



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

To: Mayor and City Council

From: Marilie Smith, Administrative Secretary

Subject: Report of Planning Commission Action

Date: October 23, 2018

RE: PCN18-0006 - Consideration and possible approval of an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan land use designations on a site approximately 874.21 acres in size generally located north of the Southern Division of Kiley Ranch, east of Pioneer Meadows Planned Development, south of Lazy 5 Regional Park, and along Pyramid Highway, Sparks, NV, from: 334.21 acres with various residential designations, 20.47 acres of Mixed Use (MU), 156.91 acres of Commercial (C), 128.92 acres of Employment Center (EC), 9.42 acres of Community Facilities (CF), and 107.4 acres of Open Space (OS); to: 338.25 acres with various residential designations, 69.04 acres of Mixed Use (MU), 127.75 acres of Commercial (C), 82.4 acres of Employment Center (EC), 42.52 acres of Community Facilities (CF), and 107.4 acres of Open Space (OS), Sparks, NV.

Please see the attached excerpt from the October 4, 2018 Planning Commission meeting transcript.

1 commercial. I don't find any reason to vote against a
2 C2 zoning, which is clearly allowed in the commercial
3 land use. I may not be happy with it, but I'll support
4 it.

5 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Thank you.

6 With that, all in favor?

7 (Commission members said "aye.")

8 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Anyone opposed?

9 Okay. Thank you. Motion carries.

10 Next, we'll move along to
11 PCN18-0006/MPA18-0002, consideration and possible
12 approval of an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan.

13 MS. MELBY: Good evening, Commissioners. I'm
14 Karen Melby, Development Service Manager.

15 This item before you tonight is a Comprehensive
16 Plan amendment for a property that is 874.2 acres
17 located north of Kiley Ranch South, east of Pioneer
18 Meadows planned development and south of the Lazy Five
19 Regional Park along the Pyramid Highway.

20 You see in the vicinity map the boundary of
21 this property is outlined in cyan.

22 I wanted to bring to your attention that there
23 is a typo in the title for this item. The Comprehensive
24 Plan does not propose to change the open space acreage.
25 It should be 107.2 acres. And the resolution has been

1 corrected to reflect this correct acreage for the open
2 space.

3 The Comprehensive Plan request land use do not
4 modify the number of or types of land use categories
5 within the Kiley Ranch North. Rather, the proposed
6 change involves the relocation or allocation,
7 reallocation of acreage among various land use
8 designations.

9 This is the existing City's land use map for
10 this property. And what they're proposing is to change
11 it to this.

12 There is a slight change in the residential
13 land uses of about 4 acres. The mixed-use acreage
14 triples. The purple here is the mixed-use. It's going
15 from, if you can see here, it is going from 20 and a
16 half acres to 69 acres. There is a decrease in the
17 acres for commercial, which represents about an 18.6
18 percent. And the employment center's being reduced by
19 36.1 percent. The community facilities has increased,
20 which it's this area right here. And that is because
21 Washoe County has purchased these, I think it's
22 approximately 33 acres, and they are building a middle
23 school right now and propose to place an elementary
24 school on this. And as I stated earlier, there is no
25 change in the open space.

1 Item 13 on this agenda, which is a tentative
2 map for 169 single-family lots in the Kiley Ranch
3 Planned Development North, the current land use
4 designation is not consistent with the zoning or the
5 Kiley Ranch North Phase 6 handbook.

6 As will be discussed under this item, the
7 zoning or the handbook prevails. But I wanted to note
8 that this proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment, if
9 approved, will bring the land use designation into
10 conformance with the approved final handbook for
11 Phase 6.

12 It's this area right here. It's MF14. And
13 what they're proposing with the tentative map, this IDR
14 land use will be more consistent.

15 On October 18th, 2004, the Kiley Ranch North
16 tentative handbook was approved. The City Council
17 approved an amendment to the Kiley Ranch North tentative
18 planned development handbook on July 11th in 2016. When
19 the City adopted the Comprehensive Plan in 2016, the
20 approved land uses that were in that planned development
21 were translated into the closest matching Comprehensive
22 Plan land use designations.

