



**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:** **PCN19-0038** – Consideration of and possible action on a Tentative Map request for a 454-lot single family subdivision generally located east of Golden Eagle Regional Park and south of Vista Boulevard in the SF-6 (Single family – 6,000 sq. ft. lots) zoning district.

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

1           Next, we have item PCN19-0038, consideration of  
2 and possible action on a tentative map request for a  
3 454-lot single-family subdivision located east of Golden  
4 Eagle Regional Park and south of Vista.

5           Oh, you're back.

6           MR. CRITTENDEN: Thank you, Madam Vice Chair.  
7 Members of the Planning Commission, Ian Crittenden,  
8 acting Development Services Manager.

9           This is a request for a 454-lot single-family  
10 residential subdivision, or a tentative map. As you can  
11 see on the map, this is located directly east of Golden  
12 Eagle Regional Park and slightly south-southwest of  
13 Vista Boulevard.

14           The City entered into the development agreement  
15 in 2018 for the development of Wingfield Commons. On  
16 January 13th, the City Council amended that agreement to  
17 change the CLOMR process, the Conditional Letter of Map  
18 Revision process. We'll get into that a little more  
19 when we're talking about floodplain. That amendment  
20 dropped the CLOMR process outlined in the development  
21 agreement into closer conformance with the standard  
22 practice for the City of Sparks.

23           The site is zoned SF6, which typically has a  
24 minimum lot size of 6,000 square feet. However, the

1 applicant is proposing to use the small lot standard  
2 permitted in our Code, which allows smaller lots so long  
3 as the density of 7.3 units per acre is not exceeded.  
4 The proposed map meets the small lot standards and has a  
5 density of 6.98 dwelling units per acre.

6 A fiscal impact analysis was submitted with the  
7 development agreement and showed an overall positive  
8 fiscal impact to the City associated with this  
9 development. The applicant submitted an update to that  
10 fiscal analysis with this request. The update verified  
11 the conclusions of the original analysis and indicated  
12 that over a 20-year period, this development will have,  
13 will generate a surplus of over \$1.6 million to the  
14 general fund and a surplus of over \$1.5 million to the  
15 road fund.

16 The site is accessed from Vista Boulevard via  
17 two streets that are within the Golden Eagle Regional  
18 Park. Golden Eagle Regional Park is located on BLM  
19 property, and it is operated through an RP&P lease with  
20 the BLM. As such, all roads within this development  
21 will be private as they do not connect to the City's  
22 road infrastructure or road network.

23 The applicant will be required to construct and  
24 maintain their access road, which will come in off of

1 Vista Boulevard onto Homerun and then down to Touchdown  
2 and then cross this open space of the park and then on  
3 to an existing road here on the west side of the kind of  
4 the red area.

5           They will also be required to construct and  
6 maintain a fire access road, or a FAAR, which is a fire  
7 apparatus access road, onto the site. If we switch over  
8 here -- I apologize for this being turned. I'm actually  
9 going to rotate it, twice, apparently, so I did it wrong  
10 way the first time.

11           This is the same orientation as the last map we  
12 were looking at. This is Vista Boulevard. So you can  
13 see here where the site access will come in, turn and  
14 come along here and down into the site, or down this far  
15 and then onto the site. And then the fire apparatus  
16 access road comes in here just east or kind of northeast  
17 of the fire station, come in through the back side and  
18 come to the back side to the east side of the property  
19 for fire access purposes.

20           So in addition to needing to construct and  
21 maintain their access roads, there is also significant  
22 improvements that will need to be done to Touchdown  
23 Drive, Homerun Drive, and the intersection of -- go  
24 back -- of Homerun Drive, Vista Boulevard. And this is

1 Scorpius Drive that goes on to the north. And that  
2 intersection will have some improvements that are needed  
3 as well. Those are all laid out very specifically in  
4 the development agreement. And the triggers for the  
5 start and the finish of those processes for those  
6 improvements are tied to things outside of this  
7 tentative map.

8           Again, like we had in the last situation, we  
9 can only require with a tentative map things that can be  
10 accomplished through the final map. And because the  
11 development agreement has triggers that we could not put  
12 inside the tentative map, they aren't found as  
13 conditions on this tentative map, because they are  
14 already conditioned through the development agreement.  
15 They have conditions such as the time we pull the  
16 building permit for a certain number of buildings, then  
17 these improvements have to be started or done. Those  
18 kind of requirements can't be put on tentative maps,  
19 because you can't build those lots until after the final  
20 map's already been approved.

21           I apologize. I'm just trying to find my place.

22           So, as I stated, as part of the development  
23 agreement process, a substantial traffic impact analysis  
24 was submitted, and there were many improvements and

1 requirements that were attached to that and in the  
2 development agreement.

