

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the January 28, 2009 Meeting

Page 1

A regular meeting of the Carson City Planning Commission was scheduled for 5:00 p.m. on Wednesday, January 28, 2009 in the Community Center Sierra Room, 851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada.

PRESENT: Chairperson Mark Kimbrough
Vice Chairperson Craig Mullet
John Peery
Steve Reynolds
Bill Vance
George Wendell

STAFF: Lee Plemel, Planning Division Director
Jennifer Pruitt, Principal Planner
Jeff Sharp, City Engineer
Joel Benton, Senior Deputy District Attorney
Kathleen King, Recording Secretary

NOTE: A recording of these proceedings, the commission's agenda materials, and any written comments or documentation provided to the recording secretary during the meeting are public record. These materials are on file in the Clerk-Recorder's Office, and available for review during regular business hours.

A. CALL TO ORDER, DETERMINATION OF QUORUM, AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

(5:02:18) - Chairperson Kimbrough called the meeting to order at 5:02 p.m. Roll was called; a quorum was present. Commissioner Bisbee was absent. Commissioner Peery led the pledge of allegiance.

B. COMMISSION ACTION ON APPROVAL OF MINUTES - November 19, 2008 and December 17, 2008

(5:03:14) - Vice Chairperson Mullet moved to approve the November 19, 2008 minutes, as presented. Commissioner Vance seconded the motion. Motion carried 4-0-1, Commissioner Peery abstaining. Vice Chairperson Mullet moved to approve the December 17, 2008 minutes, as presented. Commissioner Vance seconded the motion. Motion carried 4-0-1, Commissioner Peery abstaining.

C. MODIFICATION OF AGENDA (5:04:04) - None.

D. PUBLIC COMMENTS (5:04:11) - Chairperson Kimbrough called for public comment. (5:04:56)

David Campbell advised of having called the City Manager to inform him that this meeting was not listed in the Calendar of Events section of the City's website. He noted that the meeting was also not posted on the Community Center readerboard, and suggested increasing publicity for the meeting. Mr. Plemel advised that the issue of posting the meeting in the Calendar of Events section of the City's website had been addressed. (5:06:06) Rae Engelhardt advised of having found the commission's agenda on the City's website.

E. STAFF PUBLIC SERVICE ANNOUNCEMENTS (5:06:30) - None.

F. DISCLOSURES (5:06:37) - None.

G. CONSENT AGENDA (5:06:45) - None.

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the January 28, 2009 Meeting

Page 2

H. PUBLIC HEARING MATTERS:

H-1. SUP-08-124 ACTION TO CONSIDER A SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FROM BEN SMITH, BSA CONSTRUCTION (PROPERTY OWNER: MICHAEL D. WALKER & DSE, LLC) TO ALLOW OFF-STREET PARKING WITHIN 300 FEET OF THE BUILDING SITE, ON PROPERTY ZONED RESIDENTIAL OFFICE (RO), LOCATED AT 503 NORTH NEVADA STREET, APN 003-222-05 (5:07:59) - Chairperson Kimbrough introduced this item. Ms. Pruitt reviewed the staff report, oriented the commissioners to the subject property using a displayed aerial photograph, and narrated additional slides. She reviewed the public noticing process, as outlined in the staff report, and noted the letters of support included in the agenda materials. She further noted the findings included in the staff report, and staff's recommendation of approval. [Commissioner Reynolds arrived at 5:10 p.m.]

In response to a question, Mr. Sharp advised of no code requirement which would prohibit crossing a street from a parking lot to access a business. He noted that the subject section of Nevada Street is not very busy. Discussion followed. In response to a series of questions, Ms. Pruitt advised that the site had been extensively evaluated, over a period of several months, with regard to parking. The applicant has worked closely with Planning, Engineering, and Building Division staff to ensure accessibility. Ms. Pruitt noted a change to the site plan included in the agenda materials in that a lift will be installed on the north side of the building beneath the proposed stair. She advised that the solution is acceptable to City staff and anticipates that it will also be acceptable to the Historic Resources Commission. In response to a further question, Ms. Pruitt read condition of approval 7 into the record.

