

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

STUDY SESSION

CITY OF SPARKS PLANNING COMMISSION

Tuesday, June 30, 2020
12:00 p.m. to 1:00 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

- Sienna Reid, AICP
Planner Senior

- Jim Rundle
Planning Manager

- Casey Martinez
Office Assistant
Community Services Department

Other Participants:

(None)

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	3
2. ROLL CALL	3
3. REVIEW OF THE JULY 2, 2020 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING AGENDA	3
4. PUBLIC COMMENT	33
5. STAFF SYNOPSIS OF PLANNING RELATED ITEMS AT CITY COUNCIL MEETINGS	33
6. COMMISSIONER AND STAFF ANNOUNCEMENTS	34
7. ADJOURNMENT	35

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

SPARKS, NEVADA, TUESDAY, JUNE 30, 2020, 12:00 P.M.

-oOo-

DUE TO UNFORESEEN TECHNICAL DIFFICULTY DURING
THE FIRST PART OF THE MEETING, call to order and the
roll call was lost.

Agenda Item 3, Review of the July 2, 2020
Planning Commission Meeting Agenda, was in progress:

CHAIRMAN READ: Because I've never seen the
agenda --

MR. RUNDLE: That's up --

CHAIRMAN READ: -- like that.

MR. RUNDLE: That's up to your discretion,
Chair Read.

CHAIRMAN READ: Oh, well, let's --

MR. RUNDLE: But we can do that. I think, it's
the most efficient.

CHAIRMAN READ: Yeah, I'll go with that. So,
yeah, let's do everything under that item, PCN19-0040,
which includes MPA20-0001 and RZ20-0001. And, I guess,
I have to read those on Thursday. Is that correct?

MS. MCCORMICK: Madam Chair, you should read at

1 least a summary of each one. You don't have to read it
2 verbatim, but you should describe what is happening in
3 each separate item.

4 CHAIRMAN READ: Okay. And I just need to do
5 that on Thursday, correct?

6 MS. MCCORMICK: Yes, that's fine.

7 CHAIRMAN READ: Okay.

8 MS. MCCORMICK: Since you're not taking action.

9 CHAIRMAN READ: All right. Okay. I just want
10 to be clear so we are efficient on Thursday. So let's
11 go ahead and get started.

12 MS. REID: So I'm just going to go ahead and
13 share my screen and where everybody can see the
14 presentation.

15 All right. Is everybody able to see the
16 presentation for PCN19-40, MPA20-1 and RZ20-1 at this
17 time?

18 Okay. And just to, before I get going, can
19 everybody hear my voice in terms of volume pretty well?

20 Great. Okay.

21 MR. RUNDLE: Yes.

22 MS. REID: That'll come. Very good, then.

23 Okay. So thank you, Madam Chair, members of
24 the Commission. My name is Sienna Reid. I'm with the

1 Planning Division. This is my first opportunity to be
2 before you for a Study Session, and certainly the
3 Planning Commission will be my first time before you
4 this Thursday. So happy to be with you.

5 In terms of this particular agenda item that is
6 scheduled before you this Thursday, what I'd like to do
7 is give you an overview. It is the first of two agenda
8 items associated with the Five Ridges project. And as
9 noted when we kind of started, it includes two requests.
10 The first is a Comprehensive Plan land use amendment,
11 and the second is a rezoning request.

12 So as you are likely familiar, the Five Ridges
13 project site currently consists of one parcel. It's
14 almost 387 acres in size, located northwest of the
15 intersection of Pyramid Way and Highland Ranch Parkway,
16 you can see bound in red on this slide.

17 The Comprehensive Plan land use amendment and
18 rezoning request for this agenda item are each located
19 within this larger parcel. And I'll have some good maps
20 that give an indication of that coming up in the
21 presentation.

22 So in terms of background, development of the
23 site shown on the previous slide for mostly residential
24 purposes was initially approved about two years ago, in

1 July of 2018. Entitlement requests approved at that
2 time included a development agreement amendment, or a
3 development agreement, an annexation, a Comprehensive
4 Plan land use amendment, and a rezoning request. Those
5 were associated with the project known as the Quarry at
6 that time, and with 1,800 dwelling units within the
7 project area, as well as commercial or multi-family
8 development along Highland Ranch Parkway.

