



**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: **PCN19-0044** – Consideration of and possible action on a request for a Tentative Map for a 73-lot single-family subdivision on a site approximately 19.52 acres in size generally located southeast of Pyramid Way and south of La Posada Drive, Sparks, Nevada, APN 528-030-21, in the NUD (New Urban District – Stonebrook) zoning district. (For Possible Action)

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

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.

1 MS. REID: Okay. Thank you, Chair Read and
2 Planning Commissioners. Again, for the record, Sienna
3 Reid presenting this item from Planning.

4 Before you is another request for a tentative
5 map. This one is for Phase 3 of Village CC. That site
6 is located in the Stonebrook planned development.

7 And just before I get going, I just want to
8 make sure everyone else can see a Village CC
9 presentation before them?

10 CHAIRMAN READ: Yes.

11 MS. REID: Okay. Perfect. All right. So on
12 this slide, you can see the location of Stonebrook
13 Phase 3 Village CC. That project site project site is
14 outlined in red. The Stonebrook planned development
15 boundary, that is obviously a bit larger, is outlined in
16 blue. And so Village CC really sits generally in the
17 center of the Stonebrook planned development.

18 The proposed tentative map that has been
19 presented for your consideration consists of 73 detached
20 single-family lots. That would be on 19.52 acres, with
21 lots ranging in size from approximately 7,081 to 2,686
22 square feet in size. And in terms of gross density,
23 this project is 3.7 dwelling units per acre.

24 This slide shows the preliminary landscape
25 plan, gives you a sense of how Phase 3, Village CC is

1 laid out.

2 So, as proposed, we have access to the
3 subdivision from two intersections with Oppio Ranch
4 Parkway. And the subdivision is designed to meet the
5 single-family LDR residential standards in the
6 Stonebrook handbook. Those require interior lots be a
7 minimum of 6,000 square feet in size and corner lots be
8 6,500 square feet in size.

9 The entitlement, which, as you can seen
10 encircled in red, is designated single-family LDR in the
11 handbook. And as you can see, on the left-hand portion
12 of the slide, while we have a single designation in the
13 handbook, we have two designations in the Comprehensive
14 Plan land use map. And so what we have is, for the
15 Comprehensive Plan, the site predominantly being
16 designated low-density residential. But that eastern
17 corner of the site, that totals 0.77 acres in size, it's
18 designated open space. And so, to comply with that
19 designation, there's an undeveloped common area parcel
20 in that eastern corner.

21 From a density range perspective, the LDR
22 Comprehensive Plan land use category specifies a density
23 range between three and six dwelling units per acre.
24 So, as I previously mentioned, 3.7 dwelling units per
25 acre, this tentative map request is consistent with the

1 density range in the Comprehensive Plan land use.

2 In terms of evaluating this request, we have 12
3 findings to move into here for your consideration. And,
4 again, we've tried to keep them in numerical order to
5 the greatest extent possible, with some small
6 exceptions.

7 And starting off with Finding T1, here we have
8 conformance with the Comprehensive Plan.

9 What we have in this subdivision are 73
10 detached single-family lots. And those would provide
11 additional housing units in Sparks. And that does
12 support the production of new housing and advance
13 Policy H1.

14 For Policy CC8, this policy encourages
15 neighborhood diversity with varied lot sizes as well as
16 a mix of professional styles, materials and colors.

17 And so, in support of this policy, we have
18 future home designs that must comply with the
19 architectural standards in the handbook that address
20 varied building styles, color and material. And those
21 would ultimately be reviewed at final map.

22 Looking at Policy C4, we have sidewalks that
23 are proposed on both sides of the street per the
24 handbook. And that definitely complies with that
25 policy. And City services can be provided at acceptable

1 levels. Those were previously evaluated with the
2 handbook approval.

3 Here on this slide, we have, again, grouped
4 Findings T2 and T7, each relating to streets.

5 On conformance with the City's master plan for
6 streets, project access is provided, as planned, from
7 Oppio Ranch Parkway. That's consistent with the
8 handbook approval also.

