



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

**To:** Mayor and City Council

**From:** Marilie Smith, Administrative Secretary

**Subject:** Report of Planning Commission Action

**Date:** November 26, 2018

**RE:** PCN18-0048 - Consideration and possible recommendation to the Sparks City Council of approval of a Tentative Map for a 69-unit, multi-family residential townhome subdivision on a site 7.72 acres in size in the MF2/PUD (Multi-family/Vistas Planned Unit Development) zoning district located at 2255 Los Altos Parkway, Sparks, NV.

Please see the attached excerpt from the November 1, 2018 Planning Commission meeting transcript.

1 COMMISSIONER PETERSEN: I'll second it.

2 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Thank you. I have a  
3 first and a second. Any further comment?

4 Commissioner Carey.

5 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Thank you, Madam Chair.

6 I appreciate the staff bringing this item  
7 before the Commission. It's a little different than  
8 what we normally get.

9 I'm a little concerned about the use of the  
10 orange and the blue myself. But, I think, I'm going to  
11 go with staff on recommendation on this. I think, it is  
12 kind of more of an accent, kind of. Or even though the  
13 orange is there already, I don't think it detracts from  
14 the store. I think, it does make it look a little bit  
15 compatible.

16 So I will be supporting the motion.

17 Thank you, Madam Chair.

18 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Thank you.

19 With that, all in favor?

20 (Commission members said "aye.")

21 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Anyone opposed?

22 Okay. Thank you. Motion carries.

23 Next, we'll move along to general business item  
24 PCN18-0048, consideration and possible recommendation to  
25 the Sparks City Council of approval of a tentative map.

1 MR. CRITTENDEN: Chairman VanderWell, members  
2 of the Planning Commission, I am Ian Crittenden, Senior  
3 Planner.

4 This is a request for approval of a tentative  
5 map for a 69-lot, 69-unit, multi-family residential  
6 townhome subdivision on a site that's 7.72 acres in size  
7 and is located at 2255 Los Altos Parkway.

8 You can see here the site is highlighted in  
9 cyan. It's this slightly triangular piece that abuts  
10 Los Altos at the roundabout here at Los Altos and Vista  
11 Heights Drive. And this site is in the Vista's planned  
12 development. The site is located, again, the site is  
13 located in the Vistas planned development, and the  
14 Vistas Planned Development Handbook was approved in 1988  
15 by special use permit SP19-87-1.

16 The site was rezoned to MF2/PUD, which is  
17 multi-family, in the Vistas planned development, in July  
18 of 2018, in accordance with the development procedures  
19 outlined in the Vistas Planned Development Handbook.  
20 Rezoning of the property was approved in conjunction  
21 with the development agreement. Excuse me. The  
22 development agreement limits the number of units in the  
23 site to a maximum of 75. In addition, pursuant to the  
24 project description in the development agreement, the  
25 units must be attached townhomes.

1           The development agreement also addresses the  
2 infrastructure improvements the developer must  
3 construct, including some that are off-site. And it  
4 requires the site and buildings be constructed in  
5 conformance with the multi-family design standards in  
6 the MF2 zoning district and the design standards of the  
7 Vistas Planning Development Handbook.

8           I'll address the requirements of the  
9 development agreement, in addition to the findings that  
10 are normally covered for a tentative map, throughout my  
11 presentation. I'll call those pieces out.

12           As I stated, the applicant is requesting a  
13 tentative map for 69 townhomes. The proposed  
14 development will have direct access, for this sheet here  
15 from the tentative map. It will have direct access from  
16 Los Altos. Los Altos Parkway was designed to  
17 accommodate the volume of traffic that will be generated  
18 by this development.

19           The streets within the subdivision will be  
20 private. And the homeowners association will be created  
21 to maintain all streets and common areas. The private  
22 ownership and maintenance of the on-site utilities and  
23 common areas is required, is a requirement of the  
24 tentative map. Or the final map. Excuse me.

25           As part of the final map submittal, the

1 developer must provide to the City a report for  
2 The Canyons subdivision that includes the following:

3 An estimate of the costs to maintain, repair,  
4 replace, or restore all privately-owned streets,  
5 sidewalks and utilities within the subdivision;

6 An estimate of the total annual assessment for  
7 the subdivision's property owners that will be necessary  
8 to cover the costs of maintaining, repairing, replacing,  
9 and restores the privately-owned streets, sidewalks, or  
10 utilities;

11 And a plan to provide adequate funding to cover  
12 these costs.

13 That report is subject to City review and  
14 approval prior to recordation of any final map. And the  
15 report must be completed by a person who is registered  
16 to conduct reserve studies pursuant to NRS Chapter 116A.

17 The applicant submitted a traffic analysis.  
18 The traffic analysis is based on the maximum density  
19 permitted in the MF14 land use. We haven't talked about  
20 the zoning so far today, but the MF14 land use is the  
21 Comprehensive Plan land use that underlies that zoning.  
22 And the traffic analysis was based on the maximum number  
23 of units that are available within that land use, which  
24 is 180 units. That's the number they used for that  
25 analysis.

1           That traffic analysis states that 108 townhome  
2 units would generate an average of 627 daily trips, with  
3 48 AM peak-hour trips and 56 PM peak-hour trips. The  
4 development permit, the development agreement permits a  
5 maximum of 75 units. And the applicant is proposing 69  
6 units. Even with the higher number of a 108 units, that  
7 was used for the analysis, the PM peak trips estimate is  
8 lower than 80 peak-hour trips that would trigger the  
9 requirement for a traffic study. While not required,  
10 the developer commissioned and submitted a traffic  
11 analysis to address concerns about the project's traffic  
12 generation.

13           The applicant also submitted with the tentative  
14 map application a letter from Traffic Works. That's the  
15 firm that provided the traffic analysis. And that  
16 letter specifics three recommended off-site traffic  
17 operation and safety improvements that are based on the  
18 traffic analysis. And these improvements are  
19 specifically included in Condition 16 that's been  
20 proposed.

21           And they are construction of a fourth leg for  
22 the roundabout. The existing three legs would be the  
23 two sides of Los Altos and Vista Heights Drive. And  
24 this would be the fourth leg, which would be the  
25 entrance to the subdivision.

1           The second is that the westbound and northbound  
2 site lines be improved. And that is -- it's hard to  
3 tell on this drawing. If you go back to the vicinity  
4 map, west and north would be Vista Heights and  
5 Los Altos. And those, improve those site lines,  
6 basically, will require adjustments to landscaping to  
7 make sure that there's clear views so that people have  
8 the safe ability to see at that intersection.

