



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

**To:** Mayor and City Council  
**From:** Marilie Smith, Administrative Secretary  
**Subject:** Report of Planning Commission Action  
**Date:** April 13, 2018

**RE:** PCN16-0050 – Consideration of and possible action, for a site 386.87 acres in size located at 555 Highland Ranch Parkway, Sparks, NV, of requests for:

- DA18-0001 – A Development Agreement between the City of Sparks and Jackling Aggregates, LLC and QK, LLC; (For Possible Action)
- AX16-0003 – Voluntary annexation into the city of Sparks. Upon annexation the parcel shall convert from a Washoe County zoning designation of GR (General Rural) to a City of Sparks zoning designation of A40 (Agriculture); (For Possible Action)
- MPA17-0005 – A Comprehensive Plan land use change from Open Space (OS), Commercial (C) and Employment Center (EC) to Intermediate Density Residential (IDR) and Commercial (C); (For Possible Action) and
- RZ17-0006 – Rezoning of the site from A40 (Agriculture) to SF6 (Single Family Residential – 6,000 square feet lots) and C2 (General Commercial) zoning. (For Possible Action)

Please see the attached excerpt from the April 5, 2018 Planning Commission meeting transcript.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

(A break was taken.)

\* \* \* \* \*

CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Okay. I'm going to call the Commission meeting for April 5th back to order.

And we are now going to discuss PCN16-0050, and we're going to start with DA18-0001, to start out.

MR. ORNELAS: Chairman VanderWell and members of the Planning Commission, I am Armando Ornelas, the Community Services Director for the City. If it's okay with the Chairman and the Planning Commission, I'd like to introduce all four of the items that are part of this PCN-0050.

CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Yes.

MR. ORNELAS: And then I and Chief Maples, Fire Chief Maples will address the development agreement. And Karen Melby, your Development Services Manager, will address the annexation, Comprehensive Plan amendment, and zoning request. And then we all be available for questions.

CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Perfect. So I need to open just for all of them, just open them one at a time?

MS. MCCORMICK: You can just read the top two lines.

CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Okay.

MS. MCCORMICK: And the stated four requests.

1 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Okay.

2 MR. ORNELAS: Okay. This case involves a  
3 property located at 555 Highland Ranch Parkway, which is  
4 located just up to the west on Melanie Parkway from the  
5 Pyramid Highway. It is outlined, the parcel, the single  
6 parcel is outlined in the blue (indistinct).

7 The property's, again, 387 acres in size. It's  
8 a former aggregate mining sect. You can see the impact  
9 of that on the sect in the (indistinct). It is largely  
10 not visible from either Highland Ranch Parkway or from  
11 Pyramid Highway. It's, essentially, once you go up,  
12 you're up here, and (indistinct). It is a big access  
13 road, as shown here from Mount Ridge Parkway.

14 And, again, this case, PCN16-0050, is comprised  
15 of four requests. The first one is DA18-001, which is  
16 the proposed development agreement between the City of  
17 Sparks, Jackling Aggregates, LLC, and QK, LLC.

18 In the instance of the development agreement,  
19 the Planning Commission's responsibility is to review it  
20 and to make a recommendation as to the City Council  
21 regarding whether the development agreement is  
22 consistent with the Comprehensive Plan or not. The  
23 agreement would have to be approved by the City Council  
24 for it to take effect.

25 The second part of the request is AX16-0003,

1 which is voluntary annexation into the City of Sparks.  
2 Upon annexation, the parcel shall, will convert from a  
3 Washoe County zoning designation of General Rural to a  
4 City of Sparks zoning designation of A40, or  
5 Agriculture. The Planning Commission is responsible for  
6 making a recommendation to the City Council on  
7 annexation requests.

8 The third part of this is MPA17-0005, which a  
9 Comprehensive Plan land use change request to change its  
10 designation from Open Space, Commercial, and Employment  
11 Center to Intermediate Density Residential and  
12 Commercial. In the case of the Comprehensive Plan  
13 request, as we discussed in the past, the Comprehensive  
14 Plan is the Planning Commission's domain, by and large.  
15 And so it is your responsibility to approve or  
16 disapprove this request. And then the City Council will  
17 certify the change if you were to approve it.

18 And then the fourth part is RZ17-0006, which is  
19 a request to rezone the site from of A40, which is  
20 Agricultural, to SF6, single-family residential  
21 6,000-square-foot lots, and C2, which is General  
22 Commercial. And the Planning Commission's role is to  
23 make a recommendation on the rezoning to the City  
24 Council.

25 So the reason for bundling the development

1 agreement with the other three requests, with the  
2 annexation, Comp Plan amendment, and the zoning request,  
3 is to provide through the Planning Commission, the City  
4 Council public and third-party reviewing agencies with  
5 an understanding of what's proposed for the site at the  
6 time that these requests were being contemplated.

7           As you may recall, for example, on the 67-acre  
8 parcel to the south, on Mount Ridge Parkway, the  
9 Planning Commission saw these, the annexation, as  
10 planned in the zoning request, really without any basis  
11 in terms of anything definitive in terms of what the  
12 project would be. And so there was also no ability to  
13 condition the approvals.

14           And so, in this instance, the development  
15 agreement is a mechanism for conditions to be attached  
16 to the approvals, as would be done, for example, with a  
17 plan development handbook. They're different animals,  
18 if you will. The development agreement is not intended  
19 to be as specific or to address all the details, for  
20 example, architectural design standards, that will be  
21 addressed in the handbook.

22           Nevertheless, the development agreement, you  
23 know, in this instance includes a land plan. It  
24 includes an infrastructure plan. And by addressing  
25 those, both uses and the infrastructure requirements,

1 enables the development agreement to serve as a  
2 mechanism for satisfying the so-called concurrency  
3 requirement in the regional plan, which calls for or  
4 requires infrastructure and public services be addressed  
5 at the time that land use entitlements are considered.

6 So, in terms of what's in the agreement, the  
7 agreement's key terms are summarized on pages five and  
8 six of the agreement. Section 2 is intended to provide  
9 the developer a degree of regulatory predictability in  
10 the relation of the build-out of the project. This has  
11 a long, long build-out. And so it defines the rules and  
12 the fees that apply to development of the project.

13 Permitted uses and density are addressed in  
14 Section 3.1, which specifies that between 1,200 and  
15 1,800 residential units are permitted, which placed a  
16 gross density of between 3.1 and 4.6 dwelling units per  
17 acre. It allows for single-family detached and attached  
18 units in the portion of the property for which SF6  
19 zoning is requested. And then, in the 13 or so acres  
20 that where C2 zoning is proposed, all of the uses that  
21 are permitted in C2 zoning would be permitted.

22 The required infrastructure improvements are  
23 addressed in Section 3.2. This includes the off-site  
24 infrastructure, which is part of the developer's expense  
25 for the project. The required off-site improvements

1 include sanitary sewer upgrades and flood control and  
2 drainage improvements.

3           Also required are the widening of the Highland  
4 Ranch Parkway from the entrance to the project to the  
5 Pyramid Highway. So, essentially, from the intersection  
6 of Pyramid Highway to the entrance of the project, this  
7 lane would be required to be expanded to four lanes,  
8 four travel lanes prior to the issuance of any building  
9 permits for any structures.

10           And then the development agreement also  
11 includes provisions that require that this intersection  
12 have certain improvements made to it that are  
13 recommended in the traffic study, which is one of the  
14 attachments to the staff report that was prepared by  
15 Solaegui Engineers. That traffic analysis will be  
16 reviewed by both City engineering staff and the Nevada  
17 Department of Transportation. And both staff and the  
18 NDOT staff concur with those recommendations.

19           Those are the section improvements that must be  
20 completed prior to the issuance of any certificate of  
21 occupancy for, or final inspection of any dwelling unit  
22 in excess of 650 dwelling units. Stated more simply,  
23 prior to the 650 first certificate of occupancy or final  
24 inspection, those are permits that have to be made.  
25 That means that the developer is going to have to get

1 started in terms of getting approval from NDOT for those  
2 specific improvements well before they need that, right,  
3 so that they have that in time.

4 The idea, again, is to maintain at least a  
5 level of service E at that intersection.

6 Section 3.2 of the agreement also requires, per  
7 the determination of the City's Fire Chief, the  
8 construction of a second fire apparatus access road  
9 prior to the issuance of that 650 first C of O or  
10 occupancy permit. And as written in the development  
11 agreement, the second fire apparatus access road must be  
12 open for public use, a condition which Chief Maples will  
13 elaborate on following my presentation, and which, I  
14 believe, the developer has some concerns about. And  
15 it's up to him to address, them to address their  
16 concerns about that.

17 In addition, the development agreement  
18 specifies that all dwelling units and commercial  
19 structures intended for or to be used for human  
20 occupancy must be equipped with fire suppression  
21 systems, i.e. (indistinct).

22 And then, also, in terms of requirements from  
23 the fire department that have been incorporated into the  
24 development agreement, construction of all streets must  
25 comply with the design requirements that are set forth



1 in the City's site development and fire prevention  
2 policy guide to the approval of Fire Chief.

3 And then Section 3.11 constitutes the  
4 developer's and property owner's petition to include the  
5 subject property in Impact Fee Service Area Number 1  
6 and, essentially, in the development agreement there is  
7 not -- withdraw the petition except as permitted in the  
8 agreement.

9 Section 3.4 of the development agreement limits  
10 the total area to be cleared, graded or disturbed to 225  
11 of the 387 acres. So, as Karen will address in her  
12 presentation, the entirety of the site is being, or is  
13 close to being rezoned and to have its master plan land  
14 use designation changed to those that I mentioned. We  
15 don't have anything that would be zoned for this as open  
16 space or designated as such in our Comprehensive Plan.

