MINUTES OF THE
FERNLEY CITY COUNCIL MEETING
AUGUST 19, 2020

Mayor Edgington called the meeting to order at 5:00 pm at Fernley City Hall, 595 Silver Lace Blvd, Fernley, NV.

Mayor Edgington called for a moment of silence to remember Sparks Mayor, Ron Smith.

Mayor Edgington explained this meeting was broadcasted by Zoom. He explained how to access Zoom and how to ask questions during the appropriate time.

1. INTRODUCTORY ITEMS
1.1. Roll Call
Present: Mayor Roy Edgington, Councilman Ray Lacy, Councilman Albert Torres, Councilman Stan Lau, Councilwoman Fran McKay, Councilwoman Shellie Severa, City Manager Daphne Hooper, City Attorney Brandi Jensen, Deputy City Attorney Brent Kolvet, City Engineer Derek Starkey, City Treasurer Denise Lewis, Planning Director Tim Thompson, Assistant Planner Melinda Bauer, Building Official Shawn Keating, City Clerk Kim Swanson, Clerk Administrative Specialist II April Homme, Public Works Director Dave Whalen.

1.2. Public Forum
Mayor Edgington explained that he would open Items 5.1 and 5.2 for public comment at the time these items are heard.

Technical Break 5:12-5:20

1.3. (For Possible Action) Approval of the Agenda
08/19/2020 FCC Minutes
Motion: MOVE TO APPROVE THE AGENDA AS SUBMITTED, Action: Approve, Moved by Councilman Stan Lau. Seconded by Councilman Ray Lacy, Vote: Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote (summary: Yes = 5). Yes: Councilman Albert Torres, Councilman Ray Lacy, Councilman Stan Lau, Councilwoman Fran McKay, Councilwoman Shellie Severa.

2. CONSENT AGENDA:
2.1. (Possible Action) Approval of Voucher Report
2.2. (For possible action) Approval of Minutes August 5th City Council Meeting
2.3. (Possible Action) Approval of Business Licenses
2.4. Possible Action to Approve the Will-Serve Request from The Meadows at Inglewood, Building-H for 0.79 ERC’s for Water and 2.72 ERC’s for Sewer for Lyon County Parcel 020-341-10 located at the at 1044 Inglewood Drive, Fernley, NV 89408.
2.5. Possible Action to award a Contract for Construction for the FY 19/20 Well No. 4 New Generator and Electrical System Upgrade and Construction, to Nelson Electric, Inc. in an amount not to exceed $141,600, plus a 10% contingency of $14,160 for a Total of $155,760.
2.6. Discussion and Possible Action to Approve a Litigation Settlement and Direct Legal counsel to finalize the terms with Lyon County, LCSD, and other parties in the Redevelopment Lawsuit.

This item was addressed before item 7.

Motion: MOVE TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA AS SUBMITTED, Action: Approve, Moved by Councilman Stan Lau. Seconded by Councilman Ray Lacy, Councilwoman Fran McKay requested Item 2.6 be pulled from the Consent Agenda and heard before item 7.

Amended Motion: MOVE TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA WITH ITEM 2.6 TO BE REMOVED AND DISCUSSED BEFORE ITEM 7, Action: Approve, Moved by Councilman Stan Lau. Seconded by Councilman Ray Lacy, Vote: Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote (summary: Yes = 5). Yes: Councilman Albert Torres, Councilman Ray Lacy, Councilman Stan Lau, Councilwoman Fran McKay, Councilwoman Shellie Severa.

08/19/2020 FCC Minutes
Item 2.6 was heard after Item 6.1

**Motion:** MOVE TO APPROVE LITIGATION SETTLEMENT AND DIRECT LEGAL COUNSEL TO FINALIZE THE TERMS WITH LYON COUNTY, LCSD, AND OTHER PARTIES IN THE REDEVELOPMENT LAWSUIT., **Action:** Approve, **Moved by** Councilwoman Fran McKay, **Seconded by** Councilman Stan Lau, **Vote:** Motion carried by roll call vote (summary: Yes = 4, Absent = 1). **Yes:** Councilman Albert Torres, Councilman Ray Lacy, Councilman Stan Lau, Councilwoman Fran McKay. **Absent:** Councilwoman Shellie Severa.

3. **REPORTS** This item is for various public entity representatives to provide general information to the Council and public. No action will be taken.

3.1. **Reports by City Staff, City Council and the Mayor,** including but not limited to monthly statistical reports by city departments.

Mayor Edgington read a card from JOIN thanking the City of Fernley for their support.

City Manager Hooper reported on the Cares Act Fund. She reported that one project submitted was ineligible. The City has received a request from the Boys and Girls Club to assist with a distance learning center and this item will be on the next agenda for consideration. The City is working on “Spooktacular” and the logistics during COVID. She stated the City of Fernley has a Streets Foreman position and Deputy City Engineer position open. These items will be posted.

4. **ORDINANCES – INTRODUCTION ONLY**


City Building Official Shawn Keating presented and stated this update would make the City of Fernley Codes consistent with surrounding areas.

**Motion:** MOVE TO INTRODUCE BILL # 288 AS AN ORDINANCE ADOPTING THE 2018 UNIFORM PLUMBING AND MECHANICAL CODE, 2018 INTERNATIONAL SWIMMING
5. ORDINANCES – ADOPTION
a. Discussion with City Council & Staff
b. Public Input
c. Additional Discussion with City Council & Staff
d. Council Action or Direction to Staff

5.1 Second Reading, Public Hearing on Bill #286 - ZMA20002 (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION) Consideration and possible action to adopt Bill # 286 as an ordinance for a Zoning Map Amendment request from Lyon County School District, to change the zoning from GR20 (General Rural 20 Acres) to PF (Public Facility) on a site comprised of two parcels totaling ± 15.46 acres in size located at 4170 Farm District Road (APN: 021-351-11) and 4180 Farm District Road (APN: 021-351-12), Fernley, Nevada.

Assistant Planner Melinda Bauer presented this item; she gave a description of the property location and current zoning. She stated the zone change would bring the existing property into conformance with the existing land use designation.

Mayor Edgington opened for public comment.

There were none.

Motion: MOVE TO ADOPT BILL # 286 AS AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE CITY TO ENACT A ZONING MAP AMENDMENT ASSOCIATED WITH ZMA20002, TO CHANGE THE ZONING FROM GR20 (GENERAL RURAL 20 ACRES) TO PF (PUBLIC FACILITY) BASED ON THE FINDINGS A THROUGH C AND THE FACTS SUPPORTING THESE FINDINGS AS LISTED IN THE STAFF REPORT. Action: Approve, Moved by Councilman Albert Torres. Seconded by Councilwoman Fran McKay, Vote: Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote (summary: Yes = 5). Yes: Councilman Ray Lacy, Councilman Stan Lau, Councilwoman Fran McKay, Councilwoman Shellie Severa. Councilman Albert Torres.
5.2 Second Reading, Public Hearing on Bill #289 - ZMA20001 (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION) Consideration and possible action to adopt Bill #289 as an ordinance for a Zoning Map Amendment request from Relief Springs, LLC Series C for a site consisting of three parcels totaling ±129.94 acres in size generally located south of Main Street, east of Stock Lane, west of Miller Lane, and north of the existing Miller Meadows Subdivision, Fernley, NV.

Planning Director Tim Thompson presented this item; he gave a description of the property location and current zoning and the applicants re-zone change request. He provided a brief synopsis of the property history. He stated the request was consistent with the City of Fernley’s Master Plan. (see attached)

Councilman Torres asked a question regarding the parcel that was not purchased.
Planning Director Tim Thompson suggested Councilman Torres refer his question to the applicant.

Mr. Greg Evangelatos applicant’s consultant explained due to the uncertainty relative to the future land use, the applicant will not move forward with the acquisition of the fourth parcel.