9           And then third is the addition of pedestrian  
10 flashers -- I'll go right back to that map again -- at  
11 the intersection of Goodwin and Los Altos, the Los Altos  
12 Parkway.

13           I'm now going to start going through the  
14 tentative map findings.

15           Finding T1 requires that the request conform  
16 with the master plan.

17           The proposed tentative map is for a  
18 multi-family townhome subdivision, with 69 lots. This  
19 project would advance Goal H2 and Policy H2 by providing  
20 townhomes, which differ from traditional single-family  
21 or apartment homes, the predominant housing options in  
22 Sparks. Townhomes are a housing product that are  
23 identified in the Truckee Meadows Regional Planning  
24 Agency's 2016 housing study as one of the missing middle  
25 housing types needed in the Truckee Meadows.

1           The tentative map shows sidewalks throughout  
2 the development connecting to the pedestrian structure  
3 along Los Altos Parkway, complying with Policy C4.

4           The infrastructure serving the site, including  
5 roads, water, and sanitary sewer facilities, was  
6 designated to support multi-family development on this,  
7 on this site. And the city sewer model shows sufficient  
8 capacity to serve the 69 proposed townhomes, complying  
9 with Policy CF1.

10           Finding T2 looks for general conformity with  
11 the City's master plan for streets and highways. As  
12 discussed previously, the proposed development will have  
13 access from Los Altos. Traffic associated with this  
14 development of this site for multi-family residences was  
15 considered with the review and approval of the Vistas  
16 Planned Development Handbook in 1988. The tentative map  
17 does not change the traffic patterns or generate trips  
18 exceeding the planned capacity for the surrounding  
19 streets.

20           Finding T3 looks at environmental health laws  
21 and regulations concerning water and air pollution,  
22 disposal of solid waste, facilities to supply water, and  
23 community public sewage disposal.

24           The application was distributed to agencies  
25 that provide basic services and administer environmental



1 and health laws. Washoe County School District and the  
2 Regional Transportation Commission have provided  
3 comments. And the developer will also have to comply  
4 with the requirements of outside agencies with  
5 regulatory authority over tentative maps and final maps  
6 prior to the recordation of a final map.

7 Finding T4 requires the availability of water  
8 which meets applicable health standards and in  
9 sufficient quantity for the reasonable foreseeable needs  
10 of the subdivision to be considered.

11 The developer has estimated the domestic water  
12 requirement for this proposal, proposed development at  
13 18.11 acre-feet per year. The water rights needed to  
14 serve the project must be in place or will be dedicated  
15 with the final map.

16 Finding T5 addresses the availability and  
17 accessibility of utilities being considered.

18 The developer has estimated that sewage flows  
19 for the development will be 8,970 gallons per day. The  
20 City's sewer model shows sufficient capacity to serve  
21 the 69 proposed townhomes, but the applicant will be  
22 required to provide evidence that there is adequate  
23 sewer capacity to serve the project prior to the  
24 recordation of the final map. The stormwater and  
25 drainage plans for the development must be reviewed and

1 approved by the City Engineer prior to recordation of a  
2 final map for the project.

3 Finding T6 is regarding the availability and  
4 accessibility of public services such as schools, police  
5 protection, transportation, recreation and parks.

6 This area is currently zoned for Beasley  
7 Elementary School, Mendive Middle School and Reed High  
8 School. The letter from Washoe County School District  
9 estimates the proposed development will add 3 students  
10 to Beasley elementary, 1 to Mendive Middle School and 1  
11 to Reed High School.

12 Police protection will be provided by the  
13 Sparks Police Department.

14 Addressing transportation concerns, comments  
15 received from the Regional Transportation Commission  
16 recommended that the recommendations of the traffic  
17 study be conditions of approval. That's included in  
18 Condition 16. And the City's Transportation Manager has  
19 reviewed the project and determined that the proposed  
20 road network conforms to the approved Vistas Planned  
21 Development Handbook and is designed to handle the  
22 traffic generated by this project.

23 Fire and emergency medical response will be  
24 provided by the Sparks Fire Department and REMSA. And  
25 this project, the project site is located within the

1 6-minute response time for the Sparks Fire Department.

2 And then utilities will be provided by  
3 NV Energy, both electrical and natural gas.

4 Finding T7 requires that the proposed  
5 subdivision, it requires that we look at the effect of  
6 the proposed subdivision on existing public streets and  
7 the need for new streets or highways to serve the  
8 subdivision.

9 And the traffic analysis anticipates that this  
10 project will generate less than 627 average daily trips,  
11 with an AM peak of less than 48 trips and PM peak-hour  
12 trips of less than 56 trips. The proposed project will  
13 have access from Los Altos Parkway, which was designed  
14 to accommodate multi-family development on the site.

15 The traffic analysis concludes that  
16 project-generated traffic volumes are not expected to  
17 degrade operations of Los Altos Parkway to unacceptable  
18 levels or create any significant traffic impacts. The  
19 City's Transportation Manager concurs with these  
20 conclusions.

21 And the project's internal streets will be  
22 owned and maintained by the HOA.

23 Finding T8 looks at the physical  
24 characteristics of the land such as floodplain, slope,  
25 and soil.

1           The site is in the FEMA Zone X, which is  
2 outside the 100-year floodplain.

3           And then slope of the site, I'm going to go to  
4 the slope map. This is the slope map, this map. So the  
5 slopes on the site do trigger the application of the  
6 Slopes, Hilltops and Ridges requirements of the Sparks  
7 Municipal Code. That's Section 20.04.011. The maximum  
8 allowed disturbed area, based on the applicant's slope  
9 analysis, is 6.69 acres. The applicant is proposing to  
10 disturb 6.64 acres, leaving 1.08 acres undisturbed.

11 This degree of disturbance complies with section  
12 20.04.011 of the Sparks Municipal Code. And the site  
13 does not contain any protected hilltops or ridgelines.

14           And then, finally, for Finding T8, we talk  
15 about soils. A final geotechnical report will be  
16 required prior to the issuance of any building permits.  
17 And any recommendations of that report shall be  
18 incorporated into the design for the building permits.

19           Finding T9 requires that the recommendations  
20 and comments of those entities reviewing the tentative  
21 map to be considered.

22           As I mentioned previously, we received comments  
23 from Washoe County Schools and Regional Transportation  
24 Commission. Those have been, those comments have been  
25 addressed already.

