



WASHOE COUNTY

"Dedicated To Excellence in Public Service"

www.washoecounty.us

CM/ACM _____
Finance _____
DA _____
Risk Mgt. N/A
Clerk _____
Comptroller _____

STAFF REPORT

BOARD MEETING DATE: October 25, 2016

DATE: September 30, 2016

TO: Board of County Commissioners

FROM: Trevor Lloyd, Senior Planner, Planning and Development Division
Community Services Department, 328.3620, tlloyd@washoecounty.us

THROUGH: William H. Whitney, Division Director, Planning and Development
Community Services Department, 328-3617, bwhitney@washoecounty.us

SUBJECT: Hearing, discussion, and possible action on Appeal Case No. AX16-005 (Harris Ranch Subdivision), an appeal of the Planning Commission's decision to deny Tentative Map Case Number TM16-007 that involved the merger and re-subdivision of three lots into a 610 lot, single family detached, common open space subdivision on three parcels totaling ±610.34 acres. Lots would range in size from 10,000 square feet (.23 acres) to 50,855 square feet (1.17 acres) with lot sizes averaging approximately 14,866 square feet (.34 acres). The applicant is further requesting that the required yard setbacks be reduced from the required Low Density Suburban regulatory zone setbacks to the Medium Density Suburban regulatory zone setbacks of 20 feet front yard, 20 feet rear yard, and 8 foot side yard. The applicant is Spanish Springs Associates, LLC.

The subject parcels (APN: 534-600-01, 534-600-02 and 076-290-44) are located southeast of Pyramid Highway and Alamosa Drive. The properties are ±610.34 acres in size within the Spanish Springs Area Plan and the Spanish Springs Citizen Advisory Board boundaries, Sections 11 and 13, Township 21N, Range 20E, MDM. The Development Code sections applicable to this amendment are Articles 408 (Common Open Space Developments) and 608 (Tentative Subdivision Maps).

(Commission District 4.)

SUMMARY

The Washoe County Board of Commissioners (Board) may choose to confirm or reverse the Planning Commission's denial of Tentative Map Case Number TM16-007, which requested approval of a merger and re-subdivision of three lots into a 610 lot, single family detached, common open space subdivision on three parcels totaling ±610.34 acres. Lots will range in size from 10,000 square feet (.23 acres) to 50,855 square feet (1.17 acres) with lot sizes averaging approximately 14,866 square feet (.34 acres). The applicant is further requesting that the required yard setbacks be reduced from the required Low Density Suburban regulatory zone setbacks to the Medium Density Suburban regulatory zone setbacks of 20 feet front yard, 20 feet rear yard, and 8 foot side yard.

AGENDA ITEM # _____

Washoe County Strategic Objective supported by this item: Safe, secure, and healthy communities.

PREVIOUS ACTION

September 6, 2016 Planning Commission. After conducting a public hearing, and taking public testimony, the Planning Commission, by a unanimous vote, denied Tentative Map Case Number TM16-007. The basis for the denial included the Planning Commission's inability to make all of the necessary findings, specifically finding number 6 relating to public health.

BACKGROUND

The appellants are asking the Washoe County Commissioners to reverse the denial of the Planning Commission and approve the Harris Ranch subdivision. The appellants are asking to develop a 610 lot common open space subdivision on 610 acres of land on property that has a regulatory zone of low density suburban (LDS). The LDS regulatory zone was established on this property in 2004 and has a residential density of one dwelling unit per acre. A tentative map was previously approved on a portion of this property that allowed for the development of a 262 lot subdivision. That development has since expired and the applicants are looking to establish a new subdivision over a larger area. Lots would range in size from 10,000 square feet (.23 acres) to 50,855 square feet (1.17 acres) with lot sizes averaging approximately 14,866 square feet (.34 acres). The lot sizes are considerably smaller than the lots to the immediate west, north and east of the subject site, but they will be consistent with the lots to the immediate south within the Donovan Ranch subdivision.

FISCAL IMPACT

None.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board of County Commissioners review the record and take one of the following three actions:

1. Affirm the decision of the Planning Commission and deny Tentative Map Case Number TM16-007; or
2. Reverse the decision of the Planning Commission, and approve Tentative Map Number TM16-007 as proposed by the applicant with conditions as presented by staff; or
3. Reverse the decision of the Planning Commission, and approve Tentative Map Case Number TM16-007 but modify the request as deemed appropriate by the County Commission with conditions as presented by staff.

POSSIBLE MOTIONS

Should the Board of County Commissioners **agree** with the Planning Commission's action to deny Tentative Map Case Number TM16-007, staff offers the following motion:

“Move to confirm the Planning Commission's decision to deny Tentative Map Case Number TM16-007. This denial is based on this Board's review of the written materials and oral testimony at the public hearing, and this Board's interpretation of the findings made by the Planning Commission.”

Should the Board of County Commissioners **disagree** with the Planning Commission's action to deny Tentative Map Case Number TM16-007, staff offers the following motions:

“Move to reverse the Planning Commission's decision to deny Tentative Map Case Number TM16-007 and approve the merger and re-subdivision of three lots into a 610 lot, single family detached, common open space subdivision on three parcels totaling ±610.34 acres. This action is based on this Board's review of the written materials and oral testimony at the public hearing and this Board's interpretation of the relevant findings.”

OR

“Move to reverse the Planning Commission's decision to deny Tentative Map Case Number TM16-007 and approve the merger and re-subdivision of three lots into a 610 lot, single family detached, common open space subdivision on three parcels totaling ±610.34 acres with modifications as deemed appropriate by the County Commission. This action is based on this Board's review of the written materials and oral testimony at the public hearing, and this Board's interpretation of the relevant findings.”

Attachments:

- A. Planning Commission Action Order
- B. Planning Commission Staff Report
- C. Appeal Application
- D. Planning Commission Minutes
- E. Correspondence

xc: Applicant/Owner: Spanish Springs Associates, L.P., Attn: Jesse Haw, 550 W. Plumb Lane, #B-505, Reno, NV 89509

Representatives: C&M Engineering and Design, Attn: Lisa Menante, 5488 Reno Corporate Drive #200 B, Reno, NV 89511

Representatives: Robert M. Sader, 8600 Technology Way, Suite 101, Reno, NV 89521



Planning Commission Action Order
Tentative Map Case Number TM16-007

Decision: **Denial**

Decision Date: September 6, 2016

Mailing/Filing Date: September 8, 2016

Property Owner: Spanish Springs Associates, L.P.
 Attn: Jesse Haw
 550 W. Plumb Lane, #B-505
 Reno, NV 89509

Assigned Planner: Trevor Lloyd, Senior Planner
 Washoe County Community Services Department
 Planning and Development Division
 Phone: 775.328.3620
 E-Mail: tlloyd@washoecounty.us

Tentative Map Case Number TM16-007 (Harris Ranch) – Hearing, discussion, and possible action to approve the merger and re-subdivision of three lots into a 610 lot, single family detached, common open space subdivision on three parcels totaling ±610.34 acres. Lots will range in size from 10,000 square feet (.23 acres) to 50,855 square feet (1.17 acres) with lot sizes averaging approximately 14,866 square feet (.34 acres). The applicant is further requesting that the required yard setbacks be reduced from the required Low Density Suburban regulatory zone setbacks to the Medium Density Suburban regulatory zone setbacks of 20 feet front yard, 20 feet rear yard, and 8 foot side yard.

- Applicant/Owner: Spanish Springs Associates, L.P.
- Location: Southeast of Pyramid Highway and Alamosa Drive in Spanish Springs
- Assessor’s Parcel Numbers: 534-600-01; 534-600-02 and 076-290-44
- Parcel Size: 610.34
- Master Plan Category: Suburban Residential (SR)
- Regulatory Zone: Low Density Suburban (LDS)
- Area Plan: Spanish Springs
- Citizen Advisory Board: Spanish Springs
- Development Code: Article 408 Common Open Space Developments and Article 608 Tentative Subdivision Maps
- Commission District: 4 – Commissioner Hartung
- Section/Township/Range: Section 11 & 13, T21N, R20E, MDM, Washoe County, NV

Notice is hereby given that the Washoe County Planning Commission denied the above referenced case number based on the inability to make the findings required by Washoe County Development




To: Spanish Springs Associates, L.P.
Subject: TM16-007
Date: September 8, 2016
Page: 2

Code Section 110.608.25, specifically the Planning Commission was unable to make the finding identified below:

1. Public Health. That the design of the subdivision or type of improvement is likely to cause significant public health problems;

Anyone wishing to appeal this decision to the Washoe County Board of County Commissioners may do so within 10 calendar days after the Mailing/Filing Date shown on this Action Order. To be informed of the appeal procedure, call the Planning staff at **775.328.6100**. Appeals must be filed in accordance with Section 110.912.20 of the Washoe County Development Code.

Washoe County Community Services Department
Planning and Development Division



Carl R. Webb, Jr., AICP
Secretary to the Planning Commission

CRW/TL/ks

xc:

Applicant/Owner: Spanish Springs Associates, L.P., Attn: Jesse Haw, 550 W. Plumb Lane, #B-505, Reno, NV 89509

Representative: C&M Engineering and Design, Attn: Lisa Menante, 5488 Reno Corporate Drive #200 B, Reno, NV 89511

Representative: Robert M. Sader, 8600 Technology Way, Suite 101, Reno, NV 89521

Action Order xc: Nathan Edwards, Esq., District Attorney's Office; Keirsten Beck, Assessor's Office (CAAS); Josh Wilson, Assessor's Office; Tim Simpson, Utilities; Leo Vesely, Engineering Division; Amy Ray, Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District; Nevada Division of Environmental Protection, 901 South Stewart Street, Suite. 4001, Carson City, NV 89701-5249; Nevada Department of Transportation, Attn: Jae Pullen; Regional Transportation Commission, Attn: Debra Goodwin; Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency, One East First Street, Suite 900, Reno, NV 89501-1625; Chair Spanish Springs Citizen Advisory Board, Chair



Planning Commission Staff Report

Meeting Date: September 6, 2016

Subject: Tentative Subdivision Map Case Number: TM16-007
 Applicant(s): Spanish Springs Associates, L.P.
Agenda Item Number: 8A
 Project Summary: 610-lot common open space subdivision
Recommendation: Approval with Conditions
 Prepared by: Trevor Lloyd, Senior Planner
 Planning and Development Division
 Washoe County Community Services Department
 Phone: 775.328.3620
 E-Mail: tlloyd@washoecounty.us

Description

Tentative Map Case Number TM16-007 (Harris Ranch) – Hearing, discussion, and possible action to approve the merger and re-subdivision of three lots into a 610 lot, single family detached, common open space subdivision on three parcels totaling ±610.34 acres. Lots will range in size from 10,000 square feet (.23 acres) to 50,855 square feet (1.17 acres) with lot sizes averaging approximately 14,866 square feet (.34 acres). The applicant is further requesting that the required yard setbacks be reduced from the required Low Density Suburban regulatory zone setbacks to the Medium Density Suburban regulatory zone setbacks of 20 feet front yard, 20 feet rear yard, and 8 foot side yard.

