



FILED  
04/22/2020  
Sparks City Clerk

## Notice of Appeal to the City Council from a Decision of the Sparks Planning Commission

SMC 20.05.013(B)(1) – Appeals shall be filed within 11 calendar days after the action or decision of the Sparks Planning Commission.

SMC 20.05.013(A)(3) – An aggrieved person is one whose personal right or right of property is adversely and substantially affected by the decision of the Sparks Planning Commission.

Planning Case No.: 5 RIDGES: PCN19-0040/C420-0005  
Date of Planning Commission Decision: APR 16, 2020

### Appellant's Contact Information:

Name: MICHAEL EASTMAN  
Address: 10 MAC RD  
SPARKS NV 89436  
Telephone: 707 365 7009  
Email: EASTMANMB@YAHOO.COM

I, MICHAEL EASTMAN, certify that I am either the applicant or an aggrieved person who has the right to appeal in the above-listed Planning Case. I am appealing the decision of the Planning Commission for the following reason(s): *(attach additional pages if needed)*

SEE ATTACHMENT

[Signature]  
Signed

4/21/2020  
Date

(For City Clerk Use Only)

Received on: April 22, 2020

By: Julie Torres, Assistant City Clerk

Council Hearing Date: 05/26/2020  
Council Hearing Time: 2:00 pm

Michael Eastman  
10 Mac Rd  
Sparks, NV 89436

Notice of Appeal to the City Council from a Decision of the Sparks Planning Commission (continued)

The Sparks Planning Commission met remotely on Apr 16, 2020. The discussion at hand was of paramount importance, the proceeding of the Five Ridges development. This development is planned to contain 1200-1800 or more homes principally in the lower areas (villages 1-7) but planned to grow to the ridge tops with villages 8-10. Though this was, technically, a legal meeting, the remote nature of it and the importance of it gave the appearance of a project being pushed through without the usual public input. Yes, public input was allowed via email but many of us attempted to be on the call list but were never called for our input during the public comment timeframe. I don't believe my input would have had any bearing on the predetermined outcome, but I firmly believe the commission should have waited for a true public hearing on this matter of such significance.

My primary input for the commission would have been, and is still, that the Sparks City Council owes to its constituents to do a complete ridge analysis. I attended Planning Commission and City Council meetings in 2018 concerning this same project and there was only lip service paid to the Significant Ridgeline concept. The comment was made in passing that this ridgeline in question (old quarry) was not on the list (map) of current Proposed Significant Ridgelines. Of course that was true since the old quarry ridgeline was not IN the city limits when the ridgeline review was accomplished! You see why we feel like the commission and the council don't really want to listen to the very people they notify of the public meetings? This is one of the most compelling ridgelines in all of Sparks! Particularly from the North, it is steep sloped with nothing but blue sky above it. I understand that current or past city council members have remarked that some homes were built on ridgelines in East Sparks that slipped under the radar and should not have been built. Now we're stuck with those eyesore ridges forever. Please do everything in your power to stop a development that will suck the life out of yet another beautiful ridge.

I have additional concerns about this project but will present only one more. Even though the developer does not, strictly speaking, HAVE to build out Highland Ranch Parkway for the initial villages due to the numbers analysis, it is readily apparent to the most casual Sparks area driver that Pyramid Way and Highland Ranch are VERY impacted roadways and the new homes would have a severe impact on those roads. IF the development continues, it certainly must include significant roadway upgrades.

I close with two principal requests. 1) Redo the Planning Commission meeting when a full and truly public forum can be held. We don't need the technically challenged meeting we had on the 16<sup>th</sup> to be the way we make decisions. 2) Now that the quarry ridgeline is in the Sparks city limits, I feel you are OBLIGATED to conduct a thorough study of the ridge and its scenic importance. If our city is going to grow to the West and North, you should certainly take a look at this ridge's significance for the thousands who view it daily.



## Crittenden, Ian

---

**From:** Torres, Julie  
**Sent:** Monday, April 27, 2020 9:08 AM  
**To:** Thornley, Doug; Martini, John; Ornelas Jr, Armando; Crittenden, Ian; Smith, Marilie; Rundle, James  
**Cc:** McCormick, Alyson  
**Subject:** Planning Commission Action Appeal from Danner

Good morning,

We received two additional appeals over the weekend. Here is the one from Nancy Danner. I will forward the other shortly.

Julie

---

**From:** Hunderman, Lisa <[lhunderman@cityofsparks.us](mailto:lhunderman@cityofsparks.us)>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 27, 2020 8:25 AM  
**To:** Torres, Julie <[jt Torres@cityofsparks.us](mailto:jt Torres@cityofsparks.us)>  
**Subject:** FW: Appeal of Sparks Planning Commission Decision

Thank you!

