



# Spanish Springs Citizen Advisory Board

**DRAFT:** Approval of these draft minutes, or any changes to the draft minutes, will be reflected in writing in the next meeting minutes and/or in the minutes of any future meeting where changes to these minutes are approved by the CAB. Minutes of the regular meeting of the Spanish Springs Citizen Advisory Board held September 10, 2014 at the Spanish Springs Library at (7100A Pyramid Lake Highway).

**1. CALL TO ORDER/ DETERMINATION OF QUORUM** - The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by David Espinosa, Chair. A quorum was present.

**MEMBERS PRESENT** – Dawn Costa-Guyon, At-Large, Catherine (Cathy) Gustavson, At-Large, Charity Rosasco, At-Large Alternate, David Espinosa, David Schneck, At-Large Alternate, James (Jim) Scivally and Ken Theiss, Vice Chair.

**2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE** – Ralph Theiss led the salute to the Flag.

### **3. \*PUBLIC COMMENT**

- **Greg Prough**, former CAB member, introduced himself. He has been appointed to the Planning Commission. He said he has been a resident of Spanish Springs since 2003. He said he will look at everything thoroughly and rely on the CAB's input to make decisions that affect everyone. He invited everyone to call him if they have questions or concerns, 775-745-2904.
- **John Bradbury** asked the CAB for help to get influence with Public Works to cut the weeds in Eagle Canyon.
- **Al Rogers** introduced himself. Al Rogers is the Management Services Director. Division responsibilities include:
  - Constituent services, i.e. support to CAB.
  - Governmental affairs
  - Management and budget
  - Emergency management and homeland security
  - Support the commissioners
  - He said we have great staff, such as Andrea Tavener. We want to improve the services and want to make sure to address all issues. We support the Commissioners. We look forward to working with you in the future.

David closed item 3.

**4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA FOR THE REGULAR MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 10, 2014 – MOTION:** Ken Theiss made a motion to approve the agenda for the meeting of September 10, 2014; Dawn Costa-Guyon seconded the motion to approve the agenda. The motion carried unanimously.

**5. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF JULY 9, 2014** - Dawn made a motion to approve the agenda for the meeting minutes of July 9, 2014; Ken seconded the motion to approve the agenda. Motion passed unanimously. The motion carried unanimously.

### **6. PRESENTATION OF A CERTIFICATE OF APPRECIATION TO ALLAYNE DONNELLY**

On behalf of Commissioner Vaughn Hartung, Chair, David Espinosa presented a Certificate of Appreciation to Allayne Donnelly.

### **7.\* PUBLIC OFFICIAL REPORTS**

**A.\* Washoe County Commissioner** - Commissioner Hartung was not present. Commissioner Hartung can be reached at (775) 328-2007 or via email at [vhartung@washoecounty.us](mailto:vhartung@washoecounty.us) (This item is for information only and no action will be taken by the CAB).

### **8. \* PUBLIC SAFETY AND COMMUNITY REPORTS/UPDATES**

**A.\*Washoe County Sheriff's Office (WCSO)** – A representative of the Washoe County Sheriff's Office may be available (unless on a call for service) to address public safety questions and concerns including speeding and reckless use of recreational vehicles. For more information call (775) 328-3001 or online at [www.washoesheriff.com](http://www.washoesheriff.com) (This item is for information only and no action will be taken by the CAB.)

Lieutenant Scott Bloom gave an update:

- Schools are back in session.
- Service calls have reduced.

- Party calls and vehicle burglaries have reduced.
- The Sheriff's department has taken a proactive stance on signage for shooting in congested areas and it has been successful.
- There is laser tagging on aircrafts which is a federal offense. If you have any information, please forward your information to the Sheriffs.

Comments and Concerns:

- Audience member asked about the K-9 Unit fundraiser. Commander Bloom said he can contact her with this information.
- Audience member said there are concerns with people parking in driveways and turning around in driveways near the school as well as kids throwing rocks. Commander Bloom said he can put a motor unit in the area and inform them.

David closed item A.

**9. NEW BUSINESS** - The project description is provided below with links to the application or you may visit the Planning and Development Division website and select the Application Submittals page:

[http://www.washoecounty.us/comdev/da/da\\_index.htm](http://www.washoecounty.us/comdev/da/da_index.htm)

**A. \*AUTUMN TRAILS SUBDIVISION INTRODUCTION** - Michael Vicks, representative for K2 Engineering and Structural Design, will introduce revisions to a Regulatory Zone Amendment (RZA14-004) as well as a Tentative Map Application for the proposed Autumn Trails Subdivision. Contact Mr. Vicks at (775) 848-5787 or email: [mwvicks@gmail.com](mailto:mwvicks@gmail.com). This item was previously presented to the [Spanish Springs CAB](#) at their June 18, 2014 meeting and is back on the CAB agenda due to changes to the application. **Staff representative:** Trevor Lloyd, Senior Planner, (775) 328-3620, [tlloyd@washoecounty.us](mailto:tlloyd@washoecounty.us).