17 However, this agreement is the basis for  
18 limiting that 225 of the 387 acres, which equates to  
19 about 58 percent of the site. So that means that over  
20 40 percent of the site is supposed to be left as open  
21 space. And per the development agreement, the  
22 developer's required to convey with each final  
23 subdivision map the lands designated as open space to  
24 the entity responsible for maintenance of those lands,  
25 which would, in all likelihood, be the homeowners

1 association.

2 Section 4 permits the City Council to review  
3 the developer's compliance with the agreement at 12  
4 months from the effective date. It also requires the  
5 developer to report every 24 months after that initial  
6 review on the number of units approved and built,  
7 development densities, and status of the project.

8 Section 6.1 specifies the duration of the  
9 agreement, which is 15 years. The agreement grants the  
10 developer the right to request one five-year extension  
11 subject to certain conditions.

12 So that's what's in the agreement, if you will,  
13 in terms of the primary terms.

14 Before I address the -- you know, how this  
15 development agreement is consistent with the  
16 Comprehensive Plan, which is, you know, what the  
17 Planning Commission proposed to plan on, and that are  
18 conditioned to the City Council, Chief Maples has a --  
19 is going to address the provisions in the agreement that  
20 apply.

21 Thank you.

22 CHIEF MAPLES: Good evening, Commissioners.  
23 For the record, my name is Chris Maples, and I'm the  
24 Fire Chief for the City of Sparks. I think, this is the  
25 first time I've had the opportunity to speak before you.

1           So I wanted to address you tonight and stress  
2 one of my concerns regarding the proposed development.  
3 And that is, my primary concern is the limited access to  
4 this property. As currently proposed, the development  
5 only has a single dedicated public roadway in and out.

6           The Fire Code gives me the authority to require  
7 a secondary means of access for fire department. Beyond  
8 that, I'd ask that this access road be open to the  
9 public to ensure two ways in and two ways out for both  
10 residents and emergency vehicles.

11           My concern with the fire access road is that it  
12 will not receive the same level of maintenance as a  
13 city street open for public use. For example, it won't  
14 be plowed when it snows.

15           Additionally, if we can get it and, most  
16 importantly, emergency access roads are not typically  
17 designed for two-way traffic. While a fire access road  
18 may provide a way for fire department vehicles to enter  
19 the development, it will not be suitable for the rapid  
20 evacuation of residents should the need arise due to  
21 some natural or unnatural disaster.

22           Given the density and topography of the  
23 proposed development, my professional opinion is that an  
24 additional public access route into and out of the  
25 development is not only prudent, but also provides a

1 much greater degree of safety for the residents.

2           So to rectify this, I propose that the  
3 development agreement be amended to include a secondary  
4 access road that would be open to the public to use,  
5 rather than designed solely for access by emergency  
6 vehicles. And it's my understanding that the developer  
7 has asked for this requirement to be removed.

8           Now, I will say that subsequent to me preparing  
9 my statement, I (indistinct) contacted me and offered or  
10 suggested some possible alternatives to address my  
11 concerns about the limited access to the property. And  
12 it was very preliminary, so I'm not prepared to say  
13 whether or not those would be acceptable to me at this  
14 time, but I'm willing to consider them in the future.

15           CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Thank you.

16           MR. ORNELAS: Okay. So just to be clear, the  
17 development agreement, as presented to you, was for your  
18 consideration. It does include those requests of the  
19 Fire Department.

20           So moving on, in terms of the Planning  
21 Commission's role with regard to the development  
22 agreement's review, development agreement consistency  
23 with the Comprehensive Plan, in staff's view, the  
24 applicable Comprehensive Plan's goals and policies are  
25 MG5, which really has to do with the review of master

1 plan amendments for sites over five acres and requires  
2 the City to evaluate or cause to be evaluated impacts on  
3 facilities and services, facilities and infrastructure,  
4 the impacts on services, public services, and then the  
5 proposed land use in relationship to existing land uses  
6 and the fiscal implications.

7           And in Policy CF1, which says that when  
8 reviewing new development, the City will not approve an  
9 application unless the City services can be provided at  
10 acceptable service levels.

11           So what we intended to do in the development  
12 agreement is to provide the framework for assuring that  
13 this project can comply with those requirements of the  
14 Comprehensive Plan. So it is staff's view that for that  
15 reason, the development agreement itself is consistent  
16 with the Comprehensive Plan.

17           So that concludes my presentation on the  
18 development agreement. As I noted earlier, Ms. Melby's  
19 going to be going through the annexation, Comp Plan  
20 amendment and the zoning request, and then we'll all be  
21 available for questions.

22           CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Thank you.

23           MS. MELBY: Good evening, Planning Commission.  
24 I'm Karen Melby, Development Service.

25           So my first application I'm going to review

1 with you tonight is annexation. This is the annexation  
2 map. They are proposing or requesting or petitioning  
3 for to annex 387, approximately 387 acres.

4 The first, what I wanted to review is the  
5 annexation findings, the three findings. Finding A is  
6 in conformance to the requirements of NRS 268. This  
7 property is contiguous to the City limits and being  
8 requested by the property owner, which is in conformance  
9 with NRS 268.

10 The next finding, A2, which is conformance to  
11 the findings for annexation, and our Sparks Municipal  
12 Code actually consists of 10 findings. So I'm going to  
13 review those.

14 The first one is the location of the property.  
15 The property is located north of Highland Ranch Parkway  
16 and is contiguous to the City on two sides, and it would  
17 be this to the south and then to the east. It is also  
18 actually contiguous a tiny bit on the north. Therefore,  
19 making that being consistent with the location.

20 The next one is the logical extension of City  
21 limits. This property, again, is contiguous to the City  
22 on two sides, and it is within the City Sphere of  
23 Influence. And existing utilities are in proximity to  
24 the property. Which fits a logical extension of the  
25 City limits.

1           The next one is need for expansion. There is a  
2 housing shortage in the region. So this property will  
3 increase the single-family housing supply.

4           D is the location of the existing and planned  
5 water and sewer service. Water service will be provided  
6 by the Truckee Meadows Water Authority, and sanitary  
7 sewer will be provided by the City of Sparks. Sanitary  
8 sewer service will be provided to the project via the  
9 northwest sanitary sewer interceptor located on the east  
10 side of the project, or actually the east side of  
11 McCarran and Highland. The developer will be  
12 responsible for the construction of all new sanitary  
13 sewer lines as well as an upgrade to the existing  
14 sanitary sewer line that will connect the project to the  
15 northwest connector.

16           The City sewer system, sanitary sewer model on  
17 the maximum unit count is -- maximum unit --

18           CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Okay. It's okay.

19           MS. MELBY: In the model, we did the model, the  
20 sanitary sewer model. We modeled it at the 1,800, even  
21 though at the fiscal impact they did it at 12.3. We did  
22 do the maximum number and also looked at the 13.4 acres  
23 of commercial. The result of the sanitary sewer model  
24 indicated that the developer will be required to  
25 construct half of the improvements to the existing

1 sanitary sewer system located between the project and  
2 the northwest interceptor to make it an acceptable  
3 levels of service.

4           Item E is the community goal that must be met.  
5 This project, staff believes, complies with Policy MG7,  
6 Goal H, and Policy CF1, because annexation will provide  
7 additional land for housing development has been in the  
8 City Sphere of Influence since the year 2002, promotes  
9 Sparks' housing market, and a provision of the  
10 development agreement that the applicant is petitioning  
11 to be included in our IFSA Number 1, that impact service  
12 area, which with this development and will contribute to  
13 the construction of the fire station, storm drain,  
14 sewer, and parks improvements.

15           F is the efficient and cost-effective provision  
16 of services. The property served by the sanitary sewer,  
17 which would be extended from the east side of Pyramid  
18 Highway. And these capacity improvements will need to  
19 be added to these facilities.

20           The fire service would be from the Fire Station  
21 Number 4 or through the automatic aid agreement with the  
22 Truckee Meadows Fire District.

23           G, which is the fiscal impact analysis. The  
24 fiscal impact analysis provided estimated that this  
25 annexation and the single-family development of 1,223



1 single-family home units and 13 acres of commercial will  
2 generate \$47.3 million in revenue to the General Fund  
3 and \$33 million in General Fund expenditures, resulting  
4 in an anticipated cumulative positive impact of  
5 \$14.3 million over a 20-year analysis period.

6 As for the Road Fund, the fiscal impact  
7 analysis estimates for a 20-year revenue of \$3.3 million  
8 for the Road Fund and \$14.9 million in expenditures.  
9 This estimate results in anticipated deficiency of  
10 \$11.5 million over 20 years due to the disconnect  
11 between the limited sources of revenue available for the  
12 Road Fund and the high cost of street maintenance and  
13 repair. This is not a unique situation throughout the  
14 City and especially for this development.

15 Combining the net positive for the General Fund  
16 of \$14.3 million and the net of the Road Fund at \$11.5,  
17 this produces a project positive fiscal impact of  
18 approximately \$2.8 million over the 20-year analysis  
19 period.

20 H, which is the Washoe County, the City did  
21 email or did send a packet to Washoe County. And we  
22 have not received any comments from Washoe County.

23 I is does it create any islands. This  
24 annexation will not create any islands and is continuous  
25 to City limits.

1 J, other factors. Before any tentative maps  
2 could be reviewed by the City, the applicant must  
3 prepare and submit a slope analysis per the Sparks  
4 Municipal Code 20.04.11, which is governs slopes,  
5 hilltops and ridges, delineating the developable portion  
6 of this property.

7 Addressing Finding A3, which is the conformance  
8 to the Comp Plan, as within the Sphere of Influence and  
9 the seven-year annexation program. The City of Sparks  
10 initially exerted planning jurisdiction by including  
11 this area in our Sphere of Influence in the year 2002.  
12 The City's annexation program did expire in 2015.  
13 However, NRS 268.670 allows for the City Council to  
14 consider annexing properties without an annexation  
15 program if it is contiguous to the City limits and the  
16 annexation is requested a hundred percent by the  
17 property owners. Both of these requirements are  
18 satisfied with this request for annexation.

