

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the January 29, 2003, Meeting
Page 1

A regularly scheduled meeting of the Carson City Planning Commission was held on Wednesday, January 29, 2003, at the Community Center Sierra Room, 851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada, beginning at 5 p.m.

PRESENT: Chairperson Richard Wipfli, Vice Chairperson John Peery, and Commissioners Ron Allen, Allan Christianson, Mark Kimbrough, and Roger Sedway

STAFF PRESENT: Community Development Director Walter Sullivan, Principal Planner Lee Plemel, Senior Engineer Rob Fellows, Deputy District Attorney Jason Woodbury, Recording Secretary Katherine McLaughlin, and Associate Planner Jennifer Pruitt (P.C. 1/29/03 Tape 1-0010)

NOTE: Unless otherwise indicated, each item was introduced by the Chairperson. Staff then presented or clarified the staff report/supporting documentation. Any other individuals who spoke are listed immediately following the item heading. A tape recording of these proceedings is on file in the Clerk-Recorder's office. This tape is available for review and inspection during normal business hours.

A. ROLL CALL, DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM, AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE -

Chairperson Wipfli convened the meeting at 5 p.m. Roll call was taken. A quorum was present although Commissioner Pedlar was absent. Commissioner Sedway led the Pledge of Allegiance.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR 9/25 AND 11/19/02 (1-0027) - Commissioner Peery moved to accept the Minutes as submitted. Commissioner Christianson seconded the motion. Commissioner Kimbrough corrected "riffraff" to be "riprap" on page 12 of the September 25 Minutes. Commissioners Peery and Christianson concurred with the amendment. Motion was voted and carried 6-0.

C. PUBLIC COMMENTS (1-0048) - None.

D. AGENDA MODIFICATIONS (1-0058) - Community Development Director Walter Sullivan explained staff's request for a continuance of Item F-8 as the applicant has not had an opportunity to review staff's report.

E. DISCLOSURES (1-0074) - Commissioner Allen disclosed his membership on the Board of Equalization and that the Board had considered the Hospital's appeal of its property tax assessment. They had not discussed the Planning Commission applications during the Board of Equalization meeting. Commissioner Sedway explained his intent to recuse himself from the consideration of Items F-5, 6, and 7. Chairperson Wipfli disclosed that he had been contacted by a Ms. Cardelli regarding the bridge and that he had referred her to staff.

F. PUBLIC HEARING (1-0090)

F-1. M-02/03-5 - DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON AN APPEAL OF THE DIRECTOR'S DECISION REGARDING PARCEL MAP 1594 - Community Development Director Walter Sullivan, Senior Engineer Rob Fellows, Associate Planner Jennifer Pruitt, Principal Planner Lee Plemel, Parks and Recreation Director Steve Kastens, Michael Thiemann, Anne Macquarie - Mr. Fellows explained the Code and Statutes

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the January 29, 2003, Meeting

Page 2

mandating infrastructure improvements when parcel divisions are requested. Clarification explained the letter requesting a continuance due to the applicant's inability to meet with staff over the holidays. Staff had met with him since that time, which is the reason for the appeal of the Director's decision. Mr. Kastens explained the need for the bicycle lane. The bicycle trails master plan included the roadway as Silver Sage is a major north/south arterial and provides access to the Edmonds Sports Complex. Silver Sage became the designated north/south bicycle route when Carson Street was widened to six lanes. He also explained that staff had struggled with a similar need when the roadway improvements were required at Fuji Park and the Fairgrounds. It had been very expensive. The Code requires it be installed. The need to understand and consider the full impact of the "big picture" were noted. The same is true for the bicycle improvements. Clarification indicated that Mr. Thiemann was being required to make the same improvements as others in the area will do when they develop their property.

Mr. Thiemann explained that he is not a developer. The proposal is to split the property and sell one portion so that his brother can develop the remaining parcel. The bike lane is the only requirement which does not match the surrounding area. Estimates of the cost to install the bike lane were given to the Commission and Mr. Fellows. (A copy was given to the Clerk and is in the file.) He felt that the requirement is inconsistent with the lot size and nature of the area. Photographs of the area were displayed and described. The lane is to be installed in front of his parcels. It will pose a traffic hazard to the bicyclist as he/she will be swerving in and out of the vehicle traffic lane. His measurements of the street, the distance for the lane in front of his property and the distance to a similar lane were provided. He felt that the cost of the improvement was prohibitive. The City will in the future have to connect the bike lane to those that have already been developed as his parcel is the only one larger than one acre in the area. When this occurs, the bike lane in front of his property should be constructed. He indicated that he would have been willing to construct the bike lane if the adjacent parcels had it. His reading of the Code only requires him to do the improvement when he is within 660 feet of other bicycle lanes.

