



**CITY OF SPARKS, NV
COMMUNITY
SERVICES
DEPARTMENT**

To: Mayor and City Council

From: Marilie Smith, Administrative Secretary

Subject: Report of Sparks Planning Commission Action

Date: January 30, 2020

RE: **PCN19-0019** – Consideration of and possible action on a Tentative Map request for a 182-lot single-family subdivision on a site 62.49 acres in size located at 7900 Pyramid Way, Sparks, Nevada in the NUD (New Urban District – Stonebrook Planned Development) zoning district.

Please see the attached excerpt from the January 16, 2020 Planning Commission meeting transcript.

1 conditional review and public input.

2 I really think that, just a comment in general,
3 I really think we need to take a look at the mixed-use
4 districts as a whole, considering how the RTC has been
5 cutting transit within the district and within the City
6 as a whole. I think, there's some areas of the MUD
7 district that don't really make much sense given the
8 transportation reality moving forward.

9 Thank you.

10 COMMISSIONER READ: Thank you.

11 Any other, further discussion?

12 With that, we have a motion on the floor. All
13 those in favor, say "aye."

14 (Commission members said "aye.")

15 COMMISSIONER READ: Opposed?

16 Okay. Passes unanimously. Thank you.

17 Next, we will move to our general business
18 items. First up is PCN19-0019, consideration of and
19 possible action on a tentative map request for a 182-lot
20 single-family subdivision on a site located at 7900
21 Pyramid Way in Sparks.

22 MR. CRITTENDEN: Thank you, Madam Vice Chair.
23 Members of the Planning Commission, I am Ian Crittenden,
24 the Acting Development Services Manager.

1 So this is a tentative map request for a
2 182-lot single-family subdivision. The lot is located,
3 as you can see here on the map, this is Pyramid Way,
4 this is Dolores Drive, David James, and then Robert
5 Banks is just peaking at the top of the map here. And
6 if you've been out to the Andelin Family Farm, you kind
7 of get the reference of it. It's located here as well.

8 The proposed map will occupy the southern 62.49
9 acres of the greater 110-acre site, 110.89-acre site.
10 The greater site is outline here in red. It's actually
11 made up of two parcels. And the proposed tentative map
12 is just the area outlined in blue that is 62.49 acres.

13 The handbook designation for this site is LMDR,
14 which stands for Low Medium Density Residential, which
15 allows a maximum density of 8 units per acre, or has a
16 target density, I should say, of 8 units per acre, as
17 we'll talk about a little bit later on. And the site
18 has a Comprehensive Plan Land Use designation of IDR, or
19 Intermediate Density Residential, which permits between
20 6 and 10 units per acre.

21 As proposed, the map would permit lots between
22 6,500 and 18,479 square feet. We can see that on this
23 map here. After the Study Session, I was able to find a
24 much better map that kind of details how these lots lay

1 out on that site.

2 The proposed density minus the open space would
3 be about 3.8 units per acre. This is in conformance
4 with the handbook, which only sets an upper limit to the
5 number of units that can be built on the site, but is
6 not in compliance with the minimum standard carried in
7 the Comprehensive Plan Land Use density, which does have
8 a minimum of 6 units per acre. However, in situations
9 like this where we do have conflict between the zoning,
10 which is what the handbook is for this site, and the
11 Comprehensive Plan, the zoning is the operative
12 regulations.

13 In connection to that as well, however, the
14 applicant also owns a multi-family residential parcel
15 that is to the north of this site. If we go back out
16 here, it occupies kind of this, this area here that is
17 zoned or designated in the handbook as MDR, which is
18 Medium Density Residential, which has a maximum density
19 of 24 units per acre.

20 And so the applicant has indicated to the City
21 and written us a letter indicating their intent to
22 transfer density that is not used on the single-family
23 lots into their multi-family project. That is, that
24 density transfer is allowed per the handbook. And so

1 they just helped to clarify that that is their intent.

2 The applicant also submitted a fiscal impact
3 analysis that updated. When the handbook was amended in
4 2018, there was a fiscal impact analysis that was done
5 to kind of show how this development would -- what kind
6 of impact it would have fiscally on the City. And they
7 did an update in regards to that for this site. And
8 while the overall surplus that this site would generate
9 did drop, it still shows a positive impact, a fiscal
10 surplus of over \$400,000 over a 20-year period for the
11 site even at the lower density.