1 Finding T10, the availability and accessibility  
2 of fire protection. This fire protection will be  
3 provided by the Sparks Fire Department. And this site  
4 is within the 6-minute response time.

5 Finding T11 is that other identified impacts be  
6 addressed. Those identified impacts were that the  
7 development agreement requirements be met. And this  
8 project is subject to all limitations and requirements  
9 of the development agreement.

10 I will go through those quickly, specifically  
11 what those requirements are.

12 One is the limited number of units; 75 units is  
13 the maximum number per the development agreement. The  
14 applicant is proposing 69 units.

15 The second one is the permitted unit types,  
16 that specifically wanted it to attach townhomes by the  
17 development agreement.

18 They also are limited to a maximum of 10  
19 dwelling units per acre. At 7.72 acres and 69 units,  
20 that's a density of 8.9 units per acre. So they're  
21 underneath that maximum density.

22 And then also was a minimum reservation of open  
23 space of 1.54 acres.

24 Which takes us to the next addressed identified  
25 impact, which is landscaping. As I stated, the

1 development agreement does require a minimum of 1.54  
2 acres of open space. That is equivalent to 20 percent  
3 of the site. And the preliminary landscape plan  
4 indicates that 1.74 acres will be landscaped as commonly  
5 owned open space areas, which satisfies this  
6 requirement.

7           Landscaping within the project will be  
8 regulated by the standards for MF2 zoning district, as  
9 well as the Sparks Municipal Code Section 20.04.006,  
10 which is landscaping and screening.

11           The tentative map includes conceptual plans for  
12 common, pedestrian, and street areas, including areas  
13 along Los Altos Parkway. Common areas within the  
14 development will be maintained by the HOA. And a  
15 condition of the tentative map requires that final  
16 landscape plans be submitted with the final map and be  
17 approved prior to the recordation of that final map.

18           And then, finally under Finding T11 is  
19 architecture. The design standards for the MF2 zoning  
20 district govern the architecture for this project.

21           And then the last finding is Finding T12. And  
22 that is in regards to public notice. Public notice for  
23 tentative maps is accomplished through the posting of  
24 the agenda for a public meeting. A specific request for  
25 notice was made at a Planning Commission meeting during

1 the rezoning process for this site. And a copy of the  
2 agenda for the meeting was mailed to that individual on  
3 October 24th. The Planning Commission and City Council  
4 meetings function as the public meetings for this item.

5 In addition to that report and those findings,  
6 there were some concerns that came up through public  
7 comment and at the Study Session of the Planning  
8 Commission. And I wanted to make sure I went through  
9 and addressed those things the best I can.

10 Slope, disturbed area was brought up at that.  
11 As I mentioned previously, 6.69 acres are permitted to  
12 be disturbed, and 6.64 acres are being proposed to be  
13 disturbed. So they meet that requirement.

14 There was a specific question about the  
15 separation distance between the nearest townhome parcel.  
16 This is actually the parcel line that's being proposed.  
17 That's not necessarily the entire building envelope for  
18 that -- or not necessarily. The corner of that  
19 envelope, or the corner of that parcel is not  
20 necessarily the corner of the building. But that's what  
21 we have right now. And that distance from that corner  
22 to the adjacent house is 60 feet per by the scale. It's  
23 20 feet from the adjacent property, to the adjacent  
24 property line, which is the required setback for  
25 multi-family.

1           There were questions regarding blasting.  
2 Blasting permits are issued by the fire department, the  
3 Sparks Fire Department. They use accepted national  
4 standards for blasting as part of that review process.

5           If there are specific questions from the public  
6 about specific requirements related to blasting or  
7 specific concerns that they want to bring up, they can  
8 contact Bob King, who's the Fire Marshal, and he can  
9 review that for the public if they have any specific  
10 questions. Again, that's Bob King. He's the Fire  
11 Marshal.

12           There was questions about hours of operation or  
13 construction hours. There are standard construction  
14 hours in the Sparks -- yeah, in the Sparks Municipal  
15 Code under Section 20.04.005. Those hours are 7:00 a.m.  
16 till 7:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and 9:00 a.m. till  
17 5:00 p.m. on Saturday, with no construction permitted on  
18 Sundays.

19           There were questions about debris removal and  
20 grading, or not debris removal, but debris on the side  
21 and grading. Grading permits are also something that  
22 the City of Sparks requires, reviews and issues, you  
23 know, regarding in conformance with Sparks standards and  
24 regulations. And that would be typically reviewed  
25 through the engineering department. So that would be



1 required, and that would be how we would address those  
2 issues.

3           And then material removal is another item that  
4 was brought up. Material removal from the site will be  
5 addressed through an encroachment permit, sometimes  
6 called a curb cap permit, which is kind of the envelope  
7 that covers a lot of this, and it'll address any sort of  
8 damages to adjacent street networks, and so forth, as  
9 part of the removal or bringing in of fill or any  
10 equipment during the construction process.

11           And then a lot of the comments that we received  
12 as public comment to this item had to do with parking.  
13 Just to address parking as best I can at this time is  
14 this site is now zoned MF2, multi-family, in the City of  
15 Sparks. Our minimum parking permit is one space per  
16 unit. The applicant is proposing two spaces per unit at  
17 138 spaces, plus 27 parking spaces for guests. That  
18 exceeds both the City of Sparks parking standards, but  
19 also it's beyond the requirement from the ITE, which is  
20 the Institute of Transportation Engineers, what their  
21 average daily peak period parking demand is for  
22 townhomes in suburban locations, which is 1.46 vehicles  
23 per unit.

24           That is the end of my presentation. Sparks  
25 staff is recommending, planning staff is recommending

1 approval of this item.

2 I am available for any questions. And the  
3 applicant's representative is here if you have any  
4 questions.

5 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Great. Thank you.

6 Would the applicant like to come up and have a  
7 seat.

8 MS. ANGELA FUSS: Good evening, Madam Chair and  
9 members of the Commission. For the record, Angela Fuss,  
10 Planning Manager with Lumos & Associates.

11 I just have a very quick presentation that I  
12 want to run through. I think, I've covered very  
13 extensively everything that was in the staff report.  
14 And so I'm not sure that there's a whole lot of new  
15 things out there. There are things I just want to  
16 highlight to you.

17 One thing that was not included in the  
18 presentation was some photos of the site. And I imagine  
19 most of you have driven on Los Altos and probably driven  
20 by more recently as this project is coming before you.

