



**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:** March 4, 2021

**RE:** **PCN20-0044** – Consideration of and possible action on a request for a Tentative Map for a 356-lot townhome and detached single-family house subdivision on a site approximately 52.07 acres in size within the NUD (New Urban District – Stonebrook) zoning district generally located southeast of Pyramid Way and south of La Posada Drive, Sparks, Nevada, APN 528-030-58.

Please see the attached excerpt from the February 4, 2021 Planning Commission meeting transcript.

1 COMMISSIONER KRAMER: Aye.

2 MS. SMITH: Commissioner Petersen?

3 COMMISSIONER PETERSEN: Aye.

4 MS. SMITH: Commissioner Rawson?

5 COMMISSIONER RAWSON: Aye.

6 MS. SMITH: Commissioner West?

7 COMMISSIONER WEST: Aye.

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

10 Let's move on to general business. First item  
11 is PCN20-0044, consideration of and possible action on a  
12 request for a tentative map for a 356-lot townhome and  
13 detached single-family house subdivision on a site  
14 approximately 52.07 acres in size within the New Urban  
15 District of Stonebrook zoning district, generally  
16 located southeast of Pyramid Way and south of La Posada  
17 Drive in Sparks.

18 MS. REID: Okay. Thank you, Chair Read and  
19 members of the Planning Commission. Sienna Reid, for  
20 the record, with the Planning Division. I'll be  
21 presenting this item for you this evening.

22 And before I get going, I just want to confirm  
23 that you can see a slide indicating that we're on the  
24 Stonebrook Phase 3 Village AA and BB item.

25 CHAIRMAN READ: We can see it.

1 MS. REID: Perfect. All right. So, as noted,  
2 before you this evening is a request for a tentative  
3 map. That map is for Phase 3, Villages AA and BB, both  
4 located in the Stonebrook planned development.

5 The Villages are outlined on the slide here in  
6 red. And then can you see the larger Stonebrook  
7 development boundary shown in blue. Villages AA and BB,  
8 again in red, are generally located in the central  
9 portion of Stonebrook on the north side of Oppio Ranch  
10 Parkway.

11 The proposed tentative map consists of 356  
12 townhome and detached single-family lots on a total of  
13 52.07 acres. The lots are fairly evenly split, with 164  
14 townhome lots comprising 46 percent of the subdivision,  
15 and 192 detached single-family lots comprising  
16 54 percent of the subdivision.

17 The lots proposed range in size from  
18 approximately 2,880 to 8,201 square feet. And the  
19 overall gross density for the project is 6.8 dwelling  
20 units per acre.

21 On this slide, you can see the preliminary  
22 landscape plan for Villages AA and BB that gives you a  
23 good overall graphic for the subdivision design. Here  
24 you can see access to the subdivision will be from two  
25 intersections with Oppio Ranch Parkway.

1           And what we have in terms of how the lots break  
2 down and how they're designed is that we have 168 lots  
3 located in Village AA and then 24 lots located in  
4 Village BB, which are shown here on this slide in this  
5 lighter green color that I'm generally circling with the  
6 cursor. Those lots are designed to meet the patio home  
7 standards in the handbook, except for the minimum lot  
8 width standard of 45 feet that has been administratively  
9 reduced to 40 feet.

10           It's important to note that the handbook  
11 authorizes the administrator to approve deviations of up  
12 to 20 percent from handbook development standards, and  
13 City staff approved the deviation to reduce the minimum  
14 lot width for patio homes by 11 percent on January 29th  
15 of this year.

16           In terms of the remaining lots that are located  
17 in Village BB, we have 164 lots that are designed to the  
18 townhome standards in the handbook, and those are shown  
19 here in kind of the beige color. These lots, in terms  
20 of meeting the handbook standards for townhomes, don't  
21 have to meet a minimum lot size. There isn't one  
22 specified. And neither is there a standard for lot  
23 width or depth. Instead, these townhome standards in  
24 the handbook allow for setbacks to be measured from  
25 outer boundaries and require a minimum setback between

1 internal buildings.

2 As proposed, you can see on this slide the  
3 typical lot detail for townhomes. It shows a minimum  
4 building setback of 16 feet between buildings, which is  
5 20 percent less than the required internal building  
6 setback with 20 feet specified in the handbook.

7 Condition number 17 recommended for you  
8 requires a deviation request to reduce the required  
9 internal building setback, that that request be  
10 submitted and approved prior to recording any final map  
11 wherever separation is proposed. And so when those  
12 deviation requests come in, staff reviews those and does  
13 have the authority to condition those deviations as  
14 appropriate.