Mr. Fellows explained the Code requirement mandating that curb, gutter and sidewalk improvements be installed when parcel splits and development occur. The bicycle lane is part of the Bicycle Trails Master Plan which places the bicycle lane designations along two sides of his property. The lanes will provide safer travel for the bicyclists than having them commingle with vehicular traffic. The transition areas will provide additional safety and allow the bicyclists to stop before mingling with vehicular traffic. He also felt that the cost estimates were not valid and encouraged Mr. Thiemann to obtain additional estimates as the request is for an asphalt lane, which is not as expensive as indicated by the concrete estimate. Cost comparisons of concrete and asphalt were provided. The City had installed the bicycle lane to Clearview when it had widened Silver Sage. As projects are developed along Silver Sage, the bicycle improvements will be installed along remaining portions as illustrated by referencing an apartment owner who had installed the lanes along his property. Discussion indicated that apartments cannot be constructed on Mr. Thiemann's parcel until a zone change occurs. Mr. Fellows indicated that zone changes also require the installation of the bicycle lane.

Mr. Thiemann reiterated his contention that his parcel is the only two-acre site along Silver Sage.

Discussion between the Commission and staff indicated that staff had not previously deferred installation of a bicycle lane. Curb, gutter, and sidewalks have been deferred through the use of development agreements. Chairperson Wipfli explained that as a developer he had been required to make these improvements. The bicycle improvements

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the January 29, 2003, Meeting

Page 3

made to Silver Sage had been made by the Regional Transportation Commission. Mr. Fellows was not aware of any plans to extend the bicycle improvements beyond Clearview. Clarification indicated that the bicycle lane is four feet wide. Silver Sage is designated as a collector and has a width of 18 feet.

Public comments were solicited. Ms. Macquarie explained that she, as a bicyclist, uses Silver Sage a lot. It has become an important route for bicyclists since six lanes were placed on Highway 395/Carson Street. Although she could sympathize with the property owner, she felt that it is an important link for the bicyclists. Additional comments were solicited but none were given.

Commissioner Peery indicated that he understood both the City and the applicant's views. As the applicant did not object to the cost if the requirement was for a continuation, he supported deferring the requirement until it is a continuation. Commissioner Kimbrough disclosed that he is the Chairperson for the State Bicycle Board and had been involved with this issue for sometime. He had been upset about the loss of the bicycle lanes on Highway 395. The commitment at that time had been that City streets would be used by the bicyclists. Silver Sage was to be signed and constructed to allow this use. He intended to continue to remind the State and City of this commitment. The streets are needed for all types of transportation and should be safe for the families who bicycle. The need to work to complete the designated route was emphasized. Chairperson Wipfli felt that the improvements should be made as required by the Code. Commissioner Sedway explained that Mr. Fellows' comments had helped him decide the issue. The City and State will be making the improvements in the future unless there is a parcel split or zone change. It is a rural area with nothing at the intersection. Forcing installation of the bicycle lane in this area without connectivity does not make it safe. The City should either force all of the residents along the street to make the improvements or change the Code requirement. He supported the applicant and removal of the requirement. Commissioner Allen explained his inability to see how a portion of the bicycle lane would function and be safe for the users. Commissioner Christianson explained his feeling that the requirement is similar to one that mandated the installation of an asphalt roadway to an area which has remained undeveloped for 20 years. He preferred to defer action on the requirement until the roadway is widened and the bicycle lane is contiguous. The cost was felt to be prohibitive. If the City needed it at this time, it should pay for it. Chairperson Wipfli indicated his understanding of the Commission's comments. He suggested that the requirement be deferred with a bond until the City or State extend the bicycle lane or until an upgrade in the zoning is approved. Mr. Fellows indicated that a development agreement could be used to defer the requirement. If the improvement is not made in ten years, the development agreement automatically goes away. Commissioner Peery expressed his willingness to accept a ten-year deferral. Commissioner Peery then moved to support the appeal of Item F-1, M-02/03-5, with a condition that a development agreement exist that at the time the City develops the continuation of the bike lane that this property owner will be subject to improvement of the property as the City has implied in this documentation; this is regarding Parcel Map 1594, Development Services Engineering Department's appraisal of the widening of Silver Sage Drive and Snyder Avenue along the subject parcel frontage for the construction of bike lanes located at the intersections of Snyder Avenue, Silver Sage Drive, and Roland Street, APN 009-206-07, and that this in effect defers payment on this improvement until that time. Commissioner Christianson seconded the motion. Clarification indicated that the agreement will automatically sunset in ten years if not called before that time. The agreement runs with the land as it is recorded. The motion was voted and carried 6-0.

