



**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:** August 3, 2020

**RE:** **PCN19-0040** – Consideration of and possible action on requests for a site 28.81 acres in size within a larger parcel 386.87 acres in size generally located at 555 Highland Ranch Parkway, Sparks, Nevada, to:

- **MPA20-0001** – Amend the Comprehensive Plan land use designation from approximately 13.81 acres of Intermediate Density Residential (IDR) and approximately 15.00 acres of Commercial (C) to 28.81 acres of Multi-Family Residential (MF14); and
- **RZ20-0001** – Rezone approximately 13.81 acres from SF-6 (Single-Family Residential, 6,000 sq. ft. lots) to MF-2 (Multi-Family Residential) and approximately 15.00 acres from C2 (General Commercial) to MF-2 (Multi-Family Residential).

Please see the attached excerpt from the July 2, 2020 Planning Commission meeting transcript.

1 COMMISSIONER BLACO: Aye.  
2 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Carey?  
3 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Aye.  
4 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Pritsos?  
5 COMMISSIONER PRITSOS: Aye.  
6 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Rawson?  
7 COMMISSIONER RAWSON: Aye.  
8 MS. MARTINEZ: And Commissioner VanderWell?  
9 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Aye.  
10 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you. The motion passes  
11 unanimately.

12 Next is our public hearing items. First is  
13 PCN19-0040, consideration of and possible action on two  
14 requests for at site at 555 Highland Ranch Parkway. The  
15 first request is MPA20-0001 to amend the Comprehensive  
16 Plan land use designation. And the second is RZ20-0001,  
17 which is to rezone Single-Family Residential to  
18 Multi-Family Residential and rezone General Commercial  
19 to Multi-Family Residential.

20 MS. REID: All right. Thank you, Madam Chair  
21 and members of the Commission. For the record, Sienna  
22 Reid with the Planning Division presenting the first of  
23 two agenda items associated with the Five Ridges project  
24 tonight.

1           Before I get going, I do want to check in  
2 really quick and just ensure that you can see the full  
3 slides and that the audio, in terms of what you are  
4 hearing, is good.

5           CHAIRMAN READ: Yes, we can see it and hear  
6 you.

7           MS. REID: Okay. Perfect. Well, I'll go ahead  
8 and get going. So before you for consideration as part  
9 of this agenda item are two requests. The first is a  
10 Comprehensive Plan land use amendment, and the second is  
11 a rezoning request.

12           As you're likely familiar, the Five Ridges  
13 project site currently consists of one parcel almost 387  
14 acres in size. It's located northwest of the  
15 intersection of Pyramid Way and Highland Ranch Parkway.  
16 And the Comprehensive Plan land use amendment and  
17 rezoning request for this agenda item are each located  
18 within this larger parcel.

19           In terms of background, development of the site  
20 that was just shown on the previous slide was initially  
21 approved about two years ago, in July of 2018.  
22 Entitlement requests approved at that time included a  
23 development agreement, annexation, Comprehensive Plan  
24 land use amendment, and rezoning requests.

1           The development agreement permitted a minimum  
2 of 1,200 and a maximum of 1,800 dwelling units within  
3 that project area, as well as commercial or multi-family  
4 development along Highland Ranch Parkway.

5           Subsequently, in February of this year, an  
6 amendment to the development agreement was also  
7 approved. Modifications to the agreement at that time  
8 resulted from further analysis of the site and land and  
9 infrastructure plans by the master developer. While  
10 there were various changes made to address ownership,  
11 clarify permitted residential uses, address previously  
12 disturbed land and then further modify the timing and  
13 scope of infrastructure improvements, it's important to  
14 note that the number of permitted residential units did  
15 not change with that first amendment.

16           And so per this current agreement that's in  
17 place, entitlement requests to allow for the development  
18 of duplex or townhome uses do not require an amendment  
19 of that agreement, provided that the total number of  
20 dwelling units complies with the permitted units.

21           At this time, the master developer is seeking  
22 to develop duplex and townhome units and has submitted  
23 Comprehensive Plan use amendment and rezoning requests  
24 that will enable those uses.

1           Moving on, existing and proposed Comprehensive  
2 Plan land use designations are shown on this slide. And  
3 as you can see, on the right-hand portion of the slide,  
4 the Multi-Family Residential 14, or MF14, land use  
5 designation, which is the blue-green color, is proposed  
6 for two areas within the greater Five Ridges project  
7 site; 15 acres located to the north of Highland Ranch  
8 Parkway that are designated Commercial and 13.81 acres  
9 generally within the center of the Five Ridges project  
10 site that are designated Intermediate Density  
11 Residential, or IDR, would change to the proposed MF14  
12 land use designation.

13           And should the Comprehensive Plan land use  
14 amendment be approved, a total of 28.81 acres, which I  
15 placed here approximately 7.4 percent of the current  
16 Five Ridges project area, would be designated MF14. The  
17 remainder of the Five Ridges project area would retain  
18 the existing IDR land use designation that is shown in  
19 beige.

20           The associated rezoning requests apply to those  
21 same two areas that you can see on this slide. The 15  
22 acres zoned C2 along Highland Ranch Parkway and the  
23 13.81 acres zoned SF6, generally within the center of  
24 the Five Ridges project site, would each be rezoned to

1 MF2, which supports a maximum of 14 dwelling units per  
2 acre and allows for a wider range of residential uses  
3 compared to single-family zoning districts.

4 This slide gives the Commission a general sense  
5 of the Comprehensive Plan land use amendment and  
6 rezoning requests in relation to the conceptual land  
7 plan for Five Ridges. And this is the land plan dated  
8 November of 2019. The 15-acre portion of the site  
9 adjacent to Highland Ranch Parkway is generally located  
10 within Five Ridges Village 1, and then the 13.81-acre  
11 portion of the site is generally within Village 5 in the  
12 center of the site.

13 Shifting gears here to findings, so findings  
14 for both the Comprehensive Plan land use amendment and  
15 rezoning requests under consideration tonight have been  
16 grouped by topic. These topics include conformance and  
17 consistency, compatibility and public notice.  
18 Conformance and consistency findings address conformance  
19 of the Truckee Meadows Regional Plan and consistency  
20 with the City of Sparks Comprehensive Plan.

21 So first off here, Finding CP1 for the  
22 Comprehensive Plan land use change requires the request  
23 to conform with the land use and intensity designation  
24 in the Regional Plan.

1           Here the entire Five Ridges project site has a  
2 Tier 2 land designation, and it's also located within  
3 the Truckee Meadows Service Area, or TMSA.

