



**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:** February 21, 2021

**RE:** PCN20-0032 – Consideration of and possible action on proposed amendments to the Sparks Comprehensive Plan that: (1) revise existing and adopt new goals, policies, and text to address conformance with the 2019 Truckee Meadows Regional Plan; (2) update figures, maps, statistics, and text for general maintenance purposes; and (3) revise existing and adopt new goals, policies, and text to address certain topics including, but not limited to, annexation and development agreement procedures, sidewalks, flooding, transportation improvements, cultural resources, and non-residential land use amendments and other matters properly relating thereto.

Please see the attached excerpt from the November 5, 2020 Planning Commission meeting transcript.

1 second by Commissioner West. Any further discussion?

2 Let's go ahead and get a roll call vote.

3 MS. SMITH: Commissioner Read?

4 CHAIRMAN READ: Aye.

5 MS. SMITH: Commissioner Pritsos?

6 COMMISSIONER PRITSOS: Aye.

7 MS. SMITH: Commissioner Blaco?

8 COMMISSIONER BLACO: Aye.

9 MS. SMITH: Commissioner Carey?

10 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Aye.

11 MS. SMITH: Commissioner Petersen?

12 COMMISSIONER PETERSEN: Aye.

13 MS. SMITH: Commissioner Rawson?

14 COMMISSIONER RAWSON: Aye.

15 MS. SMITH: Commissioner West?

16 COMMISSIONER WEST: Aye.

17 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you. Motion passes  
18 unanimously.

19 Next public hearing item is PCN20-0032,  
20 consideration of and possible action on proposed  
21 amendments to the Sparks Comprehensive Plan that revise  
22 existing and adopt new goals, policies, and text to  
23 address conformance with the 2019 Truckee Meadows  
24 Regional Plan; and update figures, maps, statistics, and  
25 text for general maintenance purposes; and to revise

1 existing and adopt new goals, policies, and text to  
2 address certain topics including, but not limited to,  
3 annexation and development agreement procedures,  
4 sidewalks, flooding, transportation improvements,  
5 cultural resources, and nonresidential land use  
6 amendments; and other matters properly relating thereto.

7 MS. REID: Okay. Thank you, Chair Read and  
8 members of the Commission. Again, Sienna Reid with  
9 Planning, presenting this item tonight. I'm going to go  
10 ahead and get a screen shared for you.

11 Okay. So I've noted quite the lengthy  
12 description of this item that was already read by Chair  
13 Read. This is an item that's seeking your consideration  
14 and possible adoption of a set of amendments to the  
15 Sparks Comprehensive Plan.

16 The changes before you tonight are  
17 predominantly needed to conform to the 2019 Truckee  
18 Meadows Regional Plan that was adopted about a year ago,  
19 with the 2019 Regional Plan in place, our current  
20 Comprehensive Plan that was adopted in 2016, these  
21 various modifications to fully implement the policy  
22 framework of the Regional Plan. Those modifications  
23 were identified in a list of scheduled additions in  
24 April of this year. And an October 2020 date was agreed  
25 upon to bring forward amendments addressing those

1 scheduled additions.

2 In order to meet that relatively quick six  
3 months scheduled addition timeframe, most of the  
4 amendments address really just those changes simply  
5 needed to conform to the 2019 Regional Plan.

6 We were, however, able to integrate in with  
7 this round of amendments some general updates as well as  
8 a limited number of targeted policy changes that are  
9 very much intentionally narrow in scope.

10 We did go through an initial draft of these  
11 Comprehensive Plan amendments during a Planning  
12 Commission workshop that was held on September 17th.  
13 And in terms of that workshop, the Planning Commission  
14 didn't express any concerns with the amendments that  
15 were included with the workshop draft of the plan. The  
16 Planning Commission did, however, identify a variety of  
17 additional topics to address in a revised draft of the  
18 plan.

19 And so, you know, the public hearing drafts  
20 that you have with your staff report tonight takes into  
21 account those revisions and, as best we could, the  
22 additional topics that are listed on the slide. As you  
23 can see, the Planning Commission was looking, first off,  
24 to integrate in a bit more information about the role of  
25 transit funding in terms of achieving the vision for the

1 City's Mixed-Use District as well as the Mixed-Use Core  
2 as defined in the Regional Plan. Those two areas are  
3 synonymous in terms of geography, at least for the  
4 portion within the City of Sparks.