Michael Vicks said this is a re-introducing the Autumn Trails as a new tentative map. They previously had come to the CAB board in June with a regulatory zone amendment request. As a result of that meeting, that application had been approved; however, since then, modifications have been made to the application. Revised regulatory zone application will go in Monday along with tentative map applications.

Mike Vicks went through details of Regulatory Zone Amendment (RZA):

- Goals of RZA: Increased density on property more than what is currently allowed.
- Original developers had 185 units in sub division; they did smaller lots than are proposed. 143 acres of development used up more of the density than the remainder parcel.
- Amendment to allow specifically to complete project as they projected.
- Currently the zoning allows for 31 additional lots, and we are asking for 43, which is not too dramatic of an increase.
- In the initial proposal, we proposed re-zoning to LDS 2 (1 unit per acre to 2 units per acre). We have been told by County Attorney, LDS 2 is not used zoning. MDS is used and it's denser. That is why we came back with a new proposal to meet our new application. Brought applications together to show exactly what we are doing.
- Everything in pink would remain LDS zoning.
- 6 acre portion in the Center of project would be revised as MDS and would make all the numbers work.
- To get appropriate zoning, we have to take into account all previous development and remainder parcel and would give us amount remaining density to do a 143 sub division.

**Proposed Tentative Map: Mike showed a diagram of the lot.**

- Common area parcel – every one of the lots will be LDS.
- Proposed sub division – no ability for anyone to come in and do 1/3 acre parcel, MDS.
- Proposed sub division will be 47.6 acre project.
- On our lot, density will be .9 units per acre. Allowable density in LDS is 1 unit per acre.
- We are pushing overall density from 1 unit per acre to 1.06 units per acre, slight increase.
- Adding 12 lots. 197 lots opposed .185 lots in previously proposed project.
- Every one of the lots will be larger than the smallest of previously approved lots.
- Lot size ranging from 2,151 sq feet (1/2 acre) to 5,800 sq feet (1 ½ acre). Proposing the common area be re-zoned to MDS. Everything else will remain as current zoning and set-backs all required by LDS zoning. In order to finish off the remainder parcel on Sky Ranch North.
- Connecting roads Smoke Wagon and Hayfield up to Bridal Path.

**Comments and concerns:**

- **Lois Kolbet** asked about the common area becoming MDS.

- **Mike Vicks** addressed Lois' question. He said the previous sub division was allowed LDS, one unit per acre. We want an increased to get to 197 units. We need the zoning to allow for that density. Need 6 acres. The developer wanted to do this because make sense economically. They would like to finish the sub division. We are being consistent with remainder of the subdivision.
- Lois said she likes this map and has no trouble with it, however, if you come in and change the zoning won't other developers come in and change the zoning like you are doing. Mike said that is exactly why we are doing what we are doing. We submitted the tentative map and amendment concurrently to prevent any future changes more than 43 units on the remainder parcel. They would have to re-zone if they wanted apartment complex.
- Lois said we can use the activity in the County.
- **Trevor Lloyd**, Planning and Development, addressed Lois' concern and said no future developer can make development. They are retiring the density in this development.
- **Glenn Miller** asked if this will be tied into the Bridal Path. Mike showed the alignment with Sky Ranch and tie into Tranquil Drive. The only difference with our layout proposal is we split the lots in half, but will be consistent with other lots on subdivision and have two cul-de-sacs. Mike Vicks addressed a question about matching the look and drainage. He spoke about grading, drainage, and retention basin and showed them on the diagram and map where the retention ponds will be located.
- **Bill Meyers** asked about the water and the common area and drainage. Mike showed a low point in the road to collect the maximum overflow. The intent is to slow the water down before it gets to its final destination. In regards to the 100 year flow – its design to handle this level.
- Allyane Donnelly said a year or so ago, the drainage didn't flow away from the house. We had flood and damage. She asked in regards to the drainage and homes in the cul-de-sacs and how will that water flow, north? Mike said nothing drains north. The slope of this site will have a 2-5% slope. Nothing will head into Bridal path. On Sunset Springs, there are retention areas where it all comes down to and heads under Sunset Springs. It would have to be very significant flood for anything we could imagine if that got affected.
- **Bonnie Moffett** asked about the flow of the water. Was this the original intent? Mike said when the recession hit, the tentative map expired. The new tentative map has a few modifications. The drainage plan is the same in previous phases. We are keeping the same common area and low spots in the same place in previous plan.
- Mike clarified a question regarding lot sizes and said they are larger than the smallest than previous planned.
- **Ann Sweder** asked about water service. Mike said they have a will serve letter from Washoe County Department of Water Resources for water and sewer services. There is capacity in the system; the water rights will be imported from the Truckee river basin, he said no ground water is affected by this.
- **Bill Meyer** asked about the common area near Hay Field. Mike addressed his question to show the minor modifications.