(5:20:29) Steve Hendricks, of BSA Construction, acknowledged agreement with the conditions of approval. He commended Ms. Pruitt's presentation and advised that, due to the change of use from residential to business, the property has been updated with regard to plumbing, ADA accessibility, energy efficiency, and landscape. Mr. Hendricks noted that the stated improvements will enhance the neighborhood.

Chairperson Kimbrough called for public comment and, when none was forthcoming, entertained a motion. **Commissioner Peery moved to approve SUP-08-124, a special use permit application from DSE #4, LLC and Ben Smith of BSA Construction, LLC, to allow off-site and off-street parking to support a conversion of property from an apartment use to office use, on property in the residential office zoning district, located at 503 North Nevada Street, APN 003-222-05, allowing the use of shared parking at 503 North Division Street, APN 003-221-04, based on findings and conditions of approval contained in the staff report. Commissioner Wendell seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0.**

H-2. AB-08-126 ACTION TO MAKE A RECOMMENDATION TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS REGARDING AN APPLICATION FOR ABANDONMENT OF PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY FROM ANDREW AILES (PROPERTY OWNER: VIDLER WATER COMPANY, INC.) FOR A 50-FOOT WIDE AND 400 LINEAR FOOT PUBLIC UTILITIES AND PUBLIC ROADWAY EASEMENT, ON PROPERTY ZONED SINGLE-FAMILY ONE ACRE (SF1A), LOCATED AT 5080 HELLS BELLS ROAD, APN 010-681-06 (5:23:38) - Chairperson Kimbrough introduced this item. Ms. Pruitt reviewed the staff report in conjunction with a displayed aerial photograph, and narrated additional slides. She reviewed the public noticing process, as outlined in the agenda materials, and advised of having received no opposition to the application. She noted the comments received from other City departments, particularly those of the Engineering Division and the Parks and

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the January 28, 2009 Meeting

Page 3

Recreation Department. She further noted the findings, as outlined in the staff report, and expressed appreciation for the detailed information provided by the applicant. She advised of staff's recommendation of approval.

In response to a question, Open Space / Property Manager Juan Guzman advised that parcel B will be donated to the Open Space Program. Additionally, the applicant has agreed to improve the trail and linkages to other City property, which Mr. Guzman pointed out on a displayed aerial photograph.

(5:29:47) Andrew Ailes, of Vidler Water Company, Inc., acknowledged agreement with the conditions of approval.

Chairperson Kimbrough called for public comments and, when none were forthcoming, entertained a motion. **Commissioner Vance moved to recommend that the Board of Supervisors approve an abandonment of public right-of-way application, AB-08-126, for a 50-foot wide and a 400 linear foot public utilities and public roadway easement, being approximately 21,113 square feet, more or less, located northeast of the intersection of Hells Bells Road and Marsh Road, based on seven findings and subject to the conditions of approval contained in the staff report. Commissioner Reynolds seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0.**

H-3. ZCA-08-127 ACTION TO CONSIDER AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE CARSON CITY MUNICIPAL CODE, TITLE 18, ZONING, CHAPTER 18.05, GENERAL PROVISIONS, ADDING SECTION 18.05.080, SMALL WIND TURBINES, TO PROVIDE STANDARDS FOR THE PLACEMENT AND USE OF SMALL WIND TURBINE GENERATORS (5:31:54) - Chairperson Kimbrough introduced this item. Mr. Plemel reviewed the staff report in conjunction with a PowerPoint presentation, and the provisions of the proposed ordinance, copies of which were included in the agenda materials. He reviewed the purpose of Section II, paragraph 4) Roof Mounted Private Wind Machines and, at the request of Building Division personnel, suggested modifying the title to read "Mounting of Wind Machines," deleting the first sentence, and revising the second sentence to read, "Attachment of the wind machine or structural components to any building or structure shall be in strict compliance with the requirements of the Carson City Building Division." He referred to the written comments provided to the commissioners and staff prior to the start of the meeting.