9 Subsequently, in February of this year, an
10 amendment, known as Amendment Number 1, to the agreement
11 was processed and approved. You probably remember
12 modifications to that agreement resulted from further
13 analysis of the site by the master developer taking a
14 look at land and infrastructure planning. Various
15 changes were made to the development agreement at that
16 time. Some of those addressed ownership changes.
17 Others clarified permitted residential uses. Others
18 addressed previously disturbed land and how that would
19 be calculated in regards to slope analysis. And then
20 others modified the timing and scope of infrastructure
21 improvements.

22 However, what's really important to note with
23 Amendment Number 1 is that it did not change the
24 permitted residential units at all.

1 And so, in addition, with the agreement that's
2 currently in place, entitlement requests to allow for
3 the development of duplex or townhome uses do not
4 require an amendment of the agreement, provided that the
5 total number of dwelling units complies.

6 And so, at this time, we have the applicant,
7 the master developer, seeking to develop duplex and
8 townhome units, and so to move forward with that desired
9 use has submitted Comprehensive Plan land use amendment
10 and rezoning requests designed to amending both those
11 uses.

12 As can you see on the right of this slide, the
13 Multi-Family Residential 14, or MF14, Comprehensive Plan
14 land use designation, and this is shown in the
15 blue-green color, is proposed for two areas within the
16 greater Five Ridges project site, 15 acres that are
17 located to the north of Highland Ranch Parkway that are
18 currently designated Commercial and then another 13.81
19 acres generally within the center of the Five Ridges
20 project site designated Intermediate Density
21 Residential, or IDR, would change to the proposed MF14
22 land use designation.

23 And so, ultimately, should this Comprehensive
24 Plan land use amendment be approved, what would be

1 present on the Five Ridges project site would be 28.81
2 total acres of the MF14 Comprehensive Plan land use
3 designation, and then the remainder of the Five Ridges
4 project area would retain the existing IDR land use
5 designation. And that is shown in beige on both of
6 these maps on this slide.

7 The associated rezoning request for this item
8 applies to those same two locations within the greater
9 Five Ridges project site. The 15 acres that are
10 currently zoned C2 adjacent to Highland Ranch Parkway
11 and then that 13.81-acre area currently zoned SF6 that's
12 generally within the center of the Five Ridges project
13 site would each be rezoned to MF2, which supports a
14 maximum of 14 dwelling units per acre.

15 This slide gives the Commission a general sense
16 of the Comprehensive Plan land use and rezoning request
17 locations in relation to the conceptual land plan that
18 you're likely familiar with for Five Ridges. This is
19 the land plan from November of 2019, so with the current
20 land opted development agreement. And the 15-acre
21 portion of the site that is located adjacent to Highland
22 Ranch Parkway, that particular portion is located within
23 Five Ridges Village 1, and then the 13.81-acre portion
24 of the site generally in the center of the Five Ridges

1 project site is within Village 5, to give everybody a
2 little bit more context.

3 As of today, we have not received public
4 comment on this item. We certainly will be continuing
5 to monitor that. And if we do receive any, we will
6 bring that forward to the Planning Commission this
7 Thursday.

8 And while we won't go into all of the findings
9 today, I did want to note that when we do a review of
10 findings for Planning Commission this Thursday, we'll be
11 looking to group the Comprehensive Plan land use
12 amendment and rezoning requests by similar topic. And
13 so really what we'll be looking at is, you know, how do
14 those particular requests, in terms of the Comprehensive
15 Plan land use amendment, how does that conform with the
16 Regional Plan, in terms of the land use and intensity
17 designation, how do both the Comprehensive Plan land use
18 amendment and rezoning requests comply with the City of
19 Sparks Comprehensive Plan, and then, also, how are those
20 two requests compatible with surrounding land uses, and
21 then certainly how they complied with the required
22 public notice provision.

23 And so, at this time, I would be happy to
24 answer any questions that you might have on this first

1 agenda item or anything in the staff report that might
2 be helpful to elucidate, I think, definitely trying not
3 to go into, you know, full finding detail in terms of
4 the time that we have today. But I'm happy to answer
5 any questions.

6 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you, Sienna.

7 Do any of the Commissioners have questions?

8 MR. RUNDLE: Sienna, will you unshare your
9 screen.

10 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

11 MS. REID: All right.

12 CHAIRMAN READ: Perfect. Thank you.

13 Do any of the Commissioners have questions?
14 Raise your hand.

15 Commissioner Carey.

16 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Thank you, Madam Chair.