3           As part of this submittal, the applicant did  
4 submit an addendum to that development agreement, which  
5 showed what the impacts of the additional four units  
6 that the development -- or the impact analysis that was  
7 submitted with the development agreement looked at 450  
8 lots. Now, with 454, we wanted them to just make that  
9 small update. It did show an additional 38 trips,  
10 average trips a day, with an additional 3:00 a.m.  
11 peak-hour trips and an additional 4:00 p.m. peak-hour  
12 trips. This minimal amount of trip generation will not  
13 impact the improvements required in that traffic impact  
14 analysis and required by the development agreement.

15           There are 12 findings required to be considered  
16 with a tentative map.

17           The first, T1, looks for conformance with the  
18 Comp Plan and the zoning for the site. The proposed  
19 tentative map complies with the density standards of the  
20 Comprehensive Plan and the zoning ordinance. The Comp  
21 Plan use designation for this site is IDR, which  
22 requires six to eight, or six to 10 units per acre. And  
23 the SF6 zoning on the site requires, or has a maximum  
24 density of 7.3 units per acre. As proposed, this map

1 will provide 6.9 units per acre. The design of the site  
2 complies with the design standards for SF6 zoning  
3 district by utilizing the small lot development  
4 standards.

5 In addition, this map supports Comp Plan Goal  
6 H2, to promote a strong and diverse housing market that  
7 supports economic growth and vitality while ensuring  
8 environmental and fiscal sustainability.

9 It also supports Policy C4, which requires  
10 sidewalks for pedestrians on all street networks, and  
11 Policy CF1, which requires City services to be provided  
12 at acceptable levels.

13 Finding T2 looks for conformance with the  
14 City's master plan for roads. All streets in this  
15 development, all internal streets will be private. And  
16 the traffic analysis and addendum for this project have  
17 detailed that the improvements necessary to accommodate  
18 the traffic generated in this development will happen as  
19 part of the requirements for the development, with the  
20 development agreement.

21 Finding T3 requires the environmental and  
22 health concerns we addressed. The application was  
23 distributed to agencies that are administered by  
24 environmental and health laws. The Washoe County Health

1 District replied with two comments specific to this  
2 site. They had a lot of comments that are generally  
3 applicable to all new development and all tentative  
4 maps. But specific to this site they had two, two  
5 comments. One was that the existing septic, there's a  
6 house here on the far south end of the site, there's an  
7 existing septic tank that there will have to be  
8 abandoned. And there's also a domestic well that will  
9 have to be abandoned. Compliance with these  
10 requirements is required by Condition 4 of the proposed  
11 Conditions of Approval.

12 Finding T4 requires that adequate water be  
13 provided. The applicant has estimated that 141.37  
14 acre-feet per year will be needed. Condition 5 requires  
15 that the applicant secure water rights to serve the  
16 development prior to the final map.

17 Finding T5 looks at the availability and  
18 accessibility of other utilities, namely sewer and storm  
19 sewer. The applicant has estimated the average daily  
20 sewer flows for this development at 105,000 gallons.  
21 The sewer model shows sufficient capacity for this  
22 development. The applicant will have to submit with the  
23 final maps detailed drawings and such that will show how  
24 that's going to be accomplished and would need to be



1 approved by the City Engineer.

2 Finding T6 considers the availability of other  
3 public services. Impacts that the City was able to  
4 identify were those to schools, police, transportation,  
5 fire, and emergency medical response, and utilities.

6 Police and fire protection will be provided by  
7 the City of Sparks. This site is within the 4-minute  
8 travel time. As the fire station's right there, this  
9 one's got it pretty good as far as making the travel  
10 time.

11 As mentioned previously, street and  
12 intersection improvements will be required with the  
13 development of this site.

14 All other utilities necessary to the site will  
15 be extended underground to the site.

16 This development will have an impact on Washoe  
17 County schools, public schools. In a letter received  
18 from the Washoe County School District, it is estimated  
19 that this development will add 111 new students to  
20 Van Gorder Elementary, 40 to Sky Ranch Middle School,  
21 and 43 to Spanish Springs High School. Van Gorder  
22 Elementary is over capacity, as is Spanish Springs High  
23 School. I don't know how to say this. I might get it  
24 wrong. Bohach. Is that right? Bohach Elementary,

1 that's the new elementary school be built in Kiley  
2 Ranch, and a new Hug High School, which is on Wildcreek,  
3 are expected to provide relief to both of those schools.

4 Finding T7 looks at the effects on streets. As  
5 I discussed previously, this development will be  
6 required, will require street and intersection  
7 improvements. Those improvements in the city streets,  
8 with those improvements, city streets will be able to  
9 operate at acceptable levels of service with the  
10 additional traffic.