4           Residential density for Tier 2 lands is limited  
5 to 30 dwelling units per acre per the Regional Plan.  
6 And the proposed Multi-Family Residential 14 land use  
7 designation allows for a density range of 10 to less  
8 than 14 dwelling units an acre, which is below and  
9 certainly in compliance with the Tier 2 maximum density  
10 standard.

11           In addition, portions of the 28.81 acres  
12 proposed to change the MF14 land use designation are  
13 also identified as development constrained for the  
14 Regional Plan, and this is due to the presence of slopes  
15 of 30 percent or greater. The Comprehensive Plan  
16 encourages preservation of such slopes, and the Sparks  
17 Municipal Code requires a two-to-one ratio of  
18 nonconstrained land be preserved as open space for all  
19 areas with slopes over 30 percent that are developed.  
20 And that is to implement the Regional Plan policies for  
21 development constrained area.

22           Per Finding CP2, the Comprehensive Plan land  
23 use amendment must implement the goals of the  
24 Comprehensive Plan.

1           And then Finding Z1 for the zoning requires the  
2 rezoning request also be consistent with the  
3 Comprehensive Plan.

4           As discussed in previous slides, the request  
5 before you tonight would apply that MF14 land use  
6 designation and MF2 zoning district to a total of 21.81  
7 acres.

8           And the application of this land use and the  
9 zoning district supports high-density single-family and  
10 low-density multi-family housing products such as  
11 townhomes and duplexes commonly referred to as missing  
12 middle housing. These housing types offer alternative  
13 options to detached single-family homes and can provide  
14 home ownership opportunities at lower price points.

15           For these reasons, the Comprehensive Plan land  
16 use amendment and associated rezoning request supports  
17 not only Goal H2 of the Comprehensive Plan, but also  
18 Policies CF8 and H2 that collectively encourage housing  
19 type diversity throughout the City.

20           In response to a question raised by  
21 Commissioner Carey during the Study Session, staff did  
22 go take a further look at the fiscal health analysis  
23 that was prepared for the City in 2019, in regards to  
24 the supply of land for residential uses for which the

1 intermediate, or excuse me, the MF14 land use  
2 designation falls into. And what we found was that this  
3 category falls into a density category that covers 7.27  
4 to 14.5 dwelling units per acre. And all lands  
5 designated IDR are included within that category.

6 And so it's important here to note that such  
7 lands accommodate detached single-family housing rather  
8 than a range of housing types that would be anticipated  
9 under the MF14 land use designation and associated MF2  
10 zoning district.

11 So in terms of that land use and zoning, those  
12 designations certainly more clearly support housing type  
13 diversity with allowed uses that include not only  
14 single-family detached housing, but duplex and  
15 multi-family uses. And then the minimum density of 12  
16 dwelling units per acre that's required per the MF2 zone  
17 also helps to support a higher density and more diverse  
18 housing product.

19 Also, the proposed request would remove the  
20 opportunity for a wide variety of commercial uses to  
21 establish at the entrance of the Five Ridges project  
22 site. However, future commercial use opportunities do  
23 exist in close proximity. These include commercial  
24 designated lands located to the south side of Highland

1 Ranch Parkway and then also within the Kiley Ranch North  
2 planned development on both the west and east sides of  
3 Pyramid Way.

4 Taking a look into that long-term fiscal health  
5 analysis as it relates to employment lands, that  
6 analysis shows a supply for retail uses that exceeds  
7 forecasted land by about 266 acres.

8 So noting this, the proposed request would not  
9 adversely impact the supply of land for commercial uses  
10 and does comply with Policy MG4 that supports an  
11 adequate supply of land for employment generating uses.

12 And then, lastly, in regards to steep slopes,  
13 it is important to note that those are present within  
14 the Five Ridges project site and on portions of the site  
15 where land use and rezoning requests are proposed.

16 And so here the Comprehensive Plan, as briefly  
17 discussed, has encouraged the preservation of slopes and  
18 other unique geological features but could also further  
19 reduce this land area that can be disturbed as that  
20 slope increases. And, further, the development  
21 agreement requires compliance with those regulations for  
22 naturally occurring slopes and limits the total area to  
23 be cleared, graded or otherwise disturbed to 267 acres.

24 Shifting here to the fiscal impact of the

1 requests before you tonight, an updated fiscal impact  
2 analysis was provided with these requests. It is --  
3 request. It was assuming 1,220 residential units and no  
4 commercial space for an expanded site that totals just a  
5 bit over 421 acres. The previous fiscal impact analysis  
6 that was dated June of 2018 assumed 1,223 residential  
7 units, so fairly similar there, but it also assumed a  
8 bit over 141,000 square feet of general commercial  
9 space.

10           So due to the removal of that commercial space  
11 and expansion of the site area, the updated fiscal  
12 impact analysis does increase the length of roadways  
13 that are projected to be dedicated to the City by about  
14 200,000 square feet. Noting those changes, the analysis  
15 estimates the fiscal impact to the City would produce a  
16 positive fiscal impact of approximately \$700,000 over  
17 the 20-year analysis period.

18           With regards to infrastructure and facilities  
19 and those policies in the Comprehensive Plan, the  
20 development agreement specifies the timing and scope of  
21 improvements needed to provide City services at  
22 acceptable service levels. Roadway and intersection  
23 improvements, secondary access, sewer collection, system  
24 improvements, water transmission facilities and

1 improvements, and flood control and drainage  
2 improvements are identified to serve between 1,200 and  
3 1,800 total units.

4           In support of the current request, the  
5 applicant provided an updated trip generation letter as  
6 well as sewer and water studies analyzing development of  
7 the Five Ridges project site was solely residential  
8 development. That trip generation letter finds trips  
9 associated with 1,220 units will result in traffic  
10 impacts of less than or similar to the trips initially  
11 analyzed in 2017. The sewer study finds the existing  
12 sanitary sewer mains, trunk mains and interceptors have  
13 available capacity to serve anticipated residential  
14 units. And that study was taking a specific look at  
15 1,241 units.

16           So here it's important to note that should  
17 development exceed 1,650 equivalent residential units,  
18 the agreement does set forth sanitary sewer collection  
19 system upsizing at that point in time.

20           Also provided was the preliminary water service  
21 study assessing the ability of the Sun Valley General  
22 Improvement District to supply the water to the  
23 Five Ridges project site. That included associated  
24 costs.

1           And here really what's important to note is the  
2 agreement does require the master developer to construct  
3 all on- and off-site water facilities.

4           So with the agreement in place and the updated  
5 fiscal impact analysis, it is staff's view that the  
6 request complies with Policies MG5 and CF1 that address  
7 the fiscal implications to provide public services and  
8 the provision of City services at acceptable service  
9 levels.