21 So that photo on the left is taken from,  
22 basically, the entrance of where the project will be on  
23 Los Altos. And as you can see, there's a knoll at the  
24 top. That knoll will remain, so that that piece at the  
25 very top is not coming down.

1           That picture on the left is the views as you're  
2 looking to the southwest. So it's a very picturesque  
3 place. And that's why this property is such a coveted  
4 piece of property that is really ideal for any type of  
5 residential development but one, I think, that is going  
6 to create a positive impact to this community.

7           Ian brought up the slope. Again, I wanted to  
8 highlight this. Everything in green is the slopes that  
9 we encourage development on, the slopes less than 30  
10 percent, the slopes less than 20 and 25 percent.

11           One thing that I wanted to point out to you is  
12 that everything you can see right here, in these areas  
13 here, the slopes here, this is all common open space  
14 that's part of a separate parcel. So there are no homes  
15 directly adjacent to this property, because they are  
16 surrounded by that common open space.

17           Here's an image of the tentative map. As you  
18 can see, our primary access coming off that Los Altos  
19 roundabout. And then we have our emergency secondary  
20 access coming off of Dry Gulch Way.

21           The site has been designed so that it's more of  
22 a circular development pattern. So if you're coming by  
23 vehicle, you can go all the way around. And the same  
24 place that you come in is the same place, ultimately,  
25 that you come out.

1           The building pads themselves, or the lots  
2 themselves are about 1,300 square feet in size. These  
3 are designed to be two-story townhome units. And so  
4 that gives us the additional square footage. So looking  
5 on average, the townhomes will be about 1,600 square  
6 feet in size. And this is actually bigger than most of  
7 the single-family homes directly adjacent to the  
8 property.

9           So, again, it's very much compatible with the  
10 surrounding development.

11           All of these units have been designed with  
12 two-car garages. That was one thing that was brought up  
13 during the public hearing process. So that is part of  
14 the design.

15           And as part of the multi-family zoning, you do  
16 have to provide some community land use. So I just  
17 wanted to highlight a couple of those that are shown on  
18 the tentative map. We do have, again, the typical ones  
19 that you would see would be a tot lot, a barbecue area.  
20 They have a dog-walking area. This area, according to  
21 this, is great for walking and hiking. There's a lot of  
22 people right now that currently walk across the site.  
23 And so there'll be trails to be able to continue doing  
24 that.

25           In terms of addressing some of the neighborhood

1 concerns, one of them had to do with protection of new  
2 development with existing development. So we really  
3 tried to take that into consideration. And we've done a  
4 couple things to consider that.

5 One of them has to do with where we put the  
6 landscaping. On that border to the south -- and, again,  
7 this area here. So these are the homes that are  
8 existing. And, again, they're protected by an open  
9 space buffer in between. Then we also put in a  
10 landscape buffer with trees and shrubs. And, again,  
11 over time, as those, that landscaping matures, that will  
12 really fill out and help to protect any kind of view,  
13 viewshed impacts.

14 There's also a significant change just in the  
15 grade. So the homes are quite a bit lower, those  
16 existing homes. And so just by natural topography,  
17 those homes will have a buffer of just -- the topography  
18 will buffer them.

19 All of these townhomes are limited to two  
20 stories. And, again, the parking. So just in general,  
21 when you look at parking, whether it's from a city code  
22 or a local, kind of regional parking code, or a national  
23 parking codes, on average, townhomes are parked anywhere  
24 from one to two parking spaces per unit. Between our  
25 two-car garages and our guest parking, we're at about

1 2.3 parking spaces per unit. So that not only is above  
2 City code requirements, it's above kind of our regional  
3 parking requirements. It's also higher than national  
4 parking requirements.

5 So I wanted to bring that to your attention.

6 And that's all I have for you tonight. And I'm  
7 available if you have any questions. Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Great. Thank you.

9 Do any of the Commissioners have any questions?  
10 Commissioner Carey.

11 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Yeah, Angela, I had a  
12 question concerning Condition Number 16. Those are the  
13 roadway improvements. I don't know if I should direct  
14 that, but, yeah, I just kind of wonder if you could go  
15 over it again today. It was the roundabout and  
16 crosswalk.

17 MS. ANGELA FUSS: Oh. Yes. There were three  
18 things. So one of them is, right now, that roundabout  
19 has -- it's a three-way roundabout. So this will  
20 provide that fourth leg to that intersection. And it,  
21 basically, is equivalent to where Vista Heights comes in  
22 now on the roundabout. It was to be an extension of  
23 that Vista Heights road. So it will go from a three-way  
24 roundabout to a four-way roundabout just north.

25 And the second one is just to improve outside

1 lines. So there's some landscaping, mature landscaping  
2 that's kind of overgrown over time. So as part of this  
3 project, they'll have to improve that, both going to the  
4 north and to the west.

5 And then, finally, the pedestrian flashers. We  
6 talked a lot during the public hearing process about  
7 where is it appropriate to put those flashers. After  
8 working with staff and our traffic engineer, they felt  
9 the most used area for crossing is actually off of  
10 Goodwin, which is not connected to this development;  
11 it's actually further down. But it seemed that that's  
12 where most of the pedestrian activity is.

13 So the applicant is going to kind of go outside  
14 of what his normal, I would say, development area and  
15 put in the flashing pedestrian flasher at that location.

16 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Thank you.

17 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Thank you.

18 Anyone else have any questions?

19 Okay. All right. Even though this is a  
20 general business item, we -- it's up to my discretion to  
21 take public comment on this.

22 So if there's anybody that wishes to speak on  
23 this agenda item, you know, you can come up.

24 MS. SMITH: I have five.

25 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Okay. But what I'd like

1 to ask is, if you don't have anything to add to the  
2 previous speaker, let's not duplicate what we're talking  
3 about.

4 So we'll go ahead and we'll start with Spencer  
5 Ericksen.

6 MR. SPENCER ERICKSEN: Thank you. Is it  
7 possible to use the camera?

8 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Sure.

9 MR. SPENCER ERICKSEN: My name is Spencer  
10 Ericksen. First, thank you for allowing us to be able  
11 to speak.

12 I wanted to speak about the parking. It has  
13 been addressed by Angela and by City staff pretty well.  
14 But I did want to point out a few things.