- Applicant/Owner: Spanish Springs Associates, L.P.
- Location: Southeast of Pyramid Highway and Alamosa Drive in Spanish Springs
- Assessor's Parcel Numbers: 534-600-01; 534-600-02 and 076-290-44
- Parcel Size: 610.34
- Master Plan Category: Suburban Residential (SR)
- Regulatory Zone: Low Density Suburban (LDS)
- Area Plan: Spanish Springs
- Citizen Advisory Board: Spanish Springs
- Development Code: Article 408 Common Open Space Developments and Article 608 Tentative Subdivision Maps
- Commission District: 4 – Commissioner Hartung
- Section/Township/Range: Section 11 & 13, T21N, R20E, MDM, Washoe County, NV

Staff Report Contents

Description..... 1
Tentative Subdivision Map 3
Vicinity Map 4
Site Plan 5
Project Evaluation 6
Spanish Springs Area Plan10
Reviewing Agencies.....13
Staff Comments on Required Findings.....14
Recommendation.....16
Motion.....16
Appeal Process.....17

Exhibits Contents

Conditions of Approval..... Exhibit A
Washoe County Engineering Letter..... Exhibit B
Nevada Department of Transportation Letter Exhibit C
Nevada Department of Environmental Protection Letter..... Exhibit D
Nevada Division of Water Resources Letter Exhibit E
Washoe County Utilities Letter Exhibit F
Regional Transportation Commission Letter Exhibit G
Washoe County School District Letter..... Exhibit H
Comments & Questions from August 4, 2016 Neighborhood Meeting.....Exhibit I
Tree Preservation Plan Exhibit J
Public Notice..... Exhibit K

Tentative Subdivision Map


The purpose of a Tentative Subdivision Map is:

- To allow the creation of saleable lots;
- To implement the Washoe County Master Plan, including the Area Plans, and any specific plans adopted by the County;
- To establish reasonable standards of design and reasonable procedures for subdivision and re-subdivision in order to further the orderly layout and use of land and insure proper legal descriptions and monumenting of subdivided land; and;
- To safeguard the public health, safety and general welfare by establishing minimum standards of design and development for any subdivision platted in the unincorporated area of Washoe County.


If the Planning Commission grants an approval of the Tentative Subdivision Map, that approval is subject to Conditions of Approval. Conditions of Approval are requirements that need to be completed during different stages of the proposed project. Those stages are typically:

- Prior to recordation of a final map.
- Prior to obtaining a final inspection and/or a certificate of occupancy on a structure.
- Prior to the issuance of a business license or other permits/licenses.
- Some Conditions of Approval are referred to as "Operational Conditions." These conditions must be continually complied with for the life of the project.

The Conditions of Approval for Tentative Subdivision Map Case Number TM16-007 are attached to this staff report and will be included with the Action Order if the application is approved by the Planning Commission.



Vicinity Map



Site Plan

Project Evaluation

The applicants are proposing to develop a 610 lot common open space subdivision on 610 acres of land on property that has a regulatory zone of low density suburban (LDS). The LDS regulatory zone was established on this property in 2004 and has a residential density of one dwelling unit per acre. A tentative map was previously approved on a portion of this property that allowed for the development of a 262 lot subdivision. That development has since expired and the applicants are looking to establish a new subdivision over a larger area.

Lots will range in size from 10,000 square feet (.23 acres) to 50,855 square feet (1.17 acres) with lot sizes averaging approximately 14,866 square feet (.34 acres). The lot sizes are considerably smaller than the lots to the immediate west, north and east of the subject site, but they will be consistent with the lots to the immediate south within the Donovan Ranch subdivision.

The Character Statement of the Spanish Springs Area Plan describes the existing and desired land use pattern in the Spanish Springs planning area as distinct suburban core concentrated along Pyramid Highway that includes a broad mix of non-residential uses together with residential densities of up to three dwelling units per acre. These suburban land uses are located predominately, but not exclusively, on the west side of Pyramid Highway. Outside the suburban core, a transition to a more rural character occurs. This transition occurs most rapidly in the west as elevation increases along the western slopes of the Spanish Springs Valley. To the north and east, the transition to rural stretches out into the valley and includes lower density, suburban residential opportunities (one- to five-acre parcels).

The development will utilize the common open space development option available in Article 408, *Common Open Space Developments*, to cluster the lots toward the western portion of the property while retaining approximately 358 acres in common open space. A portion of the common open space will be dedicated lands for a future school, park and trails. The development will include a significant buffer from adjacent properties including a 100 foot buffer from the property line to the south, between 266 to 300 foot buffer from the property line to the west, 240 foot buffer from the property line to the north and over 1,000 foot buffer from the property line to the east.

Washoe County Schools

Washoe County schools in Spanish Springs are currently over-crowded and the proposed development will further impact the existing schools. The proposed development is expected to generate 169 elementary school students, 39 middle school students and 83 high school students and is currently zoned for Alice Taylor Elementary School, Shaw Middle School and Spanish Spring High School. According to the Washoe County School District (WCSD), Alice Taylor Elementary School is operating at 111 percent of base capacity, Shaw Middle School is operating at 95 percent of base capacity and Spanish Springs High School is operating at 107 percent of base capacity. Per WCSD-adopted Policy 6111, most elementary schools will transition to a multi-track year round schedule when their enrollment reaches 120 percent of capacity and most middle and high schools will be converted to a double session calendar when enrollment exceeds 120 percent of capacity. Also, assignments to the closest schools with available capacity may be implemented for students in this development. Washoe County School District has requested a condition requiring that a disclosure shall be made by the developer to each homebuyer/renter on their closing/rental documents that K-12 students in this

subdivision may be assigned to the nearest WCSD schools with available capacity in the event that the currently zoned schools cannot accommodate additional students. The applicants are proposing to set aside 21 acres of property for the possible future construction of a Washoe County school site and a Washoe County park site.

Recreational Amenities

Recreational amenities will be minimal. The applicants are not proposing the construction of any recreational improvements other than sidewalks which are required by Code. The applicants are offering to grant easements for public trails and dedicate land for a public park and several hundred acres of land will remain vacant as common open space. Additionally, the applicants are required to construct an all-weather access road with several connection roads along the southern boundary adjacent to the Donovan Ranch subdivision/aggregate pit that can be used as pedestrian access to the regional trail system. Washoe County shall condition the recordation of a public pedestrian access easement around the perimeter of the subdivision. Also, the applicants have offered to set aside a large area near the entrance to the development for a future Washoe County park. However, Washoe County cannot condition the construction of this park or the perimeter trail and the County does not have available funds at this time to construct and maintain any future park. The nearest existing Washoe County park site is located approximately 3 miles from this property at the Gator Swamp park adjacent to Alice Taylor Elementary School. Staff has proposed a condition that a disclosure be made by the developer to each homebuyer on their closing documents that a park site and perimeter pedestrian trail easement have been offered to Washoe County but the developer is not responsible for constructing the improvements and there are no guarantees that either will be constructed.

Traffic

The primary access to the project site is Pyramid Highway which transitions from a 4-lane highway to a 2-lane highway north of Sunset Springs Drive. The speed limit transitions from 55 miles per hour to 65 miles per hour north of Calle De La Plata. According to the Traffic Analysis prepared by Solaegui Engineers, the proposed development involving the 610 single-family dwelling units will generate approximately 5,544 average daily trips (ADT) with 437 trips occurring during the AM peak hour and 535 trips occurring during the PM peak hour. Their analysis provides the following recommendations:

1. The Pyramid Highway/Landmark Drive-Alamosa Drive intersection continue to operate as a full movement intersection with stop sign control at the east and west approaches;
2. The east approach include one left turn lane with 275 feet of storage length and one shared through right turn lane;
3. The south approach shall be improved to include an exclusive right turn lane with 545 feet of deceleration length;
4. The northeast corner shall be improved to include a 150 foot taper to accommodate the westbound to northbound right turn lane; and,
5. The entire segment of Alamosa Drive from Pyramid Highway to its terminus within the project site and the entire segment of the street located just south of the school site each be constructed per Washoe County collector street standards and the remaining on-site streets shall be constructed per Washoe County local street standards.

The proposed application and traffic analysis were reviewed by the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) and the Washoe County Traffic Engineer. NDOT indicated that based

on their initial review of this intersection based on the submitted traffic study, the generated vehicle trips do not warrant a traffic signal. However, it is recommended and conditioned by Washoe County staff and supported by NDOT that the applicant should design and construct a high "T" intersection at the intersection of Alamosa and Pyramid Highway. NDOT will also require an occupancy permit for any work conducted within the NDOT right of way. NDOT also recommends the installation of lighting enhancements at the intersection of Alamosa and Pyramid Highway to improve visibility of motor vehicles, bicycles and pedestrians.

The internal streets proposed throughout the subdivision are generally long and straight. As a result, Washoe County staff shall require the installation of traffic calming measures to the satisfaction of the Washoe County Engineer along the following proposed streets: Kings River, Pah Rah Ridge, Quinn River, Saval Ranch, W. Crosby Ranch, Neff Ranch, N. Spanish Ranch and Bull Run Court.

Grading and Drainage

The anticipated grading necessary to support the project involves the disturbance of approximately 785,000 cubic yards of earthen material over several hundred acres. There is not importing or exporting of dirt anticipated as it is expected that the grading of the dirt will be balanced on site. The maximum allowable steepness for cut and fill slopes within the development are a 3:1 slope.

The final design of the drainage system will need to address ongoing concerns with the discharge of the detention basins along the western boundary. It is essential that the discharge must produce no significant adverse impacts to the downhill property. The final drainage design must demonstrate that the development has mitigated any increase in runoff and that runoff discharge onto offsite properties is substantially the same manner and location of existing runoff. As these factors are Code requirements, no additional conditions of approval are recommended.