19 The last finding is public notice. Again, this  
20 notice was published in the Reno Gazette-Journal on  
21 March 22nd, 2018. We noticed property owners within  
22 750, for a total of 50 property owners.

23 Now I'd like to address the Comprehensive Plan  
24 use amendment. They're requesting this map. The  
25 existing is on the top, and the proposed is on the

1 bottom. So they're requesting to amend 4.3 acres of a  
2 Commercial, which is the little half moon there of  
3 Commercial, 85 acres of Employment Center, and  
4 approximately 298 acres of Open Space. Two, as shown in  
5 the lower graphic, two hundred and -- they are  
6 requesting to add 13.4 acres of Commercial. And then  
7 the balance of the property, which is 373 and a half  
8 acres, for Intermediate Density Residential. The DA,  
9 though, in the development agreement does limit the  
10 total area to be graded clear or disturbed to 225 acres  
11 or is longest at 58 percent of the property.

12 There are four findings for the Comprehensive  
13 Plan. The first one is the compliance with the regional  
14 plan. Staff feels that it complies with goals 1.1, 2.3,  
15 3.5, because it is within our TMSA, the Sparks Municipal  
16 Code, and also the development agreement restricts the  
17 area that could be disturbed with the slope analysis as  
18 previously discussed. It also will be included in the  
19 IFSA Number 1, which will contribute to the construction  
20 of the fire station, storm drain, sewer, and park  
21 improvements, and along with the construction of  
22 capacity improvements to the interception of Highland  
23 Ranch Parkway and then also improvements from off  
24 Highland Ranch Parkway from Pyramid Highway to the  
25 entrance of the project.

1           This project does not -- let's see. The  
2 project does trigger, I guess, would be the word, three  
3 of the criteria for regional significance. The first  
4 one is that the project is proposed to be more than 625  
5 units at the range of 1,200 to 1,800 units.

6           The traffic in the trigger for regional plan,  
7 or regional project is 6,250, and they're projecting  
8 11,000, approximately 11,000 average daily trips.

9           The sewer generation standard is 17,500 gallons  
10 per day, and it's estimated that this project would  
11 generate 378,000 gallons per day.

12           Therefore, they have triggered three of the  
13 regional projects of significance, so that when this  
14 project is forwarded to regional planning, they will  
15 have to also look at a project of regional significance  
16 and compliance with this plan.

17           The next finding, which is CP2, CPA2, which is  
18 implementation of goals in the Comprehensive Plan, staff  
19 feels that this complies with Goal MG2, Policy MG5,  
20 Policy C1, Goal H2, and policies RC22 and RC23.

21           Because this will add lands of a mix of  
22 residential and commercial uses, and as discussed  
23 previously, the fiscal impact analysis projects a net  
24 positive fiscal impact. They will be included in the  
25 ISFA Number 1 development, will contribute contributions

1 to the improvements in the Spanish Springs area. It has  
2 a provision of additional lands for housing. And a  
3 slope analysis will be required per Sparks Municipal  
4 Code housing and the hillside section of the zoning  
5 code.

6 Finding C3, which is compatibility with  
7 surrounding land uses. The subject property is located  
8 on the west side of Pyramid Highway north of Highland  
9 Ranch Parkway. The Kiley Ranch North Planned  
10 Development is on the east side of Pyramid Highway. It  
11 has 157 acres designated as Commercial, including the  
12 site of a proposed hospital. None of the commercial  
13 uses planned for the Kiley Ranch North Planned  
14 Development have been developed to date.

15 The areas to the north are large single-family  
16 properties. To the west are vacant lands with steep  
17 slopes. The subject property was finally lined for  
18 aggregate. The single-family homes and commercial, as  
19 proposed in this project, will be more compatible with  
20 the surrounding land uses than the previously mining  
21 operation.

22 The last Comprehensive Plan finding is public  
23 notice. This was published in the Reno Gazette-Journal  
24 on March 22nd. And the applicant had a neighborhood  
25 meeting on February 20, 2018. There were 13 people that

1 attended that meeting with comments and lots of  
2 questions.

3           The next item is the rezoning request. When  
4 this property would be annexed into the City, it'll come  
5 in as A40, or Agricultural. That would be the entire  
6 373.48 acres. The applicant is requesting to rezone the  
7 property to single-family 6,000, or SF6, and also  
8 commercial. The commercial would be right along the  
9 Highland Ranch Parkway.

10           The staff report has included a table which  
11 summarizes the permitted zoning uses by zoning district.  
12 I will not go into that tonight.

13           CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Thank you.

14           MS. MELBY: If the Comprehensive Plan amendment  
15 is not approved by the Planning Commission tonight, then  
16 rezoning cannot be approved.

17           There are three findings for zoning. The first  
18 one is the consistency with the Comprehensive Plan. As  
19 I previously discussed under Finding CP2, the staff  
20 believes that this finding can be made, but only if the  
21 Comprehensive Plan amendment is approved.

22           Zoning C2, which is consistent with the  
23 surrounding existing land uses. Again, as discussed on  
24 the Comprehensive Plan Finding 3, the rezoning is  
25 consistent with the commercial and residential

1 development designations in the Kiley Ranch North  
2 Planned Development and also Washoe County to the north,  
3 the large lots, residential lots to the north.

4 Finding Z3, which is public notice, the notice  
5 was published in the Reno Gazette-Journal on March 22nd,  
6 and we sent out 50 notices to property owners within 750  
7 feet of the property.

8 Staff is recommending approval based on the  
9 findings as discussed under each of these requests.

10 I would like to make a reminder that you will  
11 have to make separate motions for each one of the four  
12 requests before you tonight.

13 That concludes our presentation. Armando,  
14 Chief Maples and myself are available to answer  
15 questions.

16 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Thank you.

17 Yes, Chief Maples.

18 CHIEF MAPLES: I just want to clarify one thing  
19 before you guys move on. Karen referenced an automatic  
20 aid agreement that I have with Truckee Meadows. That  
21 agreement was negotiated prior to the time that this  
22 development was contemplated. I've had no discussions  
23 with Chief Miller whether or not that automatic aid  
24 agreement would apply to this property.

25 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Thank you for the

1 clarification. Appreciate that.

2 Okay. Thank you.

3 Would the applicant like to speak?

4 MR. MIKE RAILEY: Good evening. For the  
5 record, Mike Railey with Rubicon Design Group  
6 representing the project applicant. Scott Christy and  
7 Blake Smith, the applicants, are with me tonight, along  
8 with Paul Solaegui, the project traffic engineer.

9 I think, staff did a very thorough job and a  
10 great job on the staff report, analyzing findings and  
11 explaining the project. We're here to answer any  
12 questions you might have tonight.

13 But before we get to that, I would like to  
14 touch on Chief Maples' comments in regards to fire. We  
15 are currently considering and analyzing alternatives to  
16 address the Chief's concerns, and we'll continue to work  
17 with him to make sure that we can come to a common  
18 ground on resolving the secondary access issue.

19 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Terrific. Thank you.

20 Okay. So, I'm going to open each one of these  
21 up for discussion. So I'm going to open for public  
22 hearing DA18-0001.

23 And, so, call for anybody that wants to speak?

24 MS. MCCORMICK: Yes.

25 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Okay. So, do we have any



1 requests to speak on DA -- okay. So. All right.

2 Mr. Cole, which part -- okay. Before I have  
3 you come up here, which part of the application would  
4 you like to talk about? Or just go ahead and come up,  
5 and let's have you discuss the whole.

6 MR. ROC COLE: All over.

7 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Yep, there you go. Why  
8 don't you address the whole thing.

9 MR. ROC COLE: All of it pertains.

10 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: There you go. Go right  
11 ahead.

12 MR. ROC COLE: My name is Roc Cole. I'm a  
13 property owner adjacent to the north. And, you know,  
14 when we bought our properties, we were told this is  
15 Washoe County rural and would remain that. And now, all  
16 of a sudden, it's becoming, I guess, to be houses.

17 Just 18 years ago, or whatever, when the quarry  
18 applied for a permit there, we were told that this was a  
19 protected ridgeline above our homes and that nothing  
20 could, a road, a fence, a home, nothing could be built  
21 on that ridgeline. And, and when I look at the map,  
22 Village 5 and 6 is infringing on that ridgeline.

23 And if you look in that, in this right here at  
24 page 21, Policy RC23 is required for new development to  
25 preserve and protect amenities with many features. And

1 the problem is the quarry is unique because it can  
2 provide for an enclaved-type development pattern that  
3 preserves the ridgelines and focuses development in  
4 areas that were previously part of the aggregate quarry  
5 or well-suited for development.

6 I didn't, I couldn't make the previous  
7 community meeting, but I called Mike Railey, is it?

8 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Uh-huh (affirmative).

9 MR. ROC COLE: And he assured me that all the  
10 building was down in flat, that nothing was going, it  
11 was too steep and nothing was going up on the hills.  
12 But now that you look at their map, there is substantial  
13 development on that ridgeline.

14 And I would think, with 390 acres to build on,  
15 they could remove that ridgeline building and keep it  
16 down in what they propose.

17 And I know I'm nobody, but I'm speaking for a  
18 lot of the residents there. And, by the way, that 750  
19 feet barely covers two properties. You know, it doesn't  
20 reach out to everybody. I've made calls to people, and  
21 nobody was aware of this. And, like I said, we were  
22 promised in previous Commission meetings that that was a  
23 protected ridgeline.