23 This request is now requesting to amend the
24 land uses as adopted and the City's Comprehensive Plan
25 land use map.

1 If the Comprehensive Plan amendment is
2 approved, then the tentative plan, tentative plan
3 development handbook will have to be amended following,
4 by the amendment of some of the final handbooks and/or
5 approving some new final handbooks.

6 The Comprehensive Plan amendment will change
7 the job-housing balance to 1.6 jobs per housing unit,
8 generating an estimated 7,071 jobs. In 2016, estimated
9 job-housing balance was 1.8 jobs to housing unit, or an
10 estimated 8,138 jobs. With this Comprehensive Plan
11 amendment, the estimated job-housing balance is the same
12 as projected when we reviewed the project in 2004, which
13 was 1.6 jobs per housing unit.

14 The traffic generation letter prepared for this
15 amendment concludes that the estimated traffic
16 generation represents a reduction in traffic between the
17 2016 land uses and the 2018 of 22,587 average daily
18 trips. The a.m. peak is projected to produce 2,000
19 fewer trips, and the p.m. is estimated to result in
20 3,381 fewer trips.

21 Addressing the four Comprehensive Plan
22 findings, the first one, CP1, which is the conformance
23 with the Regional Plan, can be made because the Kiley
24 Ranch North planned development has been approved since
25 2004 and has been included in the City's utility and

1 facilities planning and is located within Fee Service
2 Impact Number 1, which as development occurs impact fees
3 are collected.

4 Addressing Finding CP2, the implementation of
5 the Comprehensive Plan, the goals and policies relevant
6 to this proposal are goals MG1, MG2 and H2, with the
7 policies MG1, MG5 and C1. Overall, the proposed land
8 use changes result in a total of 279 acres of commercial
9 and employment center and mixed-use, which represents an
10 approximately 27-acre reduction, or less than 9 percent
11 change.

12 The Kiley Ranch North was approved in 2004 and
13 has been included in the utilities and facility
14 plannings for the region since that time.

15 Therefore, staff views that the proposed land
16 use map is consistent with the goals of providing
17 nonresidential land use space and fosters a mix of land
18 uses.

19 Policy MG5 requires that fiscal implications be
20 analyzed of the proposed land use changes. With the
21 application was submitted a fiscal impact analysis,
22 which concluded that the estimated revenue for the
23 General Fund is \$287.4 million, with the expenditures
24 totaling \$211.8 million, producing a revenue surplus to
25 the General Fund of \$75.6 million over a 30-year period.

1 Addressing the Road Fund, \$25.6 million is
2 estimated to be generated, with expenditures of
3 \$57.2 million, resulting in a deficit of \$31.6 million
4 over a 30-year period.

5 If you combine the General Fund and the Road
6 Funds, the result is a positive fiscal impact of
7 approximately \$44 million.

8 City staff has two broad comments regarding the
9 fiscal impact analysis. The first one pertains to the
10 methodology. Staff has reviewed the initial
11 recommendations from EPS, which is the consulting firm
12 that the City has contracted with for preparation of a
13 fiscal impact analysis methodology that future
14 applicants will be asked to use. The City staff has
15 reviewed the draft guidelines for the preparation of a
16 fiscal impact analysis, which will be adopted in the
17 future. However, in this situation, the master
18 developer is not obligated to revise the Kiley Ranch
19 North fiscal impact analysis to reflect the methodology
20 as proposed by EPS.

21 Our second comment regarding the fiscal impact
22 analysis, the proposed land use changes for Kiley Ranch
23 North would reduce the acreages allocated for commercial
24 and employment center land uses. The build-out
25 assumptions used in the Kiley Ranch North fiscal impact

1 analysis relating to square footage projected to be
2 developed remain relatively static, which suggests more
3 intense development than the current plan for Kiley
4 Ranch FARs are, and are historically higher than the
5 characteristics of these types of developments in the
6 City of Sparks.

7 Accordingly, City staff anticipates asking that
8 such assumptions will be included in the future handbook
9 amendments, which may take the form of a minimum FAR
10 requirement for nonresidential land uses consistent with
11 achieving the build-out assumptions that are in the
12 fiscal impact analysis.

