



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

To: Mayor and City Council

From: Janet Stout, Administrative Assistant

Subject: Report of Planning Commission Action

Date: August 24, 2018

RE: PCN18-0032 - Consideration and possible recommendation of approval of a Tentative Map request for a 39-lot single-family residential subdivision on a site 5.38 acres in size in the SF6 (Single Family Residential – 6,000 sq. ft. lots) zoning district located at 3550 and 3650 Wedekind Road, Sparks, NV. (For Possible Action)

Please see the attached excerpt from the August 2, 2018 Planning Commission meeting transcript.

1 Second.

2 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Okay. I have a first and
3 a second. Any further discussion?

4 Okay. Hearing none, all in favor?

5 (Commission members said "aye.")

6 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Anyone opposed?

7 Thank you. Motion carries.

8 Next, we'll move along to General Business,
9 PCN18-00032, consideration and possible recommendation
10 of approval of a tentative map.

11 MR. CUMMINS: Thank you, Madam Chair, Planning
12 Commissioners. I'm Jonathan Cummins, Assistant Planner.

13 PCN18-0032 is a tentative map request for a
14 39-lot single-family residential subdivision on a site
15 5.38 acres in size in the SF6, Single-Family
16 Residential, zoning district.

17 The project's located on the southeast corner
18 of Wedekind and El Rancho outlined in cyan, the bluish.

19 The main access to the subdivision would be off
20 of Garfield to the south of the project. There would be
21 emergency access on the northwest corner, which will be
22 gated and used only for emergency vehicles.

23 The piece that's on the southernmost part of
24 the project here is currently an easement on the church
25 property which sits to the west. The applicant's in

1 negotiations currently to acquire that property and
2 record a boundary line adjustment to include that in the
3 subdivision.

4 The project will incorporate a mix of lot
5 sizes, to include what the Sparks Municipal Code calls
6 small lot development. The code requires that small lot
7 development meet two requirements, that the density
8 maximum is maintained by the subdivision. In the case
9 of SF6 zoning, the density maximum would be 7.3 dwelling
10 units per acre. And this proposed project would be
11 7.25, meeting those standards.

12 And the second requirement being that anyone
13 that developed a part of the subdivision be deed
14 restricted as common area. Any of the common areas will
15 remain common areas.

16 Just a little bit more background and to
17 clarify a couple of things that we've discussed since
18 Tuesday at our Study Session. The land use designation
19 for the parcels is, in fact, IDR, Intermediate Density
20 Residential. And to sort of give a little bit of
21 background of how we got that, the Planning Commission
22 and City Council both approved the annexation of these
23 parcels to be converted from county zoning of E1 state
24 residential to SF15. And, sequentially, the applicant
25 requested that it then be rezoned from SF15 to SF6 to

1 allow for this type of development.

2 The tentative map requires the following
3 finding be made by the Planning Commission.

4 Finding T1, conformance to the Comprehensive
5 Plan. Staff believes that Goal CF1 can be met, the City
6 and the developer provide adequate service levels and
7 that those service levels are available by the City.

8 Goal MG6, to promote compact development and
9 reduce the effects on the City.

10 Staff believes that the product satisfies
11 policy H1 by allowing for appropriate zoning districts
12 to exist throughout the City for new housing.

13 Additionally, Policy H2, to promote a variety
14 of housing types, as well as Policy CC8, create a
15 neighborhood diversity.

16 Finding T2 requires conformance to the street
17 master plan. The streets in the subdivision will be
18 internal to the project and subsequently privately owned
19 and maintained by a homeowners association.

20 Finding T3 requires we address the appropriate
21 health laws and regulations and ensure that they're
22 being met. We received no comments from those such
23 agencies.

24 Finding T4 requires the availability of water.
25 Truckee Meadows Water Authority will serve the property,

1 and appropriate water rights are in place.

2 Finding T5 requires we address the availability
3 of utilities. Staff is going to require that the
4 developer make the necessary improvements to the City
5 sewer prior to the final map stage.

6 T6 requires the availability of other public
7 services. Staff received comments from the Washoe
8 County School District which indicated that there would
9 be potentially 5 new students housed in the subdivision:
10 3 elementary school students, 1 middle school and 1 high
11 school student.

12 Police and fire are already served by the City
13 of Sparks.

14 And the Regional Transportation Commission of
15 Washoe County provided comments to guide in the design
16 in accordance with their standards.