Special Setbacks

The proposed subdivision will include lots ranging in size from 10,000 to 50,855 square feet. The average lot size of 14,866 square feet is consistent with the Medium Density Suburban (MDS) regulatory zone sized lots, for this reason the applicants are asking to reduce the yard setbacks to match the required setbacks of the MDS regulatory zone of 20 feet front yard, 20 feet rear yard, and 8 foot side yard. Staff supports the proposed setback reduction because the MDS setbacks are more appropriate for the small lot sizes as proposed for this development.

Site Characteristics

The property is vacant with gentle to moderate slopes throughout the property. The steeper portions of the property will remain vacant/undeveloped. According to the Spanish Springs Development Suitability map, there are no development constraints on the property. The property is surrounded by Low Density Suburban (LDS) and Low Density Rural (LDR) regulatory zones to the west, General Rural (GR) regulatory zones to the north and east, and LDS and GR regulatory zones to the south. The elevation of the site at the western edge is approximately 4560 feet, and the elevation at the highest point, near the eastern edge is approximately 4970 feet.

Fire Protection

Fire protection services will be provided by the Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District (TMFPD). Their nearest station is located approximately 4 miles to the south on La Posada Drive. All developments on the property shall comply with Washoe County Code Chapter 60. Additionally, open space and drainage shall be maintained in accordance with the vegetation management plan of Washoe County Code Chapter 60.

Water and Sewer

The Truckee Meadows Water Authority (TMWA) shall be the water service provider and is agreeable to supplying water to this project subject to certain conditions being met including the annexation of this property into the TMWA service area. In 2015, the Truckee Meadows Water Authority (TMWA) prepared a discovery for the subject site; the findings were based on 750 units (not the 610 units as proposed). Based on TMWA's conceptual water service plan, the estimated maximum daily demand is approximately 740 gallons per minute. The estimated water demand for the proposed 610 lot subdivision is approximately 274.5 acre feet and the maximum daily demand would be approximately 601.87 gallons per minute. This estimated water demand does not include water for common area irrigation which will be minimal.

Sewer service will be provided by Washoe County and treatment will be at the Truckee Meadows Water Reclamation Facility. The subdivision will be served by a gravity sewer system that drains to the existing Pebble Creek-North Spanish Springs Lift Station located west of the subdivision. According to the feasibility report provided with the application, the lift station has adequate capacity to serve the additional homes as it was sized for the full build-out of the northern portion of the Spanish Springs Area Plan. Washoe County prepared a discover study for the proposed project and concluded that it can provide sewer service to the proposed project and sufficient existing line capacity should be in place and no improvements will be required by Washoe County to the collection system or Pebble Creek Lift Station.

Landscaping

Proposed landscaping will be minimal. There is no required landscaping for this development. There are a scattering of existing trees on the property and the applicant has indicated that approximately 4 trees will be removed during the grading required for this project.

Neighborhood Meeting

The Spanish Springs Citizen Advisory Board (SSCAB) did not schedule a meeting during the application review period for the Harris Ranch Tentative Map. However, the applicants scheduled a neighborhood meeting and met with a large number neighboring residents on August 4, 2016 at Spanish Springs Elementary School. Most of the discussion focused on traffic concerns, especially involving safety concerns for traffic entering and exiting onto Pyramid Highway from Alamosa. Many expressed a desire to see a traffic signal at Alamosa and Pyramid, and there were questions regarding the proposed single primary access and how current truck traffic from the business park creates problems for residential traffic. Many residents expressed a desire to have a representative from NDOT available at the Planning Commission meeting in September. Concerns were also raised regarding setbacks, fire services, home sizes and home prices, size of lots, lighting, grading and air quality and other concerns related to growth in the Spanish Springs valley. A more complete list of questions/concerns and the applicant's responses are provided as Exhibit J.

Spanish Springs Area Plan

The following policies of the Spanish Springs Area Plan, a part of the Washoe County Master Plan, are relevant to the proposed tentative subdivision map.

Goal One: The pattern of land use designations in the Spanish Springs Area Plan will implement and preserve the community character described in the Character Statement.

SS.1.7 Tentative subdivision maps will not be approved for any development until the impacts of that development have been included in any applicable water resources facilities plan.

Staff Response: At the time this policy was written, Washoe County was the water surveyor for developments in Washoe County. Now that TMWA has taken over this responsibility, per Section 110.422.15 of the Washoe County Code, Washoe County no longer prepares such water resources facilities plans.

Goal Three: The regional and local transportation system in the Spanish Springs planning area will be a safe, efficient, multi-modal system providing significant connections to the greater region, and access to commercial services, public lands and employment opportunities in the community. The system will contribute to the preservation and implementation of the co Spanish Springs Vision and Character Statement.

SS.3.5 Washoe County will be an advocate for restricted access to Pyramid Highway pursuant to the provision of the Pyramid Highway Corridor Management Plan.

Staff Response: The proposed development will utilize an existing access onto Pyramid Highway. No new access points will be added to the Highway.

Goal Four: Maintain open vistas of the surrounding ridges a mountain ranges, and minimize the visual impact of hillside development.

SS.4.1 With the exception of temporary infrastructure for construction projects, Washoe County will require the underground placement of utility distribution infrastructure within the Suburban Character Management Area. Utility transmission facilities will be subject to a special use permit. In considering whether to grant a special use permit or in consideration of any conditions including underground placement which may be placed upon an approval, the Planning Commission will utilize the best available information including, but not limited to, the most recent Regional Utility Corridor Report and any Environmental Impact Statement or other study undertaken regarding the proposal.

Staff Response: All utility lines required to support the development will be placed underground.

SS.4.2 The Washoe County Departments of Community Development and Public Works will establish and oversee compliance with design standards for grading that minimize the visual impact of all residential and non-residential hillside development.

Staff Response: The development will avoid any grading on the steeper slopes and retain grading and development on the more gradual sloped areas.

SS.4.3 The grading design standards referred to in Policy SS.4.2 will, at a minimum, ensure that disturbed areas shall be finished and fill slopes will not exceed a 3:1 slope, and that hillside grading will establish an undulating naturalistic appearance by creating varying curvilinear contours.

Staff Response: Cut and fill slopes shall not exceed 3:1 slopes.

Goal Six: Public and private of cultural and historic resources in the community.

SS.6.2 Washoe County will cooperate and participate with state and federal agencies in the planning and conservation activities of those agencies related to cultural and historic resources.

Staff Response: The application was submitted to the State Historic Preservation Office to coordinate their efforts to conserve potential cultural and historic resources.

Goal Seven: The Spanish Springs planning area will contain an extensive system of parks and trails that provides the community and the region with a broad range of recreational opportunities; provides connections between major developments, recreational facilities, the Regional Trail System, public lands and schools; and contributes to the preservation and implementation of the community character.

SS.7.2 New trails will be designed to accommodate equestrian, pedestrian and off-road bicycle traffic, unless technical stewardships warrant consideration of a more limited use.

Staff Response: Staff has proposed conditions that the applicant record an access easement to support equestrian, pedestrian and off-road bicycles.

SS.7.4 As new residential and commercial properties develop in the Spanish Springs Valley, the Washoe County Department of Parks and Recreation will review development proposals for potential trail connections.

Staff Response: Plans were reviewed by the Washoe County Parks staff to ensure that there were connections to regional trail connections.

SS.7.6 Access to existing trails will be protected and improved whenever possible. During the process of development review, the Washoe County Departments of Community Development and Parks and Recreation will request dedication of property and/or easements when appropriate trail alignments have been identified that link significant nodes within the Spanish Springs planning area or connect existing trails.

Staff Response: The plans provide for the dedication of property and/or easements to link access to existing trails.

SS.7.7 Development proposals and population trends will be evaluated on their impact to an established community standard of seven acres of community park per

1,000 residents. When warranted, the Washoe County Department of Parks and Recreation will request the dedication of an appropriate amount of community park acreage as property develops within the planning area.

Staff Response: The applicants have offered to set aside 21 acres for the dedication of a community park (and Washoe County school site).

Goal Eight: The Spanish Springs planning area will maintain or exceed federal, state and local carbon monoxide, ambient particulates (pm10) and ozone air quality standards, and the vistas of the surrounding ridges and more distant mountain ranges will not be obstructed by man-made pollutants.

SS.8.2 Development in the Spanish Springs area will comply with all state and federal standards regarding Air Quality.

Staff Response: The Air Quality Division of the District Health Department will ensure compliance with state and federal air quality standards.

Goal Twelve: Water resources will be supplied to land uses in the Spanish Springs planning areas of sustainable resource development.

SS.12.1 Residential and commercial development must utilize one or a combination of the following reliable water resources that are replenished in quantities to meet the needs of the area without reliance upon groundwater mining or recharge from agricultural uses:

- a. Decreed Truckee River water rights or other approved imported surface water rights when used with an appropriate drought yield discount as determined by the water purveyor and approved by the State Engineer.
- b. Imported groundwater from a source that is replenished in sufficient quantity to meet the demands placed upon a source without groundwater mining.
- c. Certificated groundwater rights or permitted quasi-municipal groundwater rights (that existed as of May 22, 1990) matched by imported, decreed surface water from a source such as the Truckee River.

Staff Response: The development will be served by the Truckee Meadows Water Authority which will utilize Decreed Truckee river water.

Goal Fifteen: Water resources will be provided to residential and non-residential uses in a manner that implements and preserves the co scribed in the Spanish Springs Vision and Character Statement.

SS.15.1 Whenever applicable, all development within the Spanish Springs Suburban Character Management Area will connect to a community water service.

Staff Response: The development will connect to a community water source, which is served by the Truckee Meadows Water Authority (TMWA).

Goal Sixteen: Wastewater treatment and disposal will be provided to residential and non-

residential uses in a manner that implements and preserves the character as described in the Spanish Springs Vision and Character Statement.

SS.16.1 within the Spanish Springs Suburban Character Management Area will connect to a community sewer service.

Staff Response: The development will connect to Washoe County sewer service.

Reviewing Agencies

The following agencies received a copy of the project application for review and evaluation.

