



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

To: Mayor and City Council

From: Casey Martinez, Acting Administrative Secretary

Subject: Report of Sparks Planning Commission Action

Date: January 22, 2021

RE: **PCN19-0040** – Consideration of and possible action on a request for a Tentative Map for an 86-lot townhome subdivision on a site approximately 6.14 acres in size within a larger parcel approximately 386.9 acres in size located at 555 Highland Ranch Parkway, Sparks, Nevada, in the MF-2 (Multi-Family Residential) zoning district. (For Possible Action)

Please see the attached excerpt from the January 7, 2021 Planning Commission meeting transcript.

1 unanimously. Thank you, Sienna.

2 And you're up next again. We are starting
3 general business with PCN19-0040, consideration of and
4 possible action on a request for a tentative map for an
5 86-lot townhome subdivision on a site approximately 6.14
6 acres in size within a larger parcel approximately 386.9
7 acres in size located at 555 Highland Ranch Parkway in
8 Sparks, in the multi-family residential zoning district.

9 MS. REID: All right. Well, thank you again,
10 Chair Read and Planning Commission members. Sienna Reid
11 from Planning to present this item, which is a tentative
12 map request for Five Ridges Village 1A.

13 And just to confirm, you can see a slide that
14 does have that project noted on it?

15 CHAIRMAN READ: We can.

16 MS. REID: Perfect. All right. So this is the
17 exact same project site as the major deviation request
18 that was just considered. So we have Village 1A
19 outlined here in red, with the greater Five Ridges
20 project being outlined in blue.

21 The Five Ridges project site, which includes
22 Village 1A, is subject to a development agreement
23 between the City of Sparks, the property owner, which is
24 QK, LLC, and the developer, which is 5 Ridges
25 Development Company. And that development agreement was

1 initially approved in 2018 and recently amended in
2 November of 2020.

3 That approved development agreement permits a
4 minimum of 1,200 and a maximum of 1,800 residential
5 units across that greater Five Ridges project site that
6 was outlined in blue on the previous slide.

7 And so, on this slide, what you can see is the
8 conceptual land plan for Five Ridges. Single-family,
9 duplex and townhome units, those are all identified as
10 permitted residential uses, consistent with the adopted
11 zoning districts.

12 And in terms of, you know, development
13 entitlements that have moved forward since the adoption
14 of the development agreement and what we've seen has
15 been in May of 2020 we had the approval of the first
16 tentative map for Five Ridges. That included 460 lots
17 in a single-family subdivision that encompassed
18 Villages 2, 3, 4, 6 and 7, which, I know, are a little
19 hard to see here, so I'm just going to note that they
20 are the orange, yellow and blue areas generally in the
21 center of the Five Ridges project site.

22 And also in May of last year, the City Council
23 upheld the Planning Commission's decision on appeal to
24 approve a conditional use permit for development on
25 slopes, hilltops and ridges. That geographic boundary

1 for the CUP disturbance area, it extended beyond the
2 villages that were approved for that tentative map
3 request, to allow for disturbance within all or portions
4 of Villages 1A and 1B, which are at the entrance of the
5 Five Ridges project site closest to Highland Ranch
6 Parkway, as well as Villages 8, 9 and 10, which are
7 along the northern and northwest portions of the site.

8 So, if approved, the Village 1A tentative map
9 request before you tonight, which consists of 86
10 townhome lots, would increase the number of lots, with
11 tentative map approval for Five Ridges, from 460 to a
12 total of 546.

13 As I just mentioned, the Village 1A tentative
14 map consists of 86 townhome lots. The project site,
15 again, is 6.41 acres in size. And the lots are ranging
16 between 699 to 1,226 square feet in size. The lots
17 align to the building footprints. And so we have a
18 fairly large common area surrounding those building
19 footprint parcels totaling 5.62 acres for that common
20 area.

21 The gross density of the project is 14 dwelling
22 units per acre. That complies with both the
23 Multi-Family Residential 14 Comprehensive Plan land use
24 designation, as well as the MF2 zoning district that are
25 applicable to the subject site.