15 So on this map, it's highlighted all the guest  
16 parking spaces, 28 by my count.

17 One thing that I did have a question about. So  
18 per the description of the 69 units that are generally  
19 similar size, similar square feet, three bedrooms,  
20 two-car garage, on the application it appears that, for  
21 the two units that happen to be paired instead of  
22 grouped in more units, they're considered duplexes. And  
23 by the City of Sparks, a duplex requires one parking  
24 space per bedroom, so it would require three. Now, all  
25 the other units that happen to be attached to more than



1 one unit drop that one space per unit.

2 And I really question whether that makes sense.  
3 You know, the homeowners that are going to be living in  
4 these units, are you telling me they're going to only  
5 have one neighbor who are going to have two and a half  
6 cars and three cars, or that they have more neighbors  
7 that only have one car?

8 I also point out that the site of this  
9 development is not like townhomes. It's Sparks, Reno,  
10 Victorian Square. There is no bus service. There is no  
11 walkable grocery stores or restaurants. So maybe the  
12 homeowners that are going to buy there are going to  
13 depend on their cars.

14 I would argue that the particular usage pattern  
15 for those homeowners is going to match pretty closely to  
16 the surrounding neighborhood, which is single-family  
17 homes. And all those homes have five parking spaces,  
18 two in the garage, two in the driveway, one out front.  
19 In my neighborhood currently, I look out in the morning,  
20 and those driveways are full, and there's cars parked on  
21 the streets.

22 And so if it's similar homeowner is being  
23 targeted, with a similar size house, in the same  
24 location, and a similar price point, I don't know how  
25 you're going to argue that these magical home owners are

1 going to have less than two cars in that three-bedroom  
2 house, and they're not going to have visitors, and  
3 they're not going to have a similar usage pattern to all  
4 these neighborhoods.

5 And as a result, all that overflow parking is  
6 going to spill into those surrounding neighborhoods.  
7 And that was one of the main concerns of the surrounding  
8 homeowners during this approval process.

9 And I just wanted to make it clear to the  
10 Commission that this is one of our main concerns. We  
11 don't want to be staring at strange cars out our kitchen  
12 windows and our living room windows because there's not  
13 enough parking in the development to contain the number  
14 of cars that really have any connection are going to be  
15 there.

16 And truly, by the zoning, the applicant does  
17 have such a parking at about the minimum. But by how  
18 this development is sited and the expected usage  
19 pattern, it's just not a good decision.

20 So I don't know if there's other ways to  
21 address that, maybe by creating resident-only parking in  
22 the surrounding neighborhood, so that it would not allow  
23 overflow parking from this development. It seems like  
24 there's not much flexibility within the development  
25 itself.

1           But there is a concern, and I would be  
2 interested in hearing what are options are for  
3 minimizing our impact on the surrounding neighborhood.

4           Thank you.

5           CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Thank you.

6           Next is Jody Ericksen.

7           MS. JODY ERICKSEN: Can I also get the  
8 projector running, if that's okay? Does it have zooming  
9 capability?

10           So, Jody Ericksen. I live at 2265 Stone View.

11           Here is the lot in question. And this is Bud  
12 Beasley's school. And I want to speak about the  
13 pedestrian flashers. Angela is correct that when the  
14 community met with the developer, we spoke about our  
15 concerns about safety, pedestrian crossing safety. But  
16 we weren't -- we were talking about the problem where  
17 children and other pedestrians were getting like almost  
18 hit by cars at the roundabout.

19           So the kids now walk up, uphill, like and  
20 they're on the right side of the road from Bud Beasley,  
21 and they cross right here at the roundabout. There's  
22 like two crosses, but they cross at the lower one.

23           And cars that are coming up the hill, kind of  
24 fast because they're going uphill, they're looking to  
25 the left to see if there's oncoming traffic at the

1 roundabout, and they're missing that kids are crossing  
2 right here.

3           So the proposed flashers that Traffic Works are  
4 suggesting are down here at Goodwin. That's because  
5 there is this walkway and kind of a natural place to  
6 cross. But that's not where the safety concern is.

7           And I'm really, really concerned -- I live  
8 right here, I see it all the time -- that somebody's  
9 going to get hit by a car, like a little kid.

10           So I would ask that the Planning Commission  
11 stipulate that the flashers be put where the community  
12 would prefer them, which is here at the roundabout, so  
13 that the kids can like push a button and signal, you  
14 know, flashing lights, cars, that they're crossing the  
15 roundabout.

16           I've even seen parents, you know, standing out  
17 there to try to help make them safe. So we're talking  
18 about right here, this crossing is where I think the  
19 flashing lights should be.

20           This other area that they're talking about down  
21 here at Goodwin, off, off-screen, is like leveler, and  
22 you can see. There's like a clear line of sight. So I  
23 don't ever feel unsafe. I live right here. You know, I  
24 never hear cars screeching or, you know, anything or  
25 anybody, you know, complaining about crossing there.

1 And that's pretty visible.

2 The other thing my husband was talking about  
3 is, right here, they have the emergency exit. So people  
4 are going to like park on these streets and then like  
5 end up walking in to their duplexes, or their guests  
6 are, because there's not ample parking. And you can't  
7 park on Los Altos. If you look at the map, you can't  
8 park on Vista Heights. So people are also going to park  
9 on these side streets in residential areas, you know,  
10 because there's not enough parking, we don't feel like.

11 So those are just my thoughts. Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Thank you.

13 MS. JODY ERICKSEN: And I don't know if you  
14 want this to kind of mark where the preferred parking  
15 is. I don't know if that makes any sense.

16 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Thank you.

17 MS. JODY ERICKSEN: Where pedestrian crossings  
18 are.

19 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Next, Bill Wagner.

20 MR. BILL WAGNER: Boy, you two are good, you  
21 know that, you're really good.

22 Madam Chairperson, Commission, for the record,  
23 my name is Bill Wagner, and I live in the Vistas.

24 Subject, townhomes, PCN18-0048, at 2255  
25 Los Altos Parkway. I realize that the project will be

1 passed by the Commission as well as the City Council. I  
2 think, the reason is going to be taxes and what they  
3 need.

4 I would like you to understand where I'm coming  
5 from personally. And I know I'm going to duplicate a  
6 little bit. So please bear with me.

7 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: That's quite all right.

8 MR. BILL WAGNER: Approximately 103 cars  
9 estimated, with no driveways, 28 guest parking, with  
10 only one handicapped parking space. I own a cane and  
11 having a hard time getting to where I want to go.

12 Blasting. Ground shaking, noise. Residents  
13 who sleep, residents who sleep during the day, because,  
14 you know, a lot of people who work at night sleep during  
15 the day. And the elderly who are going out are going to  
16 be affected by this.