In response to a question, Mr. Plemel advised that by-right installation of a small wind turbine would include a building permit fee. In response to a further question, he advised that the residential special use permit application fee is approximately \$2,200. In response to a further question, he suggested that installing wind turbine generators in the historic district would pose a unique situation because of the existing height of the trees and the small lots. In response to a further question, he reiterated that representatives of adjacent counties had indicated no code enforcement complaints, including as pertinent to noise. He advised that the Douglas County ordinance had originated from a complaint. Discussion took place regarding the average residential energy consumption. Mr. Plemel responded to questions of clarification regarding the purpose of the proposed ordinance to allow by-right installation of small wind turbines. He acknowledged that special use permits would still be applicable for situations outside the provisions of the proposed ordinance.

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the January 28, 2009 Meeting

Page 4

Chairperson Kimbrough opened this item to public comment, and provided direction with regard to the same. Mr. Plemel advised the citizens present that the commissioners had been provided copies of the written comments submitted to the Planning Division.

(6:05:11) Jenny Scanland expressed confidence in City staff to craft the language of the ordinance in such a way as to “actually work.” She requested that the building permit costs be kept affordable to accommodate residential purchase of the wind energy conversion systems (“WECS”). In response to a question, Mr. Plemel advised that building permit fees are established at a percentage of the project. He offered to provide the information. Ms. Scanland suggested waiving the building permit fee. She advised that her neighbor has a WECS, and that she has never been bothered by the noise. In addition, the WECS blends so well on the neighbor’s property that interested persons have to be shown the location. Ms. Scanland responded to questions regarding the design of the WECS on her neighbor’s property.

(6:08:00) In consideration of setback requirements, Roy Engelhardt, a resident of Goni Road, inquired as to the possibility of installing a WECS on the roof of his barn. He discussed possible savings benefits to be realized in consideration of the WECS cost, and responded to corresponding questions.

In response to a previous question, Mr. Sharp advised of having talked with Chief Building Official Kevin Gattis, who informed him that the minimum building permit fee is \$65. The total fee is based on 1.5 percent of the project value and includes plan check and inspections. Chairperson Kimbrough thanked Mr. Sharp for the information.

(6:15:04) David Campbell reviewed various noise levels as listed in the table at page 34 of the staff report. He expressed concern over noise to be generated from the WECSs, and noted his written proposal to “get a sound guy in here with a noise generator and let us hear 55 dB.” He suggested the possibility of the 55 dB being a “bad bearing” and advised this would not be okay. He expressed opposition to a WECS interfering with his view. He suggested that, in a public zoning district, the neighbors should be notified and provided the opportunity to comment. He expressed opposition to having to pay costs associated with a neighbor’s WECS interfering with his electronic equipment. He expressed additional opposition to multiple WECSs being installed on one-acre or larger parcels. He suggested “inventing a new special use permit” pertinent only to WECSs in order to provide the “neighbors ... a chance to comment on it.”

(6:21:05) Mark Turner, of Silver Oak Development, advised of having considered the possibility, over the past 18 months, of using wind energy in the Silver Oak development and on the golf course. He noted the motivating factor as the rebates to be offered by NV Energy to help offset the cost of installing the equipment. He advised that the golf course “uses in excess of \$100,000 a year in electricity, mostly for the purpose of pumping water to irrigate ... The possibility of using wind generation equipment at our different pumping locations on the golf course could help us to really offset the amount of electricity which we use.” Mr. Turner suggested considering that a wind generator produces no noise unless the wind is blowing. He noted that when the wind blows in Carson City, “it’s loud one way or the other.” He expressed uncertainty that the “addition of a few decibels produced by a wind generator during those periods of time is going to be ... all that burdensome to the folks within vicinity of that equipment.” With regard to the number of units per parcel, he advised that many WECS manufacturers “have different set ups for how many units would be effective to be used in an array.” He reviewed various designs which are intended to be used in an array. He requested the commissioners to consider the facts presented as the language of the amendment is further evaluated and implemented.