Derek Kirkland with Wood Rodgers, applicant’s representative, presented a power point presentation for this item. (see attached)

Greg Evangelatos, applicant’s consultant presented additional facts regarding the history of the property and the benefits to the community if the ZMA is approved. He asked for the City Council to grant the zoning request.

Mayor Edgington opened for public comment.

Public Comment submitted by Gary and Jannette Pierson was read into record (see attached).

Public Comment submitted by Valerie Roberds was read into record (see attached).

Public Comment submitted by Michele and Kevin Jeakins was read into record (see attached).

Public Comment submitted by Dana Uhlhorn was read into record (see attached).

Public Comment submitted by Kelly Brye was read into record (see attached).

Public Comment submitted by Trisha Starkey was read into record (see attached).
Public Comment submitted by Michael Knaus was read into record (see attached).
Public Comment submitted by Karl A. Matzoll, DB-BB Investments 1, LLC was read into record (see attached).
Public Comment submitted by Joe Reisenauer was read into record (see attached).
Public Comment submitted by Marty Hanna was read into record (see attached).
Public Comment submitted by Michelle Bridges was read into record (see attached).
Public Comment submitted by LeRoy Goodman was read into record (see attached).
Public Comment submitted by Cynthia and John Miller was read into record (see attached).

Mayor Edgington opened for public comment via Zoom or email. There were none.
Mayor Edgington asked if Council or the applicant had any questions.
Derek Kirkland with Wood Rodgers, applicant’s representative, stated he was available for questions.
Councilman Ray Lacy asked if the developer had scheduled a workshop for the community.

Mr. Kirkland stated the developer would host a neighborhood meeting at the tentative map stage.

Councilwoman McKay asked questions regarding the SF6 zoning and suggested a decision be postponed until a proposed tentative map be submitted by the applicant.

Planning Director Tim Thompson stated that because this is a zone map amendment the City does not have the ability to condition the proposal at this stage. The council can adopt or reject the ordinance.

Discussion ensued.
City Deputy Attorney Brent Kolvet stated for the record that all prior public comments and letters be acknowledged and that they have been incorporated into record.

Councilwoman McKay inquired about timelines for the ZMA and if the ZMA is endanger of expiring?

08/19/2020 FCC Minutes
Planning Director Thompson answered stating the City Council has 60 days after and the Planning Commission hears the item.

**Motion:** MOVE TO ADOPT BILL #289 AS AN ORDINANCE FOR A ZONING MAP AMENDMENT TO CHANGE THE ZONING ON TWO PARCELS TOTALING ±95.30 ACRES FROM SF12 TO SF6 (APN'S 021-041-07 AND 021-041-10) AND TO CHANGE THE ZONING ON A ±34.64-ACRE PARCEL FROM SF12 AND C1 TO MDR14 (APN 021-041-08). **Moved by** Councilman Stan Lau. **Seconded by** Councilman Ray Lacy.

Ward 1: Ray Lacy: Yes
Ward 2: Shellie Severa: No
Ward 3: Stan Lau: Yes
Ward 4: Albert Torres: No
Ward 5: Fran McKay: No

**Vote:** Motion carried by roll call vote. **(summary:** Yes = 2, No = 3). **Action:** Failed

Planning Director Thompson inquired if council would like to motion for a continuance.

**Motion:** MOVE TO POSTPONE DECISION UNTIL A PROPOSED TENTATIVE MAP AND ZMA ARE SUBMITTED. **Moved by** Councilwoman Fran McKay. **Seconded by** Councilman Ray Lacy.

Derek Kirkland, applicant's representative requested that the continuance not be based on a tentative map; and that continuance be based on commitments in writing and contingent on the applicant working with staff.

Deputy City Attorney Kolvet, stated the ordinance is dead. He advised that the applicant's request for a continuance is muted by the fact that the ordinance is dead. The only way to go back and do what the applicant wants is reconsider the ordinance and seek a continuance of this ordinance. Discussion continued regarding the pending motion.

Deputy City Attorney Kolvet advised on the correct procedure; reaffirmed that the motion on the floor needed to be addressed and exposed prior to moving on with a motion to
reconsider continuance for the ordinance unless Ms. McKay wanted to withdraw her motion on the table.

Mayor Edgington called for vote.

Ward 1: Ray Lacy: Yes
Ward 2: Shellie Severa: No
Ward 3: Stan Lau: Yes
Ward 4: Albert Torres: No
Ward 5: Fran McKay: No

**Vote:** Motion carried by roll call vote. (**summary:** Yes = 2, No = 3). **Action:** Failed

**Motion:** MOVE TO RECONSIDER THE ORDINANCE, **Moved by** Councilman Stan Lau. **Seconded by** Councilman Ray Lacy.

Discussion ensued regarding the proposed motion.

Mayor Edgington called for vote.

Ward 1: Ray Lacy: Yes
Ward 2: Shellie Severa: No
Ward 3: Stan Lau: Yes
Ward 4: Albert Torres: No
Ward 5: Fran McKay: Yes

**Vote:** Motion carried by roll call vote. (**summary:** Yes = 3, No = 2). **Action:** Passed

Deputy City Attorney Kolvet stated that the applicant state specifically that they agree to a continuance until they have had chance to work with staff, and the direction they want to work with staff on so the council can understand what they are doing.

Doug Flowers with Holland and Hart LLP on behalf of the applicant stated “yes” they do agree to the continuance if the motion is amended to provide for that.
Amended Motion: MOVE TO RECONSIDER WITH A CONTINUANCE WITH THE DEVELOPERS SO THE TIMELINE DOES NOT EXPIRE WITH MORE DISCUSSION AND WORK WITH STAFF. Moved by Councilwoman Fran McKay, Seconded by Councilman Ray Lacy.

Mayor Edgington called for vote.

Ward 1: Ray Lacy: Yes
Ward 2: Shellie Severa: No
Ward 3: Stan Lau: Yes
Ward 4: Albert Torres: No
Ward 5: Fran McKay: Yes

Vote: Motion carried by roll call vote. (summary: Yes = 3, No = 2). Action: Passed

Applicant agreed to motion.

Deputy City Attorney Kolvet reiterated the motion for the record. He confirmed that the developer will bring back additional information for staff in a reasonable time.

6. RESOLUTIONS

6.1. Discussion and possible action to approve resolution 20-013 to accept the public improvements including roadway, water, sewer and storm drain infrastructure for the Silverland Estates PH 2, Windrow Drive.

City Engineer Derek Starkey presented this item; he gave a description of the location and the infrastructure completed.

Motion: MOVE TO APPROVE RESOLUTION 20-013 TO ACCEPT THE PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS INCLUDING ROADWAY, WATER, SEWER AND STORM DRAIN INFRASTRUCTURE FOR THE SILVERLAND ESTATES PH 2, WINDROW DRIVE, Action: Approve, Moved by Councilman Stan Lau, Seconded by Councilman Ray Lacy, Vote: Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote (summary: Yes = 5). Yes: Councilman Albert Torres, Councilman Ray Lacy, Councilman Stan Lau, Councilwoman Fran McKay, Councilwoman Shellie Severa.
Break 7:25 – 7:32

Item 2.6 was heard after the break.

7. ADDRESS REQUEST(S) FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS.
Councilwoman McKay requested review of false alarm policy.

Mayor Edgington requested staff provide NDOT requirements and processes. Lyon County Commissioner Vida Keller via zoom stated the document the Mayor wanted was called an Access Management Plan and the City could submit to NDOT. NDOT would make this part of the plan.

8. PUBLIC FORUM
There was none.

ADJOURNMENT
There being no further business to come before it, the Fernley City Council meeting adjourned at 7:39 pm.