13 Addressing Finding CP3, compatible with our
14 surrounding land uses, to the north is Lazy Five
15 Regional Park. To the east is Pyramid, I mean Pioneer
16 Meadows Planned Development and also some wetlands over
17 here. To the south is the Kiley Ranch South project
18 planned development. And to the west is the Quarry
19 Project. The proposed land use designations would not
20 fundamentally modify the planned character of this area
21 or adversely impact the surrounding land uses.

22 Addressing Finding CP4, which is public notice,
23 public notice was published in the Reno Gazette-Journal
24 on September 20th, 2018. The neighborhood meeting was
25 held by the applicant on September 19, 2018, and there

1 were 12 people in attendance.

2 That concludes my presentation. I'm available
3 for any questions.

4 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Thank you.

5 Any questions of staff?

6 Commissioner Petersen.

7 COMMISSIONER PETERSEN: Will this proposal put
8 additional roadways onto Vista, egress and ingress?

9 MS. MELBY: The proposal does not change any of
10 the road network.

11 COMMISSIONER PETERSEN: Oh, it doesn't?

12 MS. MELBY: No.

13 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Okay. Is the applicant
14 or applicant's representative here?

15 MR. MIKE GREELEY: Good evening. For the
16 record, Mike Greeley with Rubicon Design Group,
17 representing KM2 Development. Also with me is Lois
18 Brown with KM2, Scott Christy with KM2 and Christy
19 Corp., as well as Eugenia Larimore with EK Economic
20 Consultants.

21 I think, Karen did a great job summarizing the
22 requests and going through the issues. And we're happy
23 to address any questions that you might have.

24 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Thank you.

25 All right. Commissioners have any questions of

1 the applicant?

2 Commissioner Carey?

3 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Thank you, Madam Chair.

4 You know, Karen brought up in her presentation
5 about the higher floor area ratios that may be coming in
6 the nonresidential areas. I was wondering if you concur
7 with that assessment and whether you think that that
8 would be a reality moving forward.

9 MR. MIKE GREELEY: That's something that we're
10 working with staff right now. But, I think, definitely
11 that we're going to have to demonstrate that the fiscal
12 analysis is valid, and that's something that will come
13 in the future. So when those handbook amendments come
14 back, you'll see that come through.

15 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Thank you, Madam Chair.

16 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Any other questions from
17 the Commissioners?

18 Thank you.

19 MR. MIKE GREELEY: Thank you.

20 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Okay. With that, it is a
21 public hearing. Do I have any requests to speak?

22 Okay. With that, I'll close the public hearing
23 and bring it back to the Commission. Any further
24 questions, comments, motions?

25 COMMISSIONER READ: Commissioner Read. I'd

1 move to approve the request to amend the Comprehensive
2 Plan associated with PCN18-0006, based on findings CP1
3 through CP4, and the facts supporting these findings as
4 set forth in the staff report.

5 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Okay. I have a first.

6 COMMISSIONER BROCK: Second.

7 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Okay.

8 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Okay. Commissioner Brock
9 is second. Any comments, questions?

10 Commissioner Carey.

11 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Thank you, Madam Chair.
12 I'll make a comment on the proposed motion. As this
13 Commission may be well-aware, I am always in support of
14 more professional office, more jobs in Sparks. I think,
15 the Kiley Ranch North development is key to the City's
16 fiscal future.

17 I know, since this project's been kicked around
18 since 2004, the professional office and nonresidential
19 land uses in this area are critical, I believe, to the
20 City's success of its Comprehensive Plan. I hate losing
21 more professional office.

22 But with that being said, I would encourage
23 staff moving forward to hold the developer to the higher
24 floor area ratio standards and the higher mixed-use
25 standards moving forward. You know, we need more jobs

1 in Sparks if we're going to solve the land use issues in
2 the Spanish Springs valley and on Pyramid Highway and
3 all of that good stuff. We need to continue to hold
4 onto our land uses.

5 With that being said, I believe that, for the
6 most part, this is a technical land use change to catch
7 up with what we've done with the phased handbooks moving
8 forward. And I will be supporting the motion. I just
9 wanted to put those comments out there about the floor
10 area ratios and holding onto those land uses moving
11 forward.