17 The amount of heavy trucks dumping on the city  
18 streets also create an additional traffic congestion.

19 The length of time it will take to complete the  
20 project, could be three years, four years before they  
21 finish everything. I'm not sure about that.

22 Construction accidents. If you believe in the  
23 Peter principle, it's going to happen.

24 And, finally, and most important, are the  
25 hundreds and hundreds of Vista homeowners who are still

1 against this development.

2 Okay. And thank you all for your time. I  
3 really appreciate you listening to me.

4 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Thank you, Mr. Wagner.  
5 Next is Ron King.

6 MR. RON KING: Good evening, Chairman  
7 VanderWell and Commissioners and staff. For the record,  
8 my name is Ron King. I live in the Vistas in the City  
9 of Sparks. And I'm here to comment also on the  
10 townhouses projected to be built on Los Altos Parkway.

11 I would like to compliment staff again, as I  
12 have done often, for their exemplary efforts in taking a  
13 30-year document and legally processing that into a  
14 handbook and directions and conditions that meet today's  
15 standards. Even though I disagree with the development,  
16 I do feel that they have done a great job in being able  
17 to back you up and give you information, even though I  
18 don't always agree with that.

19 I do have one disappointment that I would like  
20 to quickly express, and that is that there were 200  
21 voices that were here at this, before this Commission  
22 and, also, before the City Council, 200 people's voices  
23 from that area that were not heeded. And it's  
24 disappointing that our no vote ended up with your yes  
25 vote. In other words, in my feeling, in my opinion, the

1 people lost. We lost.

2 And I agree wholeheartedly with the items that  
3 have been listed by Mr. Wagner and the Ericksens. I  
4 feel and know that tonight you will not add those  
5 suggestions to the tentative map proposal. I know that.  
6 I just know it'll be no motion to amend what you have  
7 already heard. And that's your prerogative.

8 And I know, I also know it will not happen  
9 within the City Council. That's unfortunate for me.  
10 It's disappointing, having been a long-term resident of  
11 the City of Sparks.

12 This is an infill project. You've got houses  
13 surrounding it. They're going to be working day and  
14 night, six days a week. No matter what we say, they are  
15 going to break the conditions. They are going to be  
16 pounding, laying, building, blasting, moving, whatever.

17 Also, I want to emphasize that I did not hear  
18 from the applicant, talked about, a little bit about the  
19 landscaping or the retaining wall along the east side of  
20 the development. I still have great fears about what's  
21 going to happen in case of an accident or a rock wall  
22 failure, or how they're going to sustain and maintain  
23 that slope on the west side and on the south peak of the  
24 development, how they're going to maintain that and keep  
25 it safe and keep cars from, after it's built, cars from



1 going over it or cars and trucks and debris going over  
2 it during construction and into the back of the  
3 (indistinct) the development.

4 So please keep the thumbscrews tight. If you  
5 don't know what that is, Google it, and on the  
6 development, and keep those conditions strictly stated  
7 and enforced.

8 Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Thank you, Mr. King.

10 Cindi shoemaker.

11 MS. CINDI SHOEMAKER: Hello. My name's Cindi  
12 shoe maker. I live at 4946 Santa Barbara Avenue in the  
13 Vistas. And we have never attended a Planning  
14 Commission meeting on this before. I've written emails  
15 before.

16 Pretty much everything that I believe, my  
17 opinions have already been voiced. I agree that there's  
18 not enough parking spaces. I walk my dogs every  
19 morning. And, yes, my husband and I have a clean  
20 garage, park our cars in it. But the majority of the  
21 people do not; they have their garages full of things.

22 So the parking is a really big one for me. I  
23 wish -- and I don't -- it's not going to affect me if  
24 people are parking by my house to get to the townhomes.  
25 But it's just something that bothers me about

1 development. I know it's going to happen. But if they  
2 can fix some things.

3 The roundabout, I think, there should be  
4 flashing lights at the roundabout. The young lady that  
5 just lost her life near the high school. Why not have  
6 flashing lights at those places? And let's protect the  
7 kids. Let's protect people. Let's protect dog-walkers.  
8 I mean, you know, it's very important to me.

9 The blasting. I'll contact Ron King, because  
10 my dogs are very sensitive to sound, vibrations. So I  
11 understand I need to contact him. I hope they send out  
12 notices ahead of time.

13 And then the last thing is the traffic. I  
14 think, their estimate is low, like somebody pointed out  
15 that it's not like a walking community. Everyone, we do  
16 rely on our cars unless we're walking our dogs or our  
17 kids to school. And Santa Barbara Avenue isn't a main  
18 thoroughfare like Los Altos, but it is definitely a  
19 thoroughfare.

20 And we've only lived there a few years. We're  
21 newbies. We love Sparks. Thank you for having us. But  
22 our neighbors across the street and our next-door  
23 neighbor's an original homeowner, and they have told us  
24 how much traffic has increased, that people use that as  
25 a shortcut, instead of going down to Vista, because

1 there's just so much traffic everywhere. And it's just,  
2 it's just going to be more and more traffic.

3 But I appreciate your time and letting me voice  
4 my concerns. My main one is, my main two are the  
5 flashing lights. I think, they should have them at both  
6 locations. And parking for the -- especially for the  
7 people that live near there, that are not in the  
8 development, but the parking in front of their homes,  
9 it's going to affect them. It would be nice if they  
10 could get us some more parking spaces. We had our own  
11 condo in the past, and we had a lot more parking spaces  
12 per unit, and they were smaller units.

13 So, thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Thank you.

15 Is there anybody else that wishes to speak on  
16 this?

17 Okay. With that, do any Commissioners have any  
18 questions?

19 COMMISSIONER READ: I have a question.

20 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Yeah, Commissioner Read.

21 COMMISSIONER READ: Can Angela come back?

22 Thank you.

23 Angela, can you address the comments about  
24 possibly moving the flashers to the roundabout?

25 MS. ANGELA FUSS: Yeah, the reason that the

1 flashers at this location was selected had to do more  
2 with the current design of Los Altos in that roundabout.  
3 The speed limit on Los Altos is 35. The majority of the  
4 traffic drives faster than 35. And so, as you're coming  
5 up, and you hit Goodwin, most people are traveling  
6 faster than 35. So it's a lot harder to slam on your  
7 brakes when you see people crossing.