1 This slide gives you a sense of the subdivision
2 design. It's the landscape plan, but with the colors it
3 makes it a little bit easier to see.

4 So, as proposed, the lots are arranged to
5 enable a series of five-, six- and seven-unit townhome
6 buildings. Access is from the first roundabout on
7 Five Ridges Parkway. And an internal sidewalk network
8 consisting of Paseo and perimeter sidewalks connects to
9 the Five Ridges Parkway sidewalk system. As proposed,
10 the internal streets would be private with this
11 particular request.

12 And in terms of design, the subdivision is
13 designed to meet MF2 zoning district standards that
14 allow for sites with multiple lots and a common
15 development plan that really shares access and parking
16 and the like, to measure setbacks from the outer
17 boundary and then have a building separation requirement
18 between buildings.

19 This slide gives you a better sense of what
20 those typical building separation setbacks are. The
21 lots would have 19 feet of separation between the
22 primary buildings and seven feet between end unit
23 covered porches.

24 And this design meets the 10-foot building
25 separation standard for two-story main buildings in the

1 MF2 zoning district, and it also complies with our
2 building projection standards and code that allow for
3 projections up to two feet into required setbacks.

4 So what we have in terms of these end unit
5 porches is, basically, a 1.5-foot projection into the
6 required setback. And, again, that effective distance
7 of seven feet between the buildings. And some of them
8 are, like I said, a larger distance, but this would be
9 the smallest.

10 And then, in addition, each of the units has
11 either a porch, a balcony or a deck that are designed to
12 serve that particular property.

13 On this slide, what you can see is the grading
14 plan for the proposed subdivision. Just to give you a
15 sense of what's proposed here -- and my cursor in white
16 is probably blending in just a tiny bit -- but what we
17 have is the grade decreasing from the northwest corner
18 of the project site to the southeast corner of the
19 project site by 70 feet. And so fill will ultimately
20 create a building pad that sits about the same elevation
21 as the Five Ridges Parkway roundabout that provides
22 access to the subdivision. And from Highland Ranch
23 Parkway, that finished grade, in terms of the southwest
24 corner of the subdivision, would be approximately 50
25 feet above Highland Ranch Parkway. And then, when we

1 get southeast corner, it would sit about 65 feet above
2 Highland Ranch Parkway.

3 And while the text is very small, separating
4 the building pad from Highland Ranch is a two-to-one, or
5 50 percent, graded slope. There are retaining walls
6 along lots 41 through 29 here and then also along lots
7 19 through 28 on the eastern side of the project site.

8 And so we have current grading and road
9 vegetation conditions that were approved with that CUP
10 for development on slopes, hilltops and ridges back in
11 May of 2020. Those apply to this site. And they need
12 to be satisfied to the approval of the administrator
13 before a tentative map is recorded, or excuse me, a
14 final map.

15 And so most portions of the subdivision
16 proposed by this tentative map are located within the
17 disturbance area approved with that May 2020 CUP for
18 development on slopes, hilltops and ridges.

19 However, as you can see on this slide, there is
20 a small portion located on the northern portion of the
21 project site that is outside of the approved CUP
22 disturbance area boundary. And that's, in terms of lot
23 numbers, lots 1 through 18, or these northern lots.

24 And so, as conditioned, the existing CUP for
25 development on slopes, hilltops and ridges must be

1 amended to include this area that is outside the
2 Village 1A project site prior to the recordation of any
3 final map.

4 So, if approved, when that amended CUP comes
5 forward, compliance with any new or revised conditions
6 that are applicable to that portion of the disturbance
7 that's outside of the current approved disturbance area,
8 this would need to be, that compliance would need to be
9 demonstrated prior to the recordation of any final map.

10 All right. So really shifting gears here to
11 the findings associated with tentative map requests,
12 there's quite a few of them. So I'll try to be complete
13 and thorough but also move through these.

14 For the most part, what we have are findings
15 that are listed in numerical order, but we do have just
16 one instance where we've grouped some topics together,
17 and that really is for streets, just to try and keep
18 those items logically grouped.