17 Sienna, welcome to the Sparks Planning
18 Commission. It's great to have you on as part of the
19 team.

20 I have a couple questions, I guess, three
21 questions. I guess, the first one in my mind is just
22 trying to figure out the two different, the differences
23 between these two different action items on our agenda
24 for Thursday. As I understand it, it looks like the

1 first, first item, it's a master plan amendment and a
2 rezone, and so the requested action is going from
3 essentially commercial to multi-family residential. And
4 then the second item that we're going to be reviewing
5 later on, that one has more to deal with the existing
6 water tank parcel. So it's an annex, it's a master
7 plan, it's a rezone, it's an annexation kind of request.

8 Is that, I guess, my first question, is that
9 kind of the right way to differentiate these two items?

10 MS. REID: Yes, absolutely, Commissioner Carey.
11 So, you know, we have two requests. They're each
12 associated with the Five Ridges project site. One way
13 that it's been useful for me to distinguish these two
14 requests is that the agenda item that I just provided an
15 overview of, that relates to properties that are already
16 within Sparks city limits. And so certainly we have the
17 Comprehensive Plan land use amendment as well as the
18 rezoning request for the ultimately 28.81 total acres.
19 And so that particular request ultimately is desired to
20 go to the MF14 land use designation and MF2 zoning
21 district.

22 So that is kind of the full, the full request
23 associated with the first agenda item.

24 The second agenda item, again, I think, it's

1 useful to say, well, how does this differ from the
2 first. And it is definitely complex in terms of the
3 number of requests associated with the item. There are
4 five particular requests. And, I think, it'll take us a
5 while to get through that presentation when we go
6 through the full item on Thursday. But for the most
7 part, most of those requests relate to property that is
8 currently outside of Sparks city limits.

9 The development agreement to be expanded to
10 cover a new property that's proposed to be annexed. And
11 then we have those host of other requests associated
12 with that kind of expansion parcel.

13 And so that's where we get the Comprehensive
14 Plan land use amendment request, the rezoning request,
15 in addition to the annexation and development agreement
16 amendment request. And because of the designations per
17 the new 2019 Truckee Meadows Regional Plan, we also have
18 a sponsorship of a Regional Plan amendment that's
19 necessary before final action can occur.

20 So there's definitely a lot of pieces to each
21 of these two requests. And so I hope that gives a
22 better sense of where we're headed.

23 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Well, it does. And thank
24 you for that, that explanation. It kind of took me a

1 while with looking through this stuff over the weekend.
2 So I just thought that would be helpful. I was glad I
3 was on the right track, what I was thinking.

4 My other question is, is I was looking through
5 the staff report and looking through your
6 recommendation. One of the things of the findings of
7 support was you're talking about the fiscal impact
8 analysis that we did last year, and there was discussion
9 that there's an overabundance of commercial land uses
10 within the projected 20-year timeline. And so,
11 basically, in the recommendation, you were saying that,
12 you know, this commercial could go away because there's
13 some within the nearby area, there's enough within the
14 City to meet kind of the demand.

15 I was curious about what that report said about
16 with -- I think, it's referred to as high density
17 single-family, low-density multi-family, like the 10
18 dwelling units per acre size of residential development.
19 I was curious what that report said about the projected
20 need for this type of multi-family. Looking through, I
21 was able to find that you had the projected need was
22 there would be a total of 3,050 units that was needed
23 over the next 20 years, and there was 305 acres that
24 were projected to be assumed with new growth patterns.

1 So I was curious with where we're at in terms of our
2 master plan and in terms of this land use of 10 dwelling
3 units per acre. Do we have enough of this type of land
4 use in the City now?

5 And I realize that's not a very fair question,
6 because this is -- you've only been on board a couple
7 months, but.

8 MS. REID: No, it's a great question. And I'll
9 tackle it to the best of my ability but do want to want
10 to put a pin in exact numbers as it relates to the land
11 use designation kind of category that the MF14 land use
12 designation would fall into. But, I think, it's
13 important to just kind of separate out. There is, in
14 terms of compliance with the City of Sparks
15 Comprehensive Plan policies, the portion of the staff
16 report that was focused on employment land, right, in
17 terms of do we need to maintain this commercial
18 designated area to support policies that say we should
19 have an adequate supply of employment-generating uses
20 and the land available there. The fiscal health
21 analysis from 2014 indicated that we do have an
22 oversupply of land that would accommodate basically
23 retail-type development.

24 And so that particular information was brought

1 in to say, you know, based on that information moving
2 away from the commercial designation along Highland
3 Ranch Parkway seems appropriate from a Comprehensive
4 Plan policy perspective.