David closed item 9A.

**B. [MASTER PLAN AMENDMENT CASE NUMBER MPA14-002 \(VILLAGE GREEN COMMERCE CENTER\)](#)** – To consider a request to amend Appendix D, *Village Green Commerce Center Specific Plan*, within the Spanish Springs Area Plan to (1) remove Assessor's Parcel Number 534-561-09 (located at 365 Calle De La Plata) from the Specific Plan and modify the maps, buffering and other development standards and phasing of the remaining properties; and (2) re-designate the Master Plan category of APN 534-561-09 from Industrial (I) to Rural Residential (RR); and (3) make the appropriate changes on all Spanish Springs Area Plan maps related thereto.

- Sandra Monsalve, Washoe County Project Planner reviewed items 9B & 9C: Master Plan case and subsequent regulatory zone.
- This case had come before the Spanish Spring CAB on July 9<sup>th</sup> with the Master Plan and zoning.
- The zoning was requested to be Low Density Rural. Sandra said she realized this low density wasn't allowed in this area under article 17.1.3.
- They want to amend the plan to Medium Density, which is 5 acre zoning to 10 acre zoning which required them to come back through the process.
- This review will act as a neighborhood meeting per Nevada Revised Statutes requirements.
- This is currently an approved plan on Spanish Springs on Calle De La Plata on Pyramid Highway. This plan has parcels within it. One parcel is zoned as industrial with a house on it. The request is to remove this parcel from industrial zoning. This is in Appendix D Spanish Spring Area Plan in the Washoe County Master Plan. In order to remove it, they would have to change the Master Plan amendment and Regulatory zoning amendment from Industrial zoning to Medium Density Rural Zoning 5 acre parcels. This is a 10 acre parcel with a house on it.
- Put this parcel back to rural large lot rural zoning in order to sell it in the future.
- This project is being heard on September 16 at the Planning Commission. It has to go before the Planning Commission, Board of County Commissioners, and additionally the Master Plan has to go to Regional Planning Commission before it can get changed on this parcel.
- Sandra invited everyone to contact her with any questions.

Questions and concerns:

- **Lois Kolbet** mentioned they can't sell the house unless it's change which seems ok. She asked what maximum number of houses could be put on the lots with the zoning being requested. Sandra said two lots; two homes, max. Lois said she didn't have problems with that.
- Maria Volkl asked for clarification about commercial zoning. Sandra answered her question about dividing the current lot and said if they want to apply for that in the future. It's putting it back to residential zoning.

**MOTION: Chair David Espinosa made a motion to approve 9B. This motion was unanimously approval.**

**MOTION: Chair David Espinosa made a motion to approve 9C. This motion was unanimously approved.**

**AND**

**C. REGULATORY ZONE AMENDMENT CASE NUMBER RZA14-003 (VILLAGE GREEN COMMERCE CENTER)** – To consider an amendment request at this time to remove APN 534-561-09 from the Village Green Commerce Center Specific Plan and change the current zoning designation of Industrial to Medium Density Rural. The address of APN 534-561-09 is 365 Calle De La Plata, Sparks, NV 89441. The property is located approximately 1,500 east of the intersection of Pyramid Hwy. and Calle De La Plata. **APN:** 534-561-09. **Staff Representative:** Sandra Monsalve, AICP, Senior Planner, 775-328-3608, [smonsalve@washoecounty.us](mailto:smonsalve@washoecounty.us). **Meeting Date:** These applications are tentatively scheduled to be heard by the Planning Commission on September 16, 2014.