Mr. Sullivan asked Mr. Thiemann to stop by the office so that the process could be explained. He also indicated

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the January 29, 2003, Meeting
Page 4

that Mr. Thiemann had ten days in which to appeal the Commission's action.

F-2. M-02/03-4 - DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON A REQUEST FROM ROBERT AND ROBERTA ANDERSON, CARSON CITY BRIDGE CENTER (1-0815) - Community Development Director Walter Sullivan, Bob Anderson, Chamber of Commerce Chief Executive Officer Larry Osborne, Club #465 President Sam Bachdorf, Kenneth Cubitt, Bruce Belshaw, Midge Breeden, Glick Bond, Inc., Chief Executive Officer and Owner Collie Hutter, Redco President Del White, Phillip Harrison, Dr. Jim Breeden, Roberta Anderson - Discussion between Mr. Sullivan and the Commission explained CCMC 18.04.155 and the office uses allowed which are allowed in the AIP zone. An aviation club would not be allowed. Discussion also indicated that the property owner should have been aware of the prohibition against large public assemblages and the manufacturers desire to prohibit any retail activity due to the traffic and safety concerns. Between 18 and 20 people have been participating in the bridge tournaments on a twice a week basis. The site had been used for this purpose for approximately 18 months. Staff had given the Andersons a list of the City meeting rooms if the Senior Center could not accommodate the club. The bridge club would be allowed to have a business license in either General Office or Commercial zones.

Mr. Anderson explained that he and his wife "own" the club. The 18 individuals who play bridge three times a week arrive in approximately nine cars. This does not create a large traffic impact on the neighborhood. It is a senior activity with the average age of the participants being 67.4 years. He read a letter from a Mr. Bacon into the record supporting the club and its use at the present location. His belief that the building is not usable for manufacturing was explained. As the Club only uses the building three times a week for 3-1/2 hours, he did not believe that they were causing a problem. They had looked for another site without success and could not afford a high rent facility. The location is well lit. Discussion between the Commission and Mr. Anderson indicated that they normally play on Wednesdays and Fridays at 1 p.m. The fee for each player is \$5. (Commissioner Sedway stepped from the room at 6:08 p.m. and returned at 6:10 p.m. A quorum was present the entire time.) It was felt that if Bill Gates or someone of his ilk were to attend, a larger group may participate. Mr. Gates has a standing invitation and has played at the Reno club. Mr. Anderson had lost \$9,000 the first year the Club was in operation. The rent for the room was \$555 for 800 square feet. Other sites had been explored but had cost more than \$1100. The staff had recommended denial due to the Code and the concern with friction zoning/uses. They have 13 months left on the lease for the current space. Mr. Anderson asked if he would be allowed to remain until the lease expires. As Mr. Anderson had not been aware of the prohibition against the use in the AIP zone, it was felt that his contract could be broken. If the Commission allows the Club to remain, it would be opening the door for other uses. In order for the Club to remain, it needs to have the Special Use Permit.

Public comments were solicited. Mr. Osborne indicated that the Chamber of Commerce and its Manufacturers Committee support staff's position. They were not against bridge players but the area is not zoned for their use. Allowing the use would open the way for other similar uses to encroach. They did not want this to happen. They had suggested several ordinance changes in the past which had not been implemented. He offered to work with staff on those modifications as they will provide additional buffering and further protect the limited amount of industrial zoning in the community. Mr. Osborne indicated that, if the request is denied, the Chamber would work with the Club to find a better location in an area which would allow the use to occur.