5 The other side thought is the residential
6 component. And so to Commissioner Carey's question,
7 where do we stand in terms of the fiscal health analysis
8 and the supply and demand of the land for MF14 land use,
9 MF2 zoning, do we need more, I did take a look at that,
10 and I do think the City of Sparks has, and based on that
11 information, adequate supply. I do want to go confirm
12 numbers. I don't have that in my notes.

13 But beyond that, there are other City of Sparks
14 Comprehensive Plan policies that promote a range of
15 housing to really housing type diversity. And so that
16 is what staff noted in terms of the materials in the
17 staff report is that we have basically a goal and a few
18 policies that look to have a wider range of housing
19 available to City of Sparks residents.

20 And so the requested MF14 land use and MF2
21 zoning do help to support those policies.

22 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you, Sienna.

23 MS. REID: M-hm (affirmative).

24 CHAIRMAN READ: Commissioner Carey, is that the

1 rest of your questions?

2 COMMISSIONER CAREY: It is. Thank you very
3 much.

4 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you. That was very
5 comprehensive. I appreciate it.

6 Do any other Commissioners have questions?

7 I will move on to the next item, which is
8 PCN19-0040, another item at Highland Ranch Parkway. And
9 under that, we have DA20-0001, ANX20-0002, MPA20-0003,
10 and RZ20-0002, and also sponsor an amendment to the 2019
11 Truckee Meadows Regional Plan.

12 MS. REID: So, again, Sienna Reid. I am going
13 to share my screen and ask if everybody can
14 adequately -- can everybody see kind of this initial
15 slide with all of the requests associated to this agenda
16 item?

17 Okay. Perfect. Okay. So, again, I think,
18 Madam Chair, members of the Commission, Sienna Reid with
19 the Planning Division.

20 I definitely want to give you a comprehensive
21 overview of this particular agenda item, which is our
22 second one associated with the Five Ridges project. But
23 I do want to note that it's lengthy, and so I will try
24 and be as brief as possible to be sensitive with

1 everybody's time today.

2 As noted when we were discussing the first
3 agenda item, this second one is definitely a little bit
4 meatier. There are five requests associated with it.
5 The first is really Amendment Number 2 to the
6 development agreement. And those proposed changes
7 really relate mostly to the proposed expansion of the
8 project site.

9 And then the other requests, which include the
10 annexation, Comprehensive Plan Land Use amendment,
11 rezoning, and then the Regional Plan amendment
12 sponsorship, those are each associated with the property
13 that would be added to the Five Ridges project site,
14 which is currently under Washoe County jurisdiction.

15 The Five Ridges project site, as it's proposed
16 to be expanded, you can see on the slide, the 34.71-acre
17 parcel that would be added to the Five Ridges project
18 site is shown in black hashing, and it's on kind of the
19 northwest corner.

20 If this property is added, the Five Ridges
21 project site would be brought up to a total of 421.58
22 acres in size. And that's what you can see bound in
23 red, that larger site area.

24 With regards to background on this site, we did

1 kind of give an overview of that information with the
2 previous agenda item. So I'll be brief here and note
3 that the initial entitlement request associated with
4 the Quarry, as the project was known at that time, were
5 approved in July of 2018. Amendment Number 1 to the
6 development agreement was approved in February of this
7 year. And then you'll remember quite recently that a
8 tentative map and conditional use permit for portions of
9 the Five Ridges project site were before the Commission
10 in April of this year as well.

11 The five requests that you'll be considering
12 this Thursday collectively work to expand the Five
13 Ridges project site and support single-family
14 development on a portion of that expansion area, in
15 essence based on the remaining portion.

16 So in terms of borders here, as far as Thursday
17 goes, what we plan to do is take the development
18 agreement amendment first and then the annexation prior
19 to the Comprehensive Plan land use amendment and
20 rezoning request, and then we'll take the Regional Plan
21 amendment sponsorship in terms of covering that item
22 last. So really what you will see is kind of this order
23 in the presentation today. But we certainly will go
24 into a lot more detail on Thursday.