11 Finding T8 looks at floodplain and slopes. The  
12 site is very flat and does not trigger any of the slopes  
13 or ridges requirements. However, the site does have an  
14 area that is in the floodplain. It's this area here  
15 outlined in yellow. This, again, is turned. So that's  
16 the orientation. It actually sits with north to the  
17 top, the top being to the north. This area here is in  
18 the floodplain. That is what spurred a lot of CLOMR  
19 discussion that brought about the development agreement  
20 amendment.

21 The applicant has submitted a CLOMR to FEMA for  
22 their review. And so we are proposing Condition -- oh,  
23 boy, I don't have it written down here -- a condition  
24 that will require that that final, that approved CLOMR

1 be presented with the tentative map, or with any final  
2 map for the site.

3 Finding T9 requires that entities with review  
4 authority be notified and have opportunity to comment.  
5 The Washoe County School District was the only agency  
6 that replied. They're not the only agency. Them and  
7 Washoe County Health District, with their comments about  
8 the septic and well, also replied. They were addressed  
9 earlier when I was covering Finding T3.

10 Finding T10 requires that fire protection  
11 concerns be considered. The site will be served by the  
12 Sparks Fire Department, as mentioned. The applicant  
13 also submitted a fire protection plan that considers and  
14 addresses the wildland urban interface. And that was  
15 considered to be approved by the Fire Chief, and that is  
16 acquired in the development agreement that they submit  
17 that.

18 Finding T11 requires that any other identified  
19 impacts be considered. Landscape and architecture will  
20 have to comply with the Sparks Municipal Code as SF6  
21 zoning. Conditions 10 and 12, respectively, require  
22 that these standards be met prior to the approval of a  
23 final map.

24 And then, finally, Finding T12 requires proper

1 notice and that a public meeting be held. Again,  
2 posting of the agenda meets the noticing requirements,  
3 and this meeting qualifies as the meeting that's  
4 required for a tentative map.

5 That is the end of my presentation. The  
6 applicant is here. If you have any questions for him or  
7 I, we'd be available to take them.

8 COMMISSIONER READ: Thank you, Ian.

9 Do the Commissioners have any questions for  
10 staff?

11 COMMISSIONER PETERSEN: I have one.

12 COMMISSIONER READ: Commissioner Petersen.

13 COMMISSIONER PETERSEN: When this first came  
14 before us, I had asked, and forgive me for forgetting,  
15 but this is just for my own information. Between the  
16 east boundaries of the ballparks and the west boundary  
17 of this project, can you give me that distance again?

18 MR. CRITTENDEN: The east boundary, I don't  
19 have that distance at this time. I don't know what that  
20 is.

21 COMMISSIONER PETERSEN: I think, I had it.  
22 When we first came, I asked the same thing. I'm  
23 curious, because I don't suppose the lighting effects  
24 from the ballfield is going to, I feel, is far enough

1 away from that proposed development, is it?

2 MR. CRITTENDEN: So we can't do anything to  
3 block all of the light generated by the ballfields from  
4 this property. What we did do during the development  
5 agreement process is looked at the distance to the  
6 nearest lightposts and what would be necessary to make  
7 sure that the actual bulb would be screened from those  
8 posts to this, to the nearest houses. And I don't  
9 remember all of the distances included in that.

10 But the applicant, as you can see in this, has  
11 a -- and it's kind of hard to see here. But there's a  
12 setback area, because there's the street, and then  
13 there's an open space area that we require them to have,  
14 to give us some more setback. They can plant that with  
15 trees and provide a little more ability to screen some  
16 of that light from the adjacent ballfields.

17 And so it was thought about, it was considered,  
18 and the requests we made have been followed. But off  
19 the top of my head right now, I could not tell you the  
20 distance between those two.

21 COMMISSIONER PETERSEN: It is my opinion, to  
22 the benefit of the developer, that it would be better  
23 for it to -- especially those lots on that west side to,  
24 for sales, see if they could shelter that somewhat.

1 Because I lived next to a ballpark one time, and I had  
2 swing shift, and it was miserable, believe me.

3 The other thing is, is a question to follow up  
4 on, is I had noticed how when you indicated that portion  
5 of the floodplain. I also noticed that your reserve,  
6 your secondary fire trail was going to go right through  
7 the corner of that floodplain. Is that not true?

8 MR. CRITTENDEN: The flood -- the road also  
9 travels near that floodplain. You can see it coming in  
10 here, them pulling that side out. And the road will  
11 actually be built up to keep it out of the floodplain as  
12 well. And so both of those things will be accomplished.

13 COMMISSIONER PETERSEN: Oh.

14 MR. CRITTENDEN: But this is the only area in  
15 the actual development that's being addressed through  
16 the CLOMR. I believe, there is some additional area for  
17 the road that'll be addressed that way as well, so.