15 This next slide shows the Comprehensive Plan  
16 land use designations for the site in relation to the  
17 proposed lots. As you can see, most of the site is  
18 designated Intermediate Density Residential, or IDR, and  
19 that's the beige color. And then the Open Space  
20 designation is present on the north and east sides of  
21 the site.

22 And the handbook designations of Low Medium  
23 Density Residential, or LMDR, and Open Space are  
24 coterminous with the Comprehensive Plan land use  
25 designations that you can see illustrated.

1           As proposed, this tentative map request  
2 includes three parcels that are split between the IDR  
3 and the Open Space Comprehensive Plan land use  
4 designations and then the conforming LMDR and Open Space  
5 handbook designation designations. As can you see  
6 identified on this slide, these are lots 273, the common  
7 area parcel east of lot 196, and then the common area  
8 parcel located on the north of lot 289.

9           Here, the handbook allows for adjustments to  
10 handbook designation boundaries due to changes in the  
11 location of streets that divide two designations and  
12 does not consider those changes to be relocations of the  
13 handbook land uses.

14           The applicant has maintained that the eastern  
15 road shown in Village BB, which is Soda Light Way in  
16 addition on the slide, should be considered the boundary  
17 of the Open Space designation and that lot 273 is  
18 entirely designated LMDR.

19           While state law requires the Planning  
20 Commission consider whether a proposed tentative map is  
21 in conformance with zoning ordinances and the  
22 Comprehensive Plan, if there is an inconsistency between  
23 the Comprehensive Plan and the zoning document, which in  
24 this case is the Stonebrook handbook, the handbook,  
25 which is the more permissive, takes precedence because

1 it is this zoning document. And so here the adjustment  
2 of the LMDR designation to the eastern side of Soda  
3 Light Way is allowed.

4 The common area parcels east of lot 196 and  
5 north of lot 289, those comply with both the  
6 Comprehensive Plan land use and handbook designations as  
7 they are going to accommodate required recreational  
8 amenities and formal landscaping rather than residential  
9 dwelling units.

10 And it's important to note that after the  
11 Planning Commission meeting packet was published, we did  
12 get a request from the applicant to remove Condition  
13 Number 16 as it's proposed. Condition Number 16 was  
14 recommended because as the handbook requires a community  
15 park within Phase 3 be offered for dedication prior to  
16 recording the last final map within Stonebrook Phase 3.  
17 And because this subdivision is the last subdivision  
18 that we'll be reviewing within Phase 3, Condition  
19 Number 16 demonstrating that that park site dedication  
20 had occurred prior to the last final map within  
21 Stonebrook, if, in fact, the last final map was located  
22 within this subdivision, was placed on this particular  
23 project.

24 However, one of the things that was provided to  
25 staff after the publication of the Planning Commission

1 meeting packet was a recorded quitclaim deed for the  
2 20-acre community park site. And so with that quitclaim  
3 deed now recorded, this condition has been fulfilled.  
4 And staff does support the applicant's request to remove  
5 this condition.

6           So shifting gears here and moving on to the 12  
7 tentative map findings that need to be considered by the  
8 Commission this evening, for the most part, these are in  
9 numerical order. We do have just one slide that  
10 attempts to group topics together and takes them a bit  
11 out of order.

12           But starting off here with Finding T1, which is  
13 conformance with the Comprehensive Plan, as proposed,  
14 the 356 lots with this tentative map will provide small  
15 lot detached single-family and townhome housing products  
16 that enhance housing diversity in Sparks. And that  
17 advances Policies H1 and H2 related to housing supply  
18 and diversity.

19           Policy CC8 encourages neighborhood diversity  
20 with varied lot sizes as well as a mix of architectural  
21 styles, materials and colors. Attached to this staff  
22 report are preliminary architectural elevations that  
23 include three designs for patio homes and two designs  
24 for townhomes. Those elevations are designed to comply  
25 with the standards in the handbook that address varied



1 building design.

2           Looking at Policy C4, sidewalks are proposed on  
3 both sides of the street per the handbook and in  
4 compliance with this policy. And City services to the  
5 site can be provided at acceptable service levels as was  
6 previously evaluated with the handbook approval and in  
7 compliance with Policy CF1.

8           Here on this slide we have Findings T2 and T7,  
9 each relating to streets. For conformance with the City  
10 streets master plan, we have project access being  
11 provided from Oppio Ranch Parkway. And that's  
12 consistent with the handbook approval.

13           Finding T7 focuses on the impacts of public  
14 streets. Here an updated trip generation letter was  
15 provided indicating the proposed subdivision will  
16 generate 3,534 average daily trips, 262 peak-hour trips  
17 in the morning, and 353 peak-hour trips in the evening.  
18 That letter indicates that adequate capacity exists to  
19 accommodate the trips associated with single-family  
20 development in Stonebrook, including this subdivision,  
21 as trips for single-family development are similar to  
22 those identified in the master traffic study that  
23 informed the roadway network design for Stonebrook.