1 So starting with Amendment Number 2 to the
2 development agreement, just to give you a quick overview
3 in terms of the proposed project that would be in effect
4 if the agreement is amended, it would be over that
5 almost 422-acre site. It would include the expansion
6 parcel. With regards to permitted uses, we have no
7 requests to change the number of residential units.
8 That would remain, in terms of permitted uses, a minimum
9 of 1,200 and a maximum of 1,800. In terms of the types
10 of uses, single-family, duplex, townhomes or
11 multi-family development would be allowed in accordance
12 with adopted zoning districts, and commercial uses would
13 also be allowed based on adopted zoning. The minimum
14 open space in terms of what has to be reserved is
15 increased by 20 acres to a total of 120. And then
16 Comprehensive Plan land use designation proposed on the
17 site as part of the last agenda item that we were
18 looking at, and those in association with this
19 particular agenda item, would result in a mix of
20 Intermediate Density Residential, Multi-Family
21 Residential 14, and Open Space. And then the proposed
22 conforming zoning district would be SF6, MF2 and A-5.
23 The conceptual land plan for Amendment Number 2
24 to the agreement is shown on this slide. It is

1 important to note that all anticipated development shown
2 on the land plan is residential. Townhomes are
3 identified in Village 1 at the project entrance, as well
4 as within Village 5 in the center of the site.

5 Single-family lots comprise the remaining development,
6 with approximately 19 single-family lots that you can
7 see shown in the expansion area.

8 As I did indicate earlier, Amendment Number 2
9 would expand the Five Ridges project site. However,
10 neither the committed number of residential units or
11 infrastructure and public service requirements necessary
12 are proposed to change.

13 And information provided, like the applicant
14 indicates that Amendment Number 2, in addition to the
15 four other requests before the Commission, is being
16 sought at this time to promote better design and
17 circulation through the project site.

18 So going into a bit more detail on the proposed
19 amendments, as part of Amendment Number 2, most of those
20 changes are very much due to the expansion of the Five
21 Ridges project site. However, there are some additional
22 changes that are proposed for clarification purposes
23 that remove reference to specific zoning district, as
24 well as changes to address some comments received from

1 the Nevada Department of Transportation, or NDOT.

2 So on this slide, what you can see with regard
3 to the changes for permitted uses and density is that we
4 do have that reference removal to specific zoning
5 districts associated with permitted uses, and this was
6 really intended to simplify that portion of the
7 development agreement. We have modifications to gross
8 density requirements. That is simply due to the
9 expansion of the site area, definitely no change to the
10 minimum or maximum number of residential units
11 specified. And then increasing that minimum amount of
12 reserved open space area.

13 In regards to the changes to address NDOT's
14 comments, these relate to Section 3.2 of the agreement,
15 and it is modified to specify that improvements to the
16 intersection of Highland Ranch Parkway and Pyramid Way
17 shall occur concurrently with the widening of Highland
18 Ranch Parkway. This was the intent of the language.
19 But since we had the development agreement open, we
20 wanted to note that the comments that NDOT had were
21 valid in terms of clarification of the language. So we
22 brought those changes forward at this time really
23 specifying that both of those improvements, the widening
24 and the intersection improvements, would be triggered by

1 the three triggers that you see on this slide, really
2 whichever occurs first.

3 And then, lastly, there are some other changes
4 with Amendment Number 2 that address updates to the
5 allowed disturbance area. That's based on an updated
6 slope analysis that includes the expanded site area,
7 also the updated other sections just to reflect the
8 project status in terms of land use and agreement
9 approval. Here we have Washoe County's approval of an
10 emergency access road as well, as well as Council's
11 approval of an agreement with the Sun Valley General
12 Improvement District to grant use of the City streets
13 and roads for water transmission facilities. And then
14 there are some further changes that add an annexation
15 property definition and then provisions regarding how
16 entitlement requests associated with that annexation
17 property will move forward.

18 In terms of considering the proposed amendment,
19 this Thursday what the Planning Commission is asked to
20 do is to review the agreement for consistency with the
21 Comprehensive Plan. I won't go into all of the details
22 on the slide. If you want to know, that would be the
23 review criteria for the development agreement amendment.

24 So shifting here to the second request, which

1 is the annexation request, I think, everybody at this
2 point is probably familiar that the annexation request
3 is for this black hatched area at the northwest corner
4 of the current Five Ridges project site.

5 And in terms of reviewing annexation requests,
6 there are a variety of findings that the Commission is
7 going to need to consider this coming Thursday. There
8 are four, but one of them is a little bit meaty. So I
9 wanted to give the Commission a heads-up that, you know,
10 this Thursday we will definitely go into more detail in
11 terms of finding A1 here that requires conformance to
12 NRS Chapter 268, which is the chapter of state law that
13 governs annexations.