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the January 28, 2009 Meeting

Page 5

(6:24:30) Bruce Kittess referred to his written comments which were included in the agenda materials. After conducting additional research, he advised that the economic stimulus package may include a subsidy for WECSs. He further advised that the roof mounted generator can include a solar panel. He expressed a preference for solar energy because of its passivity to ensure the “quiet enjoyment of our homes.” He described the dimensions of his residential property in Lakeview, and suggested he “could probably put a little farm up there on the hill. You’ll all be able to see it from the highway, or I could put one about 90 feet high and really produce a lot of electricity.” He requested the commissioners to consider a way to “lower the threshold of what is a permitted use.” He expressed the hope that WECS design will go the way of satellite dishes and get smaller and smaller over the years.

(6:27:00) Tim Howard, a 25-year resident of Carson City, reviewed his written comments which had been included in the agenda materials, and read into the record written comments provided by George Mayer. Mr. Howard requested the commissioners to focus on safety, and advised of no need for signage because the WECS does not represent high voltage.

(6:31:05) Solar Store Engineer Dennis Madeiros advised of having installed several wind turbines, and inquired as to the possibility of a “communal” WECS installation. He advised that a precedent had been established pertinent to solar voltaic farms.

(6:32:36) Leslie Madeiros, of the Solar Store, commended the commissioners and staff for expediting this matter. In consideration of aesthetics, she stated “beauty is in the eyes of the beholder.” She suggested that the sight of windmills producing energy is beautiful and becomes more so “the less I pay for energy.” She requested the commissioners to “keep that in mind as we came off of almost \$5 per gallon in gasoline this past summer ...” She expressed the opinion that the height restriction designated in the proposed ordinance “does go against NRS 278.208.” She expressed the further opinion that safety should be the primary consideration, and “seems to be the focus of Washoe ...” She advised that “the bird issue is really a non-issue.” She suggested that color should be variable based on surroundings, but not “obnoxious; ... something that blends in.” She advised that the finish is usually done by the manufacturer, not by the installer. She commended a previous suggestion for a “minimal building permit cost.”

In response to a question, Mr. Madeiros related details of a Washoe County property owner’s plans to install a 20-kW turbine on a 110-foot tower. He explained that kilowatts designate the turbine capacity. “What you really have to look at is the power that the kilowatt hours produce given wind speeds.” Mr. Madeiros discussed the function of various manufacturers’ products depending upon the height of the tower. He expressed agreement with Ms. Madeiros’ comments. In response to a further question, he advised that 100 kW would be unnecessary for residential purposes. Discussion followed, and Mr. Madeiros explained that a “downwind or vertical turbine is really a function of the swept area as well as the velocity ...” “A blade that has a fairly large annulus will do significantly better than a small blade even at two or three times the height.” Mr. Madeiros suggested considering wind turbines around the world, and noted that those which have “survived” are “these huge windmills.” He described various designs and, in response to a question, explained reasons some have become obsolete.