5 We also put a request that from the Planning  
6 Commission to include changes addressing how the City of  
7 Sparks Comprehensive Plan should be utilized by the  
8 Regional Transportation Commission in its transit  
9 planning effort, as well as changes identifying Rock  
10 Boulevard as a roadway for a future RTC corridor study.  
11 There was a request for a variety of modifications to  
12 policies and text related to the protection and  
13 management of cultural resources, addressing state law  
14 and procedures, as well as specifying coordination and  
15 collaboration and planning processes. And, lastly, we  
16 had direction from the Planning Commission to modify a  
17 policy to prioritize the creation of a historic  
18 district.

19 So, as I mentioned, the public hearing draft of  
20 the plan before you tonight, it includes the amendments  
21 that were in the workshop draft of the plan, as well as  
22 new amendments that address almost all of the additional  
23 topics that the Planning Commission identified during  
24 the workshop.

25 Each of the amendments falls into one of the

1 three categories shown on this slide, with the new  
2 changes addressing Planning Commission feedback falling  
3 each into that third category of targeted policy  
4 changes.

5 Our intention, in terms of the presentation  
6 tonight, is to give you an overview of the amendments  
7 proposed in each of the categories, similar to what we  
8 did with the workshop. But given that most of the  
9 amendments were discussed in detail during that  
10 September workshop, and then certainly the new changes  
11 were highlighted during the Study Session earlier this  
12 week, the goal is to give you an overview of the  
13 amendments that you see, in terms of the order on this  
14 slide, as succinctly as possible and then questions  
15 until the end of this presentation.

16 So, first off, in terms of these amendment  
17 categories, we have those general updates that are  
18 needed for plan maintenance. Other than  
19 property-specific land use changes, the plan hasn't been  
20 updated since its approval in 2016. So really these  
21 updates are just bringing the figures, maps, statistics  
22 in the plan up-to-date based on the most current data we  
23 have.

24 We've also updated some narrative text, as  
25 needed, so that we have current status of projects and

1 studies. Importantly here, we have included a summary  
2 of the Long-Term Fiscal Health Analysis that was  
3 recently completed in 2019.

4 And we have a few small changes to the land use  
5 category tables in Chapter 4 of the plan, removing  
6 information identifying how former land use categories  
7 were translated to those categories that we have in  
8 place today.

9 Moving on here to our second category of  
10 amendments, which are those addressing Regional Plan's  
11 amendments, these amendments cover a variety of topics.  
12 On this slide, you can see those that are proposed in  
13 the narrative portion of the managing growth section  
14 found in Chapter 4 of the Comprehensive Plan.

15 These changes identify the new regional land  
16 use framework, you often hear this referred to as the  
17 tiering framework, and how that changed in that section.

18 In terms of the 2019 Regional Plan, including  
19 this tiering framework, was really a very significant  
20 change. It shifted the geographic identification of  
21 centers, both downtown and regional, as well as  
22 transit-oriented development corridors or by bus rapid  
23 transit, to that new regional land use framework based  
24 on tiers, each with applicable density requirements. So  
25 definitely a big shift. Those tiers establish the

1 regional priority for growth and infrastructure  
2 investment. And you can actually see them illustrated  
3 on the map here this slide.

4           So just, you know, from a quick overview and  
5 perspective, states Regional Plan identified the  
6 Mixed-Use Core shown in a darker blue. We also have  
7 tiers 1, 2 and 3 within the Truckee Meadows Service  
8 Area. Those are shown in progressively lighter shades  
9 of blue. And, also, rural designations are located  
10 outside of the Truckee Meadows Service Area.

11           In terms of other changes in the managing  
12 growth narrative, we have changes that delete conflicts  
13 and procedures based on the removal from the Regional  
14 Plan. These include policies related to emerging  
15 employment centers and procedures related to previously  
16 identified cooperative planning areas.

17           And then, due to the addition of a new policy  
18 in the Regional Plan regarding land use compatibility  
19 within local government comp plans, we've kind of beefed  
20 up the language that we have on this topic, making it  
21 clear that not only the goals and policies of the  
22 Comprehensive Plan for land use compatibility, but also  
23 the land use categories themselves helped to guide that  
24 compatibility with surrounding designations.

25           Also, for Regional Plan conformance to request



1 that shift in the Regional Plan that I was just  
2 discussing in terms of going to the Mixed-Use Core with  
3 modified density requirements, we have several changes  
4 proposed for the City's Mixed-Use District. These  
5 changes are in two locations, first in the Mixed-Use  
6 District narrative in the managing growth section of  
7 Chapter 4 and then, second, in our Mixed-Use District,  
8 Mixed-Use Commercial Land Use category, also in  
9 Chapter 4.