14 We will also certainly go into a lot of detail
15 about how the annexation request conforms to the
16 annexation findings and parts needed for code. There
17 are 10 of these findings. So they actually are going to
18 be spanning the next couple of slides. Just take a
19 small look at them.

20 And then the third and fourth finding relate to
21 conformance with the Comprehensive Plan as well as
22 public notice.

23 So certainly a lot of different aspects to
24 consider with the annexation request.

1 In regards to the Comprehensive Plan land use
2 amendment and rezoning request for this second agenda
3 item, these we can group together, and it's similar to
4 what we did with the first agenda item. So this next
5 sets of slide does present an overview of both of those
6 requests.

7 In terms of existing and proposed Comprehensive
8 Plan land use, at this point in time, the 34.71-acre
9 property for which the Comprehensive Plan land use
10 amendment is proposed is designated rural. And that is
11 a Washoe County designation. The applicant is
12 requesting to apply City of Sparks comprehensive land
13 use -- Comprehensive Plan land use designation -- excuse
14 me there -- of Intermediate Density Residential, or IDR,
15 for the eastern 10 acres of the site and Open Space for
16 the western 24.71 acres of the site.

17 So the zoning, the applicant is requesting
18 conforming zoning designations to the land uses, so 10
19 acres of SF6 and 24.71 acres of A-5 agriculture.

20 When we get to the hearing this Thursday, we
21 will definitely go into, you know, a lot more of the
22 details as it relates to how these requests conform to
23 the Regional Plan land use and intensity designation,
24 how they conform to the City of Sparks Comprehensive

1 Plan, and then compatibility of surrounding land uses
2 and, lastly, public noticing in regards to required
3 provisions there.

4 And then, moving on to our fifth and last
5 request associated with this particular item is the
6 applicant's request for City Council to sponsor a
7 Regional Plan amendment.

8 So in terms of the map that you can see on this
9 slide, it shows the relationship of the site, which is
10 bound in red, to the 2019 Truckee Meadows Regional Plan
11 land designations as well as the Truckee Meadows Service
12 Area, which is the thicker black line. So what you can
13 see here is the site currently has a regional land
14 designation of Rural Area. It is adjacent to Tier 2
15 land to the east, and that encompasses the current Five
16 Ridges project site. And then not shown on the slide is
17 that the site is located outside of the City of Sparks
18 Sphere of Influence. That is another designation of
19 importance.

20 And so because the site is outside of those
21 particular designations, the Truckee Meadows Service
22 Area and the City of Sparks Sphere of Influence, and has
23 a rural area designation, what needs to occur prior to
24 City Council action on the development agreement

1 request, the annexation and Comprehensive Plan land use
2 amendment, and rezoning requests is that this Regional
3 Plan amendment be heard and determined.

4 And so the applicant is requesting Council
5 sponsor that Regional Plan amendment request, and it
6 would be to redesignate the site from Rural Area to
7 Tier 2, so the same designation that's currently applied
8 to the Five Ridges project site, to include the site
9 within the boundaries of the Truckee Meadows Service
10 Area, and then, also, within the boundaries of the City
11 of Sparks Sphere of Influence.

12 So consistent with past practice, the Planning
13 Commission reviews these sponsorship requests and
14 provides a recommendation to Council. So that's what
15 we'll be looking for this coming Thursday.

16 There are a host of specific review criteria
17 that are set forth in the Regional Plan for each of
18 those designations. I won't go into all of the details
19 for each of them. But this slide in particular shows
20 the review criteria for Tier 2 land designations. And
21 so we'll go ahead and go into detail on those in terms
22 of proximity, density requirements, land use diversity,
23 as well as connectivity, the availability and proximity
24 of infrastructure and facilities, and then assessment of

1 impacts to planned land uses.

2 In addition, we'll take a look through the
3 review criteria for the Truckee Meadows Service Area
4 what properties need to demonstrate to be included
5 within that particular boundary. A lot of these
6 findings are somewhat duplicative, those associated with
7 Tier 2 land, and that's because Tier 2 land has to be
8 located within the Truckee Meadows Service Area. But
9 we'll go ahead and go through those findings. And
10 really the one that is different from Tier 2 land is
11 this land area, or is the indication of regional need
12 for additional land uses, land area or purposes. And so
13 that's really the main difference in those two
14 particular sets of designations in the review criteria.