(6:41:55) NV Energy Renewable Generations Outreach Manager Scott Gerz reviewed statistical information regarding the number of kilowatt hours used by the average Nevadan, discussed solar and hydro rebates available through NV Energy, and explained the mechanism of net metering. He advised “there is no such thing as a transfer of kilowatt hours from one customer to another,” and reviewed the

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the January 28, 2009 Meeting

Page 6

provisions of the pertinent statute. He further advised there are several wind energy manufacturers in Nevada, and discussed new wind technologies and design. In reference to a previous question, he advised that “multiple generators on one location ... is a viable concept.” He further advised that wind generator prices are “dictated by the tower, the structure, and the foundation. ... Most customers will put a single tower up, a single wind generator, and just size that wind generator to meet their needs.” “... each tower ... is going to be that much more of an investment when you could be putting that money into the actual device that’s generating the electricity.” Mr. Gerz noted the sporadic and unpredictable nature of “wind in our area.” He provided statistical information on the annual number of kilowatt hours produced by a properly-oriented and functioning solar energy system. He discussed the WECS demonstration program prescribed by SB437. He applauded the commission and City staff for moving forward with code provisions to accommodate WECSs, and offered his assistance. In response to a previous comment, he advised of hearing about “the bird strike issue ... on a constant basis.” He encouraged any interested citizen to contact him for a visit to the wind generator installed behind the NV Energy office in Reno. He advised of having driven by said wind generator “every single day,” and that he has never seen “a goose out there.” He explained the NV Energy rebate program, and reiterated the offer of assistance.

In response to a question, Mr. Gerz referred to a displayed photograph of the 10-kW wind generator on a 60-foot tower located behind the Reno NV Energy office on Neil Road. In response to a further question, he advised that the amount of energy produced is being tracked and “we’re seeing roughly ... 3,000 to 4,000 kilowatt hours a year.” In response to a comments, he advised that the tracking equipment “has been up and down” which has resulted in inconsistencies. Discussion took place regarding appropriate wind generator applications pertinent to residential and golf course properties, and color possibilities pertinent to aesthetics as well as bird strikes. Chairperson Kimbrough thanked Mr. Gerz for his attendance and participation. He recessed the meeting at 6:54 p.m. and reconvened at 7:03 p.m.

(7:03:17) Mark Harris, an electrical engineer, advised that he works in Carson City and lives in Sparks. He provided technical information regarding the importance of site analysis, and discussed the importance of considering the effects of turbulence from objects upwind of the wind generator. He explained the importance of blade color in consideration of thermal effects. In response to a question regarding horizontal versus vertical wind generators, he discussed wind turbine components: velocity and rotor area.

(7:10:02) Derwin Bass, an architect, advised that he has been consulting with a Carson City wind company “that takes the prop on a stock to a completely new level.” He explained the mechanism of the system to “create a positive and a negative pressure to increase the wind energy content in an enclosed prop and increase the energy content of the wind coming into that four-fold.” He advised that the system is in the development stage, and that the technology can be building integrated. He expressed concern with regard to the provisions of the proposed ordinance failing to anticipate some of the new technologies in order to avoid the special use permit process. He advised that the building-integrated wind energy system will be very efficient and noted it will be aesthetically pleasing “because you don’t see it.” Chairperson Kimbrough advised that buildings sometimes involve a special use permit process anyway.

(7:13:18) Gary Kilty, a Carson City resident, advised of having entertained the possibility of installing a wind generator. He suggested the proposed setback provisions may not be necessary, noting the “50- and 60-foot light poles that are all around Carson City on sidewalks and parking lots.” He further suggested, “If the engineering is done and the concrete is meeting the psi with the correct amount of rebar, I don’t think we really have to worry about the pole falling over onto somebody’s property. I think that’s a non-

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the January 28, 2009 Meeting

Page 7

issue.” In consideration of the proposed 1:1.1, he suggested “we’re getting into the middle of a lot of pieces of property.” He reiterated the lack of necessity “if all the engineering has been done and we do pull a building permit to put this together.”