24 That would be my first. The other one is  
25 traffic on Pyramid is already atrocious. I don't know

1 if any of you guys live out there, but it's ridiculous.  
2 And this little improvement to Highland Ranch Parkway  
3 does nothing for Pyramid. And this is a lot of housing,  
4 a lot going in. And that concerns me.

5 And, I guess, that's pretty much it. I would  
6 just appreciate if you could just make it, keep it off  
7 the ridgeline and give us a little buffer zone between  
8 what was supposed to be rural, and now it's becoming  
9 high-density. And it's on the property line.

10 Thank you so much for your consideration.

11 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Thank you.

12 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Thanks for sticking  
13 around.

14 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Yes. Do we have any  
15 other requests to speak?

16 Yes, sir.

17 MR. BRADLEY PAUL ELLEY: Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: And then if you'll just  
19 fill out a request to speak when you're done. We can  
20 get it with the secretary when you're done.

21 MR. BRADLEY PAUL ELLEY: Okay. My name's  
22 Bradley Paul Elley, and my house is also (indistinct) on  
23 this project. And the problem is, I have the 20.5-acre  
24 lot that's directly north, right next to the one that's  
25 on the corner, the northeast corner. That's zoned

1 one-third acre residential. And the Lancing Group has  
2 over 200 acres that they're going to develop. They have  
3 a nice development out there. It's close to the high  
4 school. You can look down and see the high school from  
5 there. You can walk to the high school if you want to,  
6 ride a bike maybe. It is steep.

7 But if you ever go out there, and you walk it,  
8 where you think -- if you could put the map up of their  
9 parcel. I can see it in front here. But the  
10 topography, I share, I think, Mr. Cole's concerns. My  
11 property goes to the ridgetop. And what they want to  
12 do, they want to put in a congested area right below my  
13 property, 6,000-square-foot lot properties. That's  
14 really dense.

15 And what will happen in the winter, if there's  
16 any kind of inversion going on, and they allow any kind  
17 of burning to go on, all of these 6,000-acre lot  
18 residences, all that foul odor is going to go up onto my  
19 property. So I get to smell all this by-product of  
20 progress on my rural lot.

21 So I'm not real happy about that. I don't  
22 object to them building something. I'm not trying to  
23 say don't let them annex. But I'm trying to say, be  
24 reasonable. When you go up there and you look at the  
25 lot, you'll notice on a good day you don't hear much

1 road noise. On a bad day, when the wind's blowing up  
2 that, that -- if you look at the -- you can't see it  
3 from there. But the lay of the land there is it's an  
4 echo chamber for the freeway, which I call it the  
5 freeway, or the death trap for all the people who get  
6 killed by the drunks coming back from Pyramid Lake.

7 So that's going to be more congested. You're  
8 going to hear more traffic. They're going to put in,  
9 they're going to have to put in some sort of stoplight  
10 system or something there. So you're going to have that  
11 freeway come to a stop right there, and I'll hear even  
12 more motorcycles than I do now there.

13 But you also get, besides the noise that flows  
14 up there in that echo chamber, you also get a very windy  
15 area most days. Come up in a month when the wind's  
16 blowing, you'll be up there, and when I originally got  
17 this, I thought this would be a great place for a wind  
18 turbine, because the wind blows a lot up there. It  
19 blows everything --

20 (The three-minute warning sounded.)

21 MR. BRADLEY PAUL ELLEY: Oh, is that my  
22 three-minute? No.

23 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: That's your time.

24 MR. BRADLEY PAUL ELLEY: Oh, well, sorry.

25 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Wrap it up.

1 MR. BRADLEY PAUL ELLEY: Well, I'll just say  
2 thank you for your time. But, please, this congestion  
3 right below my lot, it's not compatible with the area.  
4 Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Thank you. And if you'll  
6 see the -- if you'll fill out a form for us, we'd  
7 greatly appreciate it.

8 Are there any other comments?

9 Yes, sir.

10 MR. GREG ELLEY: Yeah, I didn't fill out a  
11 form.

12 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: That's quite all right.  
13 You can go ahead and speak, and if you'll say your name  
14 and your address.

15 MR. GREG ELLEY: Sure.

16 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: And then, yes, if you'll  
17 please fill out one when you're done.

18 MR. GREG ELLEY: Yeah, my name is Greg Elley,  
19 and I'm managing partner of Pyramid West Vistas, which  
20 is 20 acres adjoined to the north here. And my concern  
21 is I'm, basically, echoing what you just heard. The  
22 density, 6,000 square feet a lot is, I just think that's  
23 too small. And it's going to lead to too much traffic.  
24 The traffic's bad already, the noise.

25 People have the right to build on their land.

1 Let's try and do it going from half, I think. And  
2 that's, basically, it. I just think it's just too  
3 dense, and it's just overwhelming.

4 So those are my concerns. Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Thank you.

6 Anyone else?

7 Yes, sir. And also, we'll ask that you fill  
8 one out, too. Thank you.

9 MR. REIF MCELROY: My name's Reif McElroy. I  
10 live at 7895 Patrina Way to the north of the property.  
11 We have multiple residents over there that are on 11-  
12 and 12-acre parcels. And I'm just echoing what  
13 everybody else is saying there. This is a high-density  
14 project adjacent to what we all thought was, at one  
15 time, and is still, rural areas, small ranchettes,  
16 whatever you want to call them. This is going to impact  
17 all those areas to the north and to the west. And it's  
18 going to affect Highland as well.

19 The road improvement in Highland Ranch Parkway  
20 to the entrance, as it was shown earlier, I feel, is  
21 very inadequate. They should be improving Highland  
22 Ranch Road all along that property line. Because  
23 there's quite a bit of traffic on Highland Ranch Road  
24 now coming down to Pyramid. That little bit of  
25 improvement isn't going to do anything for all the other

1 traffic that's coming into this high-density density  
2 point.

3 I also have an issue -- being an ex-fireman,  
4 sir -- with the fire danger. You can always see where  
5 the fire impacted that area 15 years ago. You got to  
6 have adequate services for that many houses. You should  
7 be building a fire station in that location as one of  
8 your commercial things. So that would be something I  
9 would think you'd be looking at.

10 I don't begrudge development. I am a builder.  
11 So I want them to do what they need to do. I am also  
12 concerned about the ridgeline and how it impacts our  
13 properties to the north and wanting to keep the houses  
14 down. The quarry pit isn't -- I've been up there on my  
15 horseback and quad. It's already re-cut right now at a  
16 very steep slope, but I'm sure they're going to  
17 redevelop it to fit all those houses a little  
18 differently. But I would like to see the houses stay  
19 off the ridgeline completely. And that way, you're  
20 keeping that density more intact to itself.

21 I'm, basically, just voicing what everybody  
22 else is saying. And you do need to give notice not 700  
23 feet from the property. This is a huge development.  
24 You need to go much further out. You need to hit the  
25 Desert Springs area that's impacting us to the north.



1 You need to hit the Highland area up to the west. You  
2 need to get better clarification. I found out about  
3 this yesterday, and I'm here now. So I think that needs  
4 to be improved.

5 Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Thank you. Appreciate  
7 you being here.

8 Anyone else?

9 Yes, sir.

10 MR. MIKE EASTMAN: Madam Chair, thank you for  
11 your time. We have their objection to this. It's close  
12 to my property, also.

13 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Can you state your name  
14 and your address, please.

15 MR. MIKE EASTMAN: Mike Eastman, 10 Mac Road.

16 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Thank you.

17 MR. MIKE EASTMAN: I think, in a shortcut,  
18 you've been had. I think, you have not been  
19 well-explained what kind of property this, this quarry  
20 is. If you look to the top of it, you'd probably first  
21 say, yeah, the top is here. But, of course, they can  
22 cut whatever they want to cut. It is a beautiful piece  
23 of property. It overlooks all of Sparks and all of  
24 Reno. Fantastic views up there. And, of course, people  
25 are going to want to build up there.

1           But what it does is impact our city in a way  
2 that we don't, don't really like. I don't think, I  
3 don't think any of you, if you lived where we live,  
4 would like that. You're going to have an entire  
5 beautiful ridge completely covered with houses in a way  
6 that is going to require them to do a lot of chopping  
7 and cutting up the hillside. it's going to have to come  
8 down a little bit. It's going to have to be flattened  
9 and leveled and all those kinds of things.

10           And I would encourage all of you to go out  
11 there and take a look at the site, both as a -- I know  
12 we're dealing with a dutiful hard decision, that you  
13 really don't -- and it's very tall. I mean it's a very,  
14 very good size ridge.

15           So I don't want to repeat everything everybody  
16 else has said. But I don't think they did good, good  
17 thoughts on anybody to the north, only, again, sending  
18 notification out to 750 people. Everybody out there has  
19 10-acre lots. So 10-acre lots, you don't get in past  
20 the real first row of people. You don't get all the  
21 rest of the people out there with 10-acre lots if they  
22 don't even know this is happening.

23           So I would encourage that to be done. First,  
24 tell everybody else out there. And all those people  
25 are, I believe, under the same assumptions that Roc

1 mentioned earlier, that we are all under the assumption  
2 that this was a protected ridge. And all of them  
3 believe it's a protected ridge. And they're going to be  
4 shocked when they have to come out their front door and  
5 see this giant row of houses. Maybe each individual  
6 house is pretty. But a giant row of houses sitting on  
7 the top of a ridge in the middle of Sparks is not  
8 attractive, where you intentionally bought in this rural  
9 area for that protected area. And we would certainly  
10 like to see it stay that way.

11 I think, all of us understand development has  
12 to go. I don't know that all of this Kiley Ranch and  
13 all this valley area that is being built, it looks like  
14 there are thousands of room, thousands of lots left for  
15 houses. It appears on any map. You just look at it.  
16 There's so much plans for that whole area out there, I  
17 can't imagine that they have to have this quarry and  
18 chop down one of the most beautiful areas in the city  
19 for views and for appreciation. We could do better with  
20 things like parks, trails, those kind of things, for  
21 public use lands.