**Important to note that agenda items B & C (above) are not related to item D (below)**

**D. MASTER PLAN AMENDMENT CASE NUMBER MPA12-001 (VILLAGE AT THE PEAK)** - A request to amend application of the Village at the Peak to amend the Spanish Springs Area Plan. The amendment request involves the creation of a new character management area on a 39.83 acre parcel to be named the Village Residential Character Management Area (VRCMA) and the redesignation of the 39.83 acre parcel from a mix of Industrial (I), Commercial (C) and Open Space (OS) to Suburban Residential (SR). The amendment request also includes a change to the Character Statement in the Spanish Springs Area Plan to identify the new VRCMA and to allow for multifamily uses within the VRCMA up to 9 dwelling units per acre; amend policies SS.1.1, SS.1.2, SS.1.3(d), SS.4.1, SS.15.1, SS.16.1, SS.17.5, SS.17.5.1; to add a new policies SS.1.5 (a) thru (g); to amend table C-1 to allow High Density Suburban (HDS) to the allowable use table and to adopt a new appendix (Appendix E- "Village Residential Design Guidelines"). To reflect changes requested within this application and to maintain currency of general area plan data, administrative changes to the Spanish Springs Area Plan are proposed. These administrative changes include: a revised map series with updated parcel base, and updated applicable text. **APN:** 534-562-07. **Staff representative:** Trevor Lloyd, Senior Planner, (775) 328-3620, [tlloyd@washoecounty.us](mailto:tlloyd@washoecounty.us). **Meeting Date:** This application is tentatively scheduled to be heard by the Planning Commission on September 16, 2014.

- **Trevor Lloyd**, Community Services, Planning and Development Department gave an overview on this project. This has been a long process with several workshops held with community on this process.
- This project failed at the Planning Commission. County Commissioners approved this project and Regional planning denied the request. It was brought it back to County Commissioners and asked for new applications.
- There are some significant changes: The big difference from previous application is that it has been narrowed down to one-48 acre parcel. Staff has been directed to work with applicant to bring it to the community. This is a neighborhood meeting, CAB, and Vision Workshop.
- It will be reviewed at next Tuesday, September 16 at the Planning Commission.
- Please call Trevor with questions and comments.
- John Krmptotic with KLS planning, representing Jim House is the applicant.
- Proposed Master Plan amendment to the Spanish Springs area plan.

**John gave an overview of the new application and the process:**

- 4 visioning workshops in community; there are a lot of emotions.
- This could be multi family or single family project.
- Jim House wants to request a multi family. 9 to the acre – 360 units at the most.
- This pins the request down, the village character to 1-48 acre parcel.
- We are asking for both multifamily and single family.
- The biggest issue on land use change is that it could affect the entire Spanish springs.
- 1-48 area parcel.
- Garrett will talk about the viability of the multifamily unit.

**John showed the Existing character management plan and proposed:**

- 48 acre site
- Reviewed the design guidelines for Spanish Springs in blue;
- Appendix B showed all the detail of what they are asking for.

**John Reviewed 2003 Master Plan vs. current Master Plan slideshow:**

- Land use changes since 2003. Today it's commercial and industrial and down grading in density.
- They heard they didn't want multifamily, 9 to the acre.
- There is reduction in traffic with combo of commercial and industrial in high density suburban.
- Proposed suburban resident where there was commercial/industrial. HDS which allows 9 to the acre. That is what we are requesting.

**Garrett Gordon, Representing Sugar Loaf Peak, LLC (Jim House owns Sugar Loaf Peak, LLC) reviewed the UNR Study:**

- Common theme among the different commissions: This was feasible, the right project at the right time in the right place, however the community expressed they didn't feel it was the right project. At that time, commissioner Hartung asked for quantifiable data. We pulled back application and take into concerns from the community. We felt the best thing to do was to conduct a study per Commissioner Hartung's recommendation.
- Brian Bonnenfant at UNR Regional Studies, conducted a study. The study broke it up into categories:
  - Housing demand (multi housing project),
  - Job/housing balance (near HACO business park),
  - Proliferation of multi housing in Spanish Springs, don't want to change the character. At the time, Garrett said some residents said they could get on board with a narrow 48 lot, not the whole Spanish Springs.
  - Transit/affordability. This study was submitted with application, it's a public record and anyone can request with public record.

**Garrett reviewed a map with Site of Analysis in a 2 mile radius**

- 12 million square feet of commercial/industrial this will create a potential for jobs. Equates to 8,500 potential additional for employment, this means new housing.
- According to the Spanish Springs Character Plan there would be a variety of housing options.
- Not everyone can afford single family according to wage realities.
- This is the right project at right place.

**Garrett reviewed a table diagram showing a comparison between Spanish Springs and other locations in Northern Nevada for multifamily:**

- 19,000 dwelling units in Spanish Springs; 975 multifamily; 2.8% are multifamily.
- There is housing demand for multifamily. Technical data shows Spanish springs is on high end potential for growth commercial/industrial, employees, and multifamily.