10           Moving on with this slide to findings that  
11 relate to compatibility, here we have Finding CP3 for  
12 the Comprehensive Plan land use and Finding Z2 for the  
13 rezoning, each looking at how the requests are  
14 compatible with surrounding land uses.

15           So for the requests associated with the 15  
16 acres located to the north of Highland Ranch Parkway,  
17 the MF14 land use designation would serve as a  
18 transition between commercial designated lands located  
19 to the south and east and the IDR designated lands  
20 located to the north and west. The associated rezoning  
21 from C2 to MF2, noting that it's a conforming zoning  
22 district, would likewise serve as a buffer between  
23 single-family uses in the SF6 zone to the north and  
24 future commercial uses that can establish to the east in

1 the Kiley Ranch North planned development as well as the  
2 C2 zone to the south of Highland Ranch Parkway.

3 For the requests in the center of the Five  
4 Ridges project site, changing the land use and zoning as  
5 proposed is compatible with the surrounding IDR land use  
6 and SF6 zoning with a density range of six to less than  
7 10 dwelling units per acre. The IDR land use supports  
8 the highest density of single-family uses. And while  
9 the MF14 land use designation supports more varied  
10 housing types, the 10 to less than 14 dwelling units per  
11 acre density range is only moderately denser and is  
12 appropriate adjacent to that IDR land use designation.

13 In addition, application of the conforming MF2  
14 zone would, as has been discussed, permit a greater  
15 variety of residential uses than is allowed by the  
16 existing SF6 zoning. However, here it's important to  
17 note that the MF2 zoning is the lowest density  
18 multi-family residential zoning district, and the SF6  
19 zoning district is the highest density single-family  
20 residential zoning district available in the City of  
21 Sparks.

22 So the single-family, duplex and multi-family  
23 building uses permitted in the MF2 zone with that  
24 maximum density of 14 dwelling units per acre are

1 compatible adjacent to single-family uses that are  
2 permitted in the SF6 zone. And those can establish that  
3 that maximum density of 7.3 dwelling units per acre.

4 So here, findings that relate to public  
5 noticing, CP4 and Z3, each were to make sure that  
6 required public notice is given per state law and code.  
7 For both requests, the Planning Commission and City  
8 Council meetings do function as the public hearings.

9 And with the proposed comprehensive land use  
10 amendment, mailed notices for a neighborhood meeting  
11 were provided to all property owners at a minimum within  
12 750 feet of the site. That neighborhood meeting was  
13 conducted by the applicant's representative on June 8th  
14 of this year. And nine people attended that meeting.  
15 Those that did attend expressed concerns about  
16 development of the greater Five Ridges project area,  
17 including development of homes on ridgelines in a manner  
18 that would be visible from unincorporated properties to  
19 the north, traffic impacts, and impacts to groundwater  
20 due to the municipal wells.

21 And then, in addition, for the rezoning, mailed  
22 public notice was also provided at a minimum to all  
23 property owners within 750 feet. And both requests were  
24 published in the Reno Gazette-Journal for that notice by

1 publication.

2           And so, just to wrap it up here, for public  
3 comment, there is one public comment that Casey will  
4 read. It is in opposition to the request. But that is  
5 the only written correspondence that we've received, and  
6 I've received no calls on this particular item.

7           So with that, I'll go ahead and conclude my  
8 presentation and be available for questions at the  
9 appropriate time. Staff is recommending approval of the  
10 requested Comprehensive Plan land use amendment and  
11 rezoning request. And should the Commission need  
12 further slides, those will be available with  
13 recommendations later.

14           CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you, Sienna.

15           Do any of the Commissioners have questions for  
16 staff at this time?

17           Commissioner Carey.

18           COMMISSIONER CAREY: Thank you, Madam Chair. I  
19 had some other questions, but I'll wait till after the  
20 public comment. I just had a technical question.

21           Sienna, thanks for the additional info about my  
22 question from the -- about multi-family from the Study  
23 Session.

24           I think, where I was kind of going with that

1 question, I was more interested in seeing if we have  
2 enough acreage for that multi-family around the 10  
3 dwelling units per acre within the city. I know in the  
4 staff report you justify the recommendation of approval  
5 that there's enough commercial that's planned for within  
6 the City to handle that 20-year period. I was wondering  
7 what you were able to find out in terms of acreages if  
8 there is enough multi-family that is planned for in the  
9 City around that 10 dwelling units per acre.

10 When I looked through the study, it was  
11 something like that that study projected that there was  
12 3,050 units that was the demand, and that would take up  
13 305 acres of multi-family land uses. I was just curious  
14 with if we have enough multi-family land uses in our  
15 Comprehensive Plan.

16 MS. REID: Well, to go ahead and respond to  
17 your question, Commissioner Carey, I mean you're correct  
18 in terms of looking at the long-term fiscal health  
19 analysis. I think, what's important to note is that the  
20 10 dwelling units per acre that you're referencing, that  
21 particular density falls within a category in terms of  
22 that analysis that encompasses high-density  
23 single-family and low-density multi-family. So it is  
24 spanning, as I mentioned, 7.27 to 14.5 dwelling units

1 per acre.

2           The other categories that are of higher density  
3 are firmly multi-family. So moderate density gets up to  
4 14.5 to 30, and then higher density is above 30. So we  
5 do have adequate supplies of land designated for those  
6 moderate density multi-family and high density  
7 multi-family categories per the study. But teasing out  
8 kind of the proportion of single-family versus  
9 multi-family within the high-density single-family,  
10 slash, low-density multi-family categories is quite  
11 difficult. And so that's why I really wanted to note,  
12 in kind of responding to your question, that the entire  
13 IDR land use designation is classified in that  
14 particular category.

15           And with zoning districts, SF6 and SF7 that  
16 conform, there's definitely single-family product that  
17 is included in that land supply. And so to the extent  
18 that you have, you know, conforming MF2 zoning to the  
19 MF14 land use, the City does have, you know, some MF2  
20 zoning. There's also a lot of flexibility in the  
21 planned unit development. So it's difficult to say  
22 exactly what is the total supply that's going to  
23 accommodate just multi-family development, because with  
24 that flexibility, you might not be getting multi-family

1 development, you might not be getting a duplex or even a  
2 townhome on that kind of attached single-family side of  
3 things.

4           So even that flexibility, it's difficult to say  
5 exactly what the acreage demand is and isn't. Within  
6 that category, there are 383 net acres identified as  
7 available. But, again, I think, what's important with  
8 the MF2 zoning is that it's standard zoning. It doesn't  
9 necessarily allow for a lack of a minimum density. It  
10 does have that 12 dwelling units per acre. So, you  
11 know, assuming development were to proceed forward under  
12 an MF2 zone, you would actually have a higher density  
13 product, whether that's attached single-family, small  
14 lot single-family or, say, a duplex.