24           The comment letter that was provided by the  
25 Regional Transportation Commission also finds that this

1 tentative map request will not have a detrimental impact  
2 to traffic circulation or increased trips associated  
3 with single-family residential development above what  
4 was analyzed in the master traffic study. However, it's  
5 important to note that RTC's comment letter also  
6 requests a 10-space parking lot facility be provided for  
7 residents. However, this handbook does not permit  
8 transportation uses such as a park and ride in the LMDR  
9 designation where the lots are proposed.

10           And, lastly, on transportation, NDOT comments  
11 were also provided to staff. These comments touch  
12 briefly on the permitting requirements for connections  
13 to Pyramid Way.

14           Moving on to Finding T3, agencies that regulate  
15 environmental impacts did not provide comments on this  
16 particular tentative map. However, the developer does  
17 need to meet all applicable local county and state  
18 requirements in regards to environmental impacts.

19           Finding T4 focuses on the availability of water  
20 to serve the site. Here, the domestic water requirement  
21 for 356 single-family lots is estimated at 302.74  
22 acre-feet per year. And municipal water service will be  
23 provided by TMWA.

24           Finding T5 looks at the availability of  
25 utilities to serve the site, including sewer and storm

1 drain capacity. And here the applicant has estimated  
2 that the 356 single-family lots will generate 124,600  
3 gallons of sewage per day. The applicant is required to  
4 provide evidence that there is adequate sewer capacity  
5 to serve this project prior to recording a final map.  
6 However, the City has accounted for the sewer capacity  
7 in the studies conducted at the handbook approval stage.

8 And then, also, for stormwater and drainage,  
9 there needs to be a final stormwater and drainage plan  
10 approved prior to recording any final map.

11 Moving on to finding T6, which asks the  
12 Commission to look at the availability of schools,  
13 police, transportation, and parks. On the school side  
14 of things, the Washoe County School District comments  
15 indicate that the project will add 63 new students to  
16 Bohach Elementary, 30 new students to Sky Ranch Middle  
17 School, and 28 new students to Spanish Springs High  
18 School. Bohach Elementary is projected to remain under  
19 capacity for at least five years. Sky Ranch Middle,  
20 while recently constructed, is projected to be over  
21 capacity in the next five years. And so the options  
22 identified by the School District to alleviate those  
23 projected higher enrollments include the construction of  
24 additions to the school or potentially adjustments to  
25 enrollment boundaries. In addition, Spanish Springs

1 High School is currently over capacity. However,  
2 enrollment relief is anticipated at that particular  
3 school with the opening of the new Hug High School in  
4 the fall of 2022.

5 The Sparks Police Department is slated to  
6 provide services to the site, and they expressed no  
7 concerns with the current proposal.

8 In terms of transportation, as previously  
9 discussed, the roadway network for Stonebrook was  
10 designed to accommodate the trips associated with this  
11 subdivision.

12 And parks will be provided consistent with the  
13 handbook the plans for a 20-acre community park site  
14 adjacent to La Posada and north of Villages AA and BB.

15 Finding T8 addresses floodplains, slopes, and  
16 soil. Here, the lots proposed with this tentative map  
17 don't fall within the 100-year floodplain. The site is  
18 predominantly flat and does not trigger any standards  
19 related to sites that contain significant slopes. And  
20 final geotechnical reports are required at the time of  
21 final map. The 356 lots that are proposed with this  
22 request do not impact any of these features.

23 And in regard to outside agency responses, per  
24 finding T9 here, only the School District, Regional  
25 Transportation Commission, and Nevada Department of

1 Transportation provided comments. And those were  
2 discussed on the previous slides.

3 Finding T10 asks you to consider the  
4 availability of fire protection services. Here, the  
5 project site is located slightly outside of the  
6 five-minute travel time for the Sparks Fire Department.  
7 However, residential fire sprinklers are not required  
8 due to the alternative fire protection measures  
9 specified in the Stonebrook handbook. These include a  
10 radio and paging system installed in the Truckee Meadows  
11 Fire Protection District, Station Number 17, as well as  
12 emergency access, also has an agreement with the Truckee  
13 Meadows Fire Protection District for automatic aid to  
14 serve this area.

15 Moving on to Finding T11, looking at other  
16 identified impacts. In staff's analysis of the  
17 proposal, we identified landscape area maintenance,  
18 architecture for the residences, fencing, and regional  
19 trails. Condition 12 addresses landscaping with the  
20 requirement that a landscape maintenance association  
21 maintain the common areas throughout the project.  
22 Condition 8 requires final architectural elevations be  
23 approved prior to recording a final map. And  
24 Condition 15 requires, similarly, final fencing plans at  
25 the time of final map.