9 And then, for Finding T7, impacts to public
10 streets. To help us evaluate that, there was an updated
11 trip generation letter that was provided. It analyzed
12 single-family lots in this subdivision as well as the
13 remaining single-family villages in Stonebrook in
14 relation to the master traffic study that was initially
15 prepared for Stonebrook.

16 And the letter finds that trips associated with
17 this tentative map, the remaining single-family lots
18 will be comparable to single-family units analyzed in
19 the master traffic study and indicates that adequate
20 capacity exists to accommodate the 73 lots proposed as
21 part of this request, as well as those remaining units.

22 So, ultimately, the comment letter, or the RTC
23 provided a comment letter that took a look at this trip
24 generation letter as well, and they determined that it
25 won't have a detrimental impact to traffic circulation

1 or increased trips associated with single-family
2 residential development and both the level that was
3 analyzed in that initial master traffic study.

4 Looking here on this slide at Finding T3, we
5 have laws that regulate environmental impacts, not
6 providing comments, but, again, requirements that local
7 county and state requirements have to be met.

8 In terms of Finding T4 and the availability of
9 water to serve the site, domestic water would be
10 provided by TMWA. It's estimated that the tentative map
11 would have a water requirement of 92.18 acre-feet per
12 year.

13 And then Finding T5 here, taking a look at the
14 availability of utilities to serve the site, what we
15 have is an estimate that the lots will generate 25,550
16 gallons of sewage per day. And the applicant is
17 required to provide evidence that there's adequate sewer
18 capacity prior to recording a final map, and the City
19 has accounted for the secure capacity in studies that
20 it's conducted at the handbook approval stage. And also
21 prior to recording a final map, there needs to be a
22 final stormwater and drainage plan for the development.

23 Finding T6 takes a look at availability in
24 terms of schools, police, transportation, and parks.

25 For schools, we have Washoe County comments

1 that project the project will add 16 new units to Bohach
2 Elementary, seven new students to Sky Ranch Middle
3 School, and then seven new students to Spanish Springs
4 High School. So Bohach Elementary is projected to
5 remain under capacity for at least five years. More
6 recently constructed Sky Ranch Middle School is
7 projected to be over capacity in the next five years.
8 And so the options that were noted by the school
9 district to alleviate those higher projected enrollments
10 include adjustments to enrollment boundaries or the
11 construction of additions to the school. And as was
12 noted similarly with the last item, Spanish Springs High
13 School is currently over capacity, but there is
14 anticipated to be enrollment relief in fall of 2022 as
15 the new Hug High School opens.

16 Sparks Fire, or excuse me, Sparks Police, they
17 will be providing police services to the site and did
18 not express any concerns.

19 The roadway network was also discussed
20 previously. It is adequate to accommodate this
21 tentative map.

22 And in terms of parks, those will be provided
23 consistent with the handbook. And that handbook
24 requires a 20-acre community park site that is just on
25 the south side of La Posada. It's north of Village CC.

1 But that would be coming online to serve Stonebrook and
2 a larger area as well.

3 And switching to Finding T8 here, in terms of
4 floodplain, slopes and soil, the lots that we have with
5 this tentative map, they don't fall in the floodplain.
6 The site is predominantly flat, does not trigger any
7 standards for sites that contain significant slopes.
8 And, again, our final geotechnical reports come in at
9 the time of final map. And, ultimately, when you
10 consider all these features together, this particular
11 tentative map request doesn't impact those natural
12 features.

13 And then, in regards to outside agency
14 responses, for Finding T9, here we had the school
15 district, the RTC and Washoe County Health District,
16 they provided comments and were previously discussed.

17 And Finding T10 asks you to consider
18 specifically the availability of fire protection
19 services. Here the project site is located outside the
20 four-minute travel time standard for the Sparks Fire
21 Department. The City does have an automatic aid
22 agreement with Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District.

23 And just to elaborate a little bit more on this
24 point, as this did come up in Study Session, there's
25 also provisions in the Stonebrook handbook that indicate

1 fire sprinklers aren't required for residential units in
2 Stonebrook, and that's because there were specific
3 improvements that have been made or currently exist, and
4 that was basically to be able to move through the site
5 or have Truckee Meadows Fire Protection respond in a
6 more efficient manner.