**Conclusions: 10 page study highlights**

- Demographics are changing: more houses with families and more houses living alone
  - 20-34 year olds range growing in Washoe County
  - 65-85 year olds
- Which equates to multifamily units is needed. Demographics are change – trend is for multifamily.
- Commercial/industrial within 2 mile of analysis.
- HACO continues to grow and it's under construction – 1.5 Million Sq Ft under construction.
- 7,700 jobs can be created potentially within the 2 miles of analysis site; and 8100 within northern Spanish Springs. Job opportunity.
- Current vacancy rates are 4% for multifamily units. This means there is the demand for multifamily.
- Only 2.8% of all multifamily units in Reno/Sparks are located in Spanish Springs.
- 27% of Spanish Springs residents are working in Spanish Springs. The remaining 73% commute outside of Spanish Springs.
- Industries are expected to locate within the 10 million sq ft of commercial and industrially zoned land.
- Industrial/commercial within 2 miles next to residential was highly undesirable and incompatible with the area. Multifamily creates a buffer with medium compatibility. We documented an agreement to create burms, trees, and buffers.
- All the commitments we have made and held to we have a written letter agreement. Commitments will be part of the Master Plan.
- Garrett mentioned the current zoning of the plan. The commercial and industrial would be a more intensive use with traffic. We are down zoning from commercial/industrial to multifamily.

### **Garrett Gordon Highlighted what this project is on the slideshow:**

- Caps units at 1,500 residential units, and we won't go above that.
- Proliferation and character: Garret showed the map and the boundary. Not changing boundary. We aren't asking to move the character management plan.
- This is not proliferation of multifamily – nowhere else can we do multifamily expect for the dots on the map. The next person who wants to do multifamily in your neighborhood, they will have to go through the same process.
- There has to be major changes to propose more in the future.

### **Questions and concerns:**

- **Lois Kolbet** asked what were the concerns at the Planning Commission? John said our original plan before, on the Master Plan level, could have been anywhere in the Spanish Springs, and now it's pinned down to 48 acres. There was language in Regional Plan about case by case the density increasing exceeding 5 to the acre but have to prove, case by case. Now it goes to case by case. The second was affordability; obvious the case is being made based on Brian's study; multifamily is more affordable than single family resident. And the other issue was transit planning and we are working on transit planning issue. Garrett said transit is a broad term. Only 23% people living in Spanish Springs are working in Spanish Springs. 73% are going out of the community. We believe this plan provides option for housing and positive transit goal.
- **Lois Kolbet** said she wanted to give some positive comments: One of the great things about condensed housing is condense housing uses less water. The other would be the culvert put in that would take the excess water from north side of Calle De La Plata and take it over to the sedimentation basin. The last time we had a flood, the north side of Calle De La Plata, the water had no way to get to the sedimentation basin and this construction would take care of that. She asked about a traffic signal. Garrett said design handbook commitments in Master Plan amendments that there will be a traffic signal. When warranted we will build it. The language is in there and it's a requirement. Lois asked about financing for housing and business. Business financing is hard. It stands a chance to get a traffic signal. John said the traffic engineer said the light is warranted. This developer would have to build it. He could get a reimbursement from those who benefit. Lois said she thinks the traffic figures are bogus; 10 to 1 is not accurate. Getting a traffic signal would counteract that.
- **Lois Kolbet** asked about High Density Suburban: why can't you do townhomes. John said this amendment gives us the flexibility to do multifamily, single family attached, condos, a wide range. 0 to 9 to the acre. No matter how much our client wants to do this and the validity of Brian's study, the viability is actually finding the finance for this project. That will be the real test. We have the flexibility in how we have this drafted up.
- **Lois Kolbet** spoke about property values. She said there is no detriment with multifamily units. And sometimes it improves it. Garrett said there is data about myths and facts about multifamily units on property values.
- **Sandra Theiss** said her concern was no bus service, the roads can't handle the traffic, schools over crowded, we don't have the necessary police and fire services and where will the water come from. She said she is not looking forward to it. She said they moved out to open to be in the open.
- **Maria Volkl** said we moved out here to be in the open and you come out with cheap housing.
- John said there are a lot of nay sayers about traffic. The traffic engineer takes the middle of the road use. There is a lot of science based on this. Compared to existing land use, it is a reduce in traffic. John addressed the school issue. He said school zoning can be redistricted and based on demand. Garrett read myths and facts with regard to the school issue. The original plan went to school district, police/fire department and we received no negative comments from these agencies. We have the staff report to reflect that. Our records concern, whatever impact we create, we have to mitigate. No negative comments in writing. We will look at it and see what we can do.
- **Garrett Gordon** answered the concern regarding Water rights. Water rights must be purchased through a municipality that would go through Truckee Meadow Water Authority (TMWA). We would build the infrastructure. John said Washoe County has a wholesale agreement with TMWA.
- **Maria Volkl** said she doesn't want cheap housing is coming in. She said she has worked all of her life for 10 acres. Now it will be industrial next to me. She said she was told it was 10 acre parcel, Spanish Spring ranches. It's being taken away. We paid \$21,000, Calle De La Plata, for the roads for these people will use.
- **Ralph Theiss** said they are one parcel away from the development. Ken Theiss lives on the property line. He said Jim House came to their house a few years back. We negotiated for several months and we came to an agreement. On this particular parcel, 40 acres discussed, it was 120 units on 40 acre parcel, 3 units per acre. Two years ago, they started this over and now Jim House wants to 360 units. How many apartments can you squeeze into one unit? 3 or 10 apartments per unit? That could be 3,600 units. He said they have had commission meetings; Washoe County Sheriffs can't cover that area of growth. Eagle Canyon Fire Department can't cover it. If it is built 3-stories, they don't have a ladder truck. The school district has spoken at these meetings. The bus services are 9 miles away. No one has spoke in favor of this project in 2 ½ years. We have turned in a petition against and we had 740 signatures on petition, and no one knows where those have gone. Trevor Lloyd said they have been brought to every meeting. Ralph said they didn't want our privacy interrupted with apartments. There have been traffic deaths at the intersection. We have been after stop lights for 10 years. It's on demand. It's up to NDOT to put it in. At Golden View, the church offered to pay for one to be put in. And finally one got put in after