12 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Any other comments?

13 COMMISSIONER FEWINS: Madam Chair, Commissioner
14 Fewins.

15 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Yes, Commissioner Fewins.

16 COMMISSIONER FEWINS: I guess, Karen, I don't
17 know if you can answer this for me or not. But there
18 were, obviously, 874 acres. And we've had this come up
19 quite a few times, with the mutual aid agreement with
20 Truckee Meadows Fire. What's the time frame we're
21 talking about Fire Station 6? Is there something that's
22 looking at coming?

23 MS. MELBY: I would like to have the Director
24 of Community Services address that, please.

25 COMMISSIONER FEWINS: Had to get you up here,

1 John.

2 MR. MARTINI: Good evening, Madam Chair,
3 members of the Commission. John Martini, your Community
4 Services Director.

5 As the Commission will remember, we have Impact
6 Fee Service Area 1, which contemplated fire service for
7 the impact fee service area, which once upon a time we
8 all knew as the NSSOI. Fire Station 5 was built out of
9 that fund on the east side of northeast Sparks. It has
10 been paid in full.

11 We are now -- as permits come in, cash is going
12 into the account for Fire Station 6, so that we can do
13 several things. The first off is find a suitable
14 location. Our fire chief has worked with a consultant,
15 and we have located two potential fire station locations
16 that would meet response criteria for the area. The two
17 locations came out about equal in response time. One
18 location is in Kiley North, actually off of Wingfield
19 Hills Parkway when we have extended, kind of near the
20 Belimo site that's out there now. The second one that
21 seems to be as suitable is in Pioneer Meadows, again
22 along that arterial.

23 We have started discussions with both land
24 owners on locating the site for Fire Station 6. The
25 next step will be, once the site is located, of course,

1 acquisition of the land, design of the fire station, and
2 then its eventual construction.

3 To answer your question more specifically,
4 Commissioner Fewins, timing for when that would be
5 constructed, when I last looked, the account had about a
6 half a million dollars in it, I think, is about the, you
7 know, round number as to where we are for accumulation
8 of funds. I suspect, when I bring the next update to
9 Impact Fee Service Area 1 to you for review of the land
10 use assumptions as well as the capital improvements
11 plan, of which Fire Station 6 will be included, the cost
12 of that fire station in today's dollars has grown a bit
13 above what I brought to you last time. I think, we're
14 looking at a station that's going to cost somewhere
15 between 5 and 7 million dollars.

16 So we will have to adjust impact fees to cover
17 those costs. And as soon as there's enough cash in the
18 account to start construction -- which at current rates
19 would be, in my estimate right now, in excess of 10
20 years, Commissioner Fewins. You know, we're a ways out
21 from having that station constructed and staffed and
22 built. And as the Commission will remember, the
23 staffing and the purchase of the equipment is a General
24 Fund expense. We can't put that in Impact Fee Service
25 Area 1.

1 So, in a roundabout long discussion,
2 Commissioner Fewins, I think, we're in excess of 10
3 years before we see that station. Now, I will make a
4 caveat. If we return to development levels that we saw
5 in the mid 2000s, where we were building anywhere
6 between 800 and 1,500 homes a year for a few years
7 there, that cash will come into the account at a more
8 rapid pace, and that could shorten the time to build
9 that fire station.

10 But for what we see now, we are building very
11 modestly. We're only building about 500 single-family
12 homes a year. Of course, you guys know that
13 multi-family has been on the increase. We do have some
14 multi-family activity in Impact Fee Service Area 1. The
15 majority of it, however, is in the core and does not pay
16 into that impact fee system, as the services are already
17 provided by our existing fire stations.

18 So it'll be a while, from what we're seeing
19 right now.

20 COMMISSIONER FEWINS: Thank you, John.

21 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Thank you.

22 Any other comments from the Commissioners?

23 Okay. I have one comment to Commissioner
24 Carey's comments regarding the floor area ratio. I want
25 to commend the developer and staff for working together

1 on having to remap a good portion of this, because the
2 school district came in and took an additional 15 acres
3 that would have been developed for what we needed. So I
4 believe that the developer has been very responsive in
5 working with staff and making sure that they stay within
6 our requirements.