7 And then Finding T11 looks to other impacts
8 identified in staff's analysis. Here we've identified
9 landscaping, area maintenance, architecture for the
10 residences, fencing and regional trails.

11 Basically, from kind of a standard condition
12 perspective, the landscaping does need to be required by
13 a landscape maintenance association in terms of all of
14 that landscaping in the common areas.

15 The architectural standards are outlined in the
16 handbook. And we review those house plans prior to the
17 approval of each final map.

18 And to address fencing, we just need those
19 final fencing plans at final map.

20 And then, finally, Finding T12 requires the
21 public be notified of this item through the posting of
22 the agenda. And it posted on December 29th.

23 So with that, staff is recommending the
24 Planning Commission forward a recommendation of approval
25 to City Council.

1 And I'm happy to answer any questions that you
2 may have on this particular tentative map. But I'll go
3 ahead and stop my screen share to facilitate that.

4 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you, Sienna.

5 Do any of the Commissions have questions for
6 staff?

7 Commissioner Carey.

8 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Thank you, Madam Chair.

9 And I'm not sure, Sienna, if you can answer
10 this or if the applicant's representative is available.
11 I was looking through the trip generation letter that
12 was submitted with this tentative map, and it projected
13 that there was going to be 36 units less than the
14 maximum units permitted in the handbook that were built.
15 I was just kind of curious where that, you know, 36 less
16 than the maximum, where that number was coming from and
17 if they're not going to -- if they're planning to not
18 build out to the maximum units allowed by the handbook.

19 MS. REID: So that particular trip generation
20 letter did take a look at planned build-out for the
21 remainder of the Stonebrook planned development.

22 And then, also, on page four of the staff
23 report, we also provided a table that gives a sense of
24 what entitlements have come in for Stonebrook in terms
25 of tentative map lots or multi-family units and final

1 map lots.

2 So, you know, we have an estimate from the
3 applicant in terms of that trip generation letter. And
4 certainly I'm sure the applicant's representative can
5 provide more detail as well. But what I wanted to do
6 was just simply note that, you know, that is an
7 estimate. We've tried to give you an accounting of all
8 the tentative map lots that have been improved, as well
9 as the multi-family units, and where they are in terms
10 of the final map lot process.

11 Stonebrook is near in completion in terms of
12 the actual tentative maps. Basically, what's left to
13 come forward is Villages AA and BB. But in terms of
14 final map lots, really there's only one particular area
15 that is completely platted, and that's Phase 1, which
16 was Villages A, B, C and D.

17 So, you know, that, basically, was 14 units
18 under the approved tentative map. And there might be
19 some, you know, small adjustments to the number of final
20 map lots that are ultimately submitted to the City.
21 But, you know, what we have at least projected at this
22 time, based on that information, is 90 percent of the
23 units in Stonebrook that were identified in the max cap
24 for the handbook being realized, which is a very high
25 amount.

1 And, I think, it is important to note that we
2 did emphasize in the staff report there's no minimum
3 amount of units that need to be achieved in the
4 Stonebrook planned development. So, you know, certainly
5 98 percent is quite, quite high. And, but there's some
6 uncertainty in that still in terms of we don't have all
7 the final maps, you know, submitted and before us for
8 review.

9 So certainly I'm sure the applicant's
10 representative can jump in and provide more detail, but
11 I wanted to at least point out those few points.

12 Thank you.

13 COMMISSIONER CAREY: I appreciate that, Sienna.
14 In my experience from being this Commission's
15 representative on the RTC Regional Road Impact Fee
16 Technical Advisory Committee, RRIFTAC, is that it's not
17 uncommon for a handbook to come in, you know, these are
18 the maximum units, and then once you get through with
19 all of the tentative and final mapping, building the
20 roads, parks and schools, you know, that it comes in
21 significantly less.

22 So if you're saying we're going to -- what
23 staff is anticipating with the tentative maps that we
24 have on file today, we may end up, our best projection
25 is that 98 percent of the maximum amount of units would

1 be constructed within Stonebrook?

