



**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:** May 11, 2020

**RE:** **PCN19-0040** – Consideration of and possible action on a request for a Tentative Map for a 460-lot single family residential subdivision on a site approximately 386.87 acres in size located at 555 Highland Ranch Parkway, Sparks, Nevada in the SF-6 (Single-Family Residential – 6,000 sq. ft. minimum lot sizes) zoning district.

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

1 MS. SMITH: Commissioner Read?  
2 CHAIRMAN READ: Aye.  
3 MS. SMITH: Commissioner Petersen?  
4 COMMISSIONER PETERSEN: Aye.  
5 MS. SMITH: Commissioner Blaco?  
6 COMMISSIONER BLACO: Aye.  
7 MS. SMITH: Commissioner Carey?  
8 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Yea.  
9 MS. SMITH: Commissioner Pritsos?  
10 COMMISSIONER PRITSOS: Yea.  
11 MS. SMITH: Commissioner Rawson?  
12 COMMISSIONER RAWSON: Yea.  
13 MS. SMITH: Commissioner VanderWell?  
14 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Aye.  
15 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you. Motion carries  
16 unanimously.  
17 Next, we're going to move on to general  
18 business with PCN19-0040, consideration of and possible  
19 action on a request for a tentative map for a 460-lot  
20 single-family residential subdivision on a site  
21 approximately 386.87 acres in size located at  
22 555 Highland Ranch Parkway, Sparks, Nevada, in the  
23 single-family residential 6,000-square-foot minimum lot  
24 area zoning district.

1 MR. CRITTENDEN: Sorry. Apologize. I'm trying  
2 to make my screens do what they're supposed to do.

3 All right. Chair Read, members of the Planning  
4 Commission, I'm Ian Crittenden, your Development  
5 Services Manager.

6 This is a request for a 460-lot single-family  
7 residential subdivision on 88.3 acres north of Highland  
8 Ranch Parkway and west of Pyramid Way.

9 As a reminder, Planning Commission is a  
10 recommending body for tentative maps. Your  
11 recommendation on this item will be taken to City  
12 Council for final decision.

13 The site, as indicated previously, is this area  
14 outlined in red just north of Highland Ranch Parkway and  
15 west of Pyramid Way.

16 The City entered into a development agreement  
17 in July 2018 for this, this site. And in January of  
18 2020, that development agreement was amended to reflect  
19 changes to the development plan. The development plan  
20 had evolved since initial approval of the development  
21 agreement as the master developer undertook additional  
22 analysis that had substantive impacts on the site access  
23 and provisions of the utilities.

24 The portion of the site included in this

1 tentative map is zoned SF6, which has a minimum lot size  
2 of 6,000 square feet. However, the applicant is  
3 proposing to use the small lot standards permitted by  
4 code in some Villages. The small lot standards allow  
5 smaller lots so long as the density of 7.3 units per  
6 acres is not exceeded. The proposed map meets the small  
7 lot standards and has a density of 5.12 dwelling units  
8 per acre.

9 As you may remember me mentioning in the  
10 previous application, this site does have a  
11 Comprehensive Plan land use density of IDR, or  
12 Intermediate Density Residential.

13 The proposed density of 5.21 dwelling units per  
14 acre is lower than the minimum dwelling units per acre  
15 allowed in IDR, which is 6 units per acre, but conforms  
16 with both the zoning and density limits contained in the  
17 development agreement.

18 The seeming incongruity of the proposed  
19 tentative map using the small lot standards and still  
20 not leaving the minimum density standard for the IDR  
21 land use is due to two reasons. One is the provision of  
22 open space required by the slope standards discussed in  
23 the previous item. And, two, the provision of the  
24 primary access and drainage infrastructure for the

1 entire Five Ridges development within this tentative  
2 map.

3           The agreement permits between 1,200 and 1,800  
4 total units. This tentative map is the first in what is  
5 anticipated to be a series of tentative maps that  
6 combine to form the greater development plan that will  
7 comply with this unit number requirement.