22 I would like to re-hit on that one big area, is  
23 the traffic. I don't think -- again, I don't know where  
24 you all live. But if you live on North Pyramid, north  
25 of this Highland Park Ranch, that traffic is,

1 particularly in the mornings -- obviously, mornings and  
2 evenings are worst -- it is just horrible. And it'll  
3 take forever to get down there. If you add 1,800 more  
4 homes and families that are trying to commute, sometimes  
5 two people each, all about the same time of day, it's  
6 just going to be bogged down and no one's going to be  
7 able to get anywhere.

8           So I'd appreciate it if you would really,  
9 really reconsider this and take a good look at where  
10 this property is, take a look at the elevations, the  
11 terrain out there, take a look at how --

12           (The three-minute warning sounded.)

13           MR. MIKE EASTMAN: -- wonderful it can actually  
14 be, and for some other purpose than up and by me with a  
15 bunches of houses on top of it.

16           Thank you.

17           CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Thank you.

18           Are there any other requests?

19           Yes, ma'am.

20           MS. PATRICIA METZ: I didn't (indistinct.)

21           CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: That's fine. If you'll  
22 just state your name and your address. And then, when  
23 you're done, if you'll fill out the form, that would be  
24 wonderful.

25           MS. PATRICIA METZ: My name is Patricia Metz.

1 And I'm at seven 7335 Star Hill, which is the south part  
2 of this area where we all have these, the 10 acres at  
3 least, ranches. And mine is right up there against this  
4 proposed property, the top of my property. And I bought  
5 it in 2001. And I was under the impression that nobody  
6 would be ever building out there.

7           What I'm also concerned about this time, at  
8 this time is that so-called berm between -- if there is  
9 one, between my place and others that are up this  
10 mountain that we have there. It looks like we're going  
11 to be touching right where the proposed building will  
12 be.

13           Also, at one time, with the pit, I'll call it,  
14 they were also in agreement to never even have any dust  
15 coming up. You know, that was their agreement with  
16 people on the north side of where the pit is, which  
17 would be where I live.

18           I'm also concerned about fire situations, that  
19 they would have to have very good coverage. That is  
20 very dense, what they're proposing. And lots of people  
21 would be up there over, over our mountain.

22           No, we did not plan to have houses right up on  
23 that ridge. If it goes through, I would really hope  
24 that they would handle it better to be in concern of the  
25 people that live to the north. There's all this acreage

1 of ranches. And most of the people that live in the  
2 whole area don't even know they're there.

3 So I am concerned about this whole proposal  
4 and, also, the traffic on Highland Parkway. I go up  
5 that highway many times to go over to -- on the other  
6 side of 395 even. And people drive pretty crazy on it.  
7 And with more people going into that proposed  
8 construction, I think it would be pretty dangerous.

9 But, anyway, I think there's a lot of things to  
10 look at. And it's not a simple matter.

11 So thank you for your time.

12 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Thank you, and we  
13 appreciate you staying.

14 Okay. With that, is there anyone else that  
15 requests to speak?

16 Okay. All right. Then, we're going to take  
17 each one of these separately. So I'm going to close the  
18 public hearing, and I'm going bring back to discuss  
19 DA18-001.

20 So do any of the Commissioners have questions,  
21 comments regarding the development agreement?

22 Commissioner Carey.

23 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Thank you, Madam Chair.  
24 Question for staff regarding the development agreement.  
25 Looking through Section 6.1, that requires the

1 maintenance of the open space on this property.

2 I think, one of the concerns that I have, and I  
3 appreciate Chief Maples being here, is wildfire. I  
4 think, we had some public comment expressed that, too.  
5 Given the topography of the site, I could see that  
6 wildfire being a serious issue.

7 My question about Section 6.1 requiring  
8 maintenance, does this section of the agreement require,  
9 you know, the HOA, or whoever is created for that, to  
10 maintain defensible space for the homes that are built?

11 MR. ORNELAS: The development agreement does  
12 not specifically address the issue of defensible space,  
13 Commissioner Carey. I mean I would refer the question,  
14 of course, to Chief Maples. But, typically, once the  
15 developable areas are truly defined, as you know, this  
16 is an exceptional land use plan -- scroll down.

17 This is a preliminary slope analysis. The  
18 section of the agreement that addresses slope analysis  
19 and development constraints, basically, requires an  
20 acknowledgment on the part of the developer that there  
21 are slope constraints. Ultimately, this slope analysis  
22 will have to be refined and the land plan updated to  
23 reflect the slope analysis.

24 That's a step towards, ultimately, the process  
25 of tentative and final maps where the areas that are --

1 expect to be designated open space and dedicated to the  
2 HOA or whatever the entity is responsible for  
3 maintaining, for the development agreement. We can  
4 start to look at the issue of that through that  
5 tentative map process.

6           There, it's my understanding, Chief Maples,  
7 that the International Fire Code has defensible space  
8 provisions.

9           CHIEF MAPLE: So, currently, in the City, we  
10 don't have any type of ordinance that regulates the  
11 wildland urban interface. And the reason for that is,  
12 historically, we haven't been developing out in these  
13 areas. It's been more of an urban area.

14           I believe, with the Andrea, that was the first  
15 one where we required the homeowners to, the homeowners  
16 association to maintain a defensible space on their  
17 property.

18           So, like Armando said, this is all very  
19 preliminary now. But I would assume that it  
20 incorporates something like that into this.

21           COMMISSIONER CAREY: Thank you, Chief,  
22 appreciate that, that answer.

23           My other question I had is concerning the  
24 development agreement. One of the key provisions of  
25 this development agreement is that it allows for the



1 property owner to petition to be included within IFSA  
2 Number 1. And my question is, about that is, with the  
3 proposed land, land uses on this site where it takes up  
4 the entire site where we have -- you know, it's all  
5 single-family, it's all commercial, how do those, those  
6 proposed acreages affect the calculations for our next  
7 IFSA update? Would we just take the two, one, and five  
8 acres that are developable, or would we take the entire  
9 acreages and calculate that?

10 MR. ORNELAS: We will be looking at development  
11 units for that purpose. So, as Mr. Martini explained to  
12 you in some detail in his presentation, and he did go  
13 into some detail, the -- you know, we'll be looking at  
14 the number of residential units, and commercial space  
15 will be taken into account as well.

16 And so it's not the acreage per se. It's the  
17 development units that will be taken into account with  
18 IFSA, IFSA Number 1.

19 The other point I would make, just as some  
20 clarification, is that by virtue of this agreement, they  
21 are petitioning. So this agreement, if approved by both  
22 parties, by the City Council, is the petition.

23 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Appreciate the  
24 clarifications. Thank you.

25 Thank you, Madam Chair.

1 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Any other questions?  
2 Commissioner Fewins.

3 COMMISSIONER FEWINS: Commissioner Fewins. And  
4 so under the development agreement, you talk about  
5 widening to four travel lanes from Pyramid Highway to --  
6 on Highland Ranch to the -- on the map it was called the  
7 unknown road, as they name that. Are there any kind  
8 of -- with that development agreement, when you have --  
9 say that this does go through, you have 1,800 homes  
10 coming down, there's no kind of traffic facility there  
11 at that unknown road and Highland Ranch Parkway  
12 intersection. Would there, could there be anything in  
13 that development agreement that will trigger something  
14 for some kind of traffic control at that intersection?

15 And then, further, those people are probably  
16 going to be taking a left through that, coming down  
17 Highland Ranch. Is that a --

18 MR. ORNELAS: I'm going to ask Amber Sosa to  
19 address that question, if she would.

20 COMMISSIONER FEWINS: Okay. Thank you.

21 MS. SOSA: For the record, Amber Sosa,  
22 Transportation Manager for the City of Sparks.

23 The traffic study provided for this for the  
24 Highland Ranch Parkway, and the project access  
25 intersection does provide for a three-lane traffic

1 signal control intersection.

2 MR. ORNELAS: Okay. Thank you.

3 COMMISSIONER FEWINS: And we had some  
4 discussion about Highland Ranch. And maybe this is  
5 for -- we were talking about Highland Ranch being done  
6 all the way. I think, there was public comment about  
7 improving that all the way. Can you explain possibly  
8 where that may not be able to do the development  
9 agreement with improving the whole road on that, please?

10 MR. MARTINI: Good evening, Madam Chair,  
11 members of the Commission. John Martini, Community  
12 Services Director.

13 So, as we -- we've talked many times as we look  
14 at development-related issues. When we look to a  
15 development to make a substantial public improvement, we  
16 are bound by, basically, two factors. One is a nexus,  
17 meaning do you have a reason to require an approval, or  
18 an exact what it is -- it could be improvement of a  
19 road, addition of a signal, building a flood control  
20 channel, whatever the project we're looking at seems to  
21 require.

22 The second one is called proportionality. So  
23 we have a duty to, if we decide we have a nexus to  
24 require the developer to do something that's typically  
25 an off-site improvement, what is the proportional effect

1 of that development on the object we're looking at? So  
2 in this case, Highland Ranch Parkway.

3 Certainly, as the project's proposed today, and  
4 we've heard discussion about two forms of access -- and  
5 the Chief and I will be working with the developer to  
6 figure that out. As of right now, you're looking at a  
7 project that has one way in and one way out. So it will  
8 certainly be utilizing, as we sit tonight, all of the  
9 traffic in this project will utilize Highland Ranch  
10 Parkway to either come in or out of the project.

11 So you have a nexus, we do. As we looked at  
12 this project over the last 18 months working with the  
13 developer, that was clear. Amber Sosa and your City  
14 Engineer, Jon Erickson, in conjunction with  
15 Mr. Solaegui's work, looked at what the impacts are.  
16 You've got the numbers in your report. The development  
17 agreement requires a certain amount of upgrading of  
18 Highland Ranch.