18 COMMISSIONER PETERSEN: Thank you.

19 COMMISSIONER READ: Thank you.

20 Commissioner Blaco.

21 COMMISSIONER BLACO: I apologize if I'm  
22 mistaken, but I'm not seeing any mention of the approval  
23 of the CLOMR in the Conditions of Approval.

24 COMMISSIONER READ: It says hydrological

1 report.

2 COMMISSIONER BLACO: Does it? Oh, okay.

3 MR. CRITTENDEN: That's part of that.

4 COMMISSIONER READ: Yeah. It's Condition 7.

5 COMMISSIONER BLACO: Oh, okay. Thank you.

6 Sorry about that.

7 COMMISSIONER READ: Any other questions?

8 Commissioner Carey?

9 CHAIRMAN CAREY: I don't have any questions.

10 COMMISSIONER READ: No?

11 CHAIRMAN CAREY: No questions. Thank you.

12 COMMISSIONER READ: Okay. Thank you.

13 Can the applicant come up?

14 MR. CLAY JENSON: Good evening. Clay Jenson

15 with Wingfield Nevada, the owner of Foothills at

16 Wingfield.

17 Madam Chair, Commissioners, I appreciated that

18 following the lead of earlier, Ian did a great job of

19 describing the issues at hand. And I was going to

20 clarify actually the note about the condition of

21 approval for the CLOMR. And just for the sake of

22 clarity, the development agreement modification that was

23 just approved by City Council allowed us the ability to

24 submit and get the tentative map approved prior to the

1 CLOMR being approved by FEMA as long as that CLOMR  
2 application was into FEMA.

3 The condition related to the final map, as we  
4 understand it, is that we will need to have FEMA  
5 approval of the CLOMR before the final map is approved.  
6 And so the goal is to submit the final map for review  
7 while that FEMA review is underway, so that when the --  
8 before the final map can come back to the City Council  
9 for approval, we will have that FEMA approval.

10 COMMISSIONER READ: Thank you.

11 Do any of the Commissioners have questions for  
12 the applicant?

13 COMMISSIONER PETERSEN: I do.

14 COMMISSIONER READ: Yes, Commissioner Petersen.

15 COMMISSIONER PETERSEN: Regardless of what,  
16 that fire road coming in there will still be elevated on  
17 that floodplain, right?

18 MR. CLAY JENSON: That's exactly right. We  
19 actually altered the location four or five times to stay  
20 away from the flood zone. So it's considered an  
21 all-weather access, meaning that it cannot be inundated  
22 during a flood.

23 COMMISSIONER PETERSEN: Would you happen to  
24 know the distance between your west boundary and the



1 ballpark?

2 MR. CLAY JENSON: I'm going to give you an  
3 estimate.

4 COMMISSIONER PETERSEN: Please.

5 MR. CLAY JENSON: I believe, from the closest  
6 ballfield light to the closest wall of a house is  
7 probably around 180 feet.

8 COMMISSIONER PETERSEN: That much?

9 MR. CLAY JENSON: Yeah. You got a drainage  
10 channel. Well, you've got some landscape, a drainage  
11 channel, a roadway, and then 40-foot common element, and  
12 then a block wall.

13 And the development agreement does actually  
14 require us to install landscaping along that boundary of  
15 a certain height. So we actually have site visibility  
16 requirements that show the ballfield lights. And so  
17 those trees at -- when we sell the home, have to get to  
18 a certain height so that it does provide some shading  
19 for that, that boundary.

20 COMMISSIONER PETERSEN: Thank you very much.

21 COMMISSIONER READ: Any other questions for the  
22 applicant or staff?

23 Commissioner Carey?

24 CHAIRMAN CAREY: I have no questions. Thank

1 you.

2 COMMISSIONER READ: All right. Bring it back  
3 to the Commission. Any further discussion, a motion?  
4 And I'll entertain a motion.

5 COMMISSIONER BLACO: I guess, I will.

6 COMMISSIONER READ: Go ahead.

7 COMMISSIONER BLACO: I move to forward the --  
8 Oh, I'm sorry. I move to forward to City Council a  
9 recommendation of approval of the tentative map  
10 associated with PCN19-0038 for a 454-lot single-family  
11 subdivision on a site 65 acres in size located in the  
12 SF6 zoning district, adopting Findings T1 through T12  
13 and the facts supporting these findings as set forth in  
14 the staff report, and subject to the Conditions of  
15 Approval 1 through 14.

16 COMMISSIONER PETERSEN: I'll second.

17 COMMISSIONER READ: We have a first by -- or a  
18 motion by Commissioner Blaco and a second by  
19 Commissioner Petersen. Any further discussion?

20 Okay. Go ahead and take a vote. All those in  
21 favor, state by saying "aye."

22 (Commission members said "aye.")

23 COMMISSIONER READ: Opposed? Opposed?

24 Passes unanimously. Thank you, Ian.