Approved by the Fernley City Council on September 02, 2020 by a vote of:

AYES: 5  NAYS: 0  ABSTENTIONS: 0  ABSENT: 0

ATTEST: City Clerk Kim Swanson
Mayor Roy Edgington
5.2 Planning Director Presentation

5.2 Applicants Presentation Red Hawk Zone Change

5.2 8/19/2020 City Council Public Comments Second reading

5.2 8/05/2020 City Council Public Comments First reading
Second Reading, Public Hearing on Bill #289 - ZMA20001

Consideration and possible action to adopt Bill #289 as an ordinance for a Zoning Map Amendment request from Relief Springs, LLC Series C for a site consisting of three parcels totaling ±129.94 acres in size generally located south of Main Street, east of Stock Lane, west of Miller Lane, and north of the existing Miller Meadows Subdivision, Fernley, NV.

- To change the zoning on two parcels totaling ±95.30 acres from SF12 (Single-Family Residential, 12,000 sq. ft minimum lot size) to SF6 (Single-Family Residential, 6,000 sq. ft minimum lot size). (APN’s 021-041-07 and 021-041-10)

- To change the zoning on a ±34.64-acre parcel from SF12 and C1 to MDR14 (Medium Density Residential, 14 dwelling units per acre). (APN 021-041-08)
Background:

- The subject parcels are located within a proposed commercial and residential area of Fernley previously used for farming activity.
- This area is the western gateway to downtown Fernley and is slated for new development/redevelopment.
- The subject parcels were part of an approved planned development known as Jackson Ranch that allowed for 807 units ranging from 4,700 to 6,800 square foot lots. The Jackson Ranch Planned Development (PD) was approved by the Fernley City Council in November of 2004.
- A tentative map for the Jackson Ranch PD was approved along with the PD, however, the proposed development approvals expired.
- Over the past ten years land ownership and market conditions have changed, which have led to a change in development plans for this area.
- The City of Fernley completed a Master Plan update in August 2018 which anticipated more intense type development (Mixed Residential) along Main Street and the northeast portions of the development with single-family residential acting as buffer between the more intense mixed residential use and the existing residential-rural areas located to the west and south of the project site. The intent was to allow greater density/intensity along Main Street and feather the density and lot sizes along the west and south boundaries of the project site.
Analysis:

The north parcel has a Comprehensive Master Plan (Master Plan) designation of Mixed Residential (MR). The current zoning designation includes a Split Zoning of SF12 and C1 (Limited Commercial).

- The Mixed Residential (MR) land use designation is intended to provide a mix of housing options and densities and to encourage the integration of a range of housing product types into projects.
- These locations are typically located in areas within walking distance to services and amenities.
- The density range for Mixed Residential is 7 - 14 dwelling units per acre.
- The primary uses within the Mixed Residential category are single-family detached, small-lot single family detached, single family attached, triplexes, townhomes, condos, and manufactured/mobile home parks. Lower density multi-family residential may also be considered. The equivalent zoning district for Mixed Residential is MDR14 (Medium Density Residential, maximum 14 dwelling units per acre).
- In addition, municipal services are required.
Analysis:

- The split zoning of SF12 & C1 on the north parcel not in conformance with the Master Plan designation of "Mixed Residential."

- The density and uses identified within the existing zoning classifications are inconsistent with the master plan land use.

- The zone change to MDR14 (Medium Density Residential - 14 du/ac) would bring the parcel’s zoning into conformance with the Master Plan.
Analysis:

- For the west and south parcels, the applicant is proposing to change the zoning from SF12 (Single Family - 12,000 square foot minimum) to SF6 (Single Family - 6,000 square foot minimum).
- Both the existing SF12 zoning district and proposed SF6 zoning district are equivalent zoning classifications within the Single-Family Residential Master Plan designation.
- The proposed zoning map amendment would most certainly allow for a greater number of units than would be allowed under the current SF12 zoning district.
- However, the required development and design standards would be the same under either zoning district.
Analysis:

- The proposed Zoning Map Amendment will help implement the new Master Plan and increase the overall supply of housing in the region while helping to diversify Fernley’s housing products.
- Encourages higher density near Main Street, a main thoroughfare through Fernley with growing commercial facilities and will help support redevelopment efforts along the corridor.
- The proposed Zoning Map Amendment supports a transition of zoning to coincide with the adopted Master Plan.
Analysis:

Adjacency Standards
➢ With the adoption of the revised development code earlier this year (March 4, 2020), there are now adjacency standards which will help to provide further protection for abutting the residential-rural lots by requiring additional buffering for any future single-family development.
➢ Specifically, Section 32.09.030 - Adjacency Standards, D2 - Lot Adjacency and Transition Standards - Single-family Residential requires future developments to provide adequate buffering and transitions in lot sizes.
➢ Although a project is not proposed at this time, the applicant will be required to satisfy these standards as they move forward with the design of any proposed subdivision project.
Analysis:

Adjacency Standards
Three (3) options:
✓ Transition.
✓ Buffering.
✓ Yard Matching.
Analysis:

Adjacency Standards - Transition

New subdivision lots adjacent to existing subdivision lots shall match the rear yard setbacks per base zoning, not exceed the number of stories of the existing adjacent homes and shall not exceed a fifty percent (50%) reduction in lot size of the existing subdivision lots. If existing subdivision lots are less than half acre, no transition is required.
Analysis:

Adjacency Standards - Buffering

A "buffer zone" shall be established and shall be a minimum of 20 feet wide. The buffer zone may be common open space for the proposed subdivision and shall include at least one of the following improvements: paths, trails, drainageways, landscaping, berms, or other subdivision amenities. The City may require a larger landscape buffer of a specific width, or other visual and/or sound barrier (open view fence, wall, landscaping, or combination of such measures), to mitigate any potential adverse impacts. The City may allow a major roadway or railroad right of way to constitute adequate buffering.
Analysis:

Adjacency Standards - Yard Matching

The rear yard widths of the proposed development shall match the rear yard widths of the existing development as depicted in Figure:
Analysis:

Adjacency Standards
Standards would be applied at Tentative Map
➤ A tentative subdivision map would be reviewed by city staff, the Planning Commission, and City Council for compliance with all applicable regulations. The tentative subdivision map process is the appropriate time to review the adjacency standards and place additional conditions on the proposed project.

Regardless of whether the project site retains the current SF12 zoning, or the zoning is changed to SF6, the same adjacency standards would apply.
Findings:

Based on the Findings and the facts supporting those findings as set forth in the staff report, staff has concluded the proposed Zoning Map Amendment is:

- Consistent with the City’s Master Plan and otherwise consistent with state and federal law.
- Consistent with the surrounding land uses.
- Public notice was given, and a public hearing held per the requirements of the Development Code, Nevada Revised Statutes, and the directives issued by the Governor.
Recommended Motion:

"I move to Adopt Bill #289 as an ordinance for a Zoning Map Amendment to change the zoning on two parcels totaling ±95.30 acres from SF12 to SF6 (APN’s 021-041-07 and 021-041-10) and to change the zoning on a ±34.64-acre parcel from SF12 and C1 to MDR14 (APN 021-041-08) based on the Findings and the facts supporting those Findings as set forth in the staff report."
JACKSON RANCH
Planned Development:

- Approved Nov 2004
- 807 Units
- No Buffering or larger perimeter lots
- Lot Size: 4700 sqft – 6800 sqf
SFR: Allows up to 7 du/ac and SF6 zoning

MR: Allows up to 14 du/ac and MDR-14 zoning
Supports the Master Plan Goals and Policies:

**HP.1.1** Enhance Fernley's vitality as a community by providing a variety of housing types, density and costs that accommodate the needs, desires and financial abilities of the current and future households.

**HP.1.2** Encourage housing that supports sustainable development patterns by promoting the efficient use of land ... easy access to services and public facilities.