- Washoe County Community Services Department
 - Engineering and Capital Projects
 - Planning and Development
 - Regional Parks and Open Space
 - Traffic
 - Utilities (Sewer)
- Nevada Division of Environmental Protection
- Nevada Department of Water Resources
- Nevada Department of Wildlife
- Nevada Department of Transportation
- Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District
- Truckee Meadows Regional Planning Agency
- Sparks Community Services Department
- Regional Transportation Commission
- Washoe County Health District
- Washoe County School District
- Washoe-Storey Conservation District
- Truckee Meadows Water Authority
- Nevada State Historic Preservation Office
- The Airport Authority

Twelve of the nineteen above-listed agencies/departments submitted a response to the proposed tentative subdivision map. A summary of each agency's comments and/or recommended conditions of approval and their contact information are provided. The Conditions of Approval document is attached to this staff report and will be included with the Action Order should the Planning Commission approve the tentative subdivision map application.

- Washoe County Planning and Development addressed the lot layout, setbacks, lighting, coordination with other agencies, etc.

Contact: Trevor Lloyd, 328-3620, tlloyd@washoecounty.us

- Washoe County Engineering and Capital Projects addressed grading, drainage, stormwater management, maintenance of common area, easements, traffic, etc.

Contact: Walt West, 328-2310, wwest@washoecounty.us

- Washoe County Health District addressed water system requirements, catch basin and detention basin design, rockery wall design, roadside ditch design, etc.
Contact: James English, 328-2434, jenglish@washoecounty.us
JL Shaffer, 785-4599, jshaffer@washoecounty.us
- Nevada Division of Environmental Protection requires the submittal of a construction stormwater permit.
Contact: Alexis Perkins, 687-4670
- Washoe County Planning and Development – Parks and Open Space requested the addition of a perimeter pedestrian access easement.
Contact: Dennis Troy, 328-2059, dtroy@washoecounty.us
- Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District addressed requirements of Washoe County Code 60, including the International Fire Code, vegetation management, and CC&R requirements.
Contact: Amy Ray, 326-6000, aray@fmfpd.us
- Washoe County Utility Services Division requires improvement plans for construction of sanitary sewer collection system(s), sanitary sewer report, fees, and easements.
Contact: Tim Simpson, 775.954.4648, tsimpson@washoecounty.us
- Nevada Division of Water Resources stated that water rights are required. A will serve letter from TMWA will be required.
Contact: Steve Shell, 775.684.2836, sshell@water.nv.gov
- Washoe County School District asks for a condition for a disclosure to all future homebuyer that students may be assigned to nearest school(s).
Contact: Mike Boster 775.232.1571, mboster@washoeschools.net

Staff Comments on Required Findings

Washoe County Code Section 110.608.25 requires that all of the following findings be made to the satisfaction of the Washoe County Planning Commission before granting approval of the tentative map request. Staff has completed an analysis of the application and has determined that the proposal is in compliance with the required findings as follows.

- 1) Plan Consistency. That the proposed map is consistent with the Master Plan and any specific plan.

Staff Comment: The proposed tentative map meets all of the applicable goals and policies of the Washoe County Master Plan and the Spanish Springs Area Plan.
- 2) Design or Improvement. That the design or improvement of the proposed subdivision is consistent with the Master Plan and any specific plan.

Staff Comment: The proposed tentative map meets all of the density, lot size and common open space criteria of the Washoe County Master Plan and the Spanish Springs Area Plan. The proposed development complies with the one dwelling unit per acre allowed in Low Density Suburban (LDS) regulatory zone.

- 3) Type of Development. That the site is physically suited for the type of development proposed.

Staff Comment: The site is physically suited for the type of development proposed. Although the lots are smaller than the adjacent properties to the west, east and north, the proposed development is consistent with the lot sizes of the development immediately to the south.

- 4) Availability of Services. That the subdivision will meet the requirements of Article 702, Adequate Public Facilities Management System.

Staff Comment: There are adequate public services available to serve the proposed development.

- 5) Fish or Wildlife. That neither the design of the subdivision nor any proposed improvements is likely to cause substantial environmental damage, or substantial and avoidable injury to any endangered plant, wildlife or their habitat.

Staff Comment: The proposed development is not located within an environmentally sensitive location. The proposed improvements will not cause substantial environmental damage or harm to endangered plants, wildlife or their habitat.

- 6) Public Health. That the design of the subdivision or type of improvement is not likely to cause significant public health problems.

Staff Comment: Due to the location and design of the subdivision and type of improvements, this development is not likely to cause significant public health problems.

- 7) Easements. That the design of the subdivision or the type of improvements will not conflict with easements acquired by the public at large for access through, or use of property within, the proposed subdivision.

Staff Comment: There are currently no public easements through this property. The design of the subdivision will include emergency access and pedestrian sidewalks and easements and possible trails that may be used, if built, by future residents of the development as well as residents from neighboring developments.

- 8) Access. That the design of the subdivision provides any necessary access to surrounding, adjacent lands and provides appropriate secondary access for emergency vehicles.

Staff Comment: The design of the subdivision provides access to surrounding adjacent lands and provides appropriate secondary access for emergency vehicles.

- 9) Dedications. That any land or improvements to be dedicated to the County is consistent with the Master Plan.

Staff Comment: The applicants are proposing to set aside lands for the dedication of a school site and a park site.

- 10) Energy. That the design of the subdivision provides, to the extent feasible, for future passive or natural heating or cooling opportunities in the subdivision.

Staff Comment: To the extent feasible, the development will include building materials to allow for passive or natural heating and cooling opportunities.

Recommendation

Those agencies which reviewed the application recommended conditions in support of approval of the project. Therefore, after a thorough analysis and review, Tentative Subdivision Map Case Number TM16-007 is being recommended for approval with the Conditions of Approval included as Attachment A to the staff report for this item. Staff offers the following motion for the Board's consideration.

Motion

I move that after giving reasoned consideration to the information contained in the staff report and information received during the public hearing, the Washoe County Planning Commission approve Tentative Subdivision Map Case Number TM16-007 for Harris Ranch with the Conditions of Approval included as Attachment A to the staff report, and includes that the setbacks be reduced from the required Low Density Suburban regulatory zone setbacks to the Medium Density Suburban regulatory zone setbacks of 20 foot front yard, 20 foot rear yard, and 8 foot side yard, having made all ten findings in accordance with Washoe County Development Code Section 110.608.25:

- 1) Plan Consistency. That the proposed map is consistent with the Master Plan and any specific plan;
- 2) Design or Improvement. That the design or improvement of the proposed subdivision is consistent with the Master Plan and any specific plan;
- 3) Type of Development. That the site is physically suited for the type of development proposed;
- 4) Availability of Services. That the subdivision will meet the requirements of Article 702, Adequate Public Facilities Management System;
- 5) Fish or Wildlife. That neither the design of the subdivision nor any proposed improvements is likely to cause substantial environmental damage, or substantial and avoidable injury to any endangered plant, wildlife or their habitat;
- 6) Public Health. That the design of the subdivision or type of improvement is not likely to cause significant public health problems;
- 7) Easements. That the design of the subdivision or the type of improvements will not conflict with easements acquired by the public at large for access through, or use of property within, the proposed subdivision;

- 8) Access. That the design of the subdivision provides any necessary access to surrounding, adjacent lands and provides appropriate secondary access for emergency vehicles;
- 9) Dedications. That any land or improvements to be dedicated to the County is consistent with the Master Plan; and
- 10) Energy. That the design of the subdivision provides, to the extent feasible, for future passive or natural heating or cooling opportunities in the subdivision.

Appeal Process

Planning Commission action will be effective 10 calendar days after the written decision is filed with the Secretary to the Planning Commission, unless the action is appealed to the Washoe County Board of County Commissioners, in which case the outcome of the appeal shall be determined by the Washoe County Board of County Commissioners. Any appeal must be filed in writing with the Planning and Development Division within 10 calendar days after the written decision is filed with the Secretary to the Planning Commission.

xc: Applicant/Owner: Spanish Springs Associates, L.P., Attn: Jesse Haw, 550 W. Plumb Lane, #B-505, Reno, NV 89509

Representatives: C&M Engineering and Design, Attn: Lisa Menante, 5488 Reno Corporate Drive #200 B, Reno, NV 89511

Representatives: Robert M. Sader, 8600 Technology Way, Suite 101, Reno, NV 89521

Appellant Information (continued)	
Cite the specific outcome you are requesting under the appeal: Approval of Tentative Subdivision Map Case Number TM16-007 as recommended with Conditions of Approval included as Attachment A to the staff report.	
State how you are an affected individual entitled to file this appeal: Appellant is the applicant and owner of the property subject to TM16-007.	
Did you speak at the public hearing when this item was considered?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Did you submit written comments prior to the action on the item being appealed?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

For time limitations imposed for the various types of appeals, please refer to the Washoe County Development Code (WCC Chapter 110) and Nevada Revised Statutes Chapter 278 (NRS 278).

APPELLANT AFFIDAVIT

STATE OF NEVADA)
)
COUNTY OF WASHOE)

I, Robert M. Sader, Secretary of Hawco Development Company, General Partner of Spanish Springs Associates LP, being duly sworn, depose and say that I am an appellant seeking the relief specified in this petition and that the foregoing statements and answers herein contained and the information herewith submitted are in all respects complete, true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief. I understand that no assurance or guarantee can be given by staff of the Planning and Development.


Signed *Robert M. Sader*

Address 8600 Technology Way, #101
Reno, NV 89521

Subscribed and sworn to before me this
7th day of September, 2016.

Tina Ford
Notary Public in and for said county and state

My commission expires: June 8, 2018





WASHOE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION Meeting Minutes

Planning Commission Members

James Barnes, Chair
Sarah Chvilicek, Vice Chair
Larry Chesney
Francine Donshick
Philip Horan
Greg Prough
Carl R. Webb, Jr., AICP, Secretary

Tuesday, September 6, 2016
6:30 p.m.

Washoe County Commission Chambers
1001 East Ninth Street
Reno, NV

The Washoe County Planning Commission met in a scheduled session on Tuesday, September 6, 2016, in the Washoe County Commission Chambers, 1001 East Ninth Street, Reno, Nevada.