10 As proposed, the changes to the Mixed-Use  
11 District narrative transition, we identified a bus rapid  
12 transit route to a primary investment corridor where we  
13 have multiple forms of investment being focused. Here,  
14 public investment for enhanced pedestrian and bicycle  
15 facilities, public spaces, transit, and infrastructure  
16 capacity are each needed alongside private sector  
17 investment in info on redevelopment. Certainly, a  
18 higher order transit service is still supported, but we  
19 do have the transition from that BRT route to the  
20 primary investment corridor, denoting that it's not the  
21 main focus.

22 And just to give you a quick visual, this slide  
23 shows you the location of that primary investment  
24 corridor. We have Prater Way to Sparks Boulevard, then  
25 north, in terms of the Marina, connecting to Victorian.

1 That's basically the initial bus rapid transit route  
2 that was in the Sparks Comprehensive Plan for the  
3 Mixed-Use District.

4           So I did want to point out that we've also  
5 identified Oddie as one of the corridors as part of the  
6 primary investment corridor. We do still have activity  
7 centers that are identified along the primary investment  
8 corridor. These are still envisioned to be compact  
9 mixed-use areas where we have more intense pattern of  
10 development. And in terms of their location, there's  
11 really no shift in their location with the changes  
12 before you this evening.

13           So just to wrap up here with the Mixed-Use  
14 District, another thing that's proposed to change is the  
15 minimum floor area ratio associated with the Mixed-Use  
16 District, Mixed-Use Commercial land use category.  
17 Currently, we have a variable minimum floor area ratio  
18 ranging from 0.75 to 0.5, depending on where you are in  
19 relationship to our current bus rapid transit route.  
20 And over time, what we found is this, while we have  
21 residential densities that are working pretty well at 24  
22 and 18 dwelling units per acre, that the commercial  
23 development is a little bit more difficult to support  
24 at, basically, what the former Regional Plan floor area  
25 ratios were. Those ranged between 1.0 and 0.25. It is

1 really difficult to find that those floor area ratios  
2 were supported by market demand.

3           So now that the Regional Plan, basically, has  
4 reduced all of the minimum FARs to 0.25, we think that,  
5 basically, a supporting reduction in the Comp Plan is  
6 appropriate. And we do hope, over time, that the  
7 nonresidential floor area ratio will come up as land  
8 becomes more valuable and higher density residential  
9 projects come on line.

10           So, also, within Chapter 4 of the Comprehensive  
11 Plan, we have a range of policy additions or  
12 modifications further addressing Regional Plan  
13 conformance.

14           We have policies that are added or modified to  
15 address regional utility corridor policies related to  
16 setbacks and the placement of electrical transmission  
17 infrastructure. Policy E6 under housing and  
18 affordability is modified to address the requirement  
19 that we use the regional strategy for housing and  
20 affordability in updates to Sparks requesting plan.

21           We also have a Policy RC20 under resiliency and  
22 conservation that addresses the treatment of slopes  
23 between 30, excuse me, between 15 and 30 percent,  
24 consistent with our code standards. Slopes between that  
25 15 and 30 percent gradient, those are previously

1 addressed with Sparks' former master plan, the one that  
2 was in place before 2016. And, ultimately, the policy  
3 was codified through today's standards that we have for  
4 slopes, hilltops and ridges.

5 But, however, with those code standards in  
6 place, the policy was removed when the Comp Plan was  
7 updated in 2016. But given that Regional Plan staff  
8 doesn't really have the ability statutorily to go in and  
9 look at our zoning code, we're going ahead at this time  
10 and putting an overarching policy back in place.

11 And then here we also have Policy MG3 under  
12 managing growth. It's deleted to request the removal of  
13 emerging employment centers from the Regional Plan.

14 Moving on to our third category of amendments,  
15 we have the targeted policy changes. Again, these are,  
16 they're very much limited in scope to ensure we meet the  
17 timeframe to, hopefully, the schedule of additions.

18 But starting off, we have three policies  
19 proposed to address annexation procedures. Each of them  
20 is located in the managing growth section, Chapter 4.  
21 As drafted, Policy MG7 specifies that any Regional Plan  
22 amendments associated with a property for which an  
23 application for a voluntary annexation has been filed  
24 should be processed in advance of final action on that  
25 annexation.

1           This is something that state law doesn't  
2 require, basically that you go forward and get all of  
3 your Regional Plan amendment decisions in advance of  
4 annexation. But doing so has been the process of the  
5 City of Sparks in terms of just being a good neighbor  
6 with the county. And so this policy formalizes that  
7 practice.

