoning on this property  
17 when it was annexed into the City would probably be  
18 sufficient for what the applicant wants to do, I  
19 appreciate that they are going for the rezone request to  
20 being for the A-5, which is more compatible with Washoe  
21 County.

22 And I would hope that our partners in the  
23 region, Washoe County, would show the same courtesy to  
24 the City when they are considering rezoning changes

1 there near the City. And I appreciate the accommodation  
2 of this. And I will be supporting the motion.

3 Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you, Commissioner Carey.

5 Any other discussion before we vote?

6 All right. Can we go ahead and get a roll call  
7 vote, please?

8 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Read?

9 CHAIRMAN READ: Aye.

10 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Petersen?

11 COMMISSIONER PETERSEN: Aye.

12 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Blaco?

13 COMMISSIONER BLACO: Aye.

14 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Carey?

15 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Aye.

16 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Pritsos?

17 COMMISSIONER PRITSOS: Aye.

18 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Rawson?

19 COMMISSIONER RAWSON: Aye.

20 MS. MARTINEZ: And Commissioner VanderWell?

21 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Aye.

22 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you. Passes unanimously.

23 And the fifth and final motion is for the

24 Truckee Meadows Regional Plan amendment sponsorship

1 request.

2 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Madam Chair,  
3 Commissioner VanderWell. I'm prepared to make a motion.

4 CHAIRMAN READ: Go ahead.

5 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: I move to forward a  
6 recommendation of support to City Council to sponsor an  
7 amendment to the 2019 Truckee Meadows Regional Plan for  
8 a site 34.71 acres in size to change the regional land  
9 designation from Rural Area to Tier 2 land and amend the  
10 boundaries of the Truckee Meadows Service Area and City  
11 of Sparks Sphere of Influence to include the site based  
12 on the facts as set forth in the staff report.

13 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

14 Do we have a second?

15 COMMISSIONER PETERSEN: Commissioner Petersen  
16 will second.

17 CHAIRMAN READ: All right. Thank you.

18 So we have a motion by Commissioner VanderWell  
19 and a second by Commissioner Petersen. Any discussion  
20 before we vote?

21 Yes, Commissioner Carey.

22 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Thank you, Madam Chair.  
23 Just a couple quick comments for the record. And I will  
24 be supporting the motion.

1 I view these TMRPA amendments pretty consistent  
2 with our master plan and the new Regional Plan. I  
3 think, adding this property into the TMSA, the proposed  
4 tiering change and the addition to the Sphere of  
5 Influence are consistent with what we're trying to do in  
6 this area. I think, it's pretty minor. And it's very  
7 technical stuff, but I think it's a pretty minor, minor  
8 change in general. And I hope that the City Council  
9 will support this amendment to the plan.

10 I would just like to say, you know, it took  
11 three years, about three years to get the Regional Plan  
12 updated, and it's cool to see that we're finally able to  
13 work on it. Perhaps if the Regional Plan took three and  
14 a half years to get updated, this amendment probably  
15 could have been rolled into the update. And it is  
16 pretty consistent and minor in nature.

17 I just wanted to make that point. Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you, Commissioner Carey.

19 Any other discussion before we vote?

20 Seeing none, can we please do a roll call vote?

21 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Read?

22 CHAIRMAN READ: Aye.

23 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Petersen?

24 COMMISSIONER PETERSEN: Aye.

1 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Blaco?

2 COMMISSIONER BLACO: Aye.

3 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Carey?

4 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Aye.

5 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Pritsos?

6 COMMISSIONER PRITSOS: Aye.

7 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Rawson?

8 COMMISSIONER RAWSON: Aye.

9 MS. MARTINEZ: And Commissioner VanderWell?

10 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Aye.

11 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you. Motion passes  
12 unanimately.

13 Thanks, again, Sienna and staff. That was a  
14 huge presentation, and you guys did a very thorough job,  
15 and I thought you really good on presenting that much  
16 information.

17 Next are general business items, which there  
18 are none.

19 So let's go ahead and move on to open to  
20 general public comment limited to items that are not on  
21 the agenda.

22 Casey, can you please repeat the call-in  
23 information?

24 MS. MARTINEZ: The telephone number for call-in

1 participation during the general public comment period  
2 is 1-669-900-6833, and the meeting ID is 970 0927 -- I'm  
3 sorry, that was wrong. The meeting ID number is  
4 962 4203 7566. And press star 9 to request to speak.

5 CHAIRMAN READ: Do we have any callers wanting  
6 to speak?

7 MS. MARTINEZ: I don't have any requests to  
8 speak at this time.

9 CHAIRMAN READ: All right. Thank you.  
10 Let's go ahead, then, and close public comment  
11 and move on to announcements from staff and  
12 Commissioners.

13 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Madam Chair,  
14 Commissioner VanderWell. And I don't know if I can do  
15 it here. But I would like to, if there's a possibility  
16 to ask staff, since it's been brought up by Commissioner  
17 Carey twice during this meeting regarding the MG4 policy  
18 and making sure that we have enough commercial land for  
19 employment.

20 I guess, what my question is, is since we've  
21 got such a large demand for housing and things like  
22 that, and since we have Tahoe Reno Industrial Park and  
23 then the additional 40 acres out in Fernley that's also  
24 going to be industrial, and that is going to put more



1 housing pressure on the City of Sparks as at this moment  
2 in time they are not proposition any housing in there.  
3 So, I guess, what my question is, is there something  
4 that we can do to make that policy a little more  
5 flexible?

6 MR. ORNELAS: Madam Chair, if I may.

7 CHAIRMAN READ: Yes, go ahead.

8 MR. ORNELAS: -- ask Commissioner VanderWell to  
9 clarify her question a bit.

10 You're looking to -- you're looking for staff  
11 to address additional flexibility in which policy  
12 specifically?

13 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: MG4. I apologize.

14 MR. ORNELAS: Okay. We can, we can certainly  
15 address that at a future Study Session.

16 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Okay. Thank you. I  
17 just -- it's been brought up twice during this meeting.  
18 And, I think, it's something that we possibly need to  
19 have further discussion about it, as changes with  
20 employment and how employment is happening is changing,  
21 but demand of housing is still increasing.

22 MR. ORNELAS: Yeah, I think, there's a couple  
23 of other pieces to that. One is, you know, I think, we  
24 could probably review with you again some of the

1 findings of the fiscal impact analysis, the long-term  
2 fiscal impact analysis. And then, you know, we are in  
3 the process of preparing some amendments to the  
4 regional, I'm sorry, to the Comprehensive Plan for  
5 purposes of bringing it into conformance with the 2019  
6 Regional Plan.

7 So there's an opportunity there perhaps to  
8 address some of these questions and these concerns.

9 You know, I think, now is not the time and  
10 place to go into it in much detail. But, obviously,  
11 there's a lot of change going on in the commercial real  
12 estate sector with these changes, some of which are  
13 being accelerated by the Covid pandemic. So, you know,  
14 it's certainly worthy of a conversation.

15 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: I appreciate that.  
16 Thank you very much.

17 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you, Commissioner  
18 VanderWell and Armando.

19 Any other comments from the Commissioners or  
20 staff?

21 I'd like to wish everyone a safe and happy  
22 Independence Day celebration.

23 And if there are no further comments, then I  
24 will adjourn this meeting. Thank you, everyone, for

1 hanging in there.

2 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Happy 4th, everyone.

3 COMMISSIONER BLACO: Happy Independence Day.

4 -oOo-

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24