several deaths. Jim House bought this property and he wants his zoning change so the next buyer has freedom to do whatever. People are going to work across the street at the warehouse. They will create a mess.

- **Matthew Chutter:** Addressed 2 areas of concern. The responsibility of the board is to consider the community. The applicant is requesting change to rules to community character. That's why rules are developed to protect the character. There are industrial warehouses are going automated and don't require many people. The jobs are diminishing per square foot. Dig into the statistics to find the averages. It's not the complete truth that describes our area. The second issue: This notion will create legal precedent. We moved out here because we wanted something different. We give up convenience and easy for this remoteness. We rely on the legal framework to protect us. They want to tear down our protection.
- **Ann Sweder** said RTC doesn't have a plan to come up here until 2035. The sewer system with Sparks won't have capacity. She expressed she doesn't want apartment next to her lot; it's rural, that's why they moved here. It's not right to put up the apartment complex. She said she is against it.
- **John Bradbury** talked about section 33. Section 33 is right behind the high school. Allowed section 33 – 3 section of land. Tan America got approval from City of Sparks to build 4,500 units that will connect to Lazy 5 Parkway and traffic light is the reason why it was put in. We fought for the light for years. The light at the church wasn't even supposed to be there. Things happen out of sequence. There will be more schools needed. They will have to order more buses.
- **Melody Chutter** wanted to stress how Reno is a fish bowl and when you condense the area, you can't breathe, smog, crime, traffic. Even though there will be more business generated, however, we will be spread too thin and it will create more problems. Spread too thin with services and sources of water. Everyone needs space. She said don't take it away, it's too much.
- **Vic Edwards** lives on Calle De Plata for 18 years. Their project is perfect for the industrial park near the Tesla warehouse.
- **Bonnie Moffett** asked several questions: Question for Trevor: what is the difference before when you reviewed it and it didn't meet criteria and it wasn't approved and now it does? Question about traffic light: Were you talking about our County Engineer or someone you hired? The fire services said they don't have equipment to reach a multi-story building. This use to be a 3 unit property and asked to be brought up to the 5. It was determined it didn't meet criteria. It got bumped up to the 5. What happen between then and now?
- **Trevor Lloyd** said they have been directed by our County Commissioner to make this a better project and make it work. He said they had a tough time, originally, grasping the concept around the true impacts when the effect was to change the character statement and land use on many properties instead of one single project. The review agencies didn't know how to give feedback on such a significant change, that dramatic on Spanish Springs valley versus just one property. We can look at the impacts and services needs for the one-40 acre property. It is significantly easier to look at impacts of one project than the whole valley.
- **Ron Swingham** asked about Trevor's comment 'you were directed to make it work.' Trevor said we were asked to work with applicants and go through the process. David Espinosa said you were asked by the County of Commissioners to work with the applicant, but not to go right through the process. Trevor said he miss spoke and said directed to work with application to amend application and address all the issues through the process. Trevor said by no means it's not a done deal. It still has to go to the Planning Commission and Regional Planning Commission. He apologized for miss speaking.
- **David Lewis** said he thinks Trevor is between a rock and hard spot. These boys have come up with numbers and said what everyone wants to hear. The County Commission tore Trevor apart and gave him the directive to make it work. He had to go through the the County Commissioner meeting as well as Citizen Advisory Board, and the Planning commission. It's 360 units on a narrow street that is congested. People are frustrated and angry. Our school district keeps saying we don't have space. There are a lot of problems with this project. Someday, it might be feasible. Until we get a light and more schools, it's not time. He said he had to say something to defend Trevor.
- **Terry Rondwait** said she has lived on her property since 2001. She told the CAB they are all intelligent members of the advisory board and they have to pay attention to the citizens you represent. Years ago, a different project, a member and citizen were part of stakeholder meeting at the County offices. The vocabulary was specific to planning development and zoning. The terminology used in the meeting, they will use their own words. Piece by piece, they will use their own words regarding the character. You are here to represent a rural community.
- **Lois Kolbet** spoke about the traffic report. The study said the traffic is less from multi family apartment because there is more walking and public transit – and that isn't not the case with this project. There is no public walking or transit until 2035. She said the traffic figures are bogus. The 1500 unit cap, if they use 360 units on the parcel, some other developer, and condensed it to one spot, they will eventually want high density. Those 4500 going into the high school, that will take care of the need for multi family housing for this area which has been approved for across for the library. She asked if we need more housing out there where there is no public transit and walking. She asked about access to the park on Calle De La Plata. There is no park. Would you buy access?
- **Ralph Theiss** said in 2 ½ years, 100s of people have gone to all the commission meetings, not one person has ever agreed to put in this zoning change.
- **Matthew Chutter** asked the Board to be conscious of the comparisons with traffic.