15           COMMISSIONER CAREY: May I have one quick  
16 follow-up, Madam Chair?

17           CHAIRMAN READ: Go ahead, Commissioner Carey.

18           COMMISSIONER CAREY: Thank you.

19           And I appreciate that. And I understand. It's  
20 not an apples-to-apples comparison. I get what you're  
21 saying with the zoning, and it's different than with the  
22 land uses. And how that city kind of broke them out, it  
23 was a little bit weird.

24           So you're generally saying, just so I

1 understand it, that there is enough of this type of  
2 density or type of product that's proposed with this  
3 land use change within our Comprehensive Plan that's on  
4 the books and is out there within the City. I was  
5 just --

6 MS. REID: There's 383 acres identified as  
7 surplus for the density category that spans high-density  
8 single-family and low-density multi-family. There is no  
9 guarantee that you would get a wide range of diverse  
10 housing products given that the lower end of that  
11 density category includes SF6 and SF7 zoning.

12 So I would say that the MF2 zoning, I think,  
13 does support higher density and more diverse housing  
14 types.

15 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Thank you, Sienna. Thank  
16 you, Madam Chair.

17 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

18 Any other questions for staff?

19 All right. Casey, is the applicant on the  
20 call?

21 MS. MARTINEZ: They are. And I will allow them  
22 to speak now.

23 CHAIRMAN READ: Okay.

24 MR. MIKE RAILEY: Good evening. Can you hear

1 me?

2 CHAIRMAN READ: Yes.

3 MR. MIKE RAILEY: Good evening. For the  
4 record, Mike Railey with Christy Corporation. Also on  
5 the call is Blake Smith and Blake Smith, Jr. with  
6 Five Ridges Development company.

7 I think, Sienna did an excellent job going  
8 through the requests and the findings. I know it tends  
9 to sound fairly complicated from an entitlement  
10 perspective, but in reality this is a fairly simple  
11 request just to rezone and redesignate those two, two  
12 areas to the multi-family zoning and designation which  
13 will really allow for some diversification in the  
14 housing types that are offered within Five Ridges, allow  
15 for some increased higher density and attached  
16 single-family uses. So we think it's a fairly simple  
17 request. I know it sounds fairly complicated when you  
18 read through all the literature. But in reality, it  
19 really is fairly simple.

20 So we're happy to address any questions you  
21 might have and are available any time you need us.

22 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you, Mike.

23 Do any of the Commissioners have questions for  
24 the applicant?

1 Commissioner Carey.

2 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Thank you, Madam Chair.

3 Just a quick question, Mike. Why are you  
4 proposing the M2 zoning for this project as opposed to  
5 higher density zoning that's allowed under the MF14 land  
6 use?

7 MR. MIKE RAILEY: So that's a good question.  
8 The M2, if you look at what the minimum density  
9 requirements are, in order to allow for like a duplex or  
10 a townhome-type unit, the M2 is really the best suited  
11 for that in order to make sure that we can meet those  
12 minimum density requirements, rather than set -- for  
13 example, the C2 was a minimum, I believe it's 34 units  
14 per acre. Which there's no way you can meet that  
15 density with a townhome, for example.

16 So it gives us a little bit more flexibility in  
17 providing some attached single-family products.

18 COMMISSIONER CAREY: All right. Thank you,  
19 Madam Chair.

20 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

21 Any further questions for the applicant?

22 Seeing none, I'll open it up for public comment  
23 on this item.

24 Casey, can you please repeat the call-in

1 information, and you can go ahead and read the public  
2 comment email that was received as well.

3 MS. MARTINEZ: The telephone number for call-in  
4 participation is 1-669-900-6833, and the meeting ID  
5 number is 962 4203 7566, and you'll press star 9 to  
6 request to speak.

7 We have one emailed comment for this.

8 MS. MCCORMICK: Madam Chair.

9 CHAIRMAN READ: Of course.

10 MS. MCCORMICK: Before Casey gets started, for  
11 the record, this is Alyson McCormick. This is two  
12 separate items, and each of them does require a separate  
13 public hearing.

14 CHAIRMAN READ: Okay. So. So the first one  
15 will be for the Comprehensive Plan Land Use amendment  
16 request.

17 MS. MCCORMICK: Correct.

18 CHAIRMAN READ: Okay.

19 MS. MARTINEZ: Members of the Sparks Planning  
20 Commission, as a beneficial owner of an adjoining  
21 property, APN08344030, in the legal name of my IRA  
22 account, Equity Trust Company, and on behalf of another  
23 adjoining lot owned by Pyramid West Vistas, LLC,  
24 APN08344031, as its attorney, we oppose the granting of

1 the proposed amendment to the Comprehensive Plan,  
2 MPA20-0001, and the proposed rezoning, RZ20-0001. The  
3 request is inconsistent with the stated purposes of  
4 Title 20 zoning and land use controls of the City of  
5 Sparks Municipal Code.

6 The granting of the application would not be  
7 consistent as applied to this development, which is  
8 really spot zoning. Spot zoning such as this was  
9 prohibited by the Nevada Supreme Court in Enterprise  
10 Citizens vs. Clark County Commissioners, 112 Nevada 649,  
11 918, in 1996. This should be undisputed that the added  
12 congestion in increased density of dwelling units would  
13 be injurious to public health, safety or welfare or  
14 injurious to property, including mine, or improvements  
15 of the vicinity.

16 Common sense dictates that the increase in  
17 population density will bring with it increase in crime,  
18 pollution, noise, sanitation, additional road  
19 congestion, and loss of quality of life in general.  
20 Recall from previous meetings that about the Five Ridges  
21 project that the idea in approving this project was to  
22 avoid another bedroom community by having a mix of  
23 commercial property where the occupants could live and  
24 work rather than adding to the already unsafe traffic

1 for commuters.

2           It cannot be seriously argued that granting the  
3 major deviation is unnecessary for and would be  
4 antiethical to the preservation and enjoyment of a  
5 property right possessed by other property owners in the  
6 same vicinity and land use district, and it is not  
7 denied to the property for which the major deviation is  
8 sought. This is especially true where the adjoining  
9 properties annexed to the City of Sparks, including  
10 mine, have a three-unit per acre subdivision zoning  
11 restriction instead of this much smaller  
12 6,000-square-foot silver lot limitation and now even  
13 greater urban sprawl density of 14 units per acre. Many  
14 adjoining parcels, including mine, have much steeper  
15 slopes than the applicant's.

16           Finally, granting the major deviation would  
17 constitute a spot zoning special privilege inconsistent  
18 with the limitations upon other properties in the  
19 vicinity and land use district in which the property is  
20 located. A planned unit development is an alternative,  
21 could assure maximum build-out of this parcel.