**LU.1.1** Encourage new development in areas where adequate public services and facilities can be provided efficiently.

**LU.1.2** Encourage new development to be in accordance with the Comprehensive Master Plan land use category.

**LU.1.5** Promote infill development.
MDR14:
- Conform with the Master Plan and cleans up split zoning
- Diversify Fernley's housing product types
- Compatible with adjacent land uses along Main Street
- Improve and help pay for infrastructure and flood mitigation needs in the area

SF6:
- 12,000 sqft lots will not cover cost of infrastructure & flood improvements
- Market demand of 6,000 sqft lot
- Existing SF6 zoning adjacent to subject parcels and next to RR1 zoning in this area
- Approved Jackson Ranch PD 4,700 sqft to 6,800 sqft

Proposed Zoning
Future Planning Application Protections:

- New Fernley Development Code 32.09.030 D2 provides adjacency protection for existing subdivisions.
- Future Tentative Map Conditions - Applicant is planning multiple mitigation strategies:
  1. Open Space Buffer
  2. Larger 15,000 sqft Lots and limited to single story
  3. Total density on SF6 zoned area not to exceed what would be allowable under existing SF12 zoning; approximately 343 units (3.6 du/ ac). SF-12 would not include larger perimeter lots, buffering, or future park.
August 19, 2020

TESTIMONY BEFORE THE FERNLEY CITY COUNCIL
ZMA 20001 RED HAWK RANCH

Mayor and City Council. My name is Greg Evangelatos, AICP for the record. I am an American Institute Certified Planner and have been practicing city planning in the State of Nevada for 43 years. I am the Project Manager and have engaged Wood Rodgers, a local planning and engineering firm to represent Mr. Todd Pardula, the property owner and the project.

First, the staff report and the favorable Fernley Planning Commission action contain no negative findings.

Second, we have been preparing and researching this application and the project for over 2 years.

Third, Mr. Pardula has Fee Simple ownership of all 129.9 acres and 280 Acre Feet of water currently banked with the City. He has not optioned the property. He is heavily invested in the future of the community.

Fourth, we, the project team have worked with city staff, the Planning Commission and the City Council relative to the Comprehensive Plan designations for this property as well as the Zoning criteria including buffering standards and our request is consistent with all of your rules.

Fifth, this approval would merely give us the opportunity to present a Tentative Map or series of Tentative Maps, Special Use Permit applications, Site Plan Review, etc., for both the Planning Commission and City Council to review, condition and possibly approve.

Sixth, this is the largest residential development application that the City of Fernley has seen in some time, but it is only within this context that some major infrastructure challenges can be solved.

Seventh, the property was sold in 2004 for development purposes by a local family for 14 million dollars and has therefore been placed in the developable land category long before Mr. Pardula’s acquisitions. It was approved at that time for 810 lots.

Eighth, we have met with a number of the neighbors on all three sides to share our vision for the long term development of the property and to carefully listen to their issues.

Ninth, we are willing to commit in writing any or all concessions/accommodations and will be returning with Tentative Maps, Special Use Permits, etc., that will conform to our commitments.

Tenth, and finally we are committed to creating a desirable well planned middle class community with amenities such as a trail system, neighborhood parks and a spectrum of market driven housing products.

We therefore ask for a favorable action on the part of the Fernley City Council on this item.

This decision comes down to trust. Trust in your rules. Trust in the process. Trust in your ability to condition the project to make it an asset in your community.

Thank you.
Regarding: Property Zoning Changes "Jackson Ranch"

Members of the Fernley City Council:

The City of Fernley Planning Commission and the City Council have very difficult and often thankless jobs of shaping Fernley’s future. We implore the Fernley City Council and the Fernley Planning Commission to research and look at factors that need to influence future growth in Fernley. Some of the critical factors that need to be studied include water availability with and without recharge from the Truckee Canal. Budgets in the sheriff’s office and the fire department for added personnel are also critical if the population of Fernley is increased by new housing developments. School capacity and the effects new growth would have on schools in Fernley is also an important factor. Low cost housing typically encourages young families to settle in an area, thus leading to overcrowding in the schools. It goes without saying that an increase in high density housing would require expensive modifications to the current sewer, water and road systems.

When the prospect of having a development on the 120 acres known as the “Jackson Ranch” was introduced, it was determined that this property is located in a flood plain. This problem needs to be researched before approving a high-density housing development.

We encourage the Fernley Planning Commission and the Fernley City Council to schedule several meetings regarding the zoning change of the "Jackson Ranch". Fernley residents need to be allowed to give input into the decisions being made that can change their community
significantly. Fernley's Master Plan needs to be a work in progress. Taking a step-by-step approach is an excellent way to keep on top of the impact of growth in our community. When approved development have been completed, then this impact needs to be evaluated before approving additional developments.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully,

[Signature]

Gary Pierson

[Signature]

Janette S. Pierson
August 5th City Council Meeting
1 message

valerie hoff To: "ssevera@cityoffernley.org" <ssevera@cityoffernley.org>

Wed, Aug 5, 2020 at 3:17 PM

My name is Valerie Roberds, and I live located at Main & Truckee Lane and Stock Lane.

This is right down the road from the Jackson Ranch

I would like to voice my concerns over the proposal to rezone the property to SF6 from SF12.

The last thing Fernley needs is another high density housing development in this area, when the available services (restaurant, retail, etc) struggle to support the population we currently have. Also struggling to support our existing population are fire, school, police and infrastructure resources.

As currently proposed at SF12, the project will add approximately 800 more homes to the City of Fernley. That will double under SF6, putting further strain on the already at capacity sewer and septic systems.

Lets talk traffic. With SF12, 800 homes x 2 vehicles per home is 1600 vehicles. Assume ¼ of these vehicles use Truckee Lane to Stock Lane to access their residence. 400 extra vehicles per day through a very quiet neighborhood. If you vote to rezone to SF6, it pretty much doubles. This neighborhood and access to the Main street and to Interstate 80 pretty much becomes a nightmare. Cul-de-sacs and side roads to mitigate flow to different areas will end up like the accesses on Hwy 50, east of the roundabout.

While I understand the development is inevitable, please help keep the zoning to SF12.

Regards,

Valerie Roberds
Public Input Letter

August 4, 2020

Dear City Council Members,

We are residents of the Stock Lane neighbor that is the subject of tonight’s meeting. We have lived in Fernley since 1980 and have lived on Stock lane since 1998 on a two acre parcel. My husband and I have raised 6 children and ran a custom hay company for the last 15 years. Our neighborhood provided and currently provides a safe, quiet, and wholesome atmosphere to raise our large family. We felt confident that our children were safe to play and freely walk in our neighborhood. There are not street lights- so the rule was come home when it’s getting dark. Any morning or evening, an observer may see people riding their horses, children riding bikes, people walking/running, livestock being moved, farm equipment moving between fields-all unencumbered. Places like this are far and few between in Fernley anymore.

I feel developers can’t stand to see beautiful green spaces that are seemingly unused. The Sarasola family has taken the reins from past farmers to cultivate alfalfa on the land. A beautiful sight when one first enters our small rural community. The field is also home to wildlife that is losing more habitat. On the way to work every morning, the sight of quail, rabbits, skunks, coyotes, yearly migration of geese and even an occasional deer is a wonderful sight to start the day off. In the fall and winter, the cattle are always a reminder of the past ranching days of this community.

We understand progress and growth of our community is inevitable. However, responsible growth must be the PRIORITY! People move to Fernley for many reasons. We like to think the number one reason is the slower rural lifestyle, safer community, smaller schools, and the beauty that Fernley offers. Please stop and think about what this will do to hurt our neighborhood and surrounding areas of our home and town.

Assuming these homes will be similar to Donner Trails, I see the same thing occurring at the proposed sight. Much of Donner Trails has become rental properties. Many vacant houses. Much of the neighborhood is very unkempt. Donner Trails evolved to its current state in a relatively short period of time. How will the city manage the proposed development so the neighborhood does not suffer the same end?

With that said, here are areas of concern my family has regarding the proposed project and the concern of zoning change from 12,000 sq. ft. to 6,000 sq. ft. lots and high density with a 14 unit per acre.