- **John Bradbury** spoke about the 465 single family units built behind the middle school.

#### Presenters' comments:

- John said he appreciated the citizen input and big part of planning process. Mr. Theiss is right...there has been no support for this. John said it makes him wonder what we have here. Not a lot of appetite for multifamily housing. There is some demand for market for multifamily housing.
- Garrett said there were support by some for the village concept and it would bring it together. It's a commercial/industrial, neighborhood node and we believe multi family is a nice addition today. This Master Plan has been amended 11 times just in text, not to mention the maps. It's a working document. Things change. He said he believes they have mitigated the impacts of what this project would be.

#### CAB member comments and questions:

- **Ken Theiss** said his wife is a teacher in the school district and the Spanish Springs elementary schools are already overcrowded. It's supposed to be 18 students per teacher and currently they have 22 students per teacher. They are building temporary schools. City of Sparks said they will not give more sewers to Spanish Springs; the sewer line can't handle it. A new line would have to be build or re-done. Where are the 8,500 jobs? How many jobs are out in this valley? Ken said his property is against this property line.
- Garrett Gordon responded Ken's concern regarding the issue of City of Sparks' feasibility study to handle water, sewer and storm drain. He said there is capacity for sewer, but they have concerns for future capacity. The plan for 1,500 units has been approved by regional. Sparks agreed for 1,500 for sewer service. We are staying under that.
- John said he spoke to engineering and public works director, Dwight. There is an interlocal agreement between the County and Sparks. There is an allocation of 8000 units. Equivalent Residential Units that can be connected to the main trunk line. 8,000 unit can be connected to major trunk line of allocation.
- **Chair David Espinosa** asked about ERU. He asked for the 40 acre cap? John said ERU equivalent of .7 or .8 compared to single family. Total units of 360 units which would be 300 ERUs rough estimate. ERU assigned to industrial and commercial. What is the ERU is water and sewer usage. David asked how ERUs determined for industrial vs. residential. 300 units are going to be 2-3 people per apartment; 8500 jobs created, and impact on sewer with those 8500 jobs. Significantly more than people living in that area. Are there studies done on that? How does that play out? John/Garrett said not that they are aware know of. John said there was a feasibility study for the Master Plan amendment on sewer water/storm water and market analysis and economic study commissioned by UNR.
- **Charity Rosasco** spoke about emergency services response times and school. She said her child's class size is large. She said the presenters said this is the future of Spanish springs to be bigger and better – that's not true. She said they moved out here to be spread out and for less noise and traffic. The study, you said people will eventually be employed in Spanish Springs, that's a concern. 4% vacancy rate for multifamily, is that due to foreclosure rate is high in Nevada, and people move into apartments. It's not necessarily good that our multifamily vacancy is low because of that. They can't afford single family homes, so will they spend money in our area? Not against apartments, just have to be in the right location. Garrett said it's about demographics of young and old who desire multi family. John said there will always be demands for apartments. 70% will always be single family, and the rest will be multifamily.
- **Ken Theiss** said they have come back stating it's only 40 acres and no one else can jump on the band wagon. Ken said Mr. Chutter is right. The developer will have to go through all the hoops and get approved, and someone else will go through and not get approved, they County will get sued. Garrett Gordon said in regards to case law, just because you approve one, doesn't allow another to be approved. It's case by case. Garrett said he respectfully disagreed with Ken from a legal stand point.
- **Dawn Costa-Guyon** asked about what is being slated to be built currently. HACO is building and she said she didn't know about Section 33 apartments. If we are close to capacity, and have to consider others who are building or plan to build, we have to consider water and sewer. What does the business park plan on building and those employees and impact on sewer already? John said yes. All impacts are quantified. Dawn asked what happens when they want to finish developments that aren't finished such as Lennar homes/HACO. Developments have been put on hold because of the economy; is this project infringing on their current plans. Garrett said feasibility plans were completed by everyone with Master Plan amendments as well as feasibility studies. We are different from HACO and industrial. They would all have to get approval for increase percentage. We aren't asking to go about that.
- **David Espinosa** asked Trevor about decisions being made at regional levels. We don't have the full regional numbers presented. He asked Trevor, when you are approving plans given the fact other people haven't been built yet, or approving the plan based on other plans had been approved, if overall capacity has been reached what the overall impact would be to the overall infrastructure. Trevor said they look at all the services from a global perspective. It's all tied together and we look at what happens in city of Reno and Sparks. And look at all service providers and focus on the impacts. When we establish that cap, we determined that is the upper limit to