8           Policy MG8 specifies development agreements  
9 should be used in conjunction with annexation  
10 applications for properties over 5 acres in size.

11           And then, for sites that are under that  
12 acreage, the policy supports considering the use of a  
13 development agreement as appropriate.

14           And then Policy MG9 here specifies when an  
15 annexation application should be submitted to the City  
16 in conjunction with the development and intensification.  
17 And so as defined in the policy, that development and  
18 intensification is an entitlement, a parcel map, a  
19 grading permit or a building permit is creating a new  
20 structure requiring a sewer connection.

21           Also, within the managing growth section of  
22 Chapter 4 is an amendment to Policy MG3. This is  
23 related to employment lands. And you may remember it as  
24 Policy MG4 in previous Planning Commission discussions.  
25 Just the changes and renumbering and deletions, it's now

1 MG3.

2           So in working with the policy, what the  
3 Planning Commission had expressed was the desire for  
4 more clarity in terms of how it should be applied.  
5 During the Study Session where this policy was  
6 discussed, the importance of nonresidential development  
7 in supporting the stability of the City's general funds,  
8 that from City services was also highlighted. But what  
9 we have for your consideration as part of the draft  
10 tonight is the text shown in blue. So it really adds on  
11 to the existing policy, providing further clarity by  
12 indicating that the supply of employment lands should be  
13 evaluated at the citywide level in support of economic  
14 development efforts.

15           And then it goes on to specify that the City  
16 does have a responsibility in monitoring not only land  
17 supply, but also demand for employment land over time,  
18 so that we are able to incorporate relatively recent  
19 information in terms of analyses that inform  
20 Comprehensive Plan amendments.

21           And so, you know, the information that you're  
22 familiar with us using and will continue to use is the  
23 information in the 2019 Long-Term Fiscal Health  
24 Analysis, that really set the baseline in terms of, you  
25 know, what does the City have in terms of a land supply,

1 and what do we need in terms of demand going forward.  
2 So you've seen that in some of the Comprehensive Plan  
3 amendments before you, and you can expect that to  
4 continue.

5 Also, I did want to point out that we do  
6 expect, you know, policy changes over time. There's  
7 other policies in the Comprehensive Plan related to  
8 employment land. One of them in the economic vitality  
9 section of the Comprehensive Plan supports evaluating  
10 the feasibility of expanding that to the east to  
11 accommodate job-generating uses.

12 And so, as that effort is completed and we  
13 engage in this kind of ongoing monitoring of the supply  
14 and demand, what we could expect is further policy  
15 changes that help us to guide future land use changes or  
16 maybe future study.

17 So moving on to the connectivity section of  
18 Chapter 4, this slide summarizes two future  
19 improvement-related changes and then encourages RTC to  
20 utilize the City's Comprehensive Plan in its planning  
21 effort.

22 So, first off, what you'll see is that both  
23 Greg Street and Rock Boulevard from McCarran to  
24 Victorian Avenue are identified as desired locations for  
25 RTC corridor studies. Those corridor studies often take

1 a look at how we invest, integrate facilitates for  
2 multiple types of transportation users -- bicycles,  
3 pedestrians -- in addition to automobiles. Given that  
4 Greg Street is currently an auto-oriented roadway  
5 lacking both pedestrian and bicycle facilities, adding  
6 in those types of facilities would better provide  
7 east-west connectivity for all those in the industrial  
8 area south of I-80.

9 Also, Rock Boulevard lacks bicycle facilities  
10 in most locations. But it's the roadway that runs  
11 north-south, and it intersects two primary investment  
12 corridors, both Oddie and Victorian.

13 So looking at a full range of multimodal  
14 improvements on Rock would certainly enhance the City's  
15 network of roadways that accommodate various  
16 transportation types. And the addition of Rock  
17 Boulevard to this section of the Comprehensive Plan was  
18 based on Planning Commission workshop direction.

19 In addition on this slide, you'll see Policy  
20 C6, the new policy proposed to enhance Victorian Avenue  
21 with bicycle facilities from Rock Boulevard to Pyramid  
22 Way, filling in some missing links and supporting  
23 east-west connectivity on that corridor.