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the January 29, 2003, Meeting

Page 5

President Bachdorf described the area covered by his unit and stressed the importance of maintaining a club in the Gardnerville/Carson City area. The current site is a single story building with a kitchen. It is located in the center of its drawing area. It is a quiet game. They car pool with two or more individuals per car. It is low cost entertainment for the players. While in Carson City he also does other errands/things which support the economy, i.e., shopping, lunch, buy gasoline, etc. He did not believe that they create a traffic problem for the area or the heavy trucks traversing the area. He urged the Commission to approve the application and pointed out that the higher rents would increase the seniors' cost to play.

Mr. Cubitt reiterated that they do not create traffic problems. There had not been any complaints from the adjacent occupants. They are not part of the criminal element. The industrial manufacturers were not even aware of the fact that they were there. He urged the Commission to make an exception to the Code.

Mr. Belshaw felt that there is a limited impact which is barely noticeable. The players could not afford a high rent location. Many communities consider their bridge clubs to be an asset. The sixty players a week should not pose an impact on the manufacturers. He urged the Commission to waive the requirement.

Ms. Breeden explained that another location could not be found which would fulfill their needs. A storage location for the equipment was needed. The majority of the City's meeting rooms lack the ability for them to store their equipment. She did not feel that the Club would grow.

Ms. Hutter pointed out that the manufacturers had repeatedly defended their zoning district during the last 25 years. The traffic concern is the large trucks which are required by the manufacturers and the noise found in manufacturing areas. They did not want other uses/people encroaching on their district. She also pointed out that the manufacturers employ a lot of local residents.

Mr. White pointed out that his firm had been in the Airport Industrial Park for more than 12 years. They have discussed this issue several times including the need to protect the zoning district. The stamping operations next door to his operation could create a problem for the Club. They do not want incompatible uses/businesses within their district. He urged the Commission to deny the request. The large trucks pose a traffic hazard to other drivers. He reiterated his request that the Commission deny the request and protect their investments.

Mr. Harrison indicated that he supported Mr. Osborne's comments. Although he could commiserate with the Club and regretted the situation, the industrial zone was established for industrial uses and should be protected. Failure to protect the zoning would open the door for other variances. He also pointed out the large amount of money the manufacturers had invested in their facilities.

Dr. Breeden indicated he is a member of the Club. He questioned the reason's for staff's denial. The Club was not complaining about the noise or the trucks. He felt that the exception to the Code is wholesale businesses which are allowed in the district who have more traffic/people than the Club does. The Club does not pose a danger to the complex. The Club is a small group with minimal impact. He urged the Commission to grant the exception. It would not be necessary to allow other uses in the future based on the Club's variance.

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the January 29, 2003, Meeting
Page 6

Chairperson Wipfli asked that the speakers not repeat comments made by others.

Ms. Anderson explained that she represented individuals who live in communities without bridge clubs. It forces them to drive to other communities to play. They could not afford a commercial location. They had lost \$9,000 the first year. Citizens of Carson City need the Club. Tourists who visit the area also like to participate. Competition for City meeting rooms was described. They need established meeting dates. Tournament bridge needs were limned. Examples of individuals who play were provided. The Club is listed on the internet. Their friends want and need the Club. Several cannot drive to Reno. They cannot pickup and move the Club. The Club is an asset to the community. The Commission should help them stay in the community. Many communities, such as Santa Barbara and San Diego, have the Clubs in the industrial areas as the commercial area is too expensive and has major parking problems. None of their neighbors had complained about the use. They did not want to move every two years. Public comments were then closed.