1           And, lastly, for Finding T12, it requires that  
2 the public be notified of this item. The posting of the  
3 agenda for this meeting and the City Council meeting in  
4 the future serve to provide notice to the public. And  
5 the agenda for tonight's meeting was posted on  
6 January 29th.

7           Staff is recommending that the Planning  
8 Commission forward a recommendation of approval to City  
9 Council, with support for removing Condition 16.

10           You have a suggested motion on this slide to  
11 modify that, with the italic text identifying the  
12 elimination of Condition 16, that isn't in your staff  
13 report suggested motion.

14           So with that, I'll conclude my presentation.  
15 And I am happy to answer any questions that you may have  
16 on this tentative map request.

17           CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you, Sienna.

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

20           Seeing none, if the applicant's rep would like  
21 to add anything or comment.

22           MS. STACIE HUGGINS: Chair Read, this is Stacie  
23 Huggins with Wood Rodgers. Sienna did a great job of  
24 summarizing this project. And I don't have anything to  
25 add. But I'm happy to answer any questions that you or

1 the rest of the Commission may have.

2 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you, Stacie.

3 Do any of the Commissions have any questions  
4 for the applicant's rep?

5 Commissioner West.

6 COMMISSIONER WEST: Yes. Thank you.

7 Actually, I don't have a question. But,  
8 Stacie, I did want to thank the applicant for complying  
9 with Condition 16 by granting or filing that quitclaim  
10 deed for the community park. We definitely appreciate  
11 that being completed.

12 MS. STACIE HUGGINS: Sure. Commissioner West,  
13 I just want to, so just to touch on that, we understood  
14 that that park site needed to be dedicated, and we were  
15 working on that. We were hoping to get that addressed  
16 before the staff report had been finalized and  
17 published. Unfortunately, we were about the same day  
18 that the staff report was published. But we appreciate  
19 that staff acknowledged that it was done. And we hope  
20 that you all agree to remove that condition from this  
21 tentative map moving forward.

22 COMMISSIONER WEST: Thank you.

23 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

24 Any other questions?

25 I will entertain a motion.

1 I see Commissioner West and Commissioner Carey  
2 both with their hands up. I don't know which one. Did  
3 you want to make the motion, Commissioner West?

4 COMMISSIONER WEST: Yes, I did.

5 CHAIRMAN READ: Okay. Do you want to bring the  
6 motion back up on the screen, or?

7 COMMISSIONER WEST: I have it here, either way.

8 CHAIRMAN READ: Oh, you have it. Okay. Go  
9 ahead.

10 COMMISSIONER WEST: Okay. I move to forward to  
11 City Council a recommendation of approval of the  
12 tentative map associated with PCN20-0044 for a 356-lot  
13 townhome and detached single-family house subdivision on  
14 a site approximately 52.07 acres in size, located in the  
15 NUD, New Urban District, Stonebrook, zoning district,  
16 adopting Findings T1 through T12 and the facts  
17 supporting these Findings as set forth in the staff  
18 report, and subject to the Conditions of Approval 1  
19 through 17, with the elimination of Condition 16.

20 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you, Commissioner West.

21 I have a motion. Can I get a second?

22 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Madam Chair, this is  
23 Commissioner Carey. I will second that motion. And  
24 excellent job on the motion, Commissioner West.

25 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.



1           So we have a motion by Commissioner West and a  
2 second by Commissioner Carey. Any discussion? Comment?  
3           Can we go ahead and have a roll call vote?  
4           MS. SMITH: Commissioner Read?  
5           CHAIRMAN READ: Aye.  
6           MS. SMITH: Commissioner Pritsos?  
7           COMMISSIONER PRITSOS: Aye.  
8           MS. SMITH: Commissioner Carey?  
9           COMMISSIONER CAREY: Aye.  
10          MS. SMITH: Commissioner Kramer?  
11          COMMISSIONER KRAMER: Aye.  
12          MS. SMITH: Commissioner Petersen?  
13          COMMISSIONER PETERSEN: Aye.  
14          MS. SMITH: Commissioner Rawson?  
15          COMMISSIONER RAWSON: Aye.  
16          MS. SMITH: Commissioner West?  
17          COMMISSIONER WEST: Aye.  
18          CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you. Motion passes  
19 unanimately.  
20          Let's move on to item 10, which is a  
21 presentation on the Regional Transportation Commission's  
22 development of the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan.  
23          MR. DOENGES: Thank you, Madam Chair and the  
24 members of the Planning Commission. I wasn't sure if I  
25 was going to get an introduction at first. But I'll