7 So, with that, I have a first and a second.
8 All in favor?

9 (Commission members said "aye.")

10 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Any opposed?

11 Thank you. Motion carries.

12 Next, we'll move along to
13 PCN18-0050/MPA18-0004, consideration and possible
14 approval of an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan for
15 Pioneer Meadows.

16 MR. CRITTENDEN: Planning Commission members,
17 I'm Ian Crittenden, Senior Planner.

18 As stated, this is a Comprehensive Plan
19 amendment which rests on a site 10.6 acres in size in
20 the Pioneer Meadows planned development.

21 Looking at the vicinity map here, Pioneer
22 Meadows is outlined in the kind of orange color, and the
23 site we're talking specifically about is outlined in
24 cyan.

25 The Pioneer Meadows handbook was approved in



REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

Peter Gower, Chair • Sarah Chvilicek, Vice-Chair • James Barnes • Larry Chesney • James Fewins • Ed Hawkins • Frank Petersen • Dian VanderWell • Kevin Weiske • Kimberly H. Robinson, Executive Director

December 14, 2018

Kimberly H. Robinson
Executive Director of Regional Planning, and
Clerk of the Regional Planning Commission
1105 Terminal Way, Suite 316
Reno, Nevada 89502

Received by Clerk:  12.17.18

Emailed: CT 12-18-18

Dear Ms. Robinson:

On December 12, 2018, the Regional Planning Commission (RPC) held a public hearing and determined that the following matter conforms with the comprehensive Regional Plan:

Regional Plan Conformance Review – City of Sparks Comprehensive Plan amendment, Kiley Ranch North (CR18-016) – An amendment to the Comprehensive Plan land use designation from 334.21 acres with various residential designations, 20.47 acres of Mixed Use (MU), 156.91 acres of Commercial (C), 128.92 acres of Employment Center (EC), 9.42 acres of Community Facility (CF), and 107.4 acres of Open Space (OS) to 338.25 acres with various residential designations, 69.04 acres of Mixed Use (MU), 127.75 acres of Commercial (C), 82.4 acres of Employment Center (EC), 42.52 acres of Community Facilities (CF), and 107.4 acres of Open Space (OS) on a site approximately 874.21 acres in size generally located north of the Southern Division of Kiley Ranch, east of Pioneer Meadows Planned Development, south of Lazy 5 Regional Park, along Pyramid Highway

This letter has been filed with the Clerk of the RPC on this date. Generally, petitions for review must be filed by a person or entity seeking review of the RPC action or determination pursuant to Sections I.2, I.3, III.7 or IV.11 of the Regional Planning Governing Board's ("RPGB") Regulations on Procedure. The applicable filing timeframe for a review of this matter is highlighted in the table on the following page.

Please do not hesitate to contact me at 775-321-8392 if you have any questions on this matter.

Sincerely,



Chris Tolley
Regional Planner

RPC CONFORMANCE REVIEW, CR18-016
ACTION LETTER DATED DECEMBER 14, 2018
PAGE 2

CC: File CR18-016
 City of Reno
 City of Sparks
 Washoe County
 Regional Transportation Commission

**A paper copy of this letter is available upon request*

Regional Planning Governing Board Regulations on Procedure, appeals to the RPGB pursuant to statues and/or regulation:	Timeframe:
Appeal of Regional Planning Commission’s finding of non-conformance with respect to a Project of Regional Significance (“PRS”). See RPGB Regulations on Procedure I.2 and III.7	45 days (calendar days)
Appeal of a finding of non-conformance of a master plan, facilities plan or other similar plan. See RPGB Regulations on Procedure I.2; IV.10 and IV.11	45 days (calendar days) to file objection with RPC; 30 days (calendar days) to file appeal to RPGB after RPC’s determination of objection
Petitions for review of actions of the RPC that are not subject to a specific appeal process, which includes actions of the RPC finding that a PRS or master plan, facilities plan or other similar plan conforms with the Regional Plan. See RPGB Regulations on Procedure I.3	10 days (business days)