8           A fiscal impact analysis was submitted with the  
9 development agreement that showed an overall positive  
10 fiscal impact to the City associated with this  
11 development. As this tentative map complies with the  
12 land plan that is part of that agreement an update to  
13 the fiscal impact analysis was not required.

14           Access to this map, this tentative map will be  
15 from Highland Ranch Parkway via Five Ridges Parkway, a  
16 reconstruction of the existing aggregate mine access  
17 road. Five Ridges Parkway will travel north to  
18 approximately the center of the site where it will  
19 intercept with Antelope Ridge Parkway, which will turn  
20 west and continue to connect to an existing water tower  
21 access road, in this area here. This connection will  
22 provide secondary access to the site. As stated in the  
23 amended agreement, this secondary access allows the  
24 developer to construct Five Ridges Parkway as a two-lane

1 rather than a four-lane road.

2           The agreement requires the developer to improve  
3 Highland Ranch Parkway and the intersection of Highland  
4 Ranch Parkway with Pyramid Way when certain triggers are  
5 met. The required improvements include the widening of  
6 Highland Ranch Parkway from two to four lanes and  
7 associated capacity improvements at the intersection,  
8 its intersection with Pyramid Way.

9           The improvements are triggered when any of  
10 three triggers are met. Those triggers are: one, a  
11 tentative map request is submitted that will bring the  
12 total number of dwelling units in the development to 650  
13 or more; two, the level of service for Highland Ranch  
14 Parkway degrades below D; or, three, the level of  
15 service for the intersection with Pyramid Way and  
16 Highland Ranch Parkway degrades below E.

17           This tentative map request is the first in Five  
18 Ridges and is only requesting 460 lots, which does not  
19 trip the first trigger. The applicant submitted an  
20 analysis indicating that the tentative map will not  
21 degrade the level of service of Highland Ranch Parkway  
22 or its intersection with Pyramid Way to the levels  
23 specified in the development agreement. The off-site  
24 transportation improvements required by the development

1 agreement are not required for this tentative map.

2           There are 12 findings associated with tentative  
3 maps. The proposed tentative map complies with the  
4 density -- the is the first one. T1 is in conformance  
5 with the Comprehensive Plan and zoning. And the  
6 proposed tentative map complies with the density  
7 standards for the zoning ordinance and the development  
8 agreement. The Comprehensive Plan land use designation  
9 for the site is IDR, which requires 6 to 8 units per  
10 acre. And the SF zoning district for the site has a  
11 maximum density of 7.3 units per acre.

12           As proposed, this map would provide a density  
13 of 5.12 units per acre. This is lower than the minimum  
14 6 units per acre of the Comprehensive Plan. However,  
15 NRS 278.349.1.E clearly states that where there is a  
16 conflict between existing zoning and the Comprehensive  
17 Plan, that the zoning takes precedence in the case of  
18 tentative maps. The design of this site complies with  
19 the design standards for the SF6 zoning district by  
20 utilizing the small lot development standards.

21           In addition, this map supports Comp Plan Goal  
22 H2 to promote a strong diverse housing market that  
23 supports economic growth and vitality while ensuring  
24 environmental and fiscal sustainability; Policy H1,

1 which is to ensure sufficient appropriately zoned areas  
2 that have access to infrastructure and public  
3 facilities; Policy C4, which requires sidewalks for  
4 pedestrians on all street networks within the City; and  
5 Policy CF1, which requires that City services be  
6 provided at acceptable levels.

7           The Findings T2 and T7 -- and if I hadn't  
8 mentioned this before, I have tried to group these  
9 findings into groups of general impact and category.  
10 And so they are a little out of order. And if there's  
11 any confusion, please let me know.