19 So to start off with Finding T1, which is
20 conformance with the Comprehensive Plan, as proposed, we
21 have a tentative map that would allow for 86 townhome
22 lots. And townhomes are commonly classified as missing
23 middle housing that offers home ownership opportunities
24 at lower price points than traditional detached
25 single-family housing.

1 And so incorporating those types of lots into
2 the city, it advances both Policies H1 and H2 related to
3 housing supply and diversity.

4 Looking at Policy C4, we do have an internal
5 sidewalk network that connects to the Five Ridges
6 Parkway system, in compliance with that policy.

7 And City services to the site can be provided
8 at acceptable service levels with the improvements that
9 are outlined in the Five Ridges development agreement,
10 in compliance with Policy CF1.

11 Findings T2 and T7 each relate to the streets.
12 So, as I alluded, we grouped these here. Finding T2
13 first looks at conformance with the City's street master
14 plan. And here access to the proposed subdivision, as
15 discussed, is from the first roundabout on Five Ridges
16 Parkway.

17 Off-site roadway improvements, those must be
18 installed consistent with the development agreement.
19 And just to give you a little bit more detail here, that
20 development agreement requires the widening of Highland
21 Ranch Highland Ranch Parkway from Pyramid Way to the
22 project entrance, as well as improvements to the
23 intersection of Pyramid Way and Highland Ranch upon
24 reaching specific dwelling unit or level of service
25 thresholds. So that's, on the dwelling unit side, 650

1 dwelling units. On the level of service side, that's
2 degradation of Highland Ranch below Level of Service D
3 or degradation of the intersection of Pyramid and
4 Highland below Level of Service E. And that's, in terms
5 of when it happens, it's whichever occurs first, that
6 those improvements need to go in.

7 Finding T7 focuses on impacts to public
8 streets. Trip generation for this tentative map request
9 is estimated at about 500 average daily trips, with 45
10 peak-hour trips. And those trips were included in an
11 updated trip generation letter that analyzed what would
12 be the impact of townhomes rather than commercial uses
13 in Five Ridges Villages 1A and 1-B. And some of you
14 will remember that we went through a Comprehensive Plan
15 amendment and rezoning process earlier this year to
16 evaluate that.

17 And that letter found that the development of
18 Five Ridges, with detached single-family and townhome
19 uses, results in traffic impacts that are less than or
20 similar to the master traffic study that was prepared in
21 2017.

22 However, you know, that letter doesn't evaluate
23 whether construction of the units associated with
24 Village 1A will degrade level of service on Highland
25 Ranch Parkway or its intersection with Pyramid Way below

1 those thresholds that are in the agreement and, thus,
2 trigger the need to start installing these off-site
3 roadway improvements.

4 So we do have a recommended condition, number
5 16, requiring a traffic analysis that evaluates those
6 level of service thresholds. And we get that analysis
7 prior to the recordation of a final map.

8 Additionally, a traffic signal is going to be
9 needed at the intersection of Highland Ranch Parkway and
10 Five Ridges Parkway. And so Condition 17 requires that
11 overhead safety lighting be in place prior to the first
12 certificate of occupancy for a dwelling unit in this
13 project. And then it also requires a traffic signal
14 warrant analysis so that we understand the dwelling unit
15 number at which that signal needs to be activated.

16 So, as conditioned, staff does recommend that
17 the street network serving the site is sufficient to
18 meet the needs of the tentative map request.

19 Moving on to Finding T3, agencies that regulate
20 environmental impacts didn't provide comments. However,
21 the developer does need to meet local county and state
22 requirements regarding environmental impacts.

23 Finding T4 focuses on the availability of
24 water. Here the domestic water requirement is about
25 15.5 acre-feet per year, and municipal water is going to

1 be provided by the Sun Valley General Improvement
2 District.

3 Finding T5 looks at the availability of
4 utilities to serve the site. Here we have sewer, storm
5 drain capacity. The townhome lots are estimated to
6 generate a bit over 50,000 gallons of sewage per day.
7 And the applicant is required to provide evidence that
8 there's adequate sewer capacity prior to the recordation
9 of the final map and construct sewer capacity
10 improvements consistent with the development agreement,
11 if necessary.