serve, given the existing services. Big point to not to exceed that cap. David reiterated what Trevor said: we are looking at maximum capacity at A,B,C before we approve D. Trevor said in this case, yes.

- **Dawn Costa-Guyon** asked based on the numbers from the study, the younger generation and older generation want multifamily dwellings. Those who live here are going to be employed here. Those older generation might not need the employment. Do we have the infrastructure for 65-85 age range? Many in the Spanish Springs area are frustrated with transit. Will that age group even work here? There are enough of the resources and infrastructure out here to support the aging population. Have you thought about that? Garrett said the study shows job demands by who could possibility buying out here and possible renters. 12 million sq ft of industrial/commercial has been approved and tied to conditions exceptions. John said 12 million sq ft approved number. He showed the slideshow with the yellow, red and blue on the zoning by parcel PowerPoint map. 2 million sq ft is currently is built. There is a giant potential source of employment. Brian's report show average wage for multifamily dwellers.
- **Ken Theiss** asked about interlocal agreement with 8,000 units. Where are we at right now? Trevor said he would have to look at it. Trevor said he didn't think we were nearing capacity. Ken asked about cost of multifamily as 'less' expensive than single resident. Garrett said that part of the study Washoe County Assessor, the Medium Home Price for Spanish Springs \$250K new and existing, which is higher than Reno and Sparks \$219K. There is a discrepancy; there is market out here for less expensive option of the multifamily units. Regional level of higher than average, there is a market for multifamily units, and wages at current and potential industrial. Ken Theiss asked what is the cost of the multifamily units. Garrett said he didn't know, but it's fair to say it's less than \$250,000. It's based on timing, marketing and vacancy rates. It's hard to speculate. John said it depends on what you build, and it hasn't been determined what they build. Garrett said if there is no transit, they will have to have a car to drive there, and might have to be higher end units.
- **Chair David Espinosa** reminded everyone that this is an advisory board and we don't have a binding authority.

**Motion: David made a motion for approval of recommendation of this item 9D. Question was called. None were in favor. The motion was unanimously opposite by being signified Nay. This item was not approved.**

#### **Discussion:**

- **Chair David Espinosa** asked if anyone want additional information in order to affect your opinion of this item.
- **Dawn Costa-Guyon** said it's about the community who she is representing. It's not necessarily about her own opinion but representing a community. Gathering what the community wants, and brings it to the board.
- **Jim Theiss** said he agreed with Dawn. He said they are representing the community; trying to be objective, but we are listening to your efforts.
- **Chair David Espinosa** said he is conflicted; he likes the idea of the multi tenant competition to drive down prices. This was a positive aspect. No alternative and competition and not affordable for those who are trying to build their life. The negative aspect is how far we are away from services. The traffic will be an impact and an issue. As the Chair, he said he doesn't have to vote, however, he said he would have voted nay as well, for the record. How do we get over the hump as far as long term structure for Spanish Springs and services. There is conflicting information in the presentation. He urged everyone to attend future meetings. This was contentious issue and we appreciate everyone being civil.

David closed item 9D.

**10.\*CHAIRMAN/BOARD MEMBER ITEMS** - No items.

**11.\*PUBLIC COMMENT** –

**David Lewis** asked about the maximum number of people in 360 units. John said the average is 2.0 per people per unit. Mr. Lewis asked about the maximum density. How many people can you put into a unit? Trevor Lloyd said we can't restrict the number of people who live in a unit. The health and CPS can step in if becomes a health issue. We can't limit the number of people in a unit. Trevor said all they can do is use an average.

Chair David Espinosa thanked everyone.

**12. ADJOURNMENT – Motion: Ken Theiss made a motion to adjourn the meeting, Dawn Costa-Guyon seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 9:00pm.**

Number of CAB members present: 7

Number of Public Present: 30

Presence of Elected Officials: 0

Number of staff present: 3

Submitted By: Misty Moga