1. *Determination of Quorum

Chair Barnes called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. The following Commissioners and staff were present:

Commissioners present: James Barnes, Chair
Sarah Chvilicek, Vice Chair
Larry Chesney
Francine Donshick
Philip Horan

Commissioners absent: Greg Prough

Staff present: Carl R. Webb, Jr., AICP, Secretary, Planning and Development
David Solaro, Arch., P.E., Director of Community Services Department
Kelly Mullin, Planner, Planning and Development
Trevor Lloyd, Senior Planner, Planning and Development
Nathan Edwards, Deputy District Attorney, District Attorney's Office
Kathy Emerson, Recording Secretary, Planning and Development
Katy Stark, Office Support Specialist, Planning and Development

2. *Pledge of Allegiance

Commissioner Chesney led the pledge to the flag.

3. *Ethics Law Announcement

Deputy District Attorney Edwards provided the ethics procedure for disclosures.

4. *Appeal Procedure

Secretary Webb recited the appeal procedure for items heard before the Planning Commission. He stated that all five of the cases being heard that evening were public hearing items. The

appeal procedure pertains to Items 8A, 8B, and 8C. The Development Code Amendments are appealable only if the Planning Commission denies the recommended amendment. If the Planning Commission recommends approval of the Development Code Amendment, then it moves forward to the County Commission.

5. *Public Comment

Chair Barnes opened the Public Comment period.

Garth T. Elliott, a 45 year resident of Washoe County, stated that he has been struggling with his identification. That night he changed it to a well-armed infidel. He referenced Black Lives Matter and White Lives Matter. He added the concept that Gray Lives Matter. He thinks that he earned his gray life when his kid broke his arm, when he lost a job that he did not expect, and when his wife surprised him with something. Mr. Elliott told the Planning Commission that they are the last bastion of hope for a lot of issues that come in front of Washoe County's citizens. He came to praise them. He believes that they hear a lot of appeals and things like that, which arise because County staff has somehow gone awry. He feels that this happens often, and a recent case was with the sign code. He stated that six foot is the maximum sign that you can have in Washoe County. He does not believe that is reasonable. At one of the last meetings he had with personnel, they said they worked on it for two years. Mr. Elliott said that if they had worked on it for two years, he believes they should have gotten it right. He sees big problems with the sign code. He hopes to bring one of them to the Planning Commission in the weeks to come. It is a land use issue in a sign. He looks forward to coming before the Planning Commission and stated that they perform a very important task in the stream of things.

6. Approval of Agenda

Due to the large portion of the audience present for cargo containers, Vice Chair Chvilicek moved that Item 8D be moved forward and heard first. Commissioner Chesney seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of five for, one absent.

In accordance with the Open Meeting Law, Commissioner Chesney moved to approve the agenda for the September 6, 2016 meeting as amended. Commissioner Donshick seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of five for, one absent.

7. Approval of August 2, 2016 Draft Minutes

Vice Chair Chvilicek moved to approve the minutes for the August 2, 2016, Planning Commission meeting as written. Commissioner Donshick seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of five for, one absent.

8. Public Hearings

A. Tentative Map Case Number TM16-007 (Harris Ranch) – Hearing, discussion, and possible action to approve the merger and re-subdivision of three lots into a 610 lot, single family detached, common open space subdivision on three parcels totaling ±610.34 acres. Lots will range in size from 10,000 square feet (.23 acres) to 50,855 square feet (1.17 acres) with lot sizes averaging approximately 14,866 square feet (.34 acres). The applicant is further requesting that the required yard setbacks be reduced from the required Low Density Suburban regulatory zone setbacks to the Medium Density Suburban regulatory zone setbacks of 20 feet front yard, 20 feet rear yard, and 8 foot side yard.

- Applicant/Owner: Spanish Springs Associates, L.P.

- Location: Southeast of Pyramid Highway and Alamosa Drive in Spanish Springs
- Assessor's Parcel Numbers: 534-600-01; 534-600-02 and 076-290-44
- Parcel Size: 610.34
- Master Plan Category: Suburban Residential (SR)
- Regulatory Zone: Low Density Suburban (LDS)
- Area Plan: Spanish Springs
- Citizen Advisory Board: Spanish Springs
- Development Code: Article 408 Common Open Space Developments and Article 608 Tentative Subdivision Maps
- Commission District: 4 – Commissioner Hartung
- Section/Township/Range: Section 11 & 13, T21N, R20E, MDM, Washoe County, NV
- Prepared by: Trevor Lloyd, Senior Planner
Washoe County Community Services Department
Division of Planning and Development
- Phone: 775.328.3620
- E-Mail: tlloyd@washoecounty.us

Mr. Webb provided a brief description of the item.

Chair Barnes called for disclosures of ethics or ex-parte communications by Commissioners. There were none.

Chair Barnes opened the public hearing.

Trevor Lloyd presented his staff report, dated August 16, 2016. He mentioned that Community Services Department staff was in the audience to answer questions. Jae Pullen from NDOT was also present to answer questions.

Commissioner Donshick said they are talking about very large buffers and will they be maintained by the homeowner's association through CC&R's. The fire danger being bad there, large buffers means lots of growth. Mr. Lloyd said the intention is to maintain those areas in their native state. They will be maintained by the association as would any fire breaks, as directed by Truckee Meadows Fire.

Commissioner Donshick asked about proposing to set aside 21 acres of property for possible future construction of a school and a park. Mr. Lloyd clarified the property would be located near the entrance to the subdivision.

Commissioner Horan asked about the impact of the size of the development taking in consideration the 33 percent reduction in setbacks. Mr. Lloyd said it would make it more difficult to develop the lots if you required 30 foot and 12 foot setbacks. It would not change the number of lots.

Commissioner Chesney said every month they go through this with the developments: schools, traffic and fire. Everybody writes fantastic reports stating they can accept all the students, we know that is not true. Whoever wrote the traffic studies does not drive that highway every day like he does. For them to say they are not putting in a traffic signal for a development of this size is beyond belief. This is a large enough development and a large enough developer to be able to afford a signal.

Jae Pullen, NDOT District 2 Traffic Engineer, thanked the Commission for having him there. He stated that traffic is a sensitive issue, especially when you drive it every day, people get very passionate. NDOT policy follows basic Federal guidelines. Engineers call them warrants, which gets tricky because they start throwing percentages and statistics and it doesn't make any sense in layman's terms. NDOT uses industry standards for what's been happening across the country. Sometimes they make the decision with it and sometimes they do their own study. They try to fine-tune, the best they can. The "Feds", using the Manual Uniform of Traffic Control Devices, 2009 Version, came up with 9 or 10 warrants. They cover every type of scenario, the best they can. No scenario is perfect, so they have to make judgement calls. For this, based on just the Federal guidelines, the traffic study shows that even with the additional traffic, it is the minor road and there is not enough traffic coming from the major road. In his mind, if you look at future development, 5 or 10 years from now, especially at Alamosa, there is not that much development in the north. Calle de la Plata is a definite concern of his. At the NDOT office, they keep track of intersections that they think might pose a problem. This is really going to impact Calle de la Plata and Egyptian. They will work with Traffic Operations in headquarters and let them know they need to do another field evaluation. The report Mr. Pullen has on Calle de la Plata is 3 months old, it does not meet signal warrants now but there's no doubt in his mind that adding these 610 homes, it will meet signal warrants. NDOT does not put up signals based on future growth because the future growth might not be there. The challenge is that they have to put up a signal using current warrants. It is his belief that if we can have the developer install a signal infrastructure so it can be activated once the counts are there, he is all for it. He would work with Traffic Operations to get their buy-in on it. He does not have confidence that Alamosa will meet the signal warrants. There are 2 options; there are political signal warrants which trump all other warrants and NDOT has no control over them. A roundabout does not require a signal warrant. A roundabout changes 32 conflict points down to 8. Of the remaining 8, they are not the injury type conflict points. This could be a good candidate for a roundabout. Can the developer pay for a roundabout? NDOT did not want to say roundabout or nothing so in the recommendations, they went with the high "T", at least the left turn movement is protected with the raised median and acceleration lane.

Commissioner Chesney stated he respects Mr. Pullen's professional judgement, but Mr. Pullen does not drive that each day like a lot of us have to. Commissioner Chesney stated that if you dumping that kind of traffic on Alamosa, even thinking of a roundabout on 445 is ridiculous, and the signal at Calle de la Plata should have been in two years ago. It is a mess, and you're coming in there at 65 mph and people are coming off of Calle de la Plata and the other side of the intersection, it is totally a crap-shoot every day you drive through it. I understand you have your standards, and your rules and regulations and you deal with the feds, but I'm telling you, it is bad.

Commissioner Chvilicek asked what the current service level was on Pyramid Highway. Mr. Pullen stated that he did not have specific numbers, but stated that anyone who drives Pyramid Highway - it's over capacity. We need additional lanes; there's no question there. RTC, when they look at the 2035 plan, it's showing somewhere between 4-6 lanes in some sections. That's one of the challenges when you are looking at of these types of developments, right now, the existing infrastructure is going to get worse. At this point, when we look at the plans, I don't see anything in the NDOT forecast. RTC is focusing on North Valleys; that caught us by surprise. Sections of I-80 are completely under capacity, between US Parkway and Vista. We are seeing the bottleneck that occurs at the Nugget. We have all these types of strategies that the focus is on those high, key-locations. Commissioner Chvilicek clarified that perhaps the question should be directed to Mr. Lloyd, as we always get a service level grade for existing structures. At Pyramid, the last several developments were at service level F, is that correct? Mr. Lloyd stated he wasn't sure if he could answer correctly, but he believed that several *sections* of Pyramid Highway were at level F. Mr. Pullen added that for that Route, service level E, you need to

seriously improve capacity. Commissioner Chvilicek stated that she asks a question consistently, but has not received an answer, and that is, what is, “approved but not built and the cumulative impact.” Commissioner Chvilicek stated that with all of the developments that have been brought before the Planning Commission, they are seen in neat little packages, but we don’t look at the overall impact on the area. She stated that it would be exceedingly helpful to the Commission if we had to have that cumulative impact of approved but not built. If Planning staff could help us, by just a small statement of “approved but not built, and the cumulative impact,” it would be so helpful.

Chair Barnes asked if there were further questions of staff. There were none. Chair Barnes thanked Mr. Pullen for his time.

Chair Barnes called for the applicant presentation. Bob Sader, representative of Hawco Development Company, and the land owner, Spanish Springs Associates, limited partnership, gave a brief history of the development company being comprised of local families and having land ownership in the north Spanish Springs area for many decades. Mr. Sader stated this particular property has been zoned for low density suburban development since 2005 and explained that the tentative map is to realize the zoning that has been in place. Mr. Sader continued that the proposed development is within the suburban growth management area with master plans that have been approved by the County. The tentative map is within the zoning parameters and the expectations of the master plan for future growth and development.