12 This site will be accessed from Pyramid Way via
13 a couple of different streets, the first of which is
14 Tierra Del Sol Parkway, comes in here. This is the
15 Sierra Del Sol planned development. The Tierra Del Sol
16 Parkway will be extended. This is kind of that this
17 intersection area here will come up. This is Tierra
18 Del Sol. This is Stonebrook Parkway. And there's
19 actually another street just to the north of here. I
20 apologize for flipping back and forth between these so
21 much. But this is the David James street alignment.

22 The Summerwilde Drive is another street that
23 will be brought in that will attach from here kind of
24 down to this area here where the northern attachment to

1 intersection.

2 And so a condition of approval that we have
3 suggested for this development is that with any final
4 maps that are pulled off of this tentative map, that
5 they submit a detailed analysis showing what the current
6 number of U-turns is available there or happening there,
7 plus whatever would be generated by the final map that
8 they're submitting. And if it exceeds 131, then that
9 would require that a signal light and intersection
10 improvement plans be submitted with that final map for
11 installation.

12 While we can't extend that to any other
13 development on this site, it is the intent of staff to
14 attach it to any other administrative reviews or other
15 development that comes in along this side. That will be
16 a standard that will continue to move forward with
17 additional projects to show that when we hit that
18 standard, that we make sure that that light be installed
19 and help alleviate that stress that will come as part of
20 the traffic impacts.

21 There are 12 findings of fact, or 12 findings
22 that are required to be considered when reviewing
23 tentative maps. I'm going to go through these. I've
24 tried to condense them in this one, and we'll see how

1 the planned development or the planned subdivision will
2 go. And that will replace the existing road that kind
3 of takes you into the Andelin Family Farm, it'll replace
4 that and be a new route into this, this area of the
5 city, and then, ultimately, into the county.

6 The applicant submitted a traffic impact
7 analysis that looked at the total number of trips that
8 are going to be generated by the whole of the western
9 portion of the Stonebrook Planned Development. Those
10 numbers were very high. And we talked with them and
11 worked with them and got an indication of what the
12 actual impact from this specific development would be.
13 And while a connection of Stonebrook Parkway to Pyramid
14 Way at the Dolores intersection will ultimately be
15 required, the development of this site in particular
16 will not specifically require that.

17 However, as part of their traffic analysis for
18 this site, the applicant did do what they call a gap
19 analysis to look at the number of U-turns that were
20 available at the Robert Banks intersection, again here
21 just at the top of the map, that how much room or
22 availability for additional U-turns exists there.
23 Through that analysis, they were able to show that 132,
24 or 131 total U-turns could be handled at that

1 that goes.

2 But Finding 1 looks for conformance to the
3 Comprehensive Plan. This development and the zoning for
4 the site, this development does support, is -- excuse
5 me. This development does support Comp Plan Goal H2 by
6 providing housing and being fiscally positive over a
7 20-year period. And the development also has sidewalks
8 throughout the site, which supports Policy C4. And City
9 services can be provided at acceptable levels, as sewer
10 and other infrastructures nearby and convenient to be
11 extended to the site, which supports Policy C9.

12 Findings T2 and T8 require the impacts to
13 streets and street networks be considered. As I
14 mentioned, significant roadway construction and
15 improvements are required along this west side of
16 Stonebrook. The 1,780 daily trips that this specific
17 tentative map would generate will not trigger the
18 construction of all of them. However, the
19 transportation backbone, which is, the, you know,
20 extension of Tierra Del Sol Parkway up through this site
21 and actually all the way up to La Posada Drive and some
22 other additional street improvements, excuse me, that
23 backbone infrastructure plan has actually already been
24 submitted to the City and are being reviewed by the City

1 Engineer, as the applicant is looking to develop this
2 site, and they would be able to sell, market the
3 commercial areas to the north as well more actively if
4 those improvements are approved.

5 Findings T3, T4, T5, T9 and T10 all require
6 that other agencies with administrative oversight for
7 utilities, health and safety laws have an opportunity to
8 review this project.

9 We did receive a letter that was distributed to
10 the Planning Commission from the Washoe County Air
11 Quality Department Management District, and it indicates
12 that they have air quality monitoring equipment in the
13 area and that the applicant has been asked that if -- to
14 cooperate as they determine whether or not this site
15 will continue to meet EPA standards with the development
16 of their site.