1. Railroad underpass is much too small to safely allow for the increased traffic.
2. Increased students at local schools.
3. Will fire and other emergency services be adequate?
4. While Mayor, Leroy Goodman wrote a letter stating the water treatment plant was built to service 20,000 people.
5. Currently, the city is fighting the concreting of the TCID canal because it will decrease the water supply of Fernley. If the canal is concreted, the city has said our water supply will decreased—is that an issue with so many new homes?

6. The project sight was determined to be a flood zone in past years and needed to be filled to 8 ft. Where is that addressed?

7. Increased traffic on Main Street, will impact the roundabout and the first Fernley exit.

8. I don’t see an impact statement requirement.

9. Covid-19 has limited the people allowed to take part in this meeting. Being able to participate via of the internet is not the same to fully take part in the democratic process.

Thank you,

Michele and Kevin Jeakins
Hi City Council Members,

I have been following the process on the Jackson Ranch Development, and would like to put in my two cents. As a Realtor in this area for more than a decade, I can tell you that one of the bigger problems we have in this area, and we're not alone in this, is the availability of affordable housing. There are many jobs coming to this area with the development of the Victory Logistics Industrial Park, as well as the continued growth at the Tahoe Regional Industrial Center. The people that fill these positions, are not all going to be in a position to buy a home right away, nor may all of them want to. There is a lack of rental units in this area that is inflating the rental pricing of any available units to the point that we are pricing people out of the possibility of living here.

This development looks to be a good fit for this community, it seems to me that it has addressed the concerns of the neighbors, in that it is providing a buffer zone, and larger lots where it abuts the more rural properties. It will provide much needed additional multi-family rental units, which will take the upward pressure off of the housing market, and allow a less volatile appreciation curve. I am fairly sure that a new development will have design standards that will keep it from appearing to be an instant slum, or bad area. It is in the developer's best interest to make sure that the project is aesthetically pleasing so as to draw in potential customers for their product, so I have no doubt that it will be acceptable to the eyes.

This will be a good addition to the gateway to Fernley, and will bolster the west end of town so that it becomes a more vibrant part of the city. I imagine it will raise the values of all of the properties around it.

Thank you for your time, Dana Uhlhorn
Mayor and City Council;

I am expressing an opinion supporting the approval of this zoning request. A favorable action by the City Council would allow for the applicant to develop a plan consistent with the adopted plan of the City of Fernley as well as respecting the surrounding neighborhoods.

I believe that the orderly development of this property over the next 8-10 year would allow for a combination of high quality and diverse housing to meet the needs of our community as it grows. We are in dire need of additional modern, contemporary middle class homes and even more desperate to establish attractive multi-family luxury units. I am concerned that the term "affordable" in our community is often mistranslated as "entry level". My understanding of the project is that there will not be "entry level" single family homes, but in addition to single family homes/parcels, the opportunity exists to develop townhomes/condos, which our marketplace requires now and well into the future.

The pending job creation at the Victory Logistics District as well as other job creating projects in our community requires a comparable match in available housing. Only on a project of this magnitude can the City address having a full spectrum of housing within the context of a planned community with interconnections, a trail system and a park built out over time and even land dedicated to a potential elementary school to serve this section of our city.

While I understand the fears and concerns of certain community members, which are primarily based on looking at our shaky past in regards to planning, I truly believe that this potential development will be a tremendous asset to the community so please consider supporting this application.

Thank you for the time and energy you all invest into our community.
Good evening Mayor and Council,

My neighbors and I are not in favor of the City Council approving additional density on these parcels for the Jackson Ranch property. To be clear, we are not against development on this property; however, we are not in favor of doubling the allowable density on this property. The property owner bought this property with a 12,000 square foot zoning and can come in with a project for 12,000 square foot lots at any time.

We fear that increasing density in this area will have a detrimental impact to property values, infrastructure, groundwater resources, animal and human safety, traffic flow and the general quality of life for the area.

Any development on this property should be required to install an eight-foot masonry wall with at least a 25-foot of landscaping around the entire perimeter. The perimeter lots should be larger and should not be allowed to construct homes or structures greater than one story in height so that they don't rise above the wall and landscaping.

We have been frustrated by the restrictions on participating in a public meeting but understand the Governor's regulations on public meetings due to the COVID-19 pandemic and respect that. Nevertheless, we have sent in our comments to the Clerk's office and listened to the meeting on behalf of our neighbors because they are not able to do so. We had many questions in our email and were looking forward to them being answered but it was difficult to hear when some of the commissioners were talking and impossible to hear when someone called in with zoom or on a telephone. There is also no way of seeing anything that is being presented.

This whole process has left us confused and frustrated. It seems as though our concerns are continually being put off until the next meeting or next part of the process and we get the feeling that approval of this item has already been decided. We do not feel like the resources that have been provided to the residents are adequate or our voices are being heard.

In closing, we would like to ask, does the City Council understands that they can vote no on this? You are not obligated to approve every zone change that is brought to you. You have an obligation and duty to make decisions that are in the best interests of the citizens of Fernley, not to the pocket books of the developers.

It was only February of this year that the City Council was not in favor of passing the new development code because it had 6,000 square foot lots included as an option for development. What happened to the Council's concerns about density? You eliminated this lot size from the Development Code for years but now it seems you can't approve smaller lots fast enough.

Fernley is becoming the center of development in northern Nevada and the City Council needs to control and direct that growth and stop this habit of accepting anything and everything. Please ask the important and hard questions and keep in mind that this project is not going to save the City's finances. Not one project in Fernley has ever made the City's financial situation any better in the long term. You are only adding more demand on limited resources and facilities that you already can't afford to maintain.

Stand up and be the voice of the citizens of Fernley.
Thank you for your time,

The new and longtime residents of Woodchuck Drive
Mayor and City Council;

I am expressing an opinion supporting the approval of this zoning request. A favorable action by the City Council would allow for the applicant to develop a plan consistent with the adopted plan of the City of Fernley as well as respecting the surrounding neighborhoods.

I believe that the orderly development of this property over the next 8-10 year would allow for a combination of high quality and diverse housing to meet the needs of our community as it grows. We are in dire need of additional modern, contemporary middle class homes and even more desperate to establish attractive multi-family luxury units. I am concerned that the term "affordable" in our community is often mistranslated as "entry level". My understanding of the project is that there will not be "entry level" single family homes, but in addition to single family homes/parcels, the opportunity exists to develop townhomes/condos, which our marketplace requires now and well into the future.

The pending job creation at the Victory Logistics District as well as other job creating projects in our community requires a comparable match in available housing. Only on a project of this magnitude can the City address having a full spectrum of housing within the context of a planned community with interconnections, a trail system and a park built out over time and even land dedicated to a potential elementary school to serve this section of our city.
While I understand the fears and concerns of certain community members, which are primarily based on looking at our shaky past in regards to planning, I truly believe that this potential development will be a tremendous asset to the community so please consider supporting this application.

Thank you for the time and energy you all invest into our community.

Michael Knaus
Fernley Resident
Public Input Form

Name: DB-BB Investments 1, LLC
Address: _________________________ Reno Nevada
Phone: __________ Email: kmatzoll@mdc-krush.com

Mark the meeting(s) where your concern should be expressed:
(y) City Council Meeting   ( ) Fernley Planning Commission   ( ) Budget Meeting
( ) Fernley Convention & Tourism Authority   ( ) Board of Appeals

On what date should your concern be addressed: 8/19/2020

CONCERN: To the Council members: DB-BB has been in discussions with the developers representative concerning the rezoning of the Jackson ranch/ Red Hawk Ranch. DB-JB owns the remaining portions of the Jackson Ranch and fully supports the application being presented by Relief Springs LLC Series C. The location of the property to downtown, existing utility and the freeway is a unique location for this type of zoning. The City and I believe the master plan encourages in fill properties like this one.