8           When you get to the roundabout, that roundabout  
9 acts as a natural traffic slowing down mechanism. So  
10 you hit the roundabout, you have to slow down to drive  
11 the roundabout. So because cars are already slowed down  
12 as they're going around the roundabout, it kind of  
13 already provided that feature of, you know, paying  
14 attention and slowing down.

15           I think, it will help, frankly, that some of  
16 this mature landscaping that's overgrown will be cut  
17 back. I think, that's part of the problem with not  
18 seeing people that are getting ready to cross. And so  
19 there's just a lot of overgrown landscaping.

20           Again, the applicant is willing to put in the  
21 flashers wherever staff and you, as a Planning  
22 Commission -- though it makes no sense, just based on  
23 the traffic Engineer's recommendations. He felt that it  
24 made more sense at the Goodwin crosswalk than it did at  
25 the roundabout.

1           So it wasn't based on anything financially or  
2 any of those reasons. It was just based on where do we  
3 need to slow down traffic. Which crosswalk serves more  
4 people and has problems with people slowing down.  
5 Because you are coming up, going 45 miles an hour, all  
6 of a sudden you see people crossing, you have to slam on  
7 your brakes.

8           COMMISSIONER READ: Thank you. And can you  
9 also address the -- and going back to the parking and  
10 then the comments earlier about the reference to the  
11 duplex and the parking per bedroom and additional  
12 parking.

13           MS. ANGELA FUSS: So this, because of this  
14 zoning, this project is consistent more with the  
15 multi-family, townhome, slash, apartment parking  
16 standard. And, again, per the City code, there's one  
17 set of standards. One parking space per unit is  
18 probably not enough. I think, we all (indistinct). If  
19 it was in a downtown area where you're close to transit  
20 and close to services, it would be one thing.

21           So taking that into consideration, what's an  
22 appropriate parking count? I think, you can draw  
23 whatever number you want. Somebody else is going to  
24 come out with a different number. So in that case,  
25 then, we go to standards. And we looked at what are

1 some standards locally, not just in Sparks, what about  
2 Reno, what the Carson, what about the surrounding  
3 community who has the same type of development patterns.  
4 And then what national standards, what makes sense.

5 So that's where we came up with anywhere  
6 between one and two spaces per unit makes sense. And so  
7 then we looked at, well, where are we at? We're at 2.3  
8 parking spaces per unit.

9 Each unit does have that two-car garage. That  
10 was one thing that, I think, the public was very adamant  
11 about. It's not a requirement, but that was one thing  
12 that they did, to try and work with the community and  
13 said, okay, we hear your concerns, we will put in  
14 two-car garages per unit.

15 These are also, you know, two-and three-bedroom  
16 townhomes. A lot of the single-family homes around us  
17 are four and five bedrooms. So there's a difference  
18 between parking for a four-bedroom single-family home  
19 and parking for a two-bedroom with a den townhome.

20 And we also have a very different demographic,  
21 typically, that lives in townhomes versus single-family.  
22 A lot of times, as people kind of start a home, so where  
23 you maybe can't afford the single-family home yet, so  
24 you move to the townhome. It's also the other end of  
25 the demographic where it's people that are retired,

1 their kids have moved out, so they downsize because they  
2 don't want to take care of the yards.

3           So when you take all those things into  
4 consideration, it really made more sense to say that,  
5 you know, this 2.3 parking spaces per unit makes sense  
6 for this project and for this location. It was  
7 consistent with City codes. It was consistent with  
8 national parking standards. And that's why, I think,  
9 why staff also got comfortable with that number.

10           COMMISSIONER READ: Thank you for redirecting  
11 those concerns.

12           MS. ANGELA FUSS: Sure.

13           CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Any other questions from  
14 the Commissioners?

15           Commissioner Fewins.

16           COMMISSIONER FEWINS: Yeah, one for --  
17 Commissioner Fewins. I have one for Ian.

18           So Commissioner Fewins. Ian, there's some  
19 things in the past where we've come across the 30  
20 percent slope. And under one overhead that showed kind  
21 of a horseshoe, and you saw a lot of red pieces in the  
22 map, and it looks like, on the horseshoe, it kind of  
23 goes right through that red spot there on the -- I  
24 guess, as it is, the red kind of funnels out there to  
25 the east.

1 MR. CRITTENDEN: This area?

2 COMMISSIONER FEWINS: Yeah, that area. And the  
3 horseshoe kind of went right through that on the grade,  
4 30 percent grade there. So what is kind of the City's  
5 position? Because in past projects, we've used that as  
6 open space and haven't disturbed those slopes. So what  
7 is typically, what do you look at when you see more than  
8 a grade area of 30 percent that's going to be disturbed?

9 MR. CRITTENDEN: So the percent slope and the  
10 ability to disturb isn't necessarily specific to that  
11 slope area. I know it can sound a little bit confusing,  
12 but when we look a site, we look at it holistically and  
13 we say, what are your percent slopes for each category  
14 that are just vacated by code? And then there's a  
15 certain amount of disturbed area that is allowed per  
16 sloped area.

17 And so what we do is when we look at that, we  
18 say, okay, how much of the area's in this slope  
19 category, how much is in this. And when you get to  
20 those higher slopes, you get lower and lower  
21 percentages. In fact, past a certain point, it's zero  
22 percent that can be disturbed. But that doesn't  
23 necessarily mean that you can't disturb areas that have  
24 30 percent or higher slope. It just means that you have  
25 to balance that out over the entirety of the site.



1           Now, most of the time, people will avoid those  
2 slope areas because it's harder to deal with. But in  
3 this case, they are going to disturb some of the areas  
4 that have the higher slope. But as a balance, they  
5 don't disturb more of the site than is allowed per code.

6           COMMISSIONER FEWINS: Thank you. One other  
7 question. Since this is located in a -- even if it is  
8 MF2 --

9           MR. CRITTENDEN: M-hm (affirmative).

10          COMMISSIONER FEWINS: -- but it is surrounded  
11 by single-family homes, just out of curiosity, what is  
12 the setback requirement on the MF2 versus SF6?

13          MR. CRITTENDEN: The setback in which  
14 direction?

15          COMMISSIONER FEWINS: The frontage.

16          MR. CRITTENDEN: On the front, the front  
17 setback is typically the same. Although the way that  
18 multi-family addresses front setback is a little bit  
19 different, because you're looking at a site in that case  
20 versus individual lots.

21          So as an analogy, these, these sites have --  
22 their garage is, essentially, with the drive apron.  
23 Whereas you couldn't really do that in a single-family  
24 neighborhood because of the way the streets and  
25 everything work, but because it's all private-streeted,

1 and we're looking at the front, we can actually only  
2 look at the frontage along Los Altos for that 20-foot  
3 front setback.