22           Washoe County is in process of, if it has not  
23 already occurred, increasing the zoning for parcels  
24 within the City of Sparks Sphere of Influence to provide

1 for multi-acre residential units rather than the  
2 applicant's already approved shoe box 6,000-square-foot  
3 lots.

4 You have already given this developer much more  
5 than an inch. Now it wants to take the proverbial mile.  
6 It is respectfully requested that the application and  
7 its subparts be denied outright.

8 Thank you.

9 And that's from Bradley Paul Elley.

10 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you. Are there any other  
11 callers for this item?

12 MS. MARTINEZ: We have two requests to speak.  
13 One, the one we're going to start with, has a 707 area  
14 code. And I have allowed them to speak now.

15 MR. MIKE EASTMAN: Can you hear me?

16 CHAIRMAN READ: Yes.

17 MR. MIKE EASTMAN: Okay. Good. My name is  
18 Mike Eastman. I live on the north side of the Ridge  
19 complex.

20 CHAIRMAN READ: Hey, Mike, do you have a --

21 MR. MIKE EASTMAN: And I have two parts --

22 CHAIRMAN READ: You have an echo on your phone.

23 MR. MIKE EASTMAN: Is that better?

24 CHAIRMAN READ: Yes. And we'll give you extra

1 time if you need it.

2 MR. MIKE EASTMAN: This -- I hope you give me  
3 some leeway on a little bit of time, Because I've got  
4 two comments. One of them is, at the very beginning,  
5 Chair Read, you, when your assistant there started the  
6 call-in, gave us the call-in information, the call  
7 information, before I could get called in and get my  
8 item ID number in, we had already moved beyond public  
9 comment.

10 The second part of it would be that you didn't  
11 give us any agenda. So I have no access to an agenda,  
12 so I don't know when we're supposed to speak. On a  
13 previous Planning Commission meeting on Zoom, we  
14 attempted to call in, and there was never later a chance  
15 to call in again.

16 So I tried to get my comments in first, and you  
17 had moved beyond the public comment section before I  
18 could even finish dialing the numbers and punching in  
19 all the numbers applied.

20 The core of my concern, though, is that there's  
21 been no addressing -- if you take any part of this area  
22 and you add and switch from commercial to residential,  
23 and then you also take residential areas and make them  
24 more high density, no one has seemed to suggest how many

1 more, how much greater occupancy the entire land site  
2 can manage.

3           If I remember right, you've already approved  
4 and only approved 12 to 18 hundred units, or 12 to  
5 18 hundred families living in that area. And I don't  
6 see how it's possible that we can increase density on  
7 any one part or any two parts and convert commercial to  
8 residential without a further discussion of the overall  
9 greater numbers that would be allowed in the entire  
10 area. I understand, the developer is not proposing  
11 anything larger yet. But there's no way that he's not  
12 going to.

13           And I don't, I think, the previous caller was  
14 making reference to that as well, that we aren't just  
15 talking about 12 to 18 hundred now, we're trying to get  
16 in a back door for getting a whole lot more higher  
17 density on average than what it first sounded like we're  
18 going to.

19           Many of us on this side, on the north side  
20 remain adamantly opposed to any destruction, any effect  
21 on that ridge whatsoever. And I hope that you will back  
22 up just a little bit and once again consider whether you  
23 even want to destroy that ridge view like this whole  
24 project is going to.

1 Thank you for your time, and I will talk to you  
2 later.

3 CHAIRMAN READ: Okay. Thank you.

4 Do we have another caller for this item?

5 MS. MARTINEZ: We do have another caller. The  
6 first three numbers of their phone number is 376, and I  
7 have allowed them to speak now.

8 MR. DAN FLANNAGAN: Good evening, Commission  
9 members, Madam Chair and staff. My name is Dan  
10 Flannagan. I live not adjacent to the property, within  
11 a quarter mile, which I've lived for about the last 39  
12 years.

13 It didn't take long for this amendment to occur  
14 being that this approval just recently was completed. A  
15 couple questions that I have regarding this is, on item  
16 number one, the amendment to the -- this, the  
17 Comprehensive Plan, wouldn't that also require -- and, I  
18 guess, this is to Sienna -- wouldn't that also require  
19 an amendment to the Regional Plan?

20 Number two is the removal of commercial  
21 development within any area automatically creates more  
22 daily trips within any tributaries or main roads,  
23 because the people within the particular subdivision now  
24 have to travel a certain amount of distance. And has

1 there been any study on the amounts? And there's been  
2 no indication on the documents submitted so far the  
3 amount of timeline that the increased amount of mileage  
4 the people have to travel as opposed to the commercial  
5 development within their subdivision.

6           The other item is, is your required sprinkler  
7 system in, in the particular subdivision, the first  
8 phases, you're increasing the density in these first  
9 phases by these amendments. By increasing the density  
10 of those, doesn't it also require that, number one, that  
11 either the fire station get built, they also have to put  
12 sprinklers in, and/or one or the other. The other item  
13 is, the 650 average daily trips that are triggered by  
14 the increased density of the multi-family, that would  
15 require immediate improvements to Highland Ranch Parkway  
16 and the Pyramid Kiley Ranch, excuse me, Sparks Boulevard  
17 intersection.

18           And I'm very concerned, and I'm very opposed to  
19 the amount of density. Again, I've been out here for  
20 almost 40 years and have watched this kind of  
21 development. If you want to experience it, come out to  
22 our neck of the woods about between 3:30 and 6:00  
23 o'clock, even during the Covid event we're having, and  
24 you come see what the amount of traffic that's going to

1 be generated by an additional increased density of any  
2 part of this subdivision.

3 And my other final question is, is by adding  
4 the 34.71 acres, is the developer also required to  
5 staying within the maximum amount of 1,800 dwelling  
6 units that was originally approved?

7 Again, I oppose this. I believe, the Regional  
8 Plan amendment and the development agreement do not  
9 coincide with this increased density of this that is  
10 proposed under this particular request by the developer.

11 Thank you very much.

12 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

13 Casey, any other callers on the Comprehensive  
14 Plan?

15 MS. MARTINEZ: We do not have any other callers  
16 at this time.

17 CHAIRMAN READ: Okay. So I will close public  
18 comment on the Comprehensive Plan Land Use amendment and  
19 then open public comment for the rezoning request.

20 Do we have any callers for the rezoning  
21 request?

22 MS. MARTINEZ: We do not have any callers at  
23 this time. Ope, I apologize.

24 CHAIRMAN READ: Okay.

1 MS. MARTINEZ: There is one public comment. It  
2 is from the 376 phone number, and -- woops, 365 phone  
3 number. And you are able to speak now.