*Lisa*

---

**From:** Nancy Danner <[dannernancy@aol.com](mailto:dannernancy@aol.com)>  
**Sent:** Saturday, April 25, 2020 10:36 AM  
**To:** Hunderman, Lisa <[lhunderman@cityofsparks.us](mailto:lhunderman@cityofsparks.us)>  
**Subject:** Appeal of Sparks Planning Commission Decision

Appeal to the City Council from a Decision of the Sparks Planning Commission

April 25, 2020

Planning Case No: PCN 19-0040  
Date of Planning Commission Decision: April 16, 220

Appellant's Contact Information:  
Name: Nancy & Howard Danner  
7790 Dolores Drive  
Sparks, NV  
775-425-4992

Email: [dannernancy@aol.com](mailto:dannernancy@aol.com)

I, Nancy Danner, certify that I am either the applicant or an aggrieved person who has the right to appeal in the above listed Planning Case. I am appealing the decision of the Planning Commission for the following reasons:

I had emailed numerous concerns to the Planning Commission prior to the meeting held on April 12, 2020 of which I am confident those concerns have been made available to you. In light of the fact this agenda item was approved without

benefit of the residents living in the impacted area being able to personally attend the meeting is in itself cause for alarm - then factor in the inability of those weighing in on the phone being unable to speak during their three minutes allotted time is unconstitutional. There are open meeting laws in place to prevent this type of thing from . I don't understand why or how this meeting event took place - only one item on the agenda - this is not urgent business and could wait until such time the residents impacted by this development could attend and offer their legitimate concerns. As a reminder, this ridge is directly outside my front door. It is what I see every day - every season - it is shameful - and I believe the construction of this development is against many of the codes required to build on the ridge and hillside. The citizens have the the right to be present and voice our concerns in an open meeting. Thank you.

Nancy & Howard Danner





**Notice of Appeal to the City Council  
from a Decision of the Sparks Planning Commission**

SMC 20.05.013(B)(1) – Appeals shall be filed within 11 calendar days after the action or decision of the Sparks Planning Commission.

SMC 20.05.013(A)(3) – An aggrieved person is one whose personal right or right of property is adversely and substantially affected by the decision of the Sparks Planning Commission.

Planning Case No.: CU20-0005 AND PC19-0040  
Date of Planning Commission Decision: APRIL 16, 2020

**Appellant's Contact Information:**

Name: DAN & MINDY FLANNAGAN  
Address: 7779 PATRINA WAY 89436  
SPARKS  
Telephone: 775-583-5566  
Email: ASFERG77@GMAIL.COM

I, DAN AND MINDY FLANNAGAN, certify that I am either the applicant or an aggrieved person who has the right to appeal in the above-listed Planning Case. I am appealing the decision of the Planning Commission for the following reason(s): (attach additional pages if needed)

1. WE WERE NOT ALLOWED TO SPEAK, EVEN THOUGH WE FOLLOWED THE ZOOM MEETING INSTRUCTIONS PROVIDED
2. THE APPLICANT AND SPARKS PLANNING STAFF DID NOT ACCURATELY ADDRESS THE SEVERE AND OVERLOADING TRAFFIC ON PYRAMID HWY & HIGHLANDS RANCH PKWY.
3. OUR HILLSIDES ARE NOT INCLUDED IN SECTION/CODE 20.04.011

Signed [Signature] Date 4-23-20

(For City Clerk Use Only)  
Received on: 4/24/20

Council Hearing Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Council Hearing Time: \_\_\_\_\_

By: [Signature] **FILED**  
**APR 24 2020**  
Sparks City Clerk  
By: [Signature]



RECEIVED

APR 24 2020  
Sparks City Clerk's Office

## Notice of Appeal to the City Council from a Decision of the Sparks Planning Commission

SMC 20.05.013(B)(1) – Appeals shall be filed within 11 calendar days after the action or decision of the Sparks Planning Commission.

SMC 20.05.013(A)(3) – An aggrieved person is one whose personal right or right of property is adversely and substantially affected by the decision of the Sparks Planning Commission.

Planning Case No.: 5 Ridges: Case No. PCN19-0040 / CU20-0005

Date of Planning Commission Decision: April 16, 2020

### Appellant's Contact Information:

Name: Roc Cole  
Address: 7410 MARIE WAY  
Sparks, NV 89436  
Telephone: 742-4479  
Email: GUNNERBUTTS@YAHOO.COM

I, Roc Cole, certify that I am either the applicant or an aggrieved person who has the right to appeal in the above-listed Planning Case. I am appealing the decision of the Planning Commission for the following reason(s): (attach additional pages if needed)