19 That is the proportional share. That's where  
20 we went. It is all, from the project entrance to  
21 Pyramid Highway, the effects on the roadway going  
22 forward are completely attributable to this project.

23 Now, certainly there's going to be some growth  
24 to the west in Sun Valley that likely will be coming  
25 over. But it is probably de minimis in comparison to an

1 1,800-unit subdivision utilizing this road.

2 So, to answer your question, yes, we can. But  
3 it has to be proportional.

4 So to the question asked tonight, why not just  
5 pave the road all the way to Sun Valley, I guess, would  
6 be the case? We could. However, their proportional  
7 share -- let's say it cost \$100 to do that improvement.  
8 It's probably more like a couple of million bucks.  
9 Their share would be, say, \$400,000 of that \$2 million.  
10 The public has to come up with the rest.

11 As we sit here today, Highland Ranch Parkway  
12 is, you view that annexation, a portion of it will be  
13 owned now by the City of Sparks. The rest remains in  
14 Washoe County. The two entities would have to come  
15 together in conjunction with RTC to fund the project.  
16 So that can hang a developer up while public funding is  
17 being found. The easiest way to do this is to have  
18 them, conditioned through this development agreement, to  
19 make their proportional share of that upgrade to four  
20 lanes on Highland Ranch Parkway, subject to the  
21 conditions in the development agreement.

22 That's a very long-winded way to say, no, we  
23 can't just pay for the whole thing, or require them to  
24 pay for the whole thing.

25 COMMISSIONER FEWINS: Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Anybody else have any  
2 questions?

3 Commissioner Read.

4 COMMISSIONER READ: I have a question. I have  
5 a question for the applicant.

6 And, by the way, Commissioner Fewins and I did  
7 have the opportunity to take a field, a rather bumpy  
8 field trip around the project site. So thank you,  
9 Mr. Christy, for that opportunity and sharing your plans  
10 for the property.

11 I had a question regarding the quarry area and  
12 the fill. Can you describe the flood mitigation plans  
13 at that site?

14 MR. MIKE RAILEY: I'm going to let somebody  
15 that's much more intelligent than I am.

16 MR. SCOTT CHRISTY: Yeah, good evening. For  
17 the record, Scott Christy with OK.

18 So, currently, there are some, some drainage  
19 issues out there that exist today with this development.  
20 We're not changing the drainage pattern at all. We will  
21 be providing improvements that are going to improve the  
22 situation. We're working with staff to potentially  
23 improve the situation at the Highland Ranch/Pyramid  
24 intersection to improve the culverts that are there  
25 today, as well as drainage structures coming down

1 Highland Ranch parkway.

2 Did that answer your question?

3 COMMISSIONER READ: Vaguely.

4 MR. SCOTT CHRISTY: Well, what can I be more  
5 specific about?

6 COMMISSIONER READ: You had, when we were  
7 driving, you had mentioned some sediment basins and some  
8 extra hydraulic measures, and.

9 MR. SCOTT CHRISTY: Yeah, that's all included  
10 in what we would do on Highland Ranch Parkway. So there  
11 is a sediment, sedimentation issue that's been around a  
12 long time. We've actually been working in other areas  
13 in the city to help mitigate that. In part, what we  
14 would do is to add some sedimentation control. And  
15 that's part of the problem I referenced there at  
16 Highland Ranch/Pyramid intersection. With the  
17 improvements and infrastructure being put in, we could  
18 help mitigate that problem.

19 COMMISSIONER READ: Thank you.

20 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Anybody else have any  
21 questions?

22 Okay. I just have one question, Mr. Ornelas.  
23 If you could address noticing before we move on with  
24 this.

25 MR. ORNELAS: So we notice per the requirements

1 of state law, which are likely in our municipal code as  
2 well. You know, we've often thought to ourselves, you  
3 know, sometimes it would, practically speaking, make  
4 sense to notice a larger area. We've had that  
5 conversation with our legal counsel. And, you know, it  
6 really raises the question of why did you do -- if you  
7 don't comply, if you don't do notice to be in compliance  
8 with state law and our municipal code, any time in the  
9 future when you deviate from that, you know, you're  
10 going to have to justify why, and why this time and why  
11 not some other time for some other project.

12 So on the advice of legal counsel, we complied  
13 with state law with regard to noticing.

14 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Can you explain what  
15 state law says, so that -- because, I think, we have  
16 residents here that -- so that they understand how  
17 noticing happens.

18 MR. ORNELAS: Yeah. So, for example, where the  
19 Comprehensive Plan land use amendment, if you go to  
20 that finding, CP4, the noticing was done. There's a  
21 requirement for the immigrant meeting, which is the  
22 applicant's responsibility. And then --

23 MS. MELBY: Would you like me to address that?

24 MR. ORNELAS: Yes, if you would.

25 MS. MELBY: Karen Melby, Development Service



1 Manager. The noticing for the neighborhood meeting is  
2 750 feet by state law. So the applicant did notice  
3 within 750 feet of the property. Annexations require  
4 750 feet. And, also, the zone change, they're all 750  
5 feet.

6 And the applicant received the notice for the  
7 neighborhood meeting from the City of Sparks. So it was  
8 the same notice list that was used for the neighborhood  
9 meeting was also used for the annexation request and  
10 also the rezoning.

11 MR. ORNELAS: And so there's a -- and there's a  
12 provision -- correct me if I'm wrong, Ms. Melby --

13 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Thank you.

14 MR. ORNELAS: -- that, you know, you go out a  
15 certain distance for --

16 MS. MELBY: Yeah.

17 MR. ORNELAS: -- for the greater of a certain  
18 distance or a minimum number of property owners.

19 MS. MELBY: Which is 30.

20 MR. ORNELAS: It's 30. So.

21 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Thank you.

22 MR. ORNELAS: In this case, for example, the  
23 750 produced 50.

24 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Okay. I appreciate that  
25 clarification. Thank you.

1 Mr. Railey, can I have a question of you,  
2 please? And I don't know if you can answer or not.  
3 Were you at the public meeting, the neighborhood  
4 meeting?

5 MR. MIKE RAILEY: Yes.

6 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Okay. Can you synopsise  
7 what the people that attended, what their feedback was?

8 MR. MIKE RAILEY: I think, it kind of mimics  
9 what you heard here tonight in terms of density was a  
10 concern. Also, one issue that wasn't brought up tonight  
11 that was raised at the meeting was concern of a  
12 potentially access to the north through, up into that  
13 area. We addressed that and, you know, basically, this  
14 is like how the project will be laid out. And there was  
15 line issues and the density.

16 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Okay. I appreciate that.  
17 Thank you.

18 With that, we'll go ahead, and I will --

19 COMMISSIONER FEWINS: Madam Chair.

20 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Yes, Commissioner Fewins.

21 COMMISSIONER FEWINS: If I could have the Chief  
22 come back up.

23 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Sure.

24 COMMISSIONER FEWINS: And we're still talking  
25 about the development?

1 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Yes, we are.

2 COMMISSIONER FEWINS: Yeah. The second part,  
3 that access road that you're really talking about, you  
4 know, I was driving around the City of Sparks, and  
5 there's quite a few access roads currently in our city  
6 that are not -- can you just tell the differences  
7 between what those are per a public road and a fire  
8 access road, and why you think in this development, and  
9 I think you addressed it a little bit, but in your  
10 professional opinion, why that access road is not going  
11 to be good enough?

12 CHIEF MAPLES: So it's kind of what I talked  
13 about earlier.

14 COMMISSIONER FEWINS: Yes.

15 CHIEF MAPLES: Okay. It's not open all the  
16 time. Okay. So if there's an emergency, and there's  
17 only one way out, everybody funnels down the one road.  
18 If it's a public road, the secondary access that we're  
19 talking about, there's another, there's an alternative  
20 way out.

21 This is also a very large development with a  
22 large number of units. A lot of the access roads we  
23 have around here were for much smaller developments.  
24 Okay. My concern would be sometimes they are not built  
25 to accommodate two-way traffic. They're not plowable,

1 like I said. They're not regularly maintained. This  
2 area, you have some steep hillsides, that you're aware  
3 of. You could have rock slides, and people out there  
4 removing the rocks, and we have to access it, and then  
5 that hinders our ability to get in and out. It's the  
6 same thing.

7 COMMISSIONER FEWINS: Okay. Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Okay. Any other  
9 questions regarding the development agreement, comment?

10 Okay. I'm going to call on somebody if  
11 somebody doesn't step up. So let's go. Come on. Do  
12 you want to make a motion on the development agreement  
13 for me?

14 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Madam Chair, I'd be happy  
15 to --

16 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Commissioner Carey.

17 COMMISSIONER CAREY: -- wager some comments.  
18 I'm not sure if I'm prepared to make a motion.

19 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Okay. Go right ahead.

20 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Maybe my comments will  
21 spur some more --

22 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: There you go.

23 COMMISSIONER CAREY: -- discussion.

24 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: There you go.

25 COMMISSIONER CAREY: With respect to the

1 proposed development agreement, I certainly appreciate  
2 the work of staff. I think, there's a lot of good  
3 things in this development agreement. And it will  
4 provide some good, some good stuff to help out our  
5 infrastructure needs out there.

6 I do have a lot of concerns with the proposed  
7 land use changes. In my opinion -- I'm just one  
8 Commissioner up there. I don't believe that these  
9 proposed changes are consistent with the  
10 comprehensive -- or the proposed development agreement.  
11 Got ahead of myself.

12 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Yeah.

13 COMMISSIONER CAREY: The proposed development  
14 agreement consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. This  
15 site has been designated as Business Park and Employment  
16 Center for many years now. I believe that that's an  
17 appropriate land use for this section. I think, from  
18 the land use point of view, I think there's more impacts  
19 from what the proposed land use is of this, in this  
20 development agreement are more impactful to the adjacent  
21 residences. I don't find that it's compatible.