12           So Findings T2 and T7 have impacts on streets.  
13 The proposed development will have access from Highland  
14 Ranch Parkway. Trip generation for this tentative map  
15 is estimated at 4,379 average daily trips, with 460  
16 peak-hour trips. Street improvements necessary to serve  
17 this development will be installed after the triggers  
18 contained in the development agreement are met. Those  
19 triggers have not been met at this time. And the  
20 existing street network that serve this site is  
21 sufficient to meet the needs of this request.

22           Findings T3 and T9 require consideration of  
23 outside agencies that regulate environmental health  
24 concerns be addressed, as well as other outside



1 agencies. Staff received comments from Washoe County  
2 School District, Washoe County Health District, Regional  
3 Transportation Commission, and Nevada Department of  
4 Transportation. The Washoe County Health District did  
5 not have the comment specific to this site. They did  
6 provide us a comment letter, but it had their general  
7 comments related to new residential development.  
8 Compliance with the requirements of these outside  
9 agencies is required by Condition 4.

10 Finding T4 and T5 require the consideration of  
11 available water and sewer. The applicant has estimated  
12 that 155.58 acre-feet of water per year will be needed.  
13 The water rights needed to service this project will be  
14 supplied by the Sun Valley General Improvement District,  
15 or the Sun Valley GID, and must be in place in -- must  
16 be in place or rededicated with the final map.

17 According to the development agreement, the  
18 availability of municipal water for this development is  
19 contingent upon the Sun Valley GID and the City entering  
20 into an agreement to allow the Sun Valley GID to locate  
21 its water utility infrastructure within City  
22 right-of-ways. That agreement must be approved by the  
23 City and the Sun Valley GID prior to approval of a final  
24 map.

1           The applicant has estimated the average daily  
2 sewer flow for this development to be 414,000 gallons.  
3 The City sewer model shows sufficient capacity for this  
4 development.

5           Findings T6 and T10 consider the availability  
6 of public services. Police and fire protection will be  
7 provided by the City of Sparks. This site is not within  
8 the four-minute travel time standard for Sparks Fire.  
9 All homes will have to be sprinkled. This requirement  
10 may be eliminated if the master developer can  
11 demonstrate to the approval of the Fire Chief that the  
12 dwelling units are within a four-minute travel time.  
13 That was probably only accomplishable through the  
14 construction of a new fire station, but it is the way  
15 we've written that condition.

16           The development of the site will have an impact  
17 on Washoe County public schools. In a letter received  
18 from the Washoe County School District, it is estimated  
19 that the development will add 96 new students to Hall  
20 Elementary, 41 to Shaw Middle School, and 44 to the  
21 Spanish Springs High School. Spanish Springs High  
22 School is over capacity, but the new Hug High School is  
23 anticipated to provide relief to this school.

24           Findings T8 through T12, or T8 and T11 are

1 other impacts, plus T12 is noticing. The previous item  
2 addressed the slopes, hilltops and ridges requirements  
3 for this site. And there are no floodplains on this  
4 site.

5 The other identified impacts that were  
6 determined by staff were landscaping and architecture.  
7 Landscaping and architecture for this tentative map will  
8 be subject to the standards in the Sparks Municipal  
9 Code, as well as conditions 11, 12 and 16 of the  
10 conditional use permit previously approved, CU20-0005.

11 Finding T12 requires proper notice and that a  
12 meeting be held. Notice for tentative maps is  
13 accomplished per posting of the agenda. And the  
14 Planning Commission and City Council meetings fulfill  
15 the meeting requirement.

16 Staff believes that the findings can be made  
17 and is recommending that the Planning Commission forward  
18 a recommendation of approval to the City Council.

19 That is the end of my presentation. I'd be  
20 happy to answer any questions. The applicant's  
21 representative, Mike Railey, is also here if you have  
22 questions for him.

23 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you, Ian.

24 Do any of the Commissions have questions for

1 staff? Just raise your hand.