17 The project sewer generation for this
18 development is estimated at 63,700 gallons per day. The
19 City's sewer model does show adequate capacity to move
20 this amount of sewer.

21 The project's water usage for this development
22 is estimated at 86.84 acre-feet per year. Water rights
23 sufficient to meet this need will need to be submitted
24 or documented and shown during the final, prior to the

1 final map being approved.

2 Finding T6 looks at the availability and
3 accessibility of other public services, such as school,
4 police, fire, and transportation.

5 The development will be served by the City of
6 Sparks Police Department. The site is not located where
7 the 4-minute travel time standard for Sparks Fire can be
8 met. However, this area is served by an automatic aid
9 agreement with the Truckee Meadows Fire Protection
10 District.

11 The development also increases attendance at
12 Washoe County schools. A letter from the school
13 district indicates that they anticipate that this
14 development will add 37 new students to Hall Elementary,
15 16 to Shaw Middle, and 17 to Spanish Springs High
16 School. Of these schools, only Spanish Springs High
17 School is at or exceeding capacity. And it is
18 anticipated that the Spanish Springs High School will
19 receive some relief when the new Hug High School is
20 built at the Wildcreek location.

21 Finding T8 looks at slopes and floodplain.
22 This site is not in the floodplain and does not have any
23 slopes that would trigger the requirements for the slope
24 and hillside analysis to be performed, or the additional

1 slopes and hillsides and ridges requirements to be
2 input.

3 Finding T11 looks for other identified impacts.
4 In the case of this project, we identified architecture
5 and landscaping as other identified impacts for this
6 development. The planned development handbook has lots
7 of details for architecture standards as well as
8 landscaping standards. And any final map that is
9 submitted will have to submit plans that show that they
10 meet those standards, as is our standard practice.

11 Finding T12 requires proper notice and this
12 item be heard at a meeting. The notice is accomplished
13 by the posting of the agenda. And this meeting
14 qualifies as part of the meeting requirements for a
15 tentative map.

16 That is the end of my presentation. The
17 applicant is here. And I am available for any questions
18 that you might have.

19 COMMISSIONER READ: Thank you, Ian.

20 Do any of the Commissioners have questions?

21 Commissioner Carey, do you have any questions?

22 CHAIRMAN CAREY: Thank you, Madam Vice Chair.

23 A few questions for staff.

24 Ian, and I'm sorry if I missed it here on the

1 phone, the response to the county's concern about the
2 air quality station, how is that going to be addressed,
3 again; is that an new condition of approval?

4 MR. CRITTENDEN: As staff read that letter,
5 there's not really any condition of approval to pull out
6 of that letter. That letter really is just stating
7 that, hey, we, the Washoe County Air Quality Department,
8 we have a monitoring station, we are trying to determine
9 whether or not this development will cause that station
10 to no longer meet EPA standards, we're asking the
11 developer to work with us as we try to determine whether
12 or not it does.

13 There's not really, as far as staff could see,
14 a condition of approval to pull from that, as that
15 agency already has the ability to work with the
16 developer on their own. They don't need our condition
17 to tell them they can do that.

18 CHAIRMAN CAREY: Oh, okay. I appreciate that
19 explanation. Yeah, that's a pretty important air
20 quality station. I think, it's the only one in Spanish
21 Springs. So I appreciate that, that explanation.

22 My second question is, is why can't the City
23 require the -- or condition the density transfer that
24 the applicant has proposed?

1 MR. CRITTENDEN: So the reason that the staff
2 or the City can't propose or condition that density
3 transfer is because conditions of approval for tentative
4 maps are accomplished or have to be shown to be done at
5 the time that a final map is approved. And since it
6 would require that density transfer to happen prior to a
7 tentative map, or outside of the requirements for a
8 tentative map, a tentative map could be filed, and
9 there's no way for us to tie that to the outside
10 property. We can only be addressed on the property that
11 is being tentative mapped and then accomplished through
12 the final map.

13 CHAIRMAN CAREY: Oh, okay. That makes sense,
14 because the development to the north would be built
15 after that, that final map would be issued.

16 MR. CRITTENDEN: Yeah. Well, I mean even in
17 the case of it being built beforehand, potentially, we
18 can't condition a property that's not inside the
19 tentative map, or on the tentative map, if that makes
20 sense. The tentative map can only condition property
21 inside of its boundary, not property outside of it.