22 So I won't be, I do not support this  
23 development agreement.

24 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Thank you, Commissioner  
25 Carey.

1 COMMISSIONER FEWINS: Madam Chair.

2 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Commissioner Fewins.

3 COMMISSIONER FEWINS: Commissioner Fewins. A  
4 little bit more discussion on that. I am actually in  
5 favor of the development agreement. I think, even  
6 though we do hear development is something that our city  
7 is growing and it's something that it's doing. And  
8 whether or not I -- I definitely hear concerns of  
9 citizens that own 10-acres to the north. But  
10 development is happening. Our city's growing. This is  
11 giving an ability for a housing shortage that we sound  
12 like we desperately -- well, it doesn't sound like -- we  
13 desperately are in need of. It's giving a vehicle for  
14 funding for some capital improvements that are  
15 definitely needed in this area.

16 And so, I think, you got to look at really  
17 we're going to want our city to grow. This is an  
18 ability to get an agreement with the developer to be  
19 able to fund items that are in desperate need in our  
20 city.

21 So I'm in support of this and the development  
22 agreement. I think, just the whole nexus of getting it,  
23 or concurrency with the agreement, I think, is a great  
24 plan. I think that staff's done a great job of doing  
25 that.

1           And, you know, we've had, we've definitely  
2 looked at annexing in the past and have not been  
3 favorable on it. Because, I think, developers did not  
4 meet with staff and get really the plan going. And I  
5 think that by them doing that and getting things going  
6 down the road in the right direction at the same time is  
7 a really good idea for our city.

8           CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Thank you.

9           Anyone else have any comment?

10          Okay. Is anybody prepared to make a motion?

11          COMMISSIONER FEWINS: Commissioner Fewins. I'm  
12 ready to make a motion. For the development agreement,  
13 I move to find the proposed development agreement  
14 associated with PCN16-0050 consistent with the Sparks  
15 Comprehensive Plan and to move forward with  
16 recommendation of approval to the City Council.

17          COMMISSIONER BROCK: Commissioner Brock.  
18 Second.

19          CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Okay. I have a first and  
20 a second. Is there any discussion?

21          Okay. I'm going to go ahead and make a  
22 comment. I am going to support the development  
23 agreement. I appreciate the time that staff has put  
24 into it. And I do understand, when you live in  
25 unincorporated Washoe County and then, all of a sudden,

1 we have land that then is concurrent to be annexed into  
2 the City, that there are different rules in the City,  
3 even though our unincorporated county. And,  
4 unfortunately, that is how growth is happening. And  
5 we're growing. And we need to make sure that we grow  
6 responsibly.

7 And I feel that with staff working with the  
8 developer, that they bring a plan in place. It is a  
9 20-year build-out, so it's not something that when we  
10 start doing this, that we're going to start seeing  
11 sticks in the air tomorrow. So there are steps that  
12 have to happen in order for this to come to fruition.

13 So with that, I'll call, all in favor?

14 (Commission members said "aye.")

15 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Any opposed?

16 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Nay.

17 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Okay. Motion carries.

18 Okay. Next, we'll move along to AX16-003, the  
19 voluntary annexation. Commissioners, do we have any  
20 comments, anything else?

21 Commissioner Fewins.

22 COMMISSIONER FEWINS: Yeah, I do, one, on the  
23 annexation. So we're talking about services. And,  
24 mainly, and I think maybe Mr. Martinez best answered  
25 this. And I asked this in the Study Session. And, you



1 know, were talking about we had the sewer study done,  
2 and I think this was included in the sewer study posed.  
3 Correct? Or am I correct?

4 MR. MARTINI: Yes, so the property was  
5 initially included in the sewer study for its  
6 Comprehensive Plan, which, as Commissioner Carey pointed  
7 out earlier, was professional office. It has been  
8 remodeled, including the proposed development densities.  
9 Well, for, as requested, it is reflected in the  
10 development agreement we just we just voted on.

11 So, yeah, it's included. As Armando pointed  
12 out in his -- or Karen actually did. So the northwest  
13 interceptor, the big line that runs all the way out to,  
14 up past north of Long. So it has capacity to handle  
15 this proposed development. There are some improvements  
16 that the developer will be 100 percent responsible for  
17 to upgrade between this property and the interceptor,  
18 which lies on the kind of eastern boundary of the Kiley  
19 North development.

20 So that's a cost completely borne by the  
21 developer to upgrade those existing lines that don't  
22 have that capacity.

23 COMMISSIONER FEWINS: So the line, but, I  
24 guess, the line has capacity?

25 MR. MARTINI: The interceptor does.

1 COMMISSIONER FEWINS: The interceptor does.

2 MR. MARTINI: Which is included in Impact Fee  
3 Service Area 1.

4 COMMISSIONER FEWINS: Yeah. What about where  
5 it comes down to the river, the facility?

6 MR. MARTINI: We're getting all the way to the  
7 river, actually, all the way to TMWRF.

8 COMMISSIONER FEWINS: So the facility itself  
9 has capacity to --

10 MR. MARTINI: So when we speak to TMWRF --

11 COMMISSIONER FEWINS: Yes.

12 MR. MARTINI: -- TMWRF has a permitting  
13 capacity that is both, it has a hydraulic capacity  
14 rating of about 44 million gallons a year. As the  
15 Commission knows, we also have wasteload allocation  
16 requirements on the river. Which the big three are  
17 limited nitrogen, the phosphorus, and total dissolved  
18 solids.

19 As you all well know, our nitrogen discharged  
20 to the river has been creeping up. So your Sparks  
21 staff, in conjunction with the staff at Reno, since  
22 we've worked jointly when operating the plant, we're  
23 working on the next upgrade and some work right now.

24 COMMISSIONER FEWINS: Okay.

25 MR. MARTINI: So Sparks does have some remedial

1 capacity, as been showed in the build-out of the sewer.  
2 Because you remember the results of the mall. We do  
3 need additional capacity in the future at TMWRF. In the  
4 near term, we're going to need to make some improvements  
5 to cut down on the nitrogen and TDS that we're putting  
6 into the river to allow for additional development.

7 So the way that is play out is, when we have  
8 arrived at that next black box, if you will, where the  
9 plant is, that will be loaded into the capital  
10 improvements plan for TMWA. Once approved by our City  
11 Council, then those costs are loaded into our rate  
12 studies for connection fees. I suspect we'll see a  
13 connection fee study coming your way here shortly.  
14 Mr. Hummel's working on one right now.

15 To answer your question, Commissions Fewins, if  
16 you need to create some more capacity on a chemical  
17 basis, there is a plan moving forward and a  
18 (indistinct).

19 COMMISSIONER FEWINS: Okay. Can we talk  
20 about -- Commissioner Fewins again -- storm drain in  
21 this closed basin?

22 MR. MARTINI: And it's not a closed basin.

23 COMMISSIONER FEWINS: I guess, with one, one  
24 river out.

25 MR. MARTINI: That's right, one river out.

1           COMMISSIONER FEWINS: Well, there's been a lot  
2 of talk about in north Reno on certain areas of flood.  
3 What are some things that we will not have that problem,  
4 you think, in this area?

5           MR. MARTINI: So, as you well know, since I was  
6 just here meeting last, talking about an active service  
7 area, it includes some \$18 million in flood control  
8 projects, most of which have already been completed  
9 within Impact Fee Service Area 1.

10           With their petition tonight, so to cut it  
11 short, all their stormwater that this generates will  
12 come down Highland Ranch Parkway in one form or another.  
13 They'll certainly have some retention basins on site to  
14 cut the flows down. It will then cross Pyramid Highway  
15 and get into, directly into the Sun Valley diversion  
16 channel, which is a capital improvement item inside  
17 Kiley Ranch, flow behind the Kiley Ranch dam, and then  
18 enter into the rest of our flood control structures that  
19 we built south of Kiley Ranch dam, all the way down to  
20 the river.

21           And as the Commission knows, we are just about  
22 a month and a half away from completing the north  
23 Truckee drain improvements through the industrial area.  
24 So all of the water from Highland Ranch Parkway will  
25 actually go out that brand-new twin 14-by-10 culvert

1 that we built, one way or another.

2 COMMISSIONER FEWINS: Okay. Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Thank you.

4 Anybody else have any questions, comments?

5 Okay. No. I'll entertain a motion on the  
6 annexation.

7 MS. MCCORMICK: Madam Chair?

8 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Yes.

9 MS. MCCORMICK: Assistant City Attorney Alyson  
10 McCormick. If you could open the item for public  
11 hearing.

12 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Yes. I apologize. Okay.  
13 This is a public hearing. And I will open this item.  
14 So if anybody would like to speak on it, you're welcome  
15 to come up and speak.

16 Okay. Seeing none, I'll close the public  
17 hearing and bring it back to the Commission. Questions,  
18 comments?

19 COMMISSIONER READ: Madam Chair, I'll move  
20 to --

21 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Commissioner Read, thank  
22 you.

23 COMMISSIONER READ: Before I was called on. I  
24 move to forward a recommendation of approval to City  
25 Council for the annexation request AX16-003 associated

1 with PCN16-0050, based on findings A1 through A4 and the  
2 facts supporting these findings as set forth in the  
3 staff report.

4 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: We need a second.

5 COMMISSIONER FEWINS: Commissioner Fewins  
6 seconds.

7 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Okay. I have a first and  
8 a second. Any discussion?

9 Commissioner Carey?

10 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Quick comment, if I may.

11 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Yes.

12 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Although I don't agree  
13 with the proposed land uses, I do concur with staff's  
14 recommendation. I find that this is a logical extension  
15 of the City limits. I believe, it is also contiguous.  
16 I see no need to disagree with the recommendation of  
17 staff on this one. Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Appreciate that.