(7:14:55) David Campbell noted that the proposed ordinance only addresses the “height of the thing that holds the machine up. The machine itself is undefined.” With regard to decibels, he referred to Attachment 3 which he had provided and which was included in the agenda materials. He noted that adding 3 decibels “doubles the noise intensity. It’s a logarithmic scale.” He expressed agreement that beauty is in the eye of the beholder, and disagreed that wind generators are beautiful. He expressed concern over maintenance of painted wind generators. He expressed the opinion that the entire project “is not environmentally sound.” He advised he holds a degree in environmental science. “Power generation is one of those activities which cries out for economies of scale. Big, hydroelectric power plants are much more efficient than small hydroelectric power plants. Big windmills work much better than little windmills.” Mr. Campbell advised of no quarrel with environmental protection as a motive. “They’ll get a lot more protection, a lot more bang for their buck if they get together and build a commercial wind farm.”

Chairperson Kimbrough called for additional public comment; however, none was forthcoming. He entertained commissioner comments. In response to a previous comment, Mr. Plemel reviewed the proposed height provisions. Chairperson Kimbrough noted the existing state statute with which the proposed ordinance will comply. Commissioner Reynolds pointed out that the commission was considering adoption of a new ordinance and, at the same time, the relaxation of an ordinance requiring special use permits for projects like these. “In that sense, that relaxation is not ... additional restriction on wind turbines. ... We’re talking about reducing the restriction to some degree.” Commissioner Reynolds expressed uncertainty that the public completely understands some of the aesthetic values with which the commission may be concerned. He expressed support for the concept of wind power and alternative energy. He suggested that if the commission was considering cellular towers, “we would not have room in the hallway much less in this room.” He questioned “whether there aren’t some aesthetic values we need to take into consideration here ...” He acknowledged a previous comment that street lights are 60-feet in height, but noted they “don’t have a motorized generator on top.” He suggested “we’re going to learn a lot more in the next two or three years about wind generation that we sure don’t know now.” With regard to noise, he expressed reserved agreement “that there’s a line there about 50 decibels that either below that is a reasonable amount of sound and, above that, it does seem to multiply.” He suggested a 48 or 50 decibel “cap on that.” He expressed understanding that a successful wind generator needs to be at a certain height. In response to a comment, he expressed support for considering height limitations rather than “just allowing the setback.”

Commissioner Vance pointed out errors in consistency with regard to rotor safety on pages 8 and 15. He expressed concern over the possibility that “some people will use these machines and not connect to the grid,” and suggested revising the language at page 10.

In response to a question, Mr. Plemel advised that developing a different special use permit process would require a code amendment. He acknowledged there are certain Planning Division applications which have no fee attached, and expressed certainty “it could be written into the code.” Mr. Benton was aware of no prohibition, but noted the requirement to draft a code amendment to provide for a specific special use permit fee in the one particular circumstance. Discussion followed, and Mr. Plemel expressed the belief that the “friendly way” is to establish by right provisions. The special use permit application fee is intended

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the January 28, 2009 Meeting

Page 8

for the applicant rather than the general public in order to recover some of the staff costs. “Ideally, for review, you’re adopting the standards under which it’s by right and those are the standards that most of these should fall into. ... There’s something wrong with it if everyone has to come in for a special use permit.” Mr. Plemel noted this would be staff’s preference instead of considering the possibility of waiving application fees.

Discussion took place regarding the appropriate rated capacity, as provided in Section 18.05.080(1)(a). Mr. Plemel noted the commission’s purview to modify the proposed language in addition to the alternatives presented. He explained the purpose for including the 100kW provision, and suggested leaving the provision for other than residential applications. Additional discussion followed with regard to the alternatives provided. In reference to previous testimony, Commissioner Wendell noted the three different components of a WECS: foundation, tower, and turbine. In consideration of cost effectiveness, he referred to Mr. Gerz’s testimony which indicated the importance of upgrading one WECS rather than installing “three or four small ones.” In reference to the proposed ordinance language, he suggested that Planning Division staff had fairly well addressed the applicability and definition provided in Section 18.05.080(1)(a). He discussed the possibility of several smaller units being installed in a golf course application. He advised of having reviewed the entirety of the proposed ordinance, and reiterated the opinion that Planning Division staff had done an excellent job. Commissioner Reynolds agreed, especially considering that the ordinance can be further amended in light of new information. Commissioner Wendell expressed appreciation for the fact that Planning Division staff had researched ordinances in other jurisdictions to learn “by their mistakes,” and that the provisions had been incorporated accordingly. He agreed with Commissioner Reynolds’ comments, and noted one of the greatest concerns “that the general public who are interested in this particular commodity do not want to put out several thousand dollars for a special use permit.” He noted that the proposed amendment will keep costs at a minimum in consideration of the average homeowner. In response to a question, he noted the height provisions at Section 18.05.080(c).