I was very disappointed that myself and three other people that I know of never got a chance to speak on the virtual meeting trial with ZOOM dial in, although it was very obvious that it wouldn't have even mattered. I understand that you need Houses which I'm not opposed to but proper offset from the top of the ridge lines and hilltops is needed. They have almost 400 acres to work with and the city of Sparks has a significant Ridgeline and Hilltop Ordinance that addresses it. This parcel was

Roc Cole  
Signed

4-21-20  
Date

(For City Clerk Use Only)

Received on: April 24, 2020

By: Jake King

Council Hearing Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Council Hearing Time: \_\_\_\_\_



in Washoe county when I bought my parcel and the entire ridgeline from Sun Valley to Pyramid Highway was a "Protected Ridgeline" when the City of Sparks ANNEXED this land shouldn't there have been a study to determine "significant ridgelines" before approving a MAJOR development? The ridgeline above my house is over a mile long, the future "development" wants to line it with high density houses. In the city of Sparks there are several houses on ridgelines but they all have one thing in common, mountains behind them to dull their appearance, the ridgeline they want to line houses with is SKYLINE! How can Earth tones and rooflines be sensitive to blue Sky?? This developer wants to turn our valley into California all for the sake of a view, what about our view? Please take the time to conduct a study of the parcel and move forward with an Amendment to the code as this is a "significant ridge" It is normal for a developer to "swing for the fence" but it is up to the city of Sparks to adhere to the rules in place and only allow what is reasonable. Thank you for your time and due diligence in this matter.

R

## Crittenden, Ian

---

**From:** Torres, Julie  
**Sent:** Monday, April 27, 2020 9:24 AM  
**To:** Thornley, Doug; Martini, John; Ornelas Jr, Armando; Crittenden, Ian; Rundle, James; Smith, Marilie  
**Cc:** McCormick, Alyson  
**Subject:** Planning Commission Action Appeal

Stillwell appeal below.

---

**From:** Hunderman, Lisa <[lhunderman@cityofsparks.us](mailto:lhunderman@cityofsparks.us)>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 27, 2020 8:27 AM  
**To:** Torres, Julie <[jtorres@cityofsparks.us](mailto:jtorres@cityofsparks.us)>  
**Subject:** FW: PCN19-0040/CU20-0005

Thank you!

*Lisa*

---

**From:** Mindy Stillwell <[stillwellmindy@gmail.com](mailto:stillwellmindy@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 27, 2020 4:43 AM  
**To:** Hunderman, Lisa <[lhunderman@cityofsparks.us](mailto:lhunderman@cityofsparks.us)>  
**Subject:** Re: PCN19-0040/CU20-0005

Lisa Hunderman,

I have mailed the appeal,  
I am not clear on the confusion,

Thank you,  
Melinda Stillwell  
775-240-1833

On Thu, Apr 23, 2020 at 9:21 AM Hunderman, Lisa <[lhunderman@cityofsparks.us](mailto:lhunderman@cityofsparks.us)> wrote:

Good Morning Melinda,

I have received your email and wanted to reach out to see if you could possibly clarify the intent?

Are you wanting this to be included as public comment for the appeal of this item? Are you needing the appropriate paperwork to file your own appeal?



If you could please provide some additional information, I am happy to assist you in any way that I can.

Thank you!

## **Lisa Hunderman**

### **City Clerk**

431 Prater Way | Sparks, NV 89431|

☎: Direct [775.353.2397](tel:775.353.2397) | ☎: Main [775.353.2350](tel:775.353.2350)

☎: fax [775.353.7802](tel:775.353.7802) | ✉: [lhunderman@cityofsparks.us](mailto:lhunderman@cityofsparks.us)



---

**From:** Mindy Stillwell <[stillwellmindy@gmail.com](mailto:stillwellmindy@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 22, 2020 10:46 PM  
**To:** Hunderman, Lisa <[lhunderman@cityofsparks.us](mailto:lhunderman@cityofsparks.us)>  
**Subject:** PCN19-0040/CU20-0005

Lisa Hunderman,

Respectful, I am in opposition of the 5Ridges development,

My address 6950 Dolores Dr... my property is directly below the proposed development...as a 33 year taxpaying resident,of this proposed development I am in complete opposition. This would destroy the reason why I purchased and stayed at this location, I own 10 acres in a quiet peaceful neighborhood, the ridge line development would directly destroy any and all of that. I have ridden my horses on that ridge line for over 30 years looking directly down into my home.

Next is the traffic , noise, unsafe driving conditions access, none of those issues have been addressed or rationalized,

The unconditional manner in which this has been moved forward with in our planning department is suspect .

With a public hearing which all neighbors, land owners that are directly impacted could not physically attend , with knowledge that many could not

attend via high tech capabilities, is not a open meeting,

I personally will continue the effort to appeal and extend my energy to include all my neighbors in the same position

Respectfully

Melinda Stillwell

6950 Dolores Dr.

Sparks, Nv.

89436

775-240-1833