4 MR. MIKE EASTMAN: Yes, this is Mike Eastman  
5 again. Can you hear me?

6 CHAIRMAN READ: Yes.

7 MR. MIKE EASTMAN: Okay. Good. This is  
8 challenging, because I have to have one device open to  
9 watch you on TV and another device open to be able to  
10 make a phone call, and I've got to turn one off, I  
11 guess.

12 The rezoning is an -- not, I'm sorry, the  
13 rezoning. The addition of the 37 acres is something  
14 that is illusionary to me, because I'm not sure we've  
15 ever seen anything that says exactly what we're going to  
16 do with that. And I would encourage you guys to take a  
17 good look at how that extra 37 acres is going to be used  
18 and how much of that area can be used versus how much it  
19 will be used. I would really like to see a strong  
20 presentation from the developer exactly how that's going  
21 to be, including a map that overlays it. That would be  
22 very helpful.

23 That area that is being zoned is contiguous  
24 with BLM lands. And I want to also know if there's any

1 intention to allow access to that BLM land from their  
2 land right there, which will give a very, very massive  
3 amount of people access to these more pristine lands  
4 and, obviously, attribute to the dumping problems that  
5 were already occurring out there. It would be, seem to  
6 be a far better approach to not allow access to that  
7 area, but I'd like to know that, about that as well, how  
8 much of an impact it's going to be on this access to BLM  
9 lands.

10 That's all for now.

11 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

12 Casey, any other callers?

13 MS. MARTINEZ: We do have one additional  
14 caller, and their phone number begins with 376. And you  
15 are now able to speak.

16 MR. DAN FLANNAGAN: Hi again, folks. This is  
17 Dan. Just real quick. Can you hear me?

18 CHAIRMAN READ: Yes.

19 MR. DAN FLANNAGAN: Thank you.

20 You say on the rezoning -- I'm sorry.

21 Mr. Eastman, he was commenting on the 34 acres, which  
22 was an additional comment, which is lower, under  
23 PCN19-0040. I'm talking about RZ20-001, excuse me,  
24 0001. This is converting the SF6 to the -- it's not M2.

1 It's MF2. Multi-family residential is the correct  
2 titling for that.

3 The planning department and the amount of  
4 traffic study and documents that have been submitted so  
5 far have no indication, there's just a brief letter that  
6 it will be accommodated when this density is obviously  
7 increased substantially. It does not -- the  
8 neighborhood meeting we had, the other documents have  
9 been submitted, have been very insufficient on to  
10 discuss the amount of density changes, modifications,  
11 the road improvements, those other items that I  
12 mentioned earlier under MPA20-0001.

13 I believe, the overall Regional Plan and the  
14 plan amendment that was -- that Sienna mentioned, back  
15 in 2017, of the allowed acres does not pertain to where  
16 we are at today. The development agreement has been a  
17 vague and nebulous agreements that have been modified  
18 without public input. The last meeting we had with the  
19 City Council, Jim Rundle said, stated that there had  
20 been numerous amounts of public meetings and  
21 neighborhood meetings, and he had worked with Washoe  
22 County to amend the Spanish Springs, or West Spanish  
23 Springs area plan. This is simply false, and staff  
24 needs to look into it.

1           We need to, we, as local residents that are  
2 being impacted, we would like, and are respectfully  
3 requesting, the documentation of the notifications that  
4 occurred to the amendments of the West Spanish Springs  
5 area plan. Because I have talked to the County  
6 Commissioners from Washoe County. I've talked -- and,  
7 again, been here for almost 40 years. And I have had  
8 many discussions with everyone that's still been out  
9 here almost as long as I have. And we had no  
10 notification whatsoever to any amendments to the  
11 original plan that protected those ridgelines, as well  
12 as dictated the allotment.

13           I was originally on the subcommittee with  
14 Washoe County that created those designations for  
15 commercial, residential and other types of development  
16 in this area. And we were not notified. That is simply  
17 the cold, hard facts here. And that needs to be  
18 addressed.

19           And, again, thank you very much.

20           CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

21           Any other callers?

22           MS. MARTINEZ: We do have one additional  
23 caller. And the beginning of the phone number is 742.  
24 You are now able to speak.

1 MR. ROC COLE: Hi. My name is Roc Cole. And  
2 just to further the ridgeline discussion, there's some  
3 evidence that you guys have not heard.

4 I bought my parcel 28 years ago. And under the  
5 Sparks, or the Spanish Springs suitability area plan,  
6 the ridgeline was protected. In approximately 1998,  
7 Granite was trying to put a pit in that, in the parcel  
8 we're discussing. And it went through various meetings.  
9 And in the final meeting, one of the conditions were,  
10 and I'm going to read it to you:

11 "Additionally, Condition 14 says ridgelines  
12 shown as those to be protected on the development  
13 suitability map of the Spanish Springs area plan shall  
14 not be disturbed in any way. And in the Spanish Springs  
15 area plan, most of the ridges around this site are  
16 identified as ridges that are visible from Pyramid  
17 Highway and the valley and are not to be disturbed."

18 Then you took the parcel over. And in that, in  
19 2006, the five-year -- and I quote: "The five-year  
20 extension condition for this permit is hereby removed.  
21 This in no way removes the requirement of the hearing to  
22 reporting, review, and operating requirements contained  
23 in the article, aggregate facilities of the Washoe  
24 County development Code under Washoe County

1 jurisdiction. Applicant shall adhere to all  
2 requirements imposed by the City of Sparks when they  
3 assume responsibility for aggregate pit reviews."

4           In approximately a little over two years ago,  
5 when this thing came up as the Quarry, we were advised  
6 of a neighborhood meeting. And in that, in that  
7 document it said that you could call Mike Railey. I  
8 called Mike Railey, and he informed me that, "Don't  
9 worry," was his words, "Don't worry. The ridges and  
10 hillsides are too steep to build on. We're going to be  
11 building down in the bottom. And don't worry about  
12 that," and blah, blah, blah.

13           Over a dozen of my neighbors went to the  
14 meeting at the library. And Chris Darr was also there,  
15 Chris Dare, however you say it. And all of them came  
16 back with the same thing. And now it all came out in  
17 the neighborhood meeting for this a few weeks ago. And  
18 it was stated in the same thing, that the ridgelines,  
19 the hillsides, too steep, wouldn't be built on.

20           In their development agreement with you guys, and  
21 this is in writing, and I quote -- this is Policy  
22 RC23 -- "Require new development to preserve and protect  
23 significant natural amenities, unique features, i.e.  
24 rock outcroppings, drainageways and other natural

1 features." And they state, "The Quarry is unique,  
2 because it can provide for" --

3 (Public comment time limit sound.)