Chairperson Kimbrough entertained a motion. Commissioner Wendell noted the general support indicated by the public testimony, as well as the provisions of the pertinent statute. **Commissioner Wendell moved to recommend to the Board of Supervisors approval of ZCA-08-127, a zoning code amendment to the Carson City Municipal Code, Title 18, Chapter 18.03, Definitions, to amend the definition of “wind energy conversion facility,” to add a definition for “wind machine;” and Chapter 18.05, General Provisions, to add Section 18.05.080, private use wind energy conversion systems, which sets forth specific standards and criteria for these systems.” Commissioner Peery seconded the motion.** Commissioner Reynolds expressed agreement with much of the motion, but advised he would vote against any motion which did not include some height restriction. He suggested the appropriateness of an 85-foot total height, including the blade. Commissioner Mullet expressed concern over the 1.1 setback provision, agreement with imposing a height restriction, and the belief that decibels should be limited to 50.

In response to a question, Mr. Plemel advised that Douglas County adopted a maximum height of 90 feet, and “other standards similar to ours.” Since the adoption of the Douglas County ordinance, there have been no exceptions or variance requests pertinent to height. Commissioner Wendell indicated a willingness to amend his motion to indicate a 1.1 minimum setback requirement and a height restriction of 85 or 90 feet. Commissioner Vance requested to discuss the alternatives provided in Section 18.05.050(1)(a). **Commissioner Wendell amended his motion to indicate a 1.1 minimum setback requirement and a height restriction of 85 or 90 feet. Commissioner Peery continued his second.** Commissioner Reynolds suggested a further amendment to indicate a 90-foot total height restriction and a residential limitation of

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the January 28, 2009 Meeting

Page 9

50 decibels. **Commissioner Wendell so amended his motion. Commissioner Peery continued his second.** Chairperson Kimbrough summarized the motion. At Commissioner Vance's suggestion, **Commissioner Wendell further amended his motion to include the previously-recommended language revisions. Commissioner Peery continued his second.** Chairperson Kimbrough called for a vote on the pending motion. **Motion carried 5-1.** Commissioner Wendell complimented the Planning Division staff.

H-4. ACTION TO CHANGE THE APRIL PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING DATE FROM APRIL 29 TO APRIL 22 (7:56:54) - Chairperson Kimbrough introduced this item, and Mr. Plemel reviewed the memo included in the agenda materials. Chairperson Kimbrough entertained a motion. **Commissioner Reynolds moved to reschedule the April 2009 Planning Commission meeting from the 29th to the 22nd. Commissioner Vance seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0.**

I. STAFF REPORTS

COMMISSIONER REPORTS / COMMENTS (7:59:37) - None.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION; FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS (7:59:58) - Mr. Plemel reviewed the director's report which was included in the agenda materials. In response to a question, he discussed the Board of Supervisors' action on the zoning map amendment pertinent to the Boys and Girls Clubs of Western Nevada property.

J. ACTION ON ADJOURNMENT (8:04:08) - Commissioner Wendell moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:04 p.m. Commissioner Peery seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0.

The Minutes of the January 28, 2009 Carson City Planning Commission meeting are so approved this 25th day of February, 2009.

MARK KIMBROUGH, Chair