Mr. Sader discussed the design of the lot patterns and use of large buffers in order to utilize the common open space development, to provide buffers around the properties, and as a means to buffer and transition to the larger lots located mostly on the north and the east. Mr. Sader explained their use of Article 408, in order to provide consistency and compatibly with zoning of other properties in the area.

Mr. Sader stated that they have looked closely at all of the conditions listed in the staff report, and they agree; they are not objecting to any of the conditions and they are prepared to comply with the conditions. Mr. Sader stated that he would like to discuss one of the conditions, and address the issue of the school and park site. There was a question about the location of the school and the park; they have been placed on the map as a potential school site and park site. During planning of the development, they inquired with Washoe County Parks and the Washoe County School District as to whether or not, they would wish to have a school site or a park site in this subdivision. Mr. Sader explained that is their policy when they do major planning; and it is also their policy to donate those sites if the school district or Park department wants to build facilities there. We solicited those responses and found that Washoe County Parks and Washoe County School District wanted sites in the subdivision, and that’s why they are there.

On the issue of traffic on Pyramid Highway, it seems there is a lot of concern about traffic, as there should be. Mr. Sader stated that he wanted to clarify Hawco’s view, which is to fulfill the requirements of the conditions imposed upon them. The condition that was decided on, was for a “High T” intersection on Alamosa. We at Hawco, understand and agree there are major safety issues at the intersection, when all of these houses are built. And there should be improvements to that intersection. Our view is that a signal is preferred to a High T intersection, which is in the County. We don’t oppose that, we know we’ll have to build that, and if that were the condition, we would support that. If the condition is for a High T intersection, we will support that as well. Because that at least makes the left turn out of Alamosa a much safer left turn, and that is the most important safety concern at that intersection in our view. We as a developer do not oppose a signal. The situation on Pyramid is one that we have experienced more than once. You have a set of criteria that NDOT uses on State Highways, and perhaps a different set of criteria the County uses, and then residents have a whole different criteria that they would

like to see on the road. The developer cannot solve it. We can suggest, that as this is constructed, that if you want to change that condition on the High T intersection, condition 2.hh, and if you want to say that when a signal is allowed by NDOT in the future, at that intersection, that it needs to be built. And the alternative, if it isn't allowed by NDOT, then a High-T intersection will be built. I think that gets you as far as you can go as County regulators, because it's an NDOT road, and we wouldn't oppose that. We want to see safety there and we are very concerned about all of the comments we have heard from residents, who basically prefer a signal, as we do. Mr. Sader stated that he was accompanied by the President of Hawco, Jess Haw, Traffic Engineer, Paul Solaegui, who can speak to levels of service on Pyramid Highway, and Civil Engineer, Sam Chicon who can also answer questions. Mr. Sader asked for an opportunity to comment later in the meeting based upon what is heard during testimony.

Chair Barnes called for public comment. Chair Barnes stated that he had a card from Rich Lewis, but Mr. Lewis had to leave, and asked his written comments be put on the record. "If possible, I would like my comments entered (read) into the public record. With the current approved developments on Calle de la Plata on both sides of the street off Pyramid Highway, additional developments (Harris Ranch) the road, Pyramid Highway, must be expanded to four lanes and stop lights at Calle de la Plata."

Lee Lawrence, resident of Spanish Springs stated the number one concern is the traffic congestion/situation that will occur as a result of this project. Mr. Lawrence lives on Alamosa drive, he drives onto Pyramid Highway every day and it's not too much trouble at this point in time. Doing the math, 5544 traffic movements at that intersection, if you take the peak 10 hours that is around 300 or 400 cars an hour, trying to get out of a T, or X or Y, or whatever you call it. Mr. Lawrence stated that he is not just speaking for himself, or those on Alamosa Drive, but this whole community in Washoe County, everybody that goes to Pyramid Lake, to go tubing, to go the Reservation, to go to Palomino Valley, to go to Warm Springs or wherever, has to pass through this intersection. Mr. Lawrence stated that it's not just us; it's not just Pebble Creek, not Alamosa, isn't Shadow Hills, it's everybody in Washoe County that has got to go through that intersection. Calle de la Plata is absolutely miserable right now. You have to wait, and you look and look and people are turning... I don't know how many wrecks have occurred. Even the guy from the County stated it's over capacity. It's that simple. Mr. Lawrence stated he is for responsible development; he has no problem with Jesse Haw going to Spanish Springs and building 610 houses. What he has a problem with is the responsible development aspect, and we don't have that yet. Responsible development is not in this action plan. What is needed and what has been said for years is, there is supposed to be a light at Calle de la Plata, Pyramid Highway is supposed to be 4 lanes out to Descanso to relieve the congestion and traffic. I think this project needs to be shelved until our infrastructure catches up to us. Half the time we don't have enough water. Mr. Lawrence stated he sits on another Board for the County and we just had to approve a big water project because they are running out of water, up by Mt. Rose Highway. TMWA came to us and needed permission to do that. What I'm saying is, it's responsible development – let's have some of that. Let's wait until the infrastructure catches up.

Elizabeth Pasco, thanked the Commission for the opportunity to hear her concerns regarding the Harris Ranch development. Ms. Pasco stated that she is a mother of four and her focus is on the deadly Pyramid Highway. She stated that there had been a recent rezoning of the area just south of Pebble Creek, which used to be a residential area, and is now rezoned for industrial parks. There have been several fatalities this year on Pyramid Highway. Ms. Pasco referred to the comments made by Commissioner Chesney, driving on Pyramid Highway, coming south bound, dozens and dozens of semi-trucks are pulling out from the mine and from that industrial park right there, and because the traffic is so bad, they run the stop signs, because if they stop, they're going to be stopped there a long time, until they can get their big

rigs fast enough to get back up on Pyramid Highway. So they run stop signs, and that leaves us the drivers, slamming on our brakes to prevent running into them. Also, there are non-existent shoulders on the side, safety shoulders, on the side of much of Pyramid Highway. If there are icy roads, debris on the road, or a vehicle malfunction, there is nowhere to go but in a deep ditch on both sides. If a vehicle veers off with a flat tire or something, it's going in the ditch and rolling over. There are fatalities happening because there is no shoulder, the highway is not wide enough for anyone to pull off the side of the road. If there is a proposed school and park across the street from Pebble Creek, all of the children in the Pebble Creek area going to want to cross that highway with a speed limit of 65 mph, which is going to be deadly again, for children to be crossing that road. Those are her main concerns, there are many more, but as a mother of four children, she is deeply, deeply concerned about the safety of that.

David Pasco, stated he was a native Nevadan living in Spanish Springs for approximately 26 years. Mr. Pasco stated that he would like to add to his wife's comments, who spoke previously, that there are a lot of concerns over schools and water. One thing he wants to point out, with all of the planning and reports coming up about what we can sustain and do. Consider what we didn't know that we didn't know. Spanish Springs started this year, and they didn't even know they needed to increase two more first grade classes. Through all the reports, they thought we would know that, but we didn't. So consider that with the development. Mr. Pasco stated he is not against development; his first home was Hawco, and he stated he loves their home. Mr. Pasco stated that Pyramid highway was a fast road, 65 mph, and a lot of people unfortunately go above that. Consider that in this two lane road, which is narrow. Mr. Pasco described an accident of their family friends on Pyramid, in an area where there is only about 8 inches of shoulder, where the tire caught a rut and they rolled their car. They were ok, but multiple fatalities have occurred this year. In May, there was a head-on there. In December there was a roll-over, last February there was another fatality. There have been countless accidents, who knows how many have not been reported. Mr. Pasco stated that he had been run off the road when it was two-lanes. Because of progression, because the road has been widened over years, it is saving lives. That's the bottom line. There are reports, it saves lives, it saves injuries. What is the right thing to do? The right and responsible thing to do is to put in a light at Calle de la Plata, widen Pyramid as far as we can. You're never going to be wrong for doing the right thing.

Adrian Dyette, Not present

Richard "Dick" Kirkland, stated he is a resident of Washoe County for 60 years, retired Reno Police Chief, retired Washoe County Sheriff, and retired Director of Public Safety for the State of Nevada. Mr. Kirkland stated he wanted to address not just traffic, but traffic safety and loss of lives. Mr. Kirkland did a research of the newspaper, because he wasn't notified of this until two weeks ago, and we weren't even notified of this one, even though he asked to be notified, because of this 500 hundred foot rule. Somebody makes up a rule and says we can't tell anybody because we got a rule we made up that we don't have to tell you because you are more than 500 feet away. In three months, four people have lost their lives on Pyramid. I did a check with City of Reno and City of Sparks to see if there was any other piece of highway the same size that had that many, in a year, and he could not find one. Questions were raised about the service level, but Mr. Kirkland stated that he immediately goes to, what is the traffic accident level, what are the injuries, what are the deaths, what are the crashes. Because that's the thing that NDOT and the traffic engineers do not understand. It changes when you have the kind of road that everybody has just described here and traffic gets jammed up. One of the gentlemen did say when you get to Calle de la Plata, you have to play a game of Russian roulette. You can't even see. The sagebrush has grown up, and you have to get half way out into the middle of the street. This is a really serious problem, that shouldn't go further until we have all the statistics. I asked your own staff, and I made a mistake, and said, so you guys

have these statistics, and the answer was, and it's in your package, yes. That wasn't the question. Where is the data? Where are the accidents, the deaths, the injuries, in a comparative format? What was the cause, what was the speed, following too closely, hitting a truck, etcetera, etcetera? I was amazed that I tried to get that from the NHP site which he used to supervise; we used to provide that, they don't provide that anymore – they tell you there was a certain number of accidents in a place, that's it. Ladies and gentlemen, I think we need to back up and get the facts and get the traffic accident fatality/injury accident rate, and then take a look at it. And then see what is needed. Maybe a light, it may not be. It's gonna have to be. Mr. Kirkland concluded by stating he was going to follow up with a written request for all of this information

Victor Szymkiewicz has been resident in the area of the proposed development for one year. Mr. Szymkiewicz stated he moved here from Dublin, CA that went from approximately 17,000 to 45,000-50,000 in the 15 years that he lived there. He stated it was very well organized and well laid out, in that they put the horse in front of the cart. They built the infrastructure first, and then approved the housing developments. The way I see it happening here, it's the other way around. When we have a situation where the traffic is completely messed up, then we start thinking about a five or ten year plan to improve the roads. RTC has a plan right now to increase the lanes on Pyramid to six lanes up to the Save Mart, and four lanes to Calle de la Plata, then two lanes on. I think what we need to do is wait until that plan is implemented before approving any more housing developments. Mr. Szymkiewicz recalled an incident where he and his wife had to run a traffic break to assist a neighbor/motorist with a vehicle that could not go over 20 mph and stated that it is a very dangerous situation. The number of traffic deaths is unbelievable on that road. He stated he is all for development and thinks it's great for the area. But the way the schools are way overfilled, and the way the traffic is now, and the additional houses coming in, it just wouldn't be a good idea to approve any more houses until that infrastructure is in place. Mr. Szymkiewicz further stated that the house values are determined in Dublin by the schools. The schools are phenomenal and our schools being overcrowded like this, to put more houses in, and I question the amount of students they are going to have with 600 houses, and the students from the other housing complex coming in, it will lower the housing values significantly, because we don't have adequate schooling which is extremely important to house values. Mr. Szymkiewicz closed by stating he would suggest we get the infrastructure in place and then get the houses in place. Or at least improve the infrastructure through the RTC plan for Pyramid Highway.