22 CHAIRMAN CAREY: Thank you. I have no further
23 questions.

24 COMMISSIONER READ: Any other questions for

1 staff?

2 Thank you, Ian.

3 Can the applicant come up?

4 MS. STACIE HUGGINS: Good evening. Stacie
5 Huggins representing the applicant.

6 COMMISSIONER READ: Thank you. And if you have
7 anything to add, and if you could also address the
8 letter from the Washoe County Health District.

9 MS. STACIE HUGGINS: Sure. I don't have
10 anything to add to Ian's presentation. I think, he
11 covered the project and the request very thoroughly. So
12 I don't think we need to add anything.

13 As far as the letter from Air Quality, we've
14 reviewed it, and we understand where their position is,
15 and we're happy to work with them and the City of
16 Sparks.

17 COMMISSIONER READ: Thank you.

18 Do any of the Commissioners have questions for
19 the applicant?

20 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Yes, a question --

21 COMMISSIONER READ: Commissioner Carey?

22 CHAIRMAN CAREY: Yes, thank you.

23 Question for Stacie. What is the timing on
24 the multi-family development to the north that you

1 intend to transfer, transfer units?

2 MS. STACIE HUGGINS: Well, Commissioner Carey,
3 if you'll give me just a second, because the developer
4 actually submitted a letter, and so I don't want to
5 speak out of line. I'm not sure if they have a specific
6 time. But I would anticipate it to come in in the next
7 year for an administrative review.

8 CHAIRMAN CAREY: Thank you.

9 COMMISSIONER READ: Any further questions?
10 Thank you.

11 So I'll bring it back to the Commission. Any
12 further discussion or a motion, or?

13 COMMISSIONER BLACO: I'd like to make a motion.

14 COMMISSIONER READ: Thank you, Commissioner
15 Blaco.

16 COMMISSIONER BLACO: I move to forward to City
17 Council a recommendation of approval of the tentative
18 map associated with PCN19-0019 for a 182-lot
19 single-family subdivision on a site 62.49 acres in size
20 located in the Stonebrook Planned Development, adopting
21 findings T1 through T12 and the facts supporting these
22 findings as set forth in the staff report, and subject
23 to the Conditions of Approval 1 through 17.

24 COMMISSIONER READ: Thank you.

1 COMMISSIONER PETERSEN: I'll second.

2 COMMISSIONER READ: So we have a first by
3 Commissioner Blaco and a second by Commissioner
4 Petersen. Any further discussion?

5 Okay. We'll take a --

6 CHAIRMAN CAREY: A couple comments.

7 COMMISSIONER READ: Go ahead.

8 CHAIRMAN CAREY: For the record. Thank you,
9 Madam Vice Chair.

10 You know, I'm having a really hard time with
11 making Finding T1. I can't see how the proposed
12 tentative map is in conformance with the master plan.
13 Just it fails to meet the density that was envisioned in
14 the handbook and as outlined in our Comprehensive Plan.

15 I disagree with the interpretation on NRS
16 278.349(3)(e). I don't think that was the intent of the
17 law in giving precedence to zoning that doesn't require
18 any density, and just kind of throwing that out the
19 door, or out the window, you know, for the sake of our
20 Comprehensive Plan.

21 I can certainly appreciate the tough position
22 that staff's in with this tentative map. And I
23 certainly appreciate the applicant offering the intended
24 density transfer. I think that we've gotten as much as

1 we possibly can. But I just can't see Finding 1. And I
2 don't think, without a requirement, that that density
3 transfer actually happened or anything concrete, I don't
4 see how we can use the justification of an intended
5 transfer to support making Finding T1 and try to be in
6 compliance with the Comprehensive Plan.

7 I don't have any grievance with the site at
8 this time that the applicant won't go through with the
9 density transfer, but I'm really concerned about the
10 fiscal impact. If that doesn't happen in the future,
11 and we're building a tentative map is well below the
12 density, you know, I just can't make Finding T1,
13 unfortunately.

14 And I will not be supporting the motion.

15 COMMISSIONER READ: Thank you, Commissioner
16 Carey.

17 Any other discussion?

18 Okay. We have a motion and a second. Call for
19 a vote. All those in favor, "aye."

20 (Commission members said "aye.")

21 COMMISSIONER READ: Opposed?

22 CHAIRMAN CAREY: Nay.

23 COMMISSIONER READ: Okay. It passes with one
24 nay. Thank you.