17 Finding T7 requires that impacts on existing
18 streets and highways be addressed. Applicant states
19 that there will be less than 80 peak hour trips created
20 by this subdivision. Therefore, no traffic study is
21 required.

22 Finding T8 requires that we address the
23 physical characteristics of land, floodplain, slope,
24 soil. Final hydrological and geotechnical reports will
25 be required prior to the final map stage.

1 And the slope does not exceed the minimum of 10
2 percent, which would be required in the Sparks Municipal
3 Code to trigger hillside development standards.

4 Finding T9 requires review by outside agencies
5 not previously addressed. We received only comments
6 from the school district and RTC.

7 Finding T10 specific to fire protection. The
8 project sites falls within the 6-minute response time of
9 the Sparks Fire Department, which is already currently
10 serving the site.

11 Finding T11, any other impacts identified by
12 staff. Landscaping and architecture review will be
13 addressed in the future. It's not part of this
14 approval. However, that's part of the development that
15 we're anticipating on the site. And, therefore, that's
16 something that we're pointing out to the developer.

17 And Finding T12 requires public noticing. This
18 Planning Commission and the subsequent City Council
19 meetings function as the public hearings for the item.

20 To address the Commission's questions from
21 Tuesday, there's been no contact from the public
22 regarding the project as of this evening.

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

1 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Thank you.

2 MR. CUMMINS: Questions?

3 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Okay. Is the applicant
4 here, and would they like to speak?

5 MR. BRIAN NEWMAN: Good evening, Madam
6 Chairman, Vice Chairman and other esteemed members of
7 the Planning Commission. My name is Brian Newman. I'm
8 with Meridian Land Solutions and Design, representing
9 the applicant, LLS/LLC. And with me, of course, is this
10 superstud here, Mr. Greg Evangelatos, my planning
11 consultant.

12 Just like the two people before us, we think
13 staff did a great job, rather than being redundant.
14 And, I think, we all want to get out of here soon.
15 We're just here to answer any questions that you may
16 have.

17 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Okay. Thank you.

18 Do any of the Commissions have any questions of
19 the applicant?

20 So, see, you guys lucked out.

21 MR. BRIAN NEWMAN: No.

22 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Thank you.

23 MR. BRIAN NEWMAN: Okay.

24 MR. GREG EVANGELATOS: Thank you, Madam Chair.

25 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Thank you.

1 Do any of the Commissioners have any questions?

2 No. Okay. I'm actually with it now.

3 Okay. With that, I will -- I'll entertain a
4 motion, please.

5 Commissioner Carey.

6 COMMISSIONER CAREY: Yeah, I concur with
7 staff's recommendation. I think that this proposed
8 tentative map is consistent with the land use
9 designation that we previously approved. I think, this
10 will be really good infill development and it will
11 provide a good housing choice in this part of the City.

12 With that, I'll move to forward a
13 recommendation of approval to the City Council of the
14 tentative map for the Wildcreek Meadows subdivision
15 associated with PCN18-0032, adopting findings T1 through
16 T12 and the facts supporting these findings as set forth
17 in the staff report and subject to the conditions of
18 approval 1 through 15.

19 COMMISSIONER BROCK: Commissioner Brock. I
20 second the motion.

21 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Okay. I have a first and
22 a second. Is there any further comment?

23 Okay. All in favor?

24 (Commission members said "aye.")

25 CHAIRMAN VANDERWELL: Any opposed?

1 Okay. Thank you. Motion carries.

2 Next, we'll go on to PCN18-0034.

3 MS. MELBY: Good evening, Chairman and Planning
4 Commissioners. I'm Karen Melby, Development Service
5 Manager.

6 Before you is a tentative map request for a 310
7 single-family lot subdivision within the Kiley Ranch
8 Phase 7 planned development.

9 Outlined here in cyan is the planned
10 development boundaries. The south boundary would be
11 Windmill Farms. East, west boundary is Kiley Parkway.
12 Northbound would be Lazy Five.

13 Kiley Ranch Village 9 encompasses the entire
14 Phase 7 final planned development for the Kiley Ranch
15 North plan. The land use designation is Low-Medium
16 Residential, which permits 3 to 6 dwelling units. This
17 is within the handbook, the City's designation. The
18 gross density of this proposed tentative map is 5.3
19 dwelling units per acre, which complies with the Phase 7
20 handbook.

21 In March 2018, the City Council approved a
22 tentative map with 20 conditions for a subdivision on
23 this, at this location for 344 single-family lots. The
24 master developer would like to develop this as a gated
25 community with private streets. So they had submitted a