4 The other setbacks are -- I believe, it's 15 on  
5 the sides and 20 in the rear. But, again, we'd be  
6 looking at that as a total site.

7 Now, I don't believe there's anyplace except  
8 potentially along the north side here, kind of -- or  
9 that would be the northwest, west side. I need to go to  
10 my pictures. Sorry. So you get a better requirement.

11 Yeah, along this kind of north side, they're a  
12 little bit closer, but there's a larger setback with  
13 that, kind of, that buffer area. But, in general, most  
14 of these units are no closer than 20 feet from the  
15 adjacent property line, or the site as a whole, not  
16 necessarily to the other adjacent units, which is the  
17 way we look at the single-family.

18 So, hopefully, that answered your question. If  
19 not, feel free to re-ask it.

20 COMMISSIONER FEWINS: And many, in a few in  
21 Los Altos. So.

22 MR. CRITTENDEN: Yeah.

23 COMMISSIONER FEWINS: You're not looking on the  
24 street or the horseshoe street.

25 MR. CRITTENDEN: Yeah.

1           COMMISSIONER FEWINS: So the garage can be part  
2 of that 20 feet?

3           MR. CRITTENDEN: Exactly.

4           COMMISSIONER FEWINS: So, and, I guess, what is  
5 the City code for parking on public streets? We heard a  
6 lot of public comment that are worried about cars parked  
7 on public streets. How long can one sit, have their car  
8 parked there, can be parked there without registration,  
9 et cetera?

10          MR. CRITTENDEN: Well, I don't, the answers to  
11 all of those pieces.

12          COMMISSIONER FEWINS: Okay.

13          MR. CRITTENDEN: I know that there are limits  
14 to the amount of time that you can leave a car parked  
15 without moving it along city streets. That's usually  
16 enforced by the police department. So I don't know that  
17 section of the code as well. And, obviously, you do  
18 have to have cars registered that are parked there, they  
19 have to be registered.

20                As far as parking on public streets, any public  
21 street that's not specifically designated as a no  
22 parking area is available parking to the public. As a  
23 city street, there's no, no regulation as to who can or  
24 can't park there, whether they live in the area or not.

25          COMMISSIONER FEWINS: Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Any other Commissioners  
2 have any questions?

3 The Commissioners are good? Okay.

4 COMMISSIONER FEWINS: I'm sorry, Commissioner  
5 VanderWell.

6 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Yeah, go right ahead.

7 COMMISSIONER FEWINS: Commissioner Fewins.  
8 Ian, again, I was just reminded on a question. On the  
9 end of the horseshoe, where the slopes grade to the --  
10 greater, the houses below, and there's a parking -- one  
11 more back.

12 So on the very bottom of the -- yeah. And  
13 those, that's a pretty good slope. I see trees there.  
14 Do we have any -- does the applicant know what they're  
15 going to put on the end of that parking lot, so if  
16 somebody goes right when they should have went left, and  
17 they --

18 MR. CRITTENDEN: Certainly.

19 COMMISSIONER FEWINS: -- are four-wheeling it  
20 down the side of the hill there?

21 MR. CRITTENDEN: Not that I'm aware of. This  
22 landscape plan is preliminary.

23 COMMISSIONER FEWINS: Yeah.

24 MR. CRITTENDEN: I anticipate the final  
25 landscape plan to be fairly similar. But they would

1 need to provide a landscape plan.

2 Now, as far as something to avoid the people  
3 coming over that, that hillside, we have not discussed  
4 that with the applicant at this time.

5 COMMISSIONER FEWINS: Okay. Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Okay. Any other  
7 questions?

8 Ian, I have a question really quick, because I  
9 know this has been brought up in other meetings,  
10 regarding the blasting. Now, the neighborhood, now, is  
11 or is not the neighborhood notified when there is going  
12 to be blasting?

13 MR. CRITTENDEN: I'm not aware of all of the  
14 requirements that come out of that blasting. Kike I  
15 said, it is regulated by the Fire Department. But in my  
16 discussions with the Fire Department regarding the  
17 blasting permit, input from the neighbors and concerns  
18 from the neighbors can influence all of the pieces that  
19 they're looking for and that, if there's concerns about  
20 it, they can ask for more information from the  
21 applicant. Then they can kind of go through some more  
22 stuff.

23 So if there are additional concerns or  
24 questions from the people around, they definitely need  
25 to talk to Bob King and kind of voice their concerns,

1 and he can tailor their application process and what  
2 he's looking for to the concerns in the neighborhood,  
3 obviously within reason.

4 But that would be the best way to kind of  
5 address that, from the neighbors' concerns about  
6 blasting.

7 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Okay. Thank you.

8 Any other questions? Comments?

9 Entertain a motion.

10 Commissioner Carey.

11 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Sure, I will give this a  
12 shot to get the discussion going. I certainly  
13 appreciate the applicant coming in earlier this year  
14 with the development agreement. I know it's a tentative  
15 map, but I think that the development agreement provided  
16 a lot of transparency to the public in this planning  
17 process that we normally don't have.

18 And I concur with staff's analysis that the  
19 proposed tentative map is certainly in compliance with  
20 the four requirements of that development agreement.

21 I can certainly sympathize with the public  
22 concerns that we've gotten by email and tonight about  
23 the parking requirements. I certainly think that's  
24 something we should take a look at in our code. One  
25 space per unit, I don't know if that's enough for this

1 city. We've had some other issues with some projects  
2 we've seen.

3 But, overall, I think, that the proposed  
4 density associated with this tentative map is consistent  
5 with the land use designation that's been on this site  
6 for a good three decades now. And I believe that I can  
7 make all 12 findings for this.

8 So I'd be prepared to do a motion, if I can  
9 find it.

10 I move to forward to the City Council a  
11 recommendation of approval of the tentative map for  
12 The Canyons on Los Altos Townhomes associated with  
13 PCN18-0048, adopting Findings T1 through T12 and the  
14 facts supporting these Findings as set forth in the  
15 staff report, and subject to the Conditions of Approval  
16 1 through 17 as listed in the staff report.

17 COMMISSIONER READ: Commissioner Read. Second.

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

20 Okay all in favor?

21 (Commission members said "aye.")

22 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Anyone opposed?

23 Okay. Thank you. Motion carries.

24 Next, we'll move along to public comment. Do  
25 we have any additional requests to speak?