2 No questions for staff. Oh, Commissioner  
3 Pritsos.

4 COMMISSIONER PRITSOS: Thank you, Chair Read.

5 Ian, one quick question. I know that Washoe  
6 County schools said that they were expecting Procter Hug  
7 to offer relief, but did they give specifics, or did  
8 they just generally say it would give relief?

9 MR. CRITTENDEN: I'm looking at their letter.  
10 Give me one moment to see exactly what they say. I  
11 don't believe they gave an anticipated value, but let me  
12 double-check that.

13 They do not give a value for how much of an  
14 impact they believe it will have, but they do indicate  
15 that they do believe it is have an impact on crowding at  
16 Spanish Springs High School.

17 COMMISSIONER PRITSOS: Okay. Thank you.

18 MR. CRITTENDEN: You're welcome.

19 CHAIRMAN READ: Any other questions for staff?

20 All right. Can we unmute the applicant rep to  
21 give them the opportunity to address any other questions  
22 or any other statements they'd like to make?

23 MS. MARTINEZ: They are unmuted.

24 MR. MIKE RAILEY: Good evening. Mike Railey,

1 for the record, Christy Corporation, representing Five  
2 Ridges Development Company and QK, LLC.

3 I think, once again, I think, Ian did a  
4 fantastic job of giving an overview of the project. We  
5 are in agreement with the conditions. And, I think, the  
6 comments that I made previously under the conditional  
7 use permit item are relevant to this request as well.

8 So I don't have any additional comments at this  
9 time, but we're happy to address any questions that you  
10 may have.

11 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

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

14 Commissioner Carey.

15 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Thank you, Madam Chair.

16 Question for the applicant. The density with  
17 this proposed tentative map seems to be lower than what  
18 is, what the land use that you had requested for on this  
19 site. Do you anticipate transferring additional units  
20 in the future with other tentative maps that are coming,  
21 to get to the intended density with the land use on this  
22 site?

23 MR. MIKE RAILEY: Yeah. Once again, Mike  
24 Railey, for the record.

1           This is just the first tentative map in what  
2 would be a series of tentative maps. So the development  
3 agreement actually mandates that we have a minimum of  
4 1,200 units. So you'll see that density increase as the  
5 additional tentative maps are brought on line.

6           COMMISSIONER CAREY: A follow-up, if I may,  
7 Madam Chair.

8           CHAIRMAN READ: Of course.

9           COMMISSIONER CAREY: With the minimum amount of  
10 units in the -- those are constructed as the minimum  
11 amount in the development agreement. What would the  
12 density of the overall site be? I think, it's something  
13 like 1,200 units is the minimum in the development  
14 agreement. What would be the overall density be with  
15 just 1,200 units? And what would it be with the maximum  
16 that's allowed in the development agreement?

17           MR. MIKE RAILEY: Commissioner Carey, just to  
18 run the numbers real quick, at 1,200 units, it's just  
19 over 3 units per acre. And at 1,800 units, it is about  
20 4.7 units per acre.

21           COMMISSIONER CAREY: Okay. Thank you.

22           CHAIRMAN READ: Any other questions, comments?

23           Thank you.

24           Any other further discussion by the Commission,

1 or I'll entertain -- go ahead, Commissioner Carey.

2 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Story, Madam Chair. I did  
3 have a question for staff concerning one of the  
4 conditions, Condition Number 15 and Fire Station  
5 Number 6.

6 My question is, first question is, is how will  
7 Condition Number 15 regarding the four-minute response  
8 time be reviewed and enforced by staff?

9 MR. CRITTENDEN: Just a moment. Let me, I was  
10 just pulling up the Conditions of Approval in front of  
11 me so that I can look at that.

12 Okay. 15. Apologies. I've opened the wrong  
13 set of conditions. Sorry. Hold on one moment. I  
14 apologize.

15 MS. SMITH: Chair Read, I believe, Mr. Ornelas  
16 has something to add.

17 CHAIRMAN READ: Oh. Sorry. Go ahead,  
18 Mr. Ornelas.

19 MR. ORNELAS: Thank you, Chairwoman Read.  
20 Armando Ornelas, Assistant Community Services Director,  
21 while Mr. Crittenden looks for the conditions.