12 And, also, stormwater and drainage, in terms of
13 a final plan there, must be approved prior recording a
14 final map.

15 Finding T6 looks at the availability of
16 schools, police, transportation, and parks.

17 So, first off, for schools, the project site is
18 zoned for Hall Elementary School, Shaw Middle School and
19 Spanish Springs High School. We did get comments from
20 the Washoe County School District indicating that the
21 project will add two new students for each grade level.
22 And Hall Elementary and Shaw Middle are both under
23 capacity and projected to remain so for at least 10
24 years. In terms of Spanish Springs High School, that
25 school is over capacity currently. However, we do have

1 enrollment relief anticipated due to the opening of the
2 new Procter Hug High School, and that would be in the
3 fall of 2022.

4 In terms of service for police, that would be
5 provided by the Sparks Police Department. They didn't
6 express any concerns with the proposal.

7 And then, as previously discussed, roadway
8 network improvements that are needed to accommodate the
9 Five Ridges project, those are identified in the
10 development agreement and will be installed consistent
11 with the thresholds in that agreement.

12 And in regards to parks, there are no community
13 or regional parks planned within the Five Ridges project
14 site.

15 Finding T8 addresses floodplains, slopes and
16 soil. In terms of floodplain, the lots proposed with
17 this tentative map, they do not fall within the 100-year
18 floodplain.

19 For slopes, the existing grade, as was
20 previously presented, does slope downward from northwest
21 to southeast. And then, as previously discussed earlier
22 on in this presentation, we do have fill that will be
23 used to create a building pad at a similar elevation to
24 Five Ridges Parkway, that first roundabout, and that
25 finished grade will be elevated above the current grade

1 of Highland Ranch Parkway.

2 As discussed earlier, an approved CUP for
3 development on slopes, hilltops and ridges does apply to
4 most portions of the site. And, again, we have
5 Condition 18 recommended that that CUP be amended to
6 include the portion of Village 1A that falls outside of
7 the approved CUP disturbance area.

8 Final geotech reports, those are required at
9 the time of final map.

10 And in regards to outside agency responses per
11 Finding T9, we've already discussed the school district
12 comments. RTC provided comments that were aligned with
13 what was in the traffic letter. And then additional
14 comments provided by the Washoe County Community
15 Services Department identified a conceptual alignment
16 for the Sun Valley Rim Trail that would encircle
17 Sun Valley with sections of the trail crossing public
18 lands and other sections crossing private lands. While
19 that proposed trail alignment, as noted in Washoe
20 County's comment letter, it doesn't cross through the
21 Village 1A project site, but it is something that we
22 wanted to forward on as part of the comments that were
23 provided. And we do expect that we'll get future
24 comments when we have those tentative maps proposed in
25 the western portion of the Five Ridges project site.

1 And then Finding 10 asks you to consider the
2 availability of fire protection services. Here this
3 site is located outside the four-minute travel time
4 standard for the Sparks Fire Department. And we have a
5 single point of access that's proposed from the first
6 roundabout of Five Ridges Parkway. While there is
7 emergency access from the western portion of the greater
8 Five Ridges project site, because Village 1A is kind of
9 tucked away in the southeast portion, we actually do
10 only have a single point of access here.

11 And so the fire code requires single-family
12 residential developments with more than 30 units to be
13 served by two prior access roads, unless they are
14 equipped with automatic sprinkler systems. And so we
15 have Condition 16 requiring that the dwelling units in
16 the subdivision do have fire suppression systems. And
17 that condition can't be removed if we do end up with a
18 lesser travel time in the event that a sixth City of
19 Sparks fire station is constructed.

20 Finding T11 here looks to other impacts
21 identified in staff's analysis of the proposal. We've
22 identified landscaping, area maintenance, architecture,
23 fencing and community amenities.