24 And then, also, to address Planning Commission  
25 direction, there's a new Policy C11 proposed that



1 describes how the City of Sparks should work with  
2 Regional Planning staff to ensure that when the Regional  
3 Transportation Plan is reviewed for conformance, that  
4 the Sparks Comprehensive Plan is utilized in terms of  
5 preferred street design, transit system location and  
6 operations, as well as investment priorities overall for  
7 transportation improvements, but is a policy that really  
8 built on a revised policy in the Regional Plan that  
9 indicates the Regional Transportation Plan should be  
10 consistent not only with the Regional Plan, but also  
11 local government master plans. So we feel that's a good  
12 coordination policy to really formalize at this time.

13 In terms of connectivity, we have one more  
14 policy that proposed for modification. It's Policy C4,  
15 proposed to be modified to provide a greater level of  
16 detail regarding the installation of sidewalks. As  
17 drafted, in greenfield areas sidewalks would be required  
18 adjacent to residences on local roads. But then for  
19 arterial and cluster roadways, there would be an option  
20 of either sidewalks on both sides of the street or a  
21 multiuse path on one side of the street.

22 For a new development in greenfield areas, that  
23 approach is consistent with sidewalk facilities located  
24 in the City. You can think about some of our trails and  
25 clusters in terms of Los Altos Parkway, which is

1 actually the picture you see here. It has a multiuse  
2 path on one side of the street, as does portions of  
3 Vista Boulevard.

4 And then, for previously developed areas, the  
5 draft changes to Policy C4, they support integrating in  
6 pedestrian access with sidewalks on both sides of the  
7 street or a multiuse path on one side of the street,  
8 just given that oftentimes it's more difficult to  
9 integrate in sidewalk facilities into developed areas.

10 And then, also before you tonight are changes  
11 related to flooding that add back fairly detailed  
12 policies that were inadvertently omitted during the  
13 update of the Comprehensive Plan in 2016. So to do so,  
14 we have a new critical zone map included in Chapter 3 of  
15 the plan. It depicts the area of the 1997 flood  
16 boundary. They have six new policies added to the  
17 resiliency and conservation section of Chapter 4. And  
18 we have actually elevated an existing policy, RC15, to a  
19 goal.

20 In terms of the policies and what they do, they  
21 address when elevating structures was needed and when  
22 the use of flood-resistant construction methods should  
23 be used. They also provide guidance on how  
24 Comprehensive Plan amendments in the critical zone  
25 should be evaluated, encouraging here the maintenance of

1 the open space designation, and requiring enhanced  
2 materials be submitted if we do have a request come  
3 through to change to a more intense Comprehensive Plan  
4 land use designation, giving us a better sense of what  
5 all would be entailed.

6 And then we also have a policy that supports  
7 flood protection plan project in Sparks, including  
8 levies and terracing.

9 And focusing on cultural resources, the  
10 archaeological site description in Chapter 3 is modified  
11 here to reference controlling state law for burial site  
12 discovery procedures, as well as antiquities permitting.

13 Additionally, Policy RC31 in the resiliency and  
14 conservation section of Chapter 4 is revised to identify  
15 entities involved in the protection and minimization of  
16 impacts from cultural resources.

17 So here, you want to clean out that there are  
18 two topics that were identified during the Planning  
19 Commission workshop that are not included in the public  
20 hearing draft of the plan that you're considering  
21 tonight. And those topics were excluded due to the need  
22 for additional Council direction and potential  
23 resources.

24 So the first that you can see here is the  
25 change that was noted to Policy CC3 that would

1 prioritize the creation of a historic district. At this  
2 time, staff does recommend the policy stay as is.  
3 Actually, developing a historic district is a pretty  
4 substantial work effort, and that's something we would  
5 need, again, that further direction and potential  
6 resources on.

7           The second request that isn't included in the  
8 draft before you tonight was for a new policy focusing  
9 on working collaboratively with tribal governments to  
10 identify, monitor and protect cultural resources during  
11 planning processes. At this time, staff advises against  
12 adding this new policy, because the Planning Commission  
13 indicated that such a policy should be drafted in  
14 coordination with tribal governments. And developing  
15 that, that new policy and meeting the scheduled addition  
16 completion deadline is not possible. In addition, we'd  
17 also need to balance that coordination work with other  
18 work efforts, kind of going back to the need there for  
19 really understanding how these work efforts align with  
20 other Council directives.

21           So in terms of moving forward, these are both  
22 good topics to revisit. And so staff certainly supports  
23 revisiting them from the implementation status of the  
24 plan's goals and policies that's next evaluated. That  
25 evaluation should be timed to align with updates for the

1 City's strategic plan. That would allow for staff to  
2 obtain Council direction around those efforts and  
3 consider needed resources at the same time.