Terri Rondulait thanked the Commission and Planner Trevor Lloyd for confirming the meeting tonight as she has property abutting the buffer zone, and only received a courtesy post card but did not receive an affirmative notice that the meeting was being held. Ms. Rondulait thanked the previous speakers for their comments. Ms. Rondulait asked the Commission to think of how they get to work each day. How many fatal intersections does the Commission cross every single day? People in Spanish Springs Valley Ranches have no choice – there are two, Calle de la Plata and Alamosa. Ms. Rondulait called attention to the map that was presented and expressed concern about the how densely populated the sub development proposal is with only one entrance and exit. The report indicates that there are, in parenthesis, *proposed* west and south emergency entrances and exits. How can a map be approved that does not have *existing* plans for emergency vehicles? Even Pebble Creek, less dense than this, has three entrances and exits to the highway. No lights, we would really love to have a light at Landmark and Alamosa. Calle de la Plata would be even better. Coming here tonight, out of the Donovan pit area, a vehicle flew out of there, she had to slam on her brakes and stated there was almost a good accident there tonight. Ms. Rondulait informed the Commission of another near accident involving what she thought might be high school aged drivers trying to make a right turn up Calle de la Plata and didn't slow down enough and almost ran into the sign for Spanish Springs

Valley Ranches. Ms. Rondulait closed by stating that, definitely, a multitude of traffic controls need to be implemented before anything further is approved.

Tom Thorn, stated he has lived in Spanish Springs for a year and a half and lived previously in Las Vegas for 45 years and has been involved in development companies for 30 years. Mr. Thorn stated the need for a stop light, and said in Las Vegas, they would put in a road and then add a light or an over pass after the fatality count got high enough; he stated he would like to avoid this. Just before Calle de la Plata there is a sign where you should put your chains on because of the icy conditions coming through the pass. Between Ryder, Lennar's new project, this proposed project and Pebble Creek, there are over a 1,000 houses. There absolutely needs to be a stop light at least at Alamosa, and probably at Calle de la Plata. Mr. Thorn suggested that one of the conditions of approval of the plan should be an agreement between Washoe County School District and the developer to have the 21 acres used for an elementary school. Mr. Thorn stated the need for it and indicated that lowering of property values occurs without adequate schooling. Mr. Thorn noted the plan included additional trails in the natural area and questioned what they tie into. Mr. Thorn suggested that bigger lots would be preferable to more buffer zones, having worked with housing builders for years; he believes smaller houses in an area with much larger houses would probably not do well in value.

Chair Barnes called for further public comment, and being none, opened the floor to Commission questions.

Commissioner Chvilicek asked staff the minimum acreage for an elementary school, middle school and high school. Mr. Lloyd responded from memory, and asked for a correction if he was mistaken, that a high school requires 40 acres, a middle school is 20 acres and an elementary school requires 10 acres. Mr. Sader, representative of Hawco, added that for an elementary school, the school district typically requires 10 acres, but recently has indicated they can use 8 acres if building a two-story school. During conversation with the school district, they indicated they would want 10 acres in Harris Ranch, so that is what was plotted out. Commissioner Chvilicek asked if Hawco's donation of the land was for an elementary school, as there isn't sufficient land for a larger school, and Mr. Sader affirmed that was correct, it was designed for an elementary school site, not a middle or high school, as there was not sufficient land. Commissioner Horan asked if the area for donation was 21 acres. Mr. Sader confirmed that 10 acres would be for the school and 11 acres for a park. Mr. Lloyd returned with the required acreage for schools, being 10 acres for an elementary school, 15-20 for a middle school and 40-50 acres for a high school. Commissioner Horan asked Mr. Webb, what is Article 702, Adequate Public Facilities Management System? Mr. Webb answered, specific to Article 702, it covers the minimum standards that need to be in place for public facilities and what is deemed to be public facilities. Mr. Webb stated that it was a fairly short Article and does not contain a lot of detail. Mr. Webb explained that any development, anywhere, needs to meet certain requirements such as sanitary sewer, and water... Commissioner Horan asked if it includes roads or schools, to which Mr. Webb replied he does not see it immediately, but will look it up while the hearing continues. Mr. Horan asked, we need to find that it is ok? Mr. Webb replied, based on the minimum standards, yes.

Chair Barnes asked if there were other questions, being none, closed the public hearing.

Chair Barnes called for discussion of the Commission. Commissioner Chesney stated that it is quite apparent, regardless of traffic studies, regardless what NDOT says, whatever the traffic engineer says; traffic is the biggest issue. There is no doubt the zoning is there for this development, no question in his mind about that. Commissioner Chesney states he does not think they have enough information tonight to make a decision on this, until the Commission decides on the requirements for the traffic. Regardless of what studies have been done, and

regardless of NDOT's criteria, we need to get more information on what can be done about the traffic situation. Commissioner Chesney stated that he would like to postpone this until October's meeting and see if staff and the developer can come up with a different solution for the traffic studies. Commissioner Horan stated that he agrees, but the problem the Commission faces is they are reliant upon other experts. NDOT is our expert, and Commissioner Horan agrees that it doesn't seem adequate, but what are we asking them to say? They have their standards, and it's difficult to say what will they come up with, that will be different, based on the way they do things. Commissioner Chesney stated NDOT has rules. They have the feds driving them, the state driving them, everyone is driving them. Regardless of what the studies say, regardless of NDOT's position on this, we need those to change before we go ahead with this.

Commissioner Donshick asked if the Commission could amend the current plan before us, to agree with everything, but we want the light to be built now, not in the future. Chair Barnes deferred to DDA Edwards for a legal standpoint.

DDA Edwards restated the question, and said without regard to the specific condition being considered, yes, the Commission can impose conditions on the approval of a tentative map. With regard to a condition of requiring a stop light to be built, there would need to be a nexus between what the Commission is requiring as a condition and the impact of that particular project. DDA Edwards stated he cannot say black or white if that standard would be met in this situation, but the Commission does have a general power to impose conditions on tentative maps, as long as the Commission finds there is an essential nexus between the two. DDA Edwards noted, action is required on a tentative map within 60 days of the date of acceptance of the application. The application was accepted July 15, of this year, so putting it out to the October meeting will be outside of that 60 day deadline. The only option to continue it is if the applicant is agreeable to a continuance, otherwise, the Commission will need to do their best to come up with a vote tonight, yes or no, with conditions.

Mr. Webb clarified that Article 702 only applies to sanitary sewer, so it is strictly limited to the provision of sanitary sewer as a part of public infrastructure. The applicant demonstrates that as part of their application, and further clarified that they have up to two years to demonstrate that they will conform to this as part of their development.

Chair Barnes called for further discussion. Commissioner Horan stated that he continues to go back to this. We are given these proposals for this, that and the other thing, and we get the schools and the highways and everybody else to say, yes, it is possible to do it. Commissioner Horan stated that he is struggling with what kind of condition to impose on that. It's a broken system. But how do we get out of that broken system? Commissioner Horan stated he is finding it a bit of a challenge.

Chair Barnes called for further discussion, and hearing none, called for a motion.

Mr. Webb introduced Dwayne Smith, County Engineer. Mr. Smith stated he wants to affirm that part of the work done by the County is to work with partners at NDOT, and developers, to apply the current county codes with a focus on the safety elements associated with those. Part of the recommendations that came from the County Engineering Office was for a High T intersection that would be conditioned as part of the Commission's consideration for this tentative map. That High T is a compromise with NDOT, and NDOT is willing to accept the construction of that High T. That High T can be modified into the future, when certain warrants are met, in terms of traffic levels, it can be signalized as well. Mr. Smith concluded by stating he was adamant that any consideration tonight associated with this tentative map, include the requirement for the High T intersection, which the developer is willing to build, and which NDOT is willing to accept.

Chair Barnes called for a motion.

Commissioner Chvilicek asked if the Planning Commission would see future map, final maps, etc., as this project moves forward. The answer being, no, Commissioner Chvilicek complemented the developer on the large buffer zones and echoed what Commissioner Horan stated. Commissioner Chvilicek restated that when they are asked to make a determination on the existing project in front of them, but cannot compare it to other projects and other impacts of other projects, it makes their job very, very difficult. She continued that she takes her stewardship, her responsibility to the people of Washoe County, very seriously, as do her fellow Commissioners, to represent the people so their voice can be heard. It's troubling when we try to make reasoned decisions, knowing there is a cumulative impact.

Commissioner Chesney asked if they were still under discussion. Chair Barnes said they could continue discussion. Commissioner Chesney stated that it hits him the wrong way that NDOT would dictate the type of intersections we have in these developments. It's just like NDOT could never justify a signal on North Virginia Street until four or five people got killed there, and the Governor had to step in. Commissioner Chesney said he could not support this due to the traffic. Commissioner Chesney stated it is a sad state of affairs that one agency dictates the safety of a community, and he stated he wanted that on the record.

Chair Barnes called for a motion. DDA Edwards recommended that they make a vote, one way or another.