15 And then, lastly, in terms of the City of
16 Sparks Sphere of Influence, there's a requirement that
17 cities bring forth the rationale for the request to
18 analyze and change conditions and that we provide
19 evidence that we've conferred with the effective local
20 government, which in this particular case is Washoe
21 County.

22 So I did want to give you a heads-up on these
23 review criteria. They are new to the 2019 Truckee
24 Meadows Regional Plan. And so to the best of my

1 knowledge, we are the first jurisdiction that is
2 bringing forward this type of request to bring a site
3 into the TMSA, applying the Sphere of Influence, and
4 then also apply a new regional land designation. So
5 these review criteria are new to staff and certainly new
6 to the Planning Commission, City Council; and even
7 regional staff, this will be their first time applying
8 them as well.

9 As of today, we haven't received public
10 comment. Certainly, if we do, we'll be able to provide
11 that to you on Thursday night.

12 And with that, I know that was a fairly lengthy
13 overview, but I hope it gave you a sense of the various
14 requests that you're going to be asked to consider with
15 this second agenda item this coming Thursday.

16 And so I'm happy to answer any questions that I
17 might be able to. And I will stop sharing my screen.

18 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you, Sienna. Yeah,
19 that's a very, going to be a very lengthy presentation.
20 And we were voting on all of these items separately,
21 too.

22 Do any -- how do they inter -- I mean I know
23 kind of how they interconnect. But is it feasible to
24 vote no on one and yes on others?

1 MS. REID: I think, it is possible. Certainly,
2 and I will defer to legal, but you could have a
3 situation where a Regional Plan amendment is sponsored,
4 but the Commission doesn't make a recommendation for
5 approval of, say, the other entitlement requests.
6 However, from a practical standpoint, I think, it's
7 really important to note that the changes to the
8 development agreement are very much connected to all of
9 the other requests in terms of that 34.71-acre expansion
10 parcel or annexation parcel.

11 And so while there might be a path forth with
12 some of those requests, I think, the ultimate goal and
13 the way the development agreement is set up is to have
14 all of those bundled and heard at the same time so that
15 they move forward in concert with each other, very
16 similar to how the initial development agreement was
17 approved in July of 2018.

18 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you. That's what I
19 thought, but I just wanted to get clarification before
20 Thursday.

21 Alyson, did you have anything to add to that?

22 MS. MCCORMICK: I think, Sienna answered it
23 correctly. There's a possibility at least for
24 potentially the Regional Plan amendment and annexation,

1 that you could recommend approval of both of those items
2 without recommending approval of the other items. But
3 as Sienna said, practically speaking, it doesn't really
4 make sense to do that, even though it might be lawful.

5 CHAIRMAN READ: Fair enough.

6 MR. RUNDLE: Chair Read?

7 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you for the
8 clarification. Yes?

9 MR. RUNDLE: Some of these items will require a
10 supermajority, not just a simple majority as well.

11 CHAIRMAN READ: Okay. Thank you for that
12 clarification.

13 Do any of the Commissioners have questions for
14 Sienna?

15 Commissioner Carey.

16 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Thank you, Madam Chair.

17 We received a lot of public comment a couple
18 months ago and concerns from nearby property owners
19 about ridgeline and hillside development. I'm just
20 curious if the proposed change in the development
21 agreement allowing for increased acreage, acres to be
22 disturbed, would that propose change have any impact on
23 the conditional use permit that the Planning Commission
24 and City Council subsequently upheld or any of the

1 ridgeline concerns that were brought up?

2 MS. REID: So the area for the conditional use
3 permit does not include kind of the expansion parcel.
4 So in terms of compliance with the development
5 agreement, you know, if the site is ultimately added, it
6 would need to demonstrate compliance with a conditional
7 use permit for slopes, hilltops and ridges.

8 What we anticipate moving forward is that we
9 would see an amendment to that conditional use permit
10 that the Planning Commission reviewed in April and that
11 it would be amended to cover the site over time. It
12 would need to comply with the disturbance area provision
13 of the development agreement, and certainly you would
14 see any amendments coming forward.

15 I think, in terms of public comment, it is
16 useful to acknowledge that, you know, there was a
17 statutorily required neighborhood meeting held by the
18 applicant. It was earlier, in June. June 8th was the
19 date, I believe. There were nine attendees. And there
20 was definitely a lot of discussion, so, in terms of the
21 public comment that you heard when the conditional use
22 permit and tentative map approvals from April were being
23 heard by the Commission.