4 So shifting gears here to findings, in  
5 reviewing the set of amendments to the Comprehensive  
6 Plan before you tonight, there are four findings that  
7 the Planning Commission needs to consider.

8 Findings CP1 and CP3 are not directly  
9 applicable as there are no changes to the Comprehensive  
10 Plan land use map. Without such land use changes,  
11 neither an analysis of the Regional Plan land use and  
12 intensity designation or compatibility with surrounding  
13 uses is necessary.

14 And then, in terms of Finding CP2, which  
15 requires amendments to the Comprehensive Plan implement  
16 the bulk of the plan, as proposed in the draft before  
17 you tonight, we have, basically, the addition,  
18 modification or deletion of three goals and 27 policies.

19 And staff does believe that as drafted the  
20 amended policies further implement both the existing and  
21 proposed goals for the plan.

22 So, ultimately, if the draft amendments to the  
23 Comprehensive Plan are adopted, the amended goals and  
24 policies would be utilized when we evaluate future  
25 Comprehensive Plan amendments.

1           And then, lastly, here, public notice for the  
2 proposed amendments, it was published in the Reno  
3 Gazette-Journal, consistent with state law for changes  
4 to the Comprehensive Plan that don't involve a change to  
5 the land use map.

6           So in terms of a recommendation, staff is  
7 recommending approval of the amendments contained in the  
8 public hearing draft of the Comprehensive Plan.

9           And with that, I'll conclude the presentation  
10 and be available for any questions that you might have.

11           CHAIRMAN READ: Sienna, thank you for that  
12 presentation.

13           Do any of the Commissioners have questions for  
14 staff?

15           Commissioner Carey.

16           COMMISSIONER CAREY: Thank you, Madam Chair.

17           Excellent presentation, Sienna. I appreciate  
18 the detail you went into tonight in providing an  
19 overview of these, all these changes.

20           I was curious, in terms of timing, when can we  
21 expect the next update of the Comprehensive Plan to  
22 happen?

23           MS. REID: I'll go ahead and let either Armando  
24 or Jim weigh in here, just because I know, in terms of  
25 making an effort to kind of align with the City's

1 strategic planning effort, that both of them are a  
2 little bit more familiar with the exact timing around  
3 that process.

4 MR. RUNDLE: This is Jim Rundle.

5 MR. ORNELAS: Chair -- go ahead.

6 MR. RUNDLE: Do you want to go ahead, Armando?

7 MR. ORNELAS: Yes. Madam Chair --

8 CHAIRMAN READ: Okay. Go ahead.

9 MR. ORNELAS: -- members of the Planning  
10 Commission, this is Armando Ornelas, the Assistant  
11 Community Services Director.

12 There's no exact timetable, to be perfectly  
13 candid. I think, we are looking at, you know,  
14 revisiting the start of something probably within the  
15 six- to 12-month timeframe. But that would be for  
16 commencement of the work. You know, we'll need  
17 direction, I think, from certainly the Manager, but very  
18 likely the Council, to embark on something fairly  
19 ambitious along those lines.

20 So I would not anticipate that you would  
21 revisit any significant set of amendments, you know, in  
22 the next year. And so, if it gets started within next  
23 year, we're probably in the one- to two-year timeframe  
24 for that.

25 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

1 Jim, did you have anything to add, or?

2 MR. RUNDLE: It's essentially the same. Thank  
3 you, Chair Read. Jim Rundle, Planning Manager.

4 CHAIRMAN READ: All right. Thank you.

5 Commissioner Carey, do you have any other  
6 questions?

7 COMMISSIONER CAREY: I guess, just a follow-up,  
8 just so I'm understanding kind of the timeline.

9 And I get what you're saying in terms of  
10 resources and strategic planning. But there may be some  
11 opportunity with some of these policies that may be  
12 revisited. But in terms of the overall larger  
13 Comprehensive Plan update that would include possible  
14 land use changes, we would need direction from City  
15 management and the Council, and then of kick start the  
16 whole process of the larger update we're looking at,  
17 like two to three years?

18 MR. ORNELAS: At least one to two. You know,  
19 if it starts sooner than later, then you're probably  
20 closer to that, you know, year plus timeframe. If it  
21 gets, you know, deferred, if you will, then you're  
22 looking beyond that, something probably closer to in  
23 that two- to three-year timeframe.