4 MR. ROC COLE: -- "in clay, type of development  
5 pattern that preserves ridgelines and focuses  
6 development in areas that were previously part of the  
7 aggregate quarry and are not suited for development."

8 So that, count them up. That's five times that  
9 we've been promised that this ridgeline would be  
10 protected. If you count your own hillside ordinance and  
11 look at that, it is a -- your own ordinance protects  
12 this.

13 How can you take that away from us? Where is  
14 your morals to do that to us residents, that five times  
15 we've been promised? Now, granted, one of them was just  
16 a spoof at a neighborhood meeting, a lie. But the other  
17 four are in writing and are documented. How can you  
18 take that away from us?

19 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you. Thank you, caller.

20 Casey, do we have any other callers for this  
21 item?

22 MS. MARTINEZ: There are no additional requests  
23 to speak.

24 CHAIRMAN READ: Okay. Thank you.

1           So I will close the public hearing for the  
2 rezoning request and open it up to any other questions  
3 or further discussion.

4           COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Madam Chair,  
5 Commissioner VanderWell. I have a question.

6           CHAIRMAN READ: Go ahead.

7           COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Sienna, I have a  
8 question. If you can please address the ridgeline.  
9 Because it's my understanding that what is before us  
10 tonight has nothing to do with ridgeline development, if  
11 anything.

12           MS. REID: The request before you tonight with  
13 this agenda item is for a Comprehensive Plan land use  
14 amendment and rezoning request. The locations of those  
15 requested changes, one is within the center of the  
16 Five Ridges project site is generality within an area  
17 identified as disturbed per the development agreement.  
18 The other location adjacent to Highland Ranch Parkway,  
19 the 15 acres generally associated with Five Ridges  
20 Village 1, that particular area would be subject to the  
21 development agreement standards, which require  
22 compliance with Sparks Municipal Code for slopes,  
23 hilltops and ridges.

24           Ultimately, this Commission has seen a

1 conditional use permit already for a portion of the  
2 Five Ridges site, and that was that conditional use  
3 permit that we expect to be amended over time to include  
4 other areas.

5           Based on listening in on some of the concerns  
6 expressed during the neighborhood meeting, my general  
7 sense is that there is a concern for ridgelines  
8 generally located to the north of the Five Ridges  
9 project site. And the actual amendment sites before you  
10 tonight are not adjacent to that northern boundary of  
11 the Five Ridges project site.

12           COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Thank you.

13           CHAIRMAN READ: Do you have any other  
14 questions, Commissioner VanderWell?

15           COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: No. I'm good. Thank  
16 you.

17           CHAIRMAN READ: Any other questions?

18           Commissioner Carey.

19           COMMISSIONER CAREY: Thank you, Madam Chair.

20           COMMISSIONER CAREY: Thank you, Madam Chair.

21           Sienna, I had a question. What is the fiscal  
22 impact of the proposed comprehensive land use change by  
23 removing the commercial land uses, what is the fiscal  
24 impact to the Impact Fee Service Area 1? I know we're

1 looking at a land use change. And the IFSA fees are  
2 calculated by service units and not by acres. I was  
3 just curious, by removing this commercial land uses and  
4 the ability to put in future commercial service units,  
5 what does that do to the Impact Fee Service Area?

6 MS. REID: So I'll probably ask Armando Ornelas  
7 to step in and give a little bit more detail. But I did  
8 want to just kind of preface that all of the studies and  
9 land plans that have come forward with Five Ridges have  
10 been in the range of 1,223 to about 1,241 units. And  
11 that is not proposed to change with the documents that  
12 were submitted associated with this current agenda item  
13 and that that number of units is within the development  
14 agreement specified unit range of 1,200 to 1,800.

15 So with that, I'll hand it over.

16 MR. ORNELAS: Commissioner Carey, members of  
17 the Planning Commission, Armando Ornelas, Assistant  
18 Community Services Director.

19 So staff has not looked at a comparison, if you  
20 will, of a hypothetical impact on the Impact Fee Service  
21 Area. That, that process of updating the IFSA to  
22 include Five Ridges is in progress, but it's not reached  
23 a point where, you know, we've completed that process.

24 Any, any previous, any analysis with regard to

1 the commercial uses that might have, you know, gone on  
2 this land had that, were that zoning to remain would be  
3 hypothetical and really would vary greatly depending on  
4 what the use is. So in a location like this, for  
5 example, they discussed there's a possibility of a  
6 self-storage facility. You know, that would have a very  
7 different impact than some more relatively intense  
8 commercial use.

9 So, I think, it would be fair to say that, you  
10 know, staff cannot really address your question,  
11 Commissioner Carey.

12 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Okay. Fair enough. Thank  
13 you.

14 CHAIRMAN READ: Any other questions,  
15 Commissioner Carey?

16 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Yeah, one more for Sienna.  
17 I was curious about the finding about -- I'm sorry, I  
18 have to find my notes here -- the finding about how this  
19 supports Policy MG4, and that's maintain an adequate  
20 supply of land use, of land for employment generating  
21 uses. How does the proposed land use Comprehensive Plan  
22 support that policy when it's eliminating an employment  
23 generating land use and replacing it with residential?

24 MS. REID: Yeah, so really conformance with

1 that policy gets back to taking a look at the land  
2 supply and the long-term fiscal health analysis. It  
3 really documented that there is a surplus of land  
4 devoted to retail. And so just kind of digging into the  
5 numbers there, there's a demand for 114 acres over the  
6 20-year timeframe with a supply of there 379 acres. So  
7 that surplus is 266.

8 Noting that, there are also a fair few  
9 commercial designated lands in very close proximity to  
10 the site. So directly to the south of Highland Ranch  
11 Parkway, you have commercial designated lands. To the  
12 east and west of Pyramid Way and Kiley Ranch North,  
13 there are commercial designated lands.

14 So noting kind of the oversupply documented in  
15 that recent study, plus the proximity of the other  
16 commercial designated lands, staff felt comfortable  
17 noting that the proposed request does comply with Policy  
18 MG4.

19 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Thank you for that  
20 explanation and clarification on the policy. I  
21 appreciate it.

22 No further questions, Madam Chair.

23 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

24 Any other Commissioners have questions?

1 All right. Thank you. So just to let you  
2 know, we will have two motions. And for each of them to  
3 pass, we would have to have a supermajority, which is  
4 five votes on each motion in agreement.

5 The first is the Comprehensive Plan land use  
6 amendment request.

7 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Madam Chair,  
8 Commissioner VanderWell. I'm prepared to make a motion.

9 CHAIRMAN READ: Go ahead.

10 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: I move to approve the  
11 Comprehensive Plan land use amendment, MPA20-0001,  
12 associated with PCN19-0040, based on Findings CP1  
13 through CP4, and the facts supporting these findings as  
14 set forth in the staff report.