24 Here Condition 12 addresses landscaping with
25 the requirement that we have a landscape maintenance or

1 HOA to maintain those common areas throughout the
2 project.

3 Final architectural elevations, those are
4 required prior to final map.

5 And there is a fencing condition to call your
6 attention to. Staff is recommending Condition 21 to
7 require open view perimeter fencing and that final
8 fenceings, fencing plans be provided at final map.

9 And, also, as outlined in Condition 20,
10 required recreational facilities and their associated
11 operations need to be approved by the administrator also
12 at final map.

13 And finally here, Finding T12 requires that the
14 public be notified that this item has gone through the
15 posting of the agenda for this meeting. And this agenda
16 was posted late, later in December, on the 29th, of
17 2020.

18 So with that, I'll wrap up this presentation
19 from my side. Staff is recommending the Planning
20 Commission forward a recommendation of approval to City
21 Council.

22 And I'm certainly happy to answer any questions
23 that you might have on this tentative map request.

24 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you, Sienna.

25 Do any of the Commissioners have questions for

1 staff?

2 Seeing none, would the applicant rep like to
3 add anything to the presentation?

4 MR. MIKE RAILEY: Can you hear me?

5 CHAIRMAN READ: Yes, we can.

6 MR. MIKE RAILEY: Good evening. Once again,
7 Mike Railey with Christy Corporation representing
8 5 Ridges Development Company.

9 No, I think, Sienna did a very thorough job.
10 We are in agreement with all the conditions and just
11 here to answer any questions you might have.

12 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

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

15 Seeing no questions, I'll entertain a motion.
16 Commissioner West.

17 COMMISSIONER WEST: Okay. I can make all the
18 findings, and I'm ready to provide a motion.

19 I'd move to forward to City Council a recommendation
20 of approval of the tentative map associated with
21 PCN19-0040 for an 86-lot townhome subdivision on a site
22 approximately 6.14 acres in size located in the MF2
23 zoning district, adopting Findings T1 through T12 and
24 the facts supporting these findings as set forth in the
25 staff report, and subject to Conditions of Approval 1

1 through 21.

2 CHAIRMAN READ: I have a motion.

3 COMMISSIONER KRAMER: Second that motion.

4 CHAIRMAN READ: We have a motion by
5 Commissioner West and a second by Commissioner Kramer.
6 Any discussion?

7 Commissioner Pritsos.

8 COMMISSIONER PRITSOS: Thank you, Madam Chair.

9 I just wanted to say, we've talked about this
10 before, but, you know, we are still kind of facing an
11 affordable housing crisis. And I am just very happy to
12 see that we are approving villages like this with a more
13 diverse kind of array of housing options. I think, this
14 is going to be good in the long term for the City. And
15 I will be approving, voting to approve this motion.

16 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you, Commissioner
17 Pritsos.

18 Any other discussion?

19 Can we go -- Commissioner West.

20 COMMISSIONER WEST: I just wanted to thank
21 Sienna and the staff for the thoroughness of the review
22 of this project. And it makes it a lot easier to be
23 able to go through and approve this project.

24 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

25 Anybody else?

1 All right. We have a motion and a second. Can
2 we please have a roll call vote?

3 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Read?

4 CHAIRMAN READ: Aye.

5 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Pritsos?

6 COMMISSIONER PRITSOS: Aye.

7 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Kramer?

8 COMMISSIONER KRAMER: Aye.

9 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Carey?

10 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Aye.

11 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Petersen?

12 COMMISSIONER PETERSEN: Aye.

13 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Rawson?

14 COMMISSIONER RAWSON: Aye.

15 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner West?

16 COMMISSIONER WEST: Aye.

17 CHAIRMAN READ: Great. Motion passes

18 unanimously. Thank you, Sienna.

19 Let's move on to item 9, which is PCN20-0040.

20 Or 44. I'm sorry. PCN20-0044, consideration of and
21 possible action on the request for a tentative map for a
22 73-lot single-family subdivision on a site approximately
23 19.52 acres in size generally located southeast of
24 Pyramid Way and south of La Posada Drive in Sparks, in
25 the New Urban District - Stonebrook zoning district.