________________________________________

(Should you require more room use back)

Signature: Karl A Matzoll (Representative)  Date: 8/19/2020
Kimberly Swanson

From: Joe Reisenauer
Sent: Wednesday, August 19, 2020 8:15 AM
To: City Clerk; Ray Lacy; Shellie Severa; Stan Lau; Albert Torres; Fran McKay; Roy Edginton
Subject: Second Reading and public hearing of Bill #289, ZMA Case No. 20001, 8/19/2020

Mayor and City Council,

I am in favor of the zoning request in ZMA Case No. 20001. As most of you know, I am a full time licensed NV REALTOR in Fernley. Additionally, I currently serve as Fernley Director for the Reno/Sparks Association of Realtors. My comments and opinions in favor of ZMA Case No. 20001 are my own as a licensed NV Realtor and citizen of Fernley, and not that of Reno/Sparks Association of Realtors.

I compiled a breakdown of residential housing through the Northern Nevada Multiple Listing Service (NNRMLS) over the past 30 days, and the need for increased housing in critical areas is overwhelmingly apparent.

1. Quality entry level housing neighborhoods for young families to either purchase or rent. Low inventory of housing with high demand has this segment of real estate sales the highest of any other segment of our real estate market. Our children, grandchildren and great grandchildren deserve the same opportunities we had as young people and we are not supplying that opportunity to them.

2. In all of 2020, condos/townhouses transactions are at 0. Quality condos/townhomes in a planned community is good for all of Fernley’s residents. Again, what is needed for our community is not being provided.

3. Our 1/4 acre (12,000 square foot) or larger inventory is insufficient for those moving to our community who desire a larger lot. Due to lack of inventory, prices go up and they are becoming unaffordable for those who prefer them.

In real estate, shortages in key areas cause problems across the real estate market. Being proactive to the needs of the real estate market in the City of Fernley will create balanced, affordable housing and sustained revenue for our community. ZMA Case No. 20001 has the potential to do just that.

Last week, I participated in City of Fernley's Strategic Planning workshop. Our population is poised to grow to 40,000 by 2040. It is time to be proactive to the needs of our city's future, and partner with those who can impact its growth and development. ZMA Case No. 20001 has the potential to do just that.
ZMA Case No. 20001's request is consistent with the newly adopted Master/Comprehensive Plan and complies with the new zoning regulations. This project has the potential to provide diverse housing in a carefully planned and approved setting that any city our size wants and needs. It will improve the west side of Fernley and provide quality housing that meets the needs of Fernley's future.
With approval by City Council, the specifics of the development can be ironed out like any other development via tentative maps and documentation.

Please be proactive when looking at ZMA Case No. 20001. Our community's future will benefit from it.

Joe Reisenauer, Coldwell Banker Select Real Estate
NV # S.0170373
Fernley Director, Reno/Sparks Association of Realtors
Phone: 775-835-1148
Email: joe.reisenauer@cbselectre.com
Website: www.joe.reisenauer.cbselectre.com

I do NOT send wiring instructions for real estate transactions via email. Please contact your title company for wiring instructions. Please do not convey your financial information via email to me. Contact me via telephone regarding any suspicious or inconsistent communications you receive from my email. The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorized to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in relation to the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.
Greg Evangelatos' request for zoning change

Marty Hanna
To: rlacy@cityoffernley.org, ssevera@cityoffernley.org, slau@cityoffernley.org, storres@cityoffernley.org, lmckay@cityoffernley.org more

Good morning,
I want to voice my support for the zoning change requested by Greg Evangelatos that will allow his developer/land owner to move forward with their project. Fernley needs more housing at all levels. This project is a good mix of multi-family units and single-family housing designed to blend in with the upscale neighborhood. I'm impressed by the design that will blend in so well with the existing neighborhood.
Greg Evangelatos has an excellent reputation. He has presented the City with a plan that will set the standard for further developments. It is in his interest and that of his developer/owner to present the highest quality of design and function if they hope to proceed with their other planned projects in our city.
I understand review and planning are essential, but the City needs to take that first big step into the next phase of Fernley's growth. Housing, good quality, planned development, is needed now. Five years ago, we were told we needed to be ready for growth.
I'm asking for zoning changes to be approved in order for this project to move forward.

Marty Hanna,
Fernley Rotary Club
Freedom Plumbing, LLC Office Manager
August 6, 2020

To whom this may concern,

I am writing this to inform you how I feel about the project that is being developed in the 129 acres of alfalfa field south of the main street, west ends of town, across from the Frontier Fun Center Bowling alley. I personally love this property and it's the reason why I chose to live in this neighborhood, I like not being crowded by all on my neighbors. I left Reno Nevada because all it has become is affordable housing as far as the eye could see, cheaply and quickly built, falling apart within a few years.

When I first moved here 10 years ago I wanted to understand how my arrogation worked, and in doing this I learned the History of Fernley, & what I found was amazing & scary. We are worse off than Reno when it comes to water, the only reason Fernley can exist is because of the canal water that runs every year, without it Fernley can't fill the well system that City if Fernley water treatment facility uses to take water from. With them trying to concrete the canal that means even less water will go into the well system & more house means more water use and this will eventually drain all the water, & our own well is already having problems now getting to the water, a lot of my neighbors have had to drill deeper to get to the already stressed water system.

We have already built to big and this adds stress to our already braking down system, inevitably it will lead to failure, growing is nice but I have always understood that Nevada is mostly shrub lands mixed with large deserts and a sprinkling of very very small grasslands, water is hard to come by & we have never been blessed with rain or snow like California. We always live in drought season, our droughts get so bad that make it hard for everyone living here. In this state our droughts usually last 5-8 years with only one year reprieve. & it never gives us back what we have lost. Nevada could never use water like California does because it is unsustainable to do that here. I always find it funny when California has to go into conservation mode every 8-10 years, we here in Nevada always live in conservation mode because it is always in a drought season. We can not continue to ignore how the desert works we know better than that. This will not change because we live in a desert and we don't have the water & infrastructure to handle any more homes.

I feel like Fernley has become the bedroom community for Reno/Sparks. I don't see why we need to further support this market when the available services we have now (restaurant, retail, fire, police, schools, roads, electricity, sewer, water, trash, etc.) struggle to support the population we currently have.

A single person makes
-94.81 pounds of feces a year.
-7,075.2 pounds of trash a year.
-3,033.6 gallons of water used just for showers a year. (26,880 gallons of water used a year).
-7396.8 metric tons of carbon dioxide per year.

P.S. I have questions:
How long until the system fails after the ditch gets concreted?
Can we wait until we know for sure that the ditch will or won't be concreted?
Will, the developer's fight to keep the ditch unconcealed?
Were will the Fernley Sewer Facility get there water from if they concrete the canal?
Where does the water rights that are for that property go?
Why are we going to build new homes when we have not filled the one we have now? They are not all expensive.
Are the developers going to pay the upfront cost it will take to upgrade our sewer, water, electricity, roads & trash?
Where will we get the extra water, to support these homes?

Sincerely one of your constituents.
Michelle Bridges
Hi! I am asking that the city council do NOT approve the ordinance/zoning change (Bill 289--ZMA20001) at tonight's meeting. To reduce parcel size to 6,000 sq. feet would double the number of possible houses causing much more density and public safety and health problems. (APN's 021-041-07 and 021-041-10) This is a total of 95 acres with a potential of 6 homes per acre at 6,000 ft zoning. 95 x 6 = 570 homes into an area that would exit on to main street as the only egress/digress unless Stock lane is to be accessed. Not to mention potential flooding as this property is 8 to 10 feet lower as it goes from south to north. APN 021-041-08 should not be rezoned to MDR14/medium density residential. This 34.6 acre parcel could have as many as 484 units. With the demographer figure of 2.6 people per housing unit this equates to over 2700 people jammed into these 3 parcels. That would be almost 13% increase of the current population of 21000. Keeping the Master Plan as is would allow for 285 houses to be built with minor impact from the commercial parcel (285 x 2.6 = 741 people in these parcels as it is currently zoned. As you can see the proposed zoning change would almost quadruple the impact on the area not to mention the health and safety factors. The residents of Fernley deserve integrity and responsibility from the elected officials. I know the council has been lobbied hard by the applicant and their 'voice' but make the best decision for FERNLEY. Do NOT approve the proposed changes. There is too much at stake for the city to have recommendations from people who want to be 'good neighbors' but do not live or work here. Thank you, LeRoy Goodman, resident of Fernley since 1965. DO THE RIGHT THING for the residents of FERNLEY
My husband and I, Fernley residents, approve the attached message.