2 MS. REID: That is correct, yes.

3 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN READ: Before we bring the applicant's
5 rep up, does anybody else have questions for staff, any
6 of the Commissioners?

7 Okay. I see we have the applicant rep. So,
8 Stacie, is there some more information that you wanted
9 to provide regarding Commissioner Carey's question or
10 anything else?

11 MS. STACIE HUGGINS: No, I do want to make
12 sure, can you guys hear me okay?

13 CHAIRMAN READ: We can.

14 MS. STACIE HUGGINS: Okay. Great. So Stacie
15 Huggins with Wood Rodgers, for the record, representing
16 RRW Stonebrook.

17 Commissioner Carey, I think, Sienna answered
18 your question, based on the information that we have,
19 very appropriately. We studied this. We did a count of
20 all the final lots and the pending tentative maps
21 coming. We are at 98 percent. As she said, that's
22 pretty high. And in comparison to other handbooks, it's
23 probably higher than most at their build-out.

24 So, I think, we're pretty close. And while
25 some of those lots might fall off, I don't think that

1 percentage will drop significantly even if those final
2 map numbers change a little bit.

3 Other than that, I think, you know, staff did a
4 great job of summarizing this project, and I really
5 don't have anything else to add. But I am available if
6 you guys have any questions for me specifically.

7 CHAIRMAN READ: All right. Thank you, Stacie.

8 Any questions for --

9 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Stacie -- Sorry, Madam
10 Chair. Just thank you, Stacie, for that, that
11 clarification.

12 MS. STACIE HUGGINS: Sure.

13 CHAIRMAN READ: Okay. If there's no further
14 questions, I will entertain a motion.

15 COMMISSIONER KRAMER: Madam Chair, I will make
16 that motion.

17 CHAIRMAN READ: Go ahead.

18 COMMISSIONER KRAMER: I move to forward to the
19 City Council a recommendation of approval of the
20 tentative map associated with PCN20-0044 for a 73-lot
21 single-family subdivision on a site approximately 19.52
22 acres in size located in the NUD, New Urban
23 District - Stonebrook, zoning district, adopting
24 Findings T1 through T12 and the facts supporting these
25 findings as set forth in the staff report, and subject

1 to Conditions of Approval 1 through 15.

2 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

3 We have a motion.

4 COMMISSIONER RAWSON: I'll second the motion.

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

8 Commissioner Carey.

9 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Yeah, thank you, Madam
10 Chair. I appreciate the information and the
11 clarification on my question regarding density and
12 build-out. I think, that's important to have on the
13 record.

14 I also want to extend my appreciation to staff
15 for that table on page four of the staff report. I
16 found that very helpful in my review for this, for this
17 project and the coming tentative maps.

18 I do remain a little concerned about whether we
19 will achieve the full density that is envisioned in the
20 handbook and whether or not, you know, that the 98
21 percent, that would be really high. And I would love to
22 see that. I remain mostly concerned because I'm a -- if
23 we fall short on the density that's envisioned in the
24 handbook, it's going to have a negative impact on our
25 Impact Fee Service Area Number 1 program. And I know,

1 when I voted against one of the tentative maps we saw
2 last year, I expressed these same concerns. And I hope
3 that I'm proved wrong, but appreciate the information.

4 I will be supporting the motion. Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you.

6 Any other discussion?

7 We have a motion and a second. Can we go ahead
8 and do a roll call vote?

9 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Read?

10 CHAIRMAN READ: Aye.

11 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Pritsos?

12 COMMISSIONER PRITSOS: Aye.

13 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Kramer?

14 COMMISSIONER KRAMER: Aye.

15 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Carey?

16 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Aye.

17 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Petersen?

18 COMMISSIONER PETERSEN: Aye.

19 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner Rawson?

20 COMMISSIONER RAWSON: Aye.

21 MS. MARTINEZ: Commissioner West?

22 COMMISSIONER WEST: Aye.

23 CHAIRMAN READ: Thank you. Motion passes
24 unanimously.

25 Let's go ahead and move on to item 10, which is