22 With regard to condition 15 essentially, if at  
23 the time of building permit, you know, Fire Station 6 is  
24 not in place, then the units would have to be sprinkled.

1 We would anticipate that to be the case. But, you know,  
2 there is that, that just allows for the possibility that  
3 were Fire Station 6 to be moved forward before they were  
4 looking to pull building permits on these homes, that  
5 then we could look at it otherwise.

6 Does that answer your question, Commissioner  
7 Carey?

8 COMMISSIONER CAREY: I think, it does. Thank  
9 you.

10 My other question is concerning Fire Station  
11 Number 6 in general. Do we have any idea of when that  
12 would be, maybe come online and where we're at? I know  
13 I've been on the Commission for four years, and we still  
14 collect the impact fees, and a lot of money's been set  
15 aside. And I'm just curious where we're at in terms of  
16 Fire Station Number 6 and fire service in this area.

17 MR. ORNELAS: So we are -- again, Assistant  
18 Community Services Director Armando Ornelas.

19 We are looking at or starting the preliminary  
20 design process for Fire Station 6. We have not  
21 identified a specific site yet, although we believe it  
22 would be, you know, east of the Pyramid Highway.

23 In terms of the timing for that, we don't have  
24 the -- you know, we have not collected enough fees yet



1 to construct that station. So I can't give you a time  
2 table for Fire Station 6 at this point.

3 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Fair enough. Thank you  
4 for that explanation.

5 I don't have any other questions, Madam Chair.

6 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

7 Do any of the Commissioners have any further  
8 questions?

9 Ian, go ahead.

10 MR. CRITTENDEN: Oh, I just wanted to add a  
11 fine tad onto what Armando had mentioned about the  
12 Condition 15. The way this condition is written as  
13 well, it avoids the requirements to amend the tentative  
14 map conditions if Fire Station 6 is constructed prior to  
15 these units all being constructed. If the condition was  
16 written such as that it just said they all had to have  
17 fire suppression, even if Fire Station 6 was built and  
18 they had a four-minute response time, they'd still  
19 require fire suppression systems unless this condition  
20 was amended.

21 So that was a request by the applicant, but it  
22 made a lot of sense to staff as well, rather than  
23 running this back to the mill, so to speak, if that was  
24 necessary.

1           The other thing that I failed to mention during  
2 my presentation that I feel is important to mention is  
3 there was an amendment to Condition Number 12 that  
4 should have been made available to the Planning  
5 Commission and the public in general.

6           We had written a condition basically requiring  
7 the dedication of open common areas to the HOA and LMA  
8 prior to recordation of a final map. That's kind of  
9 impossible. It needs to happen with a final map. But  
10 staff had just wrote that incorrectly. A lot of the  
11 other conditions get written that way, and I must have  
12 been in autopilot and wrote it that way. And it just  
13 didn't make any sense. And so we amended that after the  
14 applicant caught it and said we don't know how we  
15 dedicate those prior to a final map. And so we changed  
16 it to reflect that just with the final map, we want  
17 those things dedicated.

18           CHAIRMAN READ: Okay. Thank you.

19           Any further discussion, questions?

20           Are we ready? I'll entertain a motion.

21           COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Madam Chair,  
22 Commissioner VanderWell.

23           CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

24           COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: I move to forward to

1 City Council a recommendation of approval of the  
2 tentative map associated with PCN19-0040 for a 460-lot  
3 single-family subdivision on a site 88.3 acres in size  
4 located in the SF6 zoning district, adopting Findings T1  
5 through T12 and the facts supporting these findings as  
6 set forth in the staff report, and subject to Conditions  
7 of Approval 1 through 16.