Cynthia Miller
John Miller
August 2020

Mayor Roy Edgington,
City of Fernley
595 Silverlace Boulevard
Fernley, Nevada 89408

Re: Second Reading and Public Hearing of Bill #289 ZMA 20001, August 19, 2020

Mayor and City Council:

I am writing this letter in support of the Rezoning of the proposed Red Hawk Ranch Rezoning, a significant portion (129.94 acres) of the former Jackson Ranch.

I believe that the request is consistent with the adopted Comprehensive Plan and that our community needs a development such as this with a full spectrum of high quality housing.

Since this is a Zoning request, the conditioning and insuring that the public health, safety and welfare of the community will occur during the Tentative Map process and I believe that these issues can be resolved. Also the City of Fernley needs to build its tax base to provide needed public services over the near future. A planned community such as this allows for any major concerns to be addressed comprehensively.

Regards,
August 2020

Mayor Roy Edgington
City of Fernley, Nevada
595 Silverlace Boulevard,
Fernley, Nevada 89408

Re: Second Reading and Public Hearing of Bill #289, ZMA 20001, August 19, 2020

Mayor and City Council:

I am expressing an opinion supporting the approval of this zoning request. A favorable action by the City Council would allow for the applicant to develop a plan consistent with the adopted plan of the City of Fernley as well as respecting the surrounding neighborhoods.

I believe that the orderly development of this property over the next 8-10 years would allow for a combination of high quality and diverse housing to meet the needs of the community as it grows.

The pending job creation at the Victory Industrial Project as well as other job creating projects in the community requires a match in available housing. Only on a project of this magnitude can the City address having full spectrum of housing within the context of a planned community with interconnections and a trail system and a park built out over time.

I understand the concerns of the community, but truly believe that this potential development would be an asset to the community so please consider supporting the application.

Best Wishes,
To the City Council of Ferntree,

I just heard about the proposal of the Milestone & Stob Hall. I live in Ferntree for the last 31 years. The exact same plan came up about 20 years ago and was rejected because of the flood area. Since then, nothing has changed but there? So, I don't forget about it and put the money to repair the streets, especially Stob Hall. That's my fair and work.

Herb Siegel
Comments for Public Hearing:

July 8, 2020

Planning Commission & City Council,

“Change is inevitable”, wise planned growth for our community is essential. Regarding the Notice of Public Hearing, I am not in favor of the amendment to change the zoning on the APN(s) 021-041-07, 021-041-10 & 021-041-08. The acreage was already reduced to 12,000 sq. ft. in 2004.

Per the new Redevelopment Plan, this is listed as the historical area of Fernley. These smaller lots sizes are in contradiction to this plan.

Our water resources are domestic wells on the west side of Fernley. These additional homes will be drying up our water along with the surface water which replenishes the ground water. An alternative condition for the parcel owners would be that the City of Fernley run water lines down Truckee, Margaret & Carol way to be able to connect to city water resources should our wells need to be re-drilled due to the extra demand of water in this area.

In keeping with the larger lot sizes, I am also asking to develop Stock Lane with a large rural area open space walkway on the east side of the road for a barrier between rural and the newly planned housing. The adjacent lots on the perimeter of the new subdivision should be larger than 12,000 sq. ft to maintain the historical, rural area atmosphere of West Fernley & also have required larger setbacks for these homes.

There are many undeveloped areas east of Miller Lane for smaller subdivision to be created within the infrastructure density of the City of Fernley.

Also, with the proposed dense population, this will create more problems for crime in our area. This will unenviably fall back for liability to the City of Fernley for creating a bigger problem for the residence in our area of the community. This will affect the quality of life enjoyed by all residents, present & future.

We do need levels of improvements for our continuable sustainable growth. Please consider the suggested comments of the citizens before making another major mistake with the building development of our city.

Respectfully,

Tasha Lowrey
Property Owner
Comments:

7/07/2020

To City Council,

My name is Ray Lowrey and I’m submitting this letter to ask you to deny lowering the lot size for ZMA 20001.

I’m concerned in many ways of what this will do to my property values as well as the additional traffic brought into our neighborhoods. We are a rural neighborhood soon to be the last in Fernley.

With the additional homes, I’m worried about the liability of other peoples’ children walking our streets. We have livestock that draws children’s attention. We irrigate our field with open ditches and the children can drowned in them.

I would also like to see no connecting roads to our subdivision.

The traffic down Miller Lane for people to get to the high school will be extremely dangerous. Be prepared to pull kids out of the canal. The roads will not handle the flow of this additional traffic.

Respectfully submitted,

Ray Lowrey
Affected Parcel Owner
Fernley City Council
Fernley Planning Department
595 Silver Lace Blvd.
Fernley, NV 89408

Subject: ZMA20001 Zoning Map Amendment change request for APN 021-041-07 and
APN 021-041-10

To all whom this may concern:

As property owners of Miller Meadows Subdivision, we are greatly concerned at the rezoning
of the above referenced property that joins our subdivision to the North.

We wrote an email message to Kimberly Swanson on Monday, July 6, 2020 and asked that the
planning commission delay the rezoning of this property until we were able to have a question
and answer session in an open meeting with the planning department. Apparently, the planning
department went ahead and rezoned these parcels without the open session we asked for.

As you know, Miller Meadows is one of the nicest subdivisions in Fernley and we have many
concerns about how this property that joins our subdivision will be developed, as our way of
life and our property values will be impacted by future development on the property to our
North. These concerns are (but not limited to) as follows:

- Multiple water drainage problems
- Road access problems
- Increased traffic problems on Miller Lane, Main St. Shadow Ln, McCart St. and W.
  Cedar St.
- Property value impact in our subdivision
- Sound abatement problems
- Dust mitigation during construction on the property to our North

We realize the impact Covid 19 restrictions have imposed on public meetings, but these things
are too important and adversely affect too many people to be done without public input. We
hereby formally appeal the decision of the planning department and we request the decision to
rezone be set aside until a public meeting can be held.
Attached is a list of property owners in Miller Meadows who have signed on to this letter.

Sincerely,

Robert C. Bannon
President, Miller Meadows Homeowners Association

p.p. Anthony Ilardi

[Signatures]
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To whom this may concern,

My family and I just moved back to Fernley in May 2019. I grew up in Fernley on Margaret Way myself. I lived there for 19 years then moved away because my husband joined the Coast Guard which allowed us to move to all over our great country until his enlistment ended. We moved back to Fernley to raise our children near our family and in a safe neighborhood where they would learn about Fernley's amazing history of agriculture and ranching. For those who do not know Fernley's History, our city was established in 1904 as a primarily agricultural and ranching community. I personally grew up raising steer, swine, chicken, goats and many more farm animals to either sell to others for food or to help feed my family. I need my children to be raised this way as well because it taught me hard work, values, and respect, not only for human but animal life as well. This is extremely important to realize that everyone in Fernley will be impacted greatly if the city decided to develop on Jacksons Ranch or continue The Gateway to the city project. The Gateway to the city project would affect all agricultural resource on the west end of Fernley by increasing the traffic. Increase in traffic worsens our air and drinking water, causes a threat to groundwater supply and our native species by increasing pollution. I ask please do not allow for mass development. My family lives off the meat we raise and the water supply from the canal to feed our well water.

Very Respectfully,

Allie Mitchell

Fernley NV 89408

Resource

just received “NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING”.