Commissioner Horan made the following motion: I move that after giving reasoned consideration to the information contained in the staff report and information received during the public hearing, the Washoe County Planning Commission approve Tentative Subdivision Map Case Number TM16-007 for Harris Ranch with the Conditions of Approval included as Attachment A to the staff report, and includes that the setbacks be reduced from the required Low Density Suburban regulatory zone setbacks to the Medium Density Suburban regulatory zone setbacks of 20 foot front yard, 20 foot rear yard, and 8 foot side yard, having made all ten findings in accordance with Washoe County Development Code Section 110.608.25 with the additional condition that we have the High T intersection as an additional condition.

Mr. Webb clarified that was already a condition, condition 2.hh.

Chair Barnes called for a second. None being heard, the motion failed.

Commissioner Chvilicek made the following motion: I move that after giving reasoned consideration to the information contained in the staff report and information received during the public hearing, the Washoe County Planning Commission deny Tentative Subdivision Map Case Number TM16-007 for Harris Ranch with the Conditions of Approval included as Attachment A to the staff report, and includes that the setbacks be reduced from the required Low Density Suburban regulatory zone setbacks to the Medium Density Suburban, and the reason she is moving for denial is in terms of the finding, item 6, public health.

Mr. Webb clarified on the motion, if the maker is denying subdivision map TM16-007 for Harris Ranch, that is sufficient, and then state the reason for denial, which in this case is item 6.

Commissioner Chvilicek restated her motion to move for denial based on item 6, public health.

Commissioner Chesney seconded the motion.

Chair Barnes called for discussion on the motion.

Commissioner Horan said as stated earlier, it is a real struggle as to what the Commission is being asked to do, and he appreciates the motion made now and he will support that motion, but it's a very difficult thing for them to address. It is a broken system.

Chair Barnes called for further discussion on the motion, there being none, called for a vote.

The motion for denial passed unanimously (five in favor of denial, one absent)

Mr. Webb made an announcement for the public in attendance that the doors to the facility will lock at 10:00 p.m. They can get out but can't get back in. Also, the front gates which front 9th Street will close at 10:30. They can always exit the facility through the gate that fronts on Sutro. The gate has an automatic sensor which opens when you go out. The gate is between the Senior Center and the Rodeo area (RLEC).

Recess: DDA Edwards asked for a recess based on what Mr. Webb just brought up.

DDA Edwards stated for the record that a door has been propped open in the lobby. Since this is a public meeting, it has to be available to the public and the public has to be able to get in. This is like the old days, the Planning Commission meetings haven't gone this late in a long time and the building is now automatically locking. No part of the meeting has been closed or will be closed to the public.

Comments and Questions From
Neighborhood Meeting on August 4, 2016
At Spanish Springs Elementary School
For Harris Ranch Subdivision (TM16-007)

- Notice mailed to all households supplied by the county, plus all Spanish Springs CAB members.
- 36 residents attended (see attached sign in sheet), representing 21 households. Trevor Lloyd, the responsible county planner, was in attendance.
- Bob Sader and Jesse Haw made a brief presentation on behalf of the applicant outlining the requested amendment. The meeting started at 6:10 p.m. and ended at 7:35 p.m.
- Summary of Topics
 - traffic congestion on Pyramid Highway
 - need for signal at Alamosa due to safety concerns
 - traffic impact of this project
 - school overcrowding and new school funding
 - size of lots, size and quality of homes to be built

- Specific Questions or Comments from Residents:

1. Will there be more traffic on Alamosa as a result of this?

Hawco Response: Yes.

2. You mentioned that there would be emergency access?

Hawco Response: There is an existing emergency access easement on the Donovan Pit haul road which enters the subdivision at its southwest corner.

3. Are you planning on putting in a light at Alamosa and Pyramid?

Hawco Response: We want to know the answer to that too. Traffic is clearly the biggest issue in Spanish Springs. There is going to be more traffic. It's NDOT's decision to make. NDOT has until Aug. 9 to comment on what it would like to see at that intersection. We do not know what required intersection improvements on Pyramid Highway will be at this point, except a lengthy deceleration lane.

4. Who would we reach out to about the possibility of that light?

Hawco Response: Your first contact would be the county planner, Trevor Lloyd.

5. Does the county have a process where you look at accidents and deaths and come to the point where you recommend installing a light?

County Response: Yes, we have an expert who evaluates that.

Hawco Response: How many of you would be in favor of a signal at Alamosa and Pyramid if this project is approved?

Citizen Response: (Almost all raised their hands.)

6. Are you as a developer of this planned subdivision required to do any estimates of the impact of traffic from this subdivision?

Hawco Response: Yes. There is a traffic report that was attached to the application. It can be obtained from the county, and is on the county website.

7. Does Hawco own the land north of Serenade, which is a street in Pebble Creek?

Hawco Response: Hawco owns the parcel west of Pebble Creek, but owns no property north of Pebble Creek.

8. My concern is the elementary school planned in this subdivision will have an impact on that middle school that is already crowded.

Hawco Response: Building new schools depends on whether the voters pass the school bond on the November election.

9. Why doesn't this subdivision have a southern access road?

Hawco Response: There is a corridor study of Pyramid Highway that sets where new intersections will be allowed. It provides that intersections must be no less than half a mile apart. We do not have that spacing at the south end of the project.

10. When was the corridor study done? When was it last updated?

County Response: The study was done by the RTC over a decade ago. Do not know about updates.

11. What type of homes will Hawco build?

Hawco Response: Hawco may be the builder of some or all of these homes, or lots may be sold to other homebuilders. The homes will be market rate housing, just like Pebble Creek and Eagle Canyon. Hawco can't tell you for sure what style and size of homes will be built. The home builders will decide that.

12. How big are these lots going to be?

Hawco Response: The average lot size is 14866 sq. ft. The biggest lot is over 50,000 sq. ft.

13. How many acres is the open space buffer area around the subdivision? Can this be changed?

County Response: Theoretically it could be changed.

Hawco Response: The open space will be common area deeded to the HOA and the CC&Rs will restrict its uses, so it is unlikely it will be changed and the HOA would have to do it.

14. What kind of street lights are you planning?

Hawco Response: Minimal street lighting with down-lighting fixtures.

15. What are the rules about lighting?

County Response: Lights have to be covered with down-shielding.

16. In the business center, they have bright lights. I don't want any more bright lights outside of these houses on the streets.

Hawco Response: We don't anticipate lighting the streets, except for intersections.

17. How large are these homes and how fast will they be built?

Hawco Response: It's difficult to say... there are a lot of factors: soil, streets, slopes, costs, and market factors. If you just want a guess it would be an average size of 3-3500 sq. ft., with 80-100 homes built a year starting a year or two from now. Construction type would be stucco and tile roofs, but we will have to see what the market wants at that time.

18. Are you going to do construction without a water truck in high winds? Do you have a water truck?

Hawco Response: Water for dust suppression is required on construction sites. We will stop ground-disturbing construction in high winds but there are times when it sneaks up.

County Response: The health district is very tough on dust hazards and they will fine developers if it is a problem.

19. What is the width of the road you are going to pave and is there a chance it could be wider?

Hawco Response: All road widths will comply with county standards. The main entry road is an unloaded collector, which is wide, but we do not know the exact width, which is set by the county.

20. Will there be left turn and right turn on Alamosa?

Hawco Response: There will most likely be left turn pocket, but the design must be approved by NDOT. We are told from the traffic study that there will be a free right from Pyramid to Alamosa.

21. What is going to happen to our mailboxes? If you create a right turn lane onto Alamosa, would it affect that?

Hawco Response: It may. We would have to look more into that. Current residents must have a safe place for their mailboxes and Hawco will provide land for that use.

22. How would this project affect the trigger for getting a light at Calle de la Plata and Pyramid Highway?

Hawco Response: Recently NDOT has indicated this intersection qualifies for a signal. This subdivision will, of course, increase traffic there.

23. Who decides where road impact fee money is going?

Hawco Response: The Regional Transportation Commission has a list of priorities (CIP) for the area. Funds are collected and dedicated to improvements in the north and south benefit districts, which are divided between the north and south side of the I-80. The RTC decides where to spend the money.

24. We only have one fire station out here. How does the county fire district propose to deal with new growth?

County Response: The fire district will comment on this project. It must meet the minimum response time.

- Specific comments and questions were taken down by an employee of the applicant and are paraphrased above.

SIGN IN SHEET

Neighborhood Resident's Meeting
Harris Ranch Subdivision
Spanish Springs Elementary School
August 4, 2016

Name (Please Print)	Address (Please Print)
1. DENNIS & CAROLYN REEVE	11680 CAMPO RICO
2. Carl & Jill Savely	305 Alamosa Dr.
3. DICK & CINDY KIRKLAND	755 FRIEDMAN CIR
4. Ted + Teresa Thurston	445 Alamosa Dr
5. Ted	
6. EMILY HALL	11500 CAMPO RICO LN
7. ROGER L. BERZINSKI	11500 CAMPO RICO LN
8. Ruben Martin	495 ALAMOSA DRIVE PO Box 2119 SPARKS
9. MIKE RILEY	3770 DESERT FOX DR.
10. Corey + Kristy Dalton	441 Alamosa Dr
11. Himanshu Patel	12185 Oceanview Dr.
12. Lee Lawrence	483 Alamosa Dr.
13. Dennis Gilman	240 Serenade Dr.
14. Tim & Heema Kockey	205 SERENAD DR.
15. Diane Dutcher	12245 OCEAN VIEW DR
16. Paul Dutcher	12245 Ocean view DR.
17. BERNIE GROSS	140 SERENADE DR
18. LYNN STARNES	140 SERENADE DR
19. DONNA WHELCHER	325 ALAMOSA DR
20. E.E. WHELCHER	" " "

SIGN IN SHEET
Neighborhood Resident's Meeting
Harris Ranch Subdivision
Spanish Springs Elementary School
August 4, 2016

Name (Please Print)	Address (Please Print)
21. DAUE GRAHAM	245 Mystic-Mountain SP
22. Donna L. McMillan/Neil Falcher	380 Mystic Mtn. Dr., SP
23. Tom & Lynda Donovan	11625 Pyramid Way
24. Dale & Kathy Tartuzzi	11905 Anthem Dr Sparks
25. Jim & Joyce Lohman	12040 Ocean View Dr. Sparks
26. Ricklin Smith	11700 Capo Rico
27. Patti Wright	11700 Capo Rico
28.	
29.	
30.	
31.	
32.	
33.	
34.	
35.	
36.	
37.	
38.	
39.	
40.	