15 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

16 COMMISSIONER PRITSOS: I'll second.

17 CHAIRMAN READ: We have a second from  
18 Commissioner Pritsos and a motion by Commissioner  
19 VanderWell. Any discussion before we vote?

20 Okay. Can we have a roll call vote?

21 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Madam Chair, a couple  
22 questions, a comment comments, for the record.

23 CHAIRMAN READ: Oh.

24 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Sorry, I didn't have my

1 hand up fast enough. Thank you. I appreciate that.

2 I just, I have a hard time with this proposed  
3 land use change. I think, you know, from a  
4 Comprehensive Plan standpoint, I'm having a hard time  
5 making finding CP2. And I don't concur with staff's  
6 recommendation that the proposed land use change is  
7 going to implement the goals and policies of the plan.  
8 I agree that it's going to help advance the housing  
9 policies, which is important to meet that missing  
10 middle. I think, that was, staff did a good job at  
11 doing that. But I'm really concerned about how we're  
12 applying this fiscal impact study with the land use  
13 changes.

14 You know, one thing that's important for me  
15 when I'm looking at Comprehensive Plan changes -- I  
16 think, that's a big deal, that's the heart of what we do  
17 here on the Planning Commission -- I really take a hard  
18 look at Policy MG1. And that's have a land use plan  
19 that provides a diverse and integrated mix of  
20 residential and nonresidential land uses.

21 Looking at this proposed land use change,  
22 although it's a small area, we're talking 15 acres of  
23 commercial, completely eliminated it and making the  
24 whole development residential I don't think advances

1 that policy, which is a very important policy, in my  
2 mind.

3           Looking at Policy MG4, and I appreciate the  
4 explanation from staff, and I agree with what they're  
5 saying on that there appears to be a surplus, but, you  
6 know, the proposed land use change is going to eliminate  
7 the only acreage within this development that has  
8 commercial, and it provides the only opportunity for  
9 employment and for commercial services. People within  
10 Five Ridges in the future are going to need a place to  
11 get a gallon of milk, they're going to need a place to  
12 go out to eat, they're going to need a place for an  
13 employment. I just have a hard time removing the  
14 opportunity for any sort of use within this development  
15 that would help provide commercial services.

16           I get what they're saying in terms of the  
17 fiscal impact study and that abundance, but I have a  
18 really hard time with how this big impact, Impact Fee  
19 Service Area 1, and the fees that we as a Commission are  
20 going to have to look at. You know, land use changes  
21 happen all the time. And we've seen it in this  
22 development, we've seen it in other developments within  
23 Impact Fee Service Area 1, that when they change, that  
24 has a big impact on how we charge those fees. And I

1 don't feel comfortable, you know, when we look at  
2 impacts, you know, increasing those, those fees. And, I  
3 think, it's going to hurt us overall when we're looking  
4 at trying to implement the goals and policies of the  
5 Comprehensive Plan.

6           And the last point I would just like to make, I  
7 think, it's important that we provide that jobs-house  
8 mix. We need to have an integrated land use mix and try  
9 to get away from areas in Spanish Springs that just have  
10 one, one type of land use. I think, we need to do a  
11 better job, I think, on this area.

12           And I will not be supporting the motion.

13           Thank you, Madam Chair. I'll get off my high  
14 horse now.

15           CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

16           Any other comments before we call for the vote?

17           All right. There's a motion and second. Can  
18 we go ahead and get a roll call vote?

19           MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Read?

20           CHAIRMAN READ: Aye.

21           MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Petersen?

22           COMMISSIONER PETERSEN: Aye.

23           MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Blaco?

24           COMMISSIONER BLACO: Aye.

1 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Carey?  
2 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Nay.  
3 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Pritsos?  
4 COMMISSIONER PRITSOS: Aye.  
5 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Rawson?  
6 COMMISSIONER RAWSON: Aye.  
7 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner VanderWell?  
8 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Aye.  
9 CHAIRMAN READ: Okay. Thank you. Motion  
10 passes six to one. Next --  
11 MS. MCCORMICK: Chair?  
12 CHAIRMAN READ: Yes? You're muted.  
13 MS. MCCORMICK: I'm sorry. I just wanted to  
14 clarify that the rezone only requires a simple majority.  
15 CHAIRMAN READ: Oh, thank you.  
16 MS. MCCORMICK: The Comprehensive Plan land use  
17 amendment is what requires the supermajority.  
18 CHAIRMAN READ: Okay. Thank you for clarifying  
19 that.  
20 So can I get a motion on the rezoning request?  
21 COMMISSIONER BLACO: I'm prepared to make a  
22 motion.  
23 CHAIRMAN READ: Go ahead, Commissioner Blaco.  
24 COMMISSIONER BLACO: I move to forward a

1 recommendation of approval to City Council for the  
2 rezoning request RZ20-0001, associated with PCN19-0040,  
3 based on Findings Z1 through Z3, and the facts  
4 supporting these findings as set forth in the staff  
5 report.

6 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

7 COMMISSIONER PRITSOS: I'll second again.

8 CHAIRMAN READ: All right. We have a motion by  
9 Commissioner Blaco and a second by Commissioner Pritsos.  
10 Any discussion?

11 Commissioner Carey.

12 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Thank you, Madam Chair.

13 I will electively be supporting this motion. I  
14 didn't agree with the comprehensive land use plan  
15 change. But since that MF14 land use is now assigned on  
16 this site, I have no reason other to support the  
17 proposed motion and make all the required findings with  
18 the land use being changed.

19 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

20 Any other discussion?

21 Can we get a roll call vote?

22 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Read?

23 CHAIRMAN READ: Aye.

24 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Petersen?

1 COMMISSIONER PETERSEN: Aye.

2 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Blaco?

3 COMMISSIONER BLACO: Aye.

4 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Carey?

5 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Aye.

6 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Pritsos?

7 COMMISSIONER PRITSOS: Aye.

8 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Rawson?

9 COMMISSIONER RAWSON: Aye.

10 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner VanderWell?

11 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Aye.

12 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you. Motion passes

13 unanimately. Thank you, Sienna, for your presentation.

14 I guess, we'll hear from you soon.

15 All right. Next, we have up PCN19-0040,

16 consideration of and possible action on five requests

17 for the same site at 555 Highland Ranch Parkway.

18 The first request is DA20-0001, which is to

19 amend the development agreement between the City of

20 Sparks, QK, LLC, and 5 Ridges Development Company to

21 increase the site.

22 Next is ANX20-0002, which is an annexation of a

23 site from a Washoe County General Rural zoning to a City

24 of Sparks Agricultural zoning.