1. 6000 SQUARE FOOT LOTS ARE TOO SMALL. 12,000 is what the land is zoned for and it should stay that way.
2. Neighborhood commercial is a good idea if confined to the northern part of the property.
3. Medium density residential, 14 units calculates to 3100 square feet. Not sure what this is, but sounds like a lot of people and traffic in a small space. I am not in favor.
4. Realizing that this is a VICINITY MAP AND ASKING FOR A ZONE CHANGE, I have other questions not related but important to this project.
   1. What happens to the remainder of the property that borders miller lane, will it remain a hole in the ground as it has for the last 10 years or so.
   2. Where will the streets connect?
   3. What improvements will be made to miller lane.
   4. What is the estimated car count, and how many people will this area house?

This is a big deal and it is time for something to happen there, but if it is not planned well, we will have to live with it forever. I understand the need to structure a project that is profitable for a developer, but it needs to be in the best interest of the town. Some of these things are not in the best interest of the town. I would hope the planning commission will think carefully about this and not pass it on for the city council to adjust.
To City Council Members

I am writing in response to the zoning of the parcels located at 525 W. Main St. Feruley, NV. I oppose the zoning change to SE6 (Residential Single Family 4,000 sq ft). Actually I would love to see it stay as Agriculture or a city park.

With all the new development, I am concerned about the water table and my well going dry. Then being forced to go on city water and sewer, which I understand is very expensive. I am on a limited income. I have lived on Margaret Way for over 30 years and love this very quiet and calm neighborhood. It's so peaceful. With more population and traffic comes more crime and problems. There are plenty of apartments here already, maybe one acre parcels could be developed. Of course the police, fire and schools will be impacted. Our neighborhood streets will be busy with traffic (cars and people). I say "NO" to this re-zoning.

Respectfully,
Sharon Henderson
Sharon Henderson
Who it may concern:

By writing this letter I want to be very clear and describe how my family and me love the peaceful and safe community we have in the rural area of West Fernley. We love there is no traffic so kids can drive their bikes on the street or walk to the bus stop safely, the silent at night that sometimes you can hear the owls the fresh air coming from the big alfalfa field on Stock Lane; we have wonderful neighbors and we take care of each other, in most of the houses they have farm animals, big gardens or vegetable plots that need a lot of water and I'm grateful that we have groundwater to keep everything irrigating.

Here at home we oppose to the development of 800-1200 houses in our neighborhood because this area is rural adding all those residences will not reflect a rural area, we don't want high density houses here we want our neighborhood as it is. The development increase traffic so much vehicles will making their way to the canal all the silent and safe on the streets will be lost; besides of the traffic the groundwater tables will be stress as the city infrastructure and the local business that can't supply the people already in town, schools can't have more student they don't have the employees or spaces for more kiddos.

So for the reason I tried to explained above and other that maybe I can't put in words my family and me are oppose to build in the alfalfa area of Stock Lane. Let West Fernley stay as a beautiful, peaceful and safe RURAL AREA.

Sincerely
Carol Way residents.
Fernley Planning Commission
Fernley City Council

Dear Members,

This letter is being submitted as ‘public commentary’ regarding the Zoning Map Amendments proposed by “Relief Springs, LLC”. If passed by you, those changes would occur on property known historically as the Jackson Ranch.

As a long-time Fernley resident, I agree with my neighbors who object strenuously to these changes. Many of you who will preside over this decision also agree with us that this parcel happens to be the “Gateway To The City”. Given that it is most often the first impression visitors will embrace when they arrive in our community, isn’t it incumbent upon all of us to make sure we get this decision right?

As Tech Industry employees continue to pour into the Reno/Fernley Corridor, the definition of “affordable housing” has taken on an entirely new meaning; like it or not, home buyers from Silicon Valley, Washington, Oregon and Colorado have redefined entry-level prices for homes—And they have certainly turned our real estate holdings into a “Seller’s Market”—Why then, do we need to build any structure here that amounts to the ‘least common denominator’? You need only look at the houses along McCart and Cedar Streets to appreciate the failure of that ages-old vision...And believe me, a 20 foot “Buffer Zone” between this abomination and the beautiful development of Miller Meadows (or the homes in Country Lane Estates), will not amount to a contiguous zoning remedy.

**It is also not surprising that these developers, who are fond of talking about benefits to our infrastructure, have not once mentioned that they will be paying for traffic lights at Miller and Main, or Truckee and Main.

**For those new members of either the Commission or Council, I hope you will also take this opportunity to research the status of easements along the western border of Stock Lane. It has long been known that the road has deviated off of its legal path; any future incorporation of it into the City’s infrastructure will require condemnation of land portions existing within the lots that border Stock Lane.

I will end by saying that I actually believe in affordable housing, but it must exist in a different form than what is being proposed here. Planned communities (now being built in Reno and Sparks) have developed around Condominium and Apartment complexes; these incorporate the availability of parks and genuine open space, and particularly, their nearby access to public schools—For my way of thinking, that will need to happen east and southeast of downtown Fernley—in the meantime, let’s figure out how to do something beautiful with Fernley’s ‘Gateway to the City’.

Respectfully,

Bob Robertson
Public Input Letter

Dear City Council Members,

We are residents of the Stock Lane neighbor that is the subject of tonight’s meeting. We have lived in Fernley since 1980 and have lived on Stock Lane since 1998 on a two acre parcel. My husband and I have raised 6 children and ran a custom hay company for the last 15 years. Our neighborhood provided and currently provides a safe, quiet, and wholesome atmosphere to raise our large family. We felt confident that our children were safe to play and freely walk in our neighborhood. There are not street lights- so the rule was come home when it’s getting dark. Any morning or evening, an observer may see people riding their horses, children riding bikes, people walking/running, livestock being moved, farm equipment moving between fields-all unencumbered. Places like this are far and few between in Fernley anymore.

I feel developers can’t stand to see beautiful green spaces that are seemingly unused. The Sarasola family has taken the reins from past farmers to cultivate alfalfa on the land. A beautiful sight when one first enters our small rural community. The field is also home to wildlife that is losing more habitat. On the way to work every morning, the sight of quail, rabbits, skunks, coyotes, yearly migration of geese and even an occasional deer is a wonderful sight to start the day off. In the fall and winter, the cattle are always a reminder of the past ranching days of this community.

We understand progress and growth of our community is inevitable. However, responsible growth must be the PRIORITY! People move to Fernley for many reasons. We like to think the number one reason is the slower rural lifestyle, safer community, smaller schools, and the beauty that Fernley offers. Please stop and think about what this will do to hurt our neighborhood and surrounding areas of our home and town.

Assuming these homes will be similar to Donner Trails, I see the same thing occurring at the proposed sight. Much of Donner Trails has become rental properties. Many vacant houses. Much of the neighborhood is very unkempt. Donner Trails evolved to its current state in a relatively short period of time. How will the city manage the proposed development so the neighborhood does not suffer the same end?

With that said, here are areas of concern my family has regarding the proposed project and the concern of zoning change from 12,000 sq. ft. to 6,000 sq. ft. lots and high density with a 14 unit per acre.

1. Railroad underpass is much too small to safely allow for the increased traffic.
2. Increased students at local schools. I teach at Fernley Elementary and I can tell you our school cannot handle the huge influx of students at our school. Last year I had 27 students in my class.
3. Fire and other emergency services will not be adequate.
4. While Mayor, Leroy Goodman, wrote a letter stating the water treatment plant was built to service 20,000 people.
5. Currently, the city is fighting the concreting of the TCID canal because it will decrease the water supply of Fernley.
6. The project sight was determined to be a flood zone and needed to be filled to 8 ft.
7. Increased traffic on Main Street, will impact the roundabout and the first Fernley exit.
8. I don’t see an impact statement requirement.
9. Covid-19 has limited the people allowed to take part in this meeting. Being able to participate via of the internet is not the same to the democratic process.