19 Okay. All in favor?

20 (Commission members said "aye.")

21 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Any opposed?

22 Okay. The motion carries.

23 Next, we'll discuss the comprehensive land use  
24 amendment request, which is MK17-0005, public hearing  
25 item. And I will open it. Would anybody like to come

1 up and speak on that?

2 Okay. With that, I'll close the public hearing  
3 and bring it back to the Commission. Any Commissioners  
4 have any comments?

5 Commissioner Carey.

6 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Couple questions for  
7 staff, if I may. With the proposed Comprehensive Plan  
8 amendment, do we have any idea of what the fiscal impact  
9 to the City would be from changing the land use from  
10 Business Park, Employment Center, to single-family and  
11 Commercial?

12 MS. MELBY: The fiscal impact analysis that we  
13 discussed earlier had a net benefit, if I remember the  
14 numbers correctly --

15 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: It's 2.8.

16 MS. MELBY: -- of 2.8 acres.

17 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: \$2.8 million.

18 MS. MELBY: \$2.8 million.

19 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Yes.

20 MS. MELBY: Yes.

21 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Yeah, it was.

22 MR. ORNELAS: Arkansas Ornelas, Assistant  
23 Community Services Director. I think, to more directly  
24 address your question, Commissioner Carey, the fiscal  
25 impact analysis did not ask for repairs and, if you

1 will, of the instant uses to the proposed uses. The  
2 fiscal impact instances for the proposed use and zoning  
3 classification.

4           You know, I would say that with this, something  
5 along the lines of a planned development, where you add  
6 in particular specific uses that's been, you know,  
7 designated and contemplated, it would be, you know, it  
8 would have been probably something that we would have  
9 amended. In this case, we did not do that.

10           COMMISSIONER CAREY: Sometimes it's definitely  
11 the opinion of staff that this side is not suitable for  
12 business park, more suitable for --

13           MR. ORNELAS: Yeah, I mean I would have to  
14 agree with the applicant's contention that given the  
15 compatibility of the site, that the employment center  
16 types of uses at the designation that is on there  
17 contemplates aren't really viable.

18           You know, I would point to the much more  
19 developable and for purposes of employment center are on  
20 the east side of the Pyramid Highway in Kiley Ranch  
21 North and Stonebrook. I think, those are appropriate  
22 locations for that type of use. I think, the market  
23 hasn't been there to date. But I think that that's a  
24 more realistic expectation from that side of the  
25 highway.



1           You know, certainly it's nothing that we can,  
2 any of us can for certain. But I appreciate the  
3 question. But I would, I would agree with the  
4 applicant's contention, again, that this is not a  
5 particularly suitable site for (indistinct).

6           COMMISSIONER CAREY: Okay. I think, I know how  
7 this is going to go. All of it's just in there. Thank  
8 you.

9           CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Commissioners, any other  
10 Commissioners have any questions?

11           Okay. I'll entertain a motion.

12           COMMISSIONER PETERSEN: Madam Chairman, I can  
13 make a motion on this one.

14           CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Commissioner Petersen,  
15 thank you.

16           MS. MCCORMICK: Madam Chair, did you public  
17 hearing on this one?

18           CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: I did.

19           MS. MCCORMICK: Thank you.

20           CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Thank you. You're  
21 training me good. So, thank you. That's okay. We all  
22 are.

23           COMMISSIONER PETERSEN: Commissioner Petersen.  
24 I move to approve the Comprehensive Plan land use  
25 amendment MPA17-0005 associated with PCN16-0050 based on

1 the findings CP1 through CP4 and the facts supporting  
2 these findings as set forth in the staff report.

3 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Can I get a second?

4 COMMISSIONER READ: Commissioner Read. Second.

5 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Thank you. I have a  
6 first and second. Any discussion?

7 Commissioner Carey.

8 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Thank you, Madam Chair.  
9 I'll try to keep this brief.

10 I will not be supporting the motion. I  
11 disagree with the proposed land use change. I think  
12 that this site has been designated as an employment  
13 center for a long time. I agree with that. Past, past  
14 master plan amendments, I would agree with that as well.

15 I believe that, if we're going to really get  
16 serious about meeting our employment goals of the  
17 Comprehensive Plan, we need to stick with our master  
18 plan. We need jobs in the Spanish Springs valley.

19 I think, if we're going to solve the traffic  
20 issues on Pyramid Highway, on Vista, on Sparks  
21 Boulevard, we really need to get serious about keeping  
22 with our master plan and having offices in Sparks.

23 I certainly appreciate staff's opinion of that  
24 this will help meet the housing goals. We have  
25 immediate need for housing. There's no doubt about

1 that. But in the opinion, humble opinion of this  
2 Commissioner, I believe that we need to advance our  
3 employment goals that have been on the books for 30  
4 years.

5 And I will not be supporting the motion. Thank  
6 you very much.

7 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Okay. With that, I'll  
8 call for the vote. All in favor?

9 (Commission members said "aye.")

10 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Opposed?

11 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Nay.

12 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Okay. Thank you. Motion  
13 carries.

14 Next, we'll move along to the rezoning request  
15 RZ17-0006. I will open the public hearing. Is there  
16 anybody that requests, requests to speak?

17 Yes. And if you'll please state your name and  
18 your address again, please. Thank you.

19 MR. BRADLEY PAUL ELLEY: Bradley Paul Elley  
20 again.

21 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Thank you.

22 MR. BRADLEY PAUL ELLEY: I've been a property  
23 owner in Spanish Springs, and my family has, since 1974  
24 when Mr. York sold us the lots that Mr. Harvey  
25 Whittemore had the City of Sparks, basically, put in an

1 enclave of his property. So we had to drive a quarter  
2 mile out to get to the new road.

3 So I say that because I don't know what is  
4 compatible with a development of 6,000-square-foot lots  
5 with adjoining one-third acre and 40-acre and 20-acre  
6 lots. Can anyone please explain that to me? Why is  
7 that compatible? Do you have any idea how small that  
8 is?

9 And modern zoning normally doesn't allow that,  
10 except for senior housing, okay, in my understanding.  
11 But you don't seem concerned about that at all.

12 So, again, my office is getting gored. Thank  
13 you.

14 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Thank you.

15 Anybody else wish to speak?

16 With that, I'll close the public hearing and  
17 bring it back to the Commission. Any questions,  
18 comments?

19 COMMISSIONER FEWINS: Yeah, I have a question  
20 of Karen.

21 MS. MELBY: Yes.

22 COMMISSIONER FEWINS: Karen, I think, a couple  
23 years ago you did a very thorough study on the air,  
24 airplanes that tried to fly with this property. Did you  
25 find that it was loud out there on the approaches and

1 leaving of the airplanes?

2 MS. MELBY: No. The planes that flew over the  
3 site when I was doing the noise study, before they  
4 opened the Granite, that Granite opened their pit there,  
5 was very -- hardly picked up on the noise meter.

6 COMMISSIONER FEWINS: Thank you.

7 MS. MELBY: M-hm (affirmative).

8 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Any other questions?

9 I have a question for clarification, please,  
10 for the gentleman that spoke before, to discuss as far  
11 as density. And then a follow-up with that is our code  
12 regarding ridgeline development and slope development.

13 MS. MELBY: Okay.

14 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Thank you.

15 MS. MELBY: Your first question is in regard to  
16 the property?

17 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: The property, the  
18 proposed property density and why we're -- why we're  
19 proposing it, that it's allowed.

20 COMMISSIONER CAREY: I think, compatibility.

21 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: The compatibility, yes.

22 MS. MELBY: The compatibility.

23 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Thank you.

24 MS. MELBY: Well, the Kiley Ranch project to  
25 the east of this will have actually even smaller than

1 6,000-square-foot lots. Some of the villages have like  
2 4,500-square-foot lots. Typical, a 6,000-square-foot  
3 lot is our typical lot size for residential within the  
4 City of Sparks. So 6,000-square-foot lot is pretty  
5 typical, and that is our most common zoning district  
6 within the City of Sparks if you look at a zoning map.  
7 It is the most common. And, also, most common, I think,  
8 in most of our planned development handbooks, also.

9 So that's why we feel that it's -- it's the  
10 typical lot size within the City of Sparks.

11 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Thank you. The next,  
12 ridgeline development?

13 MS. MELBY: When we do the slope analysis,  
14 we'll have to look at the steep slopes in that area. We  
15 had in the Sparks Municipal Code an identified  
16 ridgeline. And I did look at that map when I was  
17 preparing the staff report. And that is not an  
18 identified ridgeline in the code.

19 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Okay. Thank you.  
20 Appreciate the clarification.

21 Anyone else, questions, comments?

22 Okay. We're going to draw straws here in a  
23 minute, you guys.

24 COMMISSIONER READ: Madam Chair, I'll make a  
25 motion.

1 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Commissioner Read, thank  
2 you.

3 COMMISSIONER READ: I move to forward a  
4 recommendation of approval to City Council for the  
5 rezoning request RZ17-0006 associated with PCN16-0050  
6 based on findings Z1 through Z3 and the facts supporting  
7 these findings as set forth in the staff report.

8 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Can I get a second,  
9 please?

10 COMMISSIONER FEWINS: Yeah, Commissioner Fewins  
11 seconds.

12 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Okay. I have a first and  
13 a second. Any discussion?

14 Commissioner Carey.

15 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Thank you, Madam Chair. I  
16 will be supporting the motion to approve. I know  
17 disagree with the land use change. However, now that  
18 our Comprehensive Plan has been changed, I find that  
19 this rezone is compatible with it. I can meet all the  
20 required findings.

21 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Thank you.

22 With that, all in favor?

23 (Commission members said "aye.")

24 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Any opposed?

25 Okay. Thank you. Motion carries.