24 And so, I think, there is still a concern. And

1 it's noted in the staff report, in terms of summarizing
2 that conversation about development on ridgeline.
3 However, you know, this, this particular item doesn't
4 necessarily relate to the CUP. It just basically,
5 that's more land that would have to go through that CUP
6 process.

7 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Thank you for that
8 explanation. Just thought I'd ask, for the record.

9 My second question, and this may be for Jim, I
10 was curious about the City's seven-year annexation
11 program. I know that that's been expired for a couple
12 years now. Does the City have any plans to update that
13 plan, or do we need a seven-year annexation program?

14 MR. RUNDLE: Well, we don't necessarily need an
15 annexation program. But we are, in terms of annexing
16 parcels, the regional plan does direct that we should
17 have one.

18 So what we're doing is the City Council will be
19 reviewing the City's Comprehensive Plan this year for
20 conformance with the 2019 Regional Plan. And ultimately
21 we anticipate approval with the Council and Regional
22 Planning Commission. Once those items are adopted, we
23 will incorporate a seven-year annexation program into
24 our Comprehensive Plan, or it's a component. But it

1 would be after the approval of Comprehensive Plan
2 occurs, potentially in the fall in this year, by the
3 Sparks Planning Commission for the Comp Plan, and then
4 the annexation program would follow that up.

5 But for a contiguous annexation, you do not
6 necessarily need the annexation program to be in place.

7 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Thank you, Jim.

8 Thanks, Madam Chair.

9 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

10 Any other questions from the Commission?

11 And so, Jim, just to be clear, both of these
12 public hearing items require supermajority, which is
13 five yes votes, correct?

14 MS. MCCORMICK: Madam Chair?

15 CHAIRMAN READ: Yes.

16 MS. MCCORMICK: The two master plan amendment
17 items require a supermajority of five or more.

18 CHAIRMAN READ: Okay. I just wanted to make
19 sure all the Commissioners were aware of that.

20 I don't see any more questions. And under
21 general business, there are no general business items.

22 So we will move on to public comment, which is
23 any item on or off the agenda. Do we have any public
24 comment?

1 MS. SMITH: We have no public comment requests.

2 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

3 I'll close public comment and move on to staff
4 synopsis of planning related items at City Council
5 meetings.

6 MR. RUNDLE: Thanks, Commissioner Read, or
7 Chair Read.

8 The most important component, I think, that
9 happened at the June 22nd meeting was that the City
10 Council approved a right-of-way agreement between the
11 City of Sparks and the Sun Valley General Improvement
12 District to allow operate and maintain its water
13 distribution system within the City of Sparks'
14 right-of-way. And that's specifically for the Five
15 Ridges development and that section of Highland Ranch
16 Parkway that Sienna was discussing today.

17 And, I think, that's the most port item for the
18 Planning Commission to be aware of.

19 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you, Jim.

20 Any questions?

21 Seeing none, we'll move on to Commissioner and
22 staff announcements.

23 MR. RUNDLE: Chair Read, I do not have any from
24 the staff perspective.

1 CHAIRMAN READ: Okay. Any Commissioners?

2 Seeing -- oh, Commissioner Carey.

3 COMMISSIONER CAREY: I was just curious, with
4 the Governor extending the Phase 2 for the current
5 pandemic situation, I was curious if we're going to be
6 planning to have another meeting this month or if we'll
7 be maintaining these virtual meetings moving forward, if
8 there's any update to that respect.

9 MS. MCCORMICK: Madam Chair?

10 CHAIRMAN READ: Yes.

11 MS. MCCORMICK: Directive 6, which is the
12 directive from the Governor's Office that allows for
13 virtual meetings without a physical location for the
14 public to attend was extended yesterday by Directive 26
15 through July 31st. I don't know whether we have a
16 second meeting planned for July. Someone else can speak
17 to that. But if we do, it will be held virtually. And
18 our meeting Thursday is lawfully going to be held
19 virtually.

20 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you, Alyson.

21 Does that answer your question, Commissioner
22 Carey, more or less?

23 COMMISSIONER CAREY: It does. Thank you.

24 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

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

Any other questions?

Great. With that, I will adjourn the meeting.
Thank you to staff for keeping it within the hour.
Sienna, great job.

BOARD MEMBER BLACO: Thank you, everybody.

CHAIRMAN READ: Bye. I'll see you Thursday.

BOARD MEMBER BLACO: Thank you. Bye-bye.

BOARD MEMBER RAWSON: Thank you.

-oOo-