8 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

9 We have a first. Do we have a second?

10 COMMISSIONER BLACO: Commissioner Blaco. I  
11 will second that.

12 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

13 Any other comments by the Commission before we  
14 call for a vote?

15 Commissioner Carey.

16 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Thank you, Madam Chair.  
17 Just a couple comments before the roll call vote.

18 I could certainly appreciate the applicant and  
19 the commitments stated on the record to meet the minimum  
20 density standards within this development and to get  
21 closer to what the intended density is for the land use  
22 on this site. However, with respect to this tentative  
23 map, I'm really concerned about the low-density nature  
24 of this, of this product. And I'm having a really hard

1 time making Finding T1.

2           Because this proposed tentative map does not  
3 meet the density requirements, I'm really concerned  
4 about the impact that that's going to have on our  
5 existing Impact Fee Service Area Number 1 program and,  
6 you know, the shift of the cost burden on the other  
7 users of IFSA Number 1 and the City taxpayers.

8           And as the Commission well knows, and we'll  
9 probably get into this at our next meeting, you know,  
10 the purpose of this program is so that everyone pays a  
11 proportional share based on the units that are created  
12 from development. It's based on our master plan land  
13 uses and those densities that are called out.

14           I'm afraid, with the low density of this  
15 tentative map, we're going to come up short and we're  
16 not going to have enough money to meet the required  
17 infrastructure that's needed to serve not only this  
18 development, but other parts of Impact Fee Service Area  
19 Number 1. I'm really concerned about the impacts of  
20 lower density and collecting those fees needed for  
21 roadway improvements, fire protection, parks, and the  
22 infrastructure, other infrastructure needed.

23           I hope that the Commission and the staff will  
24 understand how important, you know, density and land

1 uses are with respect to our Impact Fee Service Area  
2 Number 1 program.

3 I had similar concerns with another tentative  
4 map that had a lower density than what the land use  
5 called out for in January, and I was not able to support  
6 that project. And I'm not able to support this project  
7 tonight and make this in this finding.

8 I hope that I'm proved wrong. I have no reason  
9 to suspect that the applicant won't transfer additional  
10 units throughout this development and get closer and  
11 meets that density. But I just don't want to come up  
12 short in meeting the impact fees that are collected,  
13 needed to serve this development and the rest of the  
14 City. And I really, and I can't make the Finding T1.  
15 And I will not be supporting the motion.

16 Thank you, Madam Chair.

17 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you, Commissioner Carey.

18 Any other comments, questions?

19 Okay. Madam secretary, can we -- we have a  
20 motion and a second. Can we please do a roll call vote?

21 MS. SMITH: Commissioner Read?

22 CHAIRMAN READ: Aye.

23 MS. SMITH: Commissioner Petersen?

24 COMMISSIONER PETERSEN: Yea.

1 MS. SMITH: Commissioner Blaco?

2 COMMISSIONER BLACO: Yea.

3 MS. SMITH: Was that a yea, Commissioner Blaco?

4 I'm sorry.

5 COMMISSIONER BLACO: Yes.

6 MS. SMITH: Okay. I'm sorry.

7 Commissioner Carey?

8 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Nay.

9 MS. SMITH: Commissioner Pritsos?

10 COMMISSIONER PRITSOS: Yea.

11 MS. SMITH: Commissioner Rawson?

12 COMMISSIONER RAWSON: Yea.

13 MS. SMITH: Commissioner VanderWell?

14 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Yes.

15 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you. Motion passes with  
16 one vote against. Thank you, staff.

17 Next is consideration of and possible action on  
18 the City of Sparks Annual Report for 2019 to the Truckee  
19 Meadows Regional Planning Agency.

20 MR. RUNDLE: Thank you, Chairwoman Read. Jim  
21 Rundle, Planning Manager, here again this year to  
22 present the annual report for the City of Sparks.

23 The NRS requires that each local planning  
24 jurisdiction prepare an annual report for submission to