24 I mean I don't think that this is, this next  
25 effort necessarily is one that, you know, lasts a whole



1 year. But it is one where, I think, you know, you're  
2 looking at a concerted six months. And so we need to be  
3 able to dedicate, you know, in reality, a substantial  
4 amount of probably, you know, the Planning Manager's  
5 time as well as, you know, Ms. Reid's time to that  
6 effort. And, you know, frankly, given some of the  
7 additional, added things that are on staff's plate, not  
8 just planning staff, but, you know, City staff broadly  
9 as a result of Covid, you know, in the short term, I  
10 don't, you know, it's more than we could take on.

11 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Understood. Thanks for  
12 the additional explanation.

13 Thank you, Madam Chair.

14 CHAIRMAN READ: Okay. Any other questions for  
15 staff?

16 Seeing none, let's -- oh, Chair West. Sorry.

17 COMMISSIONER WEST: Yes. Commissioner West. I  
18 don't really have any questions. I just want to make a  
19 quick statement. Being new to the Planning Commission,  
20 I didn't have the opportunity to actually be part of  
21 these amendment changes. But I did want to express my  
22 appreciation for all the hard work that the Planning  
23 Commissioners before me and the staff have taken to  
24 develop these amendments as we work closer to conforming  
25 with the Regional Plan.

1           So, again, thank you very much for your hard  
2 work.

3           CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you, Commissioner West.  
4 Any other questions?

5           Let's go ahead and open it up for public  
6 comments for this item.

7           Do we have anyone waiting for public comment?

8           MS. MARTINEZ: We have no requests to speak at  
9 this time.

10          CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

11          Let's go ahead and close public comment and  
12 bring it back to the Commission. Any further  
13 discussion?

14          Commissioner Carey.

15          COMMISSIONER CAREY: Thank you, Madam Chair.  
16 I'll kick discussion off.

17          I would echo Commissioner West's comments about  
18 the work and appreciation to staff on this update, a lot  
19 of good, good stuff. And, I think, this update will  
20 help bring us in compliance with the Regional Plan and  
21 help make the City's Comprehensive Plan a little bit, or  
22 much better.

23          I just, I appreciate staff willing to take a  
24 look at and allow for meaningful consultation with the  
25 tribes in looking at revising the cultural resources

1 policy. I'll just state for the record, it is not my  
2 intention to shut anything down or prevent the City from  
3 growing in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan with  
4 amending this policy. I just feel strongly that it's  
5 important that when it comes to cultural resources, it  
6 should be the policy and practice of the City to work  
7 with the tribes in our area to identify, protect and  
8 appropriately manage cultural resources within the City.  
9 Establishing policies like this and protocols and  
10 working collaboratively with the tribes will help the  
11 City be in compliance with federal and state law when it  
12 comes to the cultural resources. So look forward to  
13 future discussions on that.

14 Appreciate staff's explanation and strategy  
15 with respect to Rock Boulevard. I think, a corridor  
16 study along Rock Boulevard's going to do a lot of great  
17 stuff. It's going to help improve safety. It's going  
18 to enhance multimodal transportation. And it's really  
19 going to, I think, going to spur economic development  
20 investment, as we've seen in other corridor studies in  
21 the city. And it'll bring a lot of new energy and  
22 investment to the west side of the city, which is much  
23 needed and going to be, quite frankly, great.

24 I do want to thank staff for at least  
25 entertaining looking at a historic district. I can

1 certainly appreciate the staff, limited staff time we  
2 have and resources available, and look forward to  
3 working with the City Council on, hopefully, making  
4 Policy CC3 and looking at a culture, or historic  
5 district, or doing something to protect historic  
6 resource in the city a higher priority.

7           You know, we're literally down to one-half of a  
8 block in downtown Sparks with the remaining commercial  
9 area that hasn't been redeveloped. I think, there's a  
10 lot, there's a great opportunity with a lot of the  
11 historic homes around Victorian Square that have  
12 maintained their integrity over there and help tell the  
13 city's story. That can make a really good and strong  
14 culture, or historic district.

15           And, you know, with respect to, I think, the  
16 new Policy CC11 and trying to tie RTC investments with  
17 our mixed-use, our mixed-use core goals. I think, staff  
18 nailed that policy, and I really appreciate the  
19 discussion we've had as a Commission on that. I think,  
20 it'll help bridge the gap between investments and  
21 service changes with RTC and what we need as a city and  
22 implement our Comprehensive Plan.

23           I appreciate the additional work with the new  
24 policy, the new MG3. And, I think, it will help do a  
25 better job of providing housing in relation to jobs in

1 the city. And, you know, that's been one area, I think,  
2 that the City was really going to have to look at moving  
3 forward when we look at land use changes and new  
4 projects. You know, my time on the Planning Commission,  
5 we've all done our fair share of approving quite a few  
6 tentative maps and new housing in the City. We've also  
7 approved quite a few land changes from commercial and  
8 employment, emerging employment areas into residential.

9           And so, you know, for me, it was really  
10 eye-opening having that workshop with the City Council  
11 last year and developing the fiscal impact study and  
12 looking at those financial projections and needs for  
13 employment land uses moving forward. And, you know, I  
14 really remain concerned about the City's road fund  
15 moving forward and being able to provide enough funding  
16 to support road maintenance and do transportation needs  
17 for the city, as well as providing, you know, a property  
18 tax base that will provide all the services we come to  
19 rely on.

20           But I really think this MG3, this new MG3 is  
21 really going to help us and help with the discussions  
22 moving forward.

23           Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

24           CHAIRMAN READ: All right, Commissioner Carey.

25           Any other speakers, questions, discussion?

1 I'll entertain a motion.

2 MR. RUNDLE: Madam Chair.

3 CHAIRMAN READ: Yes, Jim.

4 MR. RUNDLE: If you're prepared for a motion,  
5 I'd like for the Planning Commission to consider an  
6 amended motion. I can put it on my screen, if that's  
7 what you'd like me to do. But I'd like the resolution  
8 number to be included in the motion.

9 CHAIRMAN READ: Okay. Can you go ahead and  
10 show that.

11 MR. RUNDLE: Is that showing on your screen,  
12 Madam Chair?

13 CHAIRMAN READ: No, not yet.

14 MR. RUNDLE: Okay. Is it showing on your  
15 screen now?

16 CHAIRMAN READ: Yes, it is.

17 Okay. I'll entertain a motion.

18 Commissioner West.

19 COMMISSIONER WEST: Yes. I'd move to approve  
20 the Resolution 228 and the amendments to the City of  
21 Sparks Comprehensive Plan, MPA20-0005, associated with  
22 PCN20-0032, based on Findings CP1 through CP4, and the  
23 facts supporting these Findings as set forth in the  
24 staff report.

25 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

1 Do we have a second?

2 COMMISSIONER PRITSOS: Second.

3 COMMISSIONER BLACO: Commissioner Blaco. I'll  
4 second that.

5 CHAIRMAN READ: Okay. I think, Commissioner  
6 Pritsos beat you again, Commissioner Blaco.

7 So we have a motion from Commissioner West, a  
8 second from Commissioner Pritsos. Any further  
9 discussion before the vote?

10 Marilie, can we please have a roll call vote?

11 MS. SMITH: Commissioner Read?

12 CHAIRMAN READ: Aye.

13 MS. SMITH: Commissioner Pritsos?

14 COMMISSIONER PRITSOS: Aye.

15 MS. SMITH: Commissioner Blaco?

16 COMMISSIONER BLACO: Aye.

17 MS. SMITH: Commissioner Carey?

18 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Aye. Good job, staff.

19 MS. SMITH: Commissioner Petersen?

20 COMMISSIONER PETERSEN: Aye.

21 MS. SMITH: Commissioner Rawson?

22 COMMISSIONER RAWSON: Aye.

23 MS. SMITH: Commissioner West?

24 COMMISSIONER WEST: Aye.

25 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you. Motion passes

1 unanimously.

2           Next, we will move on to general business. And  
3 we have the selection of a Commissioner to serve as a  
4 first alternate on the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning  
5 Commission effective immediately from the following pool  
6 of applicants, listed in alphabetical order: Frank  
7 Petersen, Mike Rawson, and Kyle West.

8           Commissioner Carey.

9           COMMISSIONER CAREY: Thank you, Madam Chair.

10           I guess, because Commissioner West volunteered  
11 himself, I'll go ahead and make a motion to appoint  
12 Commissioner West as the first alternate for Regional  
13 Planning.

14           COMMISSIONER RAWSON: I second that.

15           CHAIRMAN READ: All right. I think,  
16 Commissioner Rawson beat everybody else out on that. So  
17 we have a motion by Commissioner Carey, a second by  
18 Commissioner Rawson. Any discussion?

19           Can we please have a roll call vote?

20           MS. SMITH: Commissioner Read?

21           CHAIRMAN READ: Aye.

22           MS. SMITH: Commissioner Pritsos?

23           COMMISSIONER PRITSOS: Aye.

24           MS. SMITH: Commissioner Blaco?

25           COMMISSIONER BLACO: Aye.