Discussion between the Commission and staff indicated that if the Commission upholds staff's recommendation and the Board of Supervisors supports the denial, the use becomes an enforcement issue. Commissioner Peery felt that American law indicated that a precedence had been established as they had been at the location for 18 months. He felt that they should be allowed to continue to play at the current location until a new location can be found or the lease expires. Commissioner Christianson explained the manufacturers' policing efforts to restrict the uses within the district. He felt that there are places for things to exist and where they should not be. He agreed that the Club was good for the community but felt certain that there is a better place for them. He indicated his intent to support the staff and deny the request. Commissioner Sedway questioned the reasons the "City" was kicking the Club out of its current location. The City had only become aware of the Club due to a "fluke". He understood friction zones and the desire to not mix uses. The Club has been operating without any problems. People have been coming and going without any problems. The landlord will also lose. He encouraged the Commission and staff to allow the Club to remain at the present location. The use will not make the zoning district "untrue" and nonconforming. Commissioner Kimbrough pointed out that the Planning Commission's role is to deal with planning issues after lots of thinking and planning effort occurs. There are reasons for not mixing the uses. He would like to question the landlord. Discussion indicated that the applicant had applied for a business license. If the applicant had applied for a business license at the time they moved in, he would have known about the zoning problem. Commissioner Kimbrough's personal experience with having an office in a commercial was noted. He indicated that he would support staff's denial based on the zoning. Commissioner Allen acknowledged that the facility would rent for less than a commercial site. He was aware of one location which rents for fifty cents a square foot. He agreed that the industrial people need to be by themselves. His recollection of an industrial site on Fairview and the conflict which caused the firm to leave the City was described to illustrate his concern. He felt that it was important to protect the Airport Industrial Park zone to maintain the industrial base as the City is losing its sales tax base. He did not oppose the Club, however, it does not conform to the zoning. He reiterated that he had seen places which will not jeopardize the health and safety of either the Club members or the general public. Chairperson Wipfli indicated that he liked having the Club in the community. He felt that the location is self-imposed and that an error had occurred which had allowed it to happen. He also indicated that there are a lot of locations which will give them a good deal and volunteered to help Mr. Osborne find a suitable one for the Club. He also asked that the motion include a sunset clause for the transit rather than leave it open ended. Commissioner Christianson moved that the Planning Commission deny the applicant's request for a Bridge Social Club in the AIP zone on the basis that a Bridge Social Club is not an appropriate use in the Airport Industrial Park zone and pursuant to Section 18.04.155(3), in the

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the January 29, 2003, Meeting

Page 7

opinion of the Planning Commission that this particular use is not in keeping with the purpose of the AIP district and would cause zoning friction between this type of use and the other surrounding industrial uses. Commissioner Allen seconded the motion. Discussion indicated that it would be two or three months before the enforcement process would occur. Mr. Sullivan volunteered to assist with the Chamber of Commerce in the search for a new location. The amenities needed by the Club were limned. He suggested that the Senior Citizens Center be considered. Commissioner Christianson indicated that he would not add the time restriction to the motion and that his motion stood as indicated. Commissioner Allen concurred. The motion was voted and carried 4-2 with Commissioners Sedway and Peery voting Naye. Mr. Sullivan explained the appeal process.

RECESS: A recess was declared at 6:48 p.m. A quorum of the Commission was present when Chairperson Wipfli reconvened the meeting at 6:54 p.m. Commissioner Pedlar was absent as previously indicated.

F-3. U-01/02-20 - ACTION ON THE REVIEW OF A PREVIOUSLY APPROVED SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR THE OPERATION OF A DAYCARE CENTER FOR LISAM. KENNISON (1-1995)
- Associate Planner Jennifer Pruitt, Lisa Kennison, Community Development Director Walter Sullivan - Commissioner Christianson explained his policy to oppose the expansion of a childcare facility. The expansion of days was for periodic care and not for a regular ongoing basis. Mr. Sullivan explained that six children are allowed. Two of the children are the applicant's. The entire neighborhood had been noticed. There have not been any complaints. Ms. Kennison agreed with the staff report. She also indicated that the weekend daycare operation would be occasional as she did not wish to work seven days a week. Public comments were solicited but none were given. Commissioner Christianson moved to approve a one year review of Special Use Permit U-01/02-20, an approved childcare facility for up to six children, amending Condition of Approval No. 9 to allow days of operation to include Saturdays and Sundays, 7:00 a.m. to 5 p.m. Commissioner Peery seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0.

F-4. V-02/03-2 - ACTION ON A VARIANCE REQUEST FROM LEROY SNYDER (1-2115)
- Associate Planner Jennifer Pruitt, Leroy Snyder, Betty Ihfe - Ms. Pruitt indicated that there were only four conditions of approval in the staff report and not the five indicated in the motion. Photographs of the area were limned. Mr. Snyder had read the staff report and agreed with it. Reasons for requesting the variance were discussed. The subdivision's CC&Rs does not address the materials for patios. The Homeowners Association Architectural Committee does review and approve the plans before construction can occur. Public comments were solicited. Ms. Ihfe explained her involvement with the subdivision since 1983. She concurred that the patio covers are a necessity for the homes during the summertime. Many of the covers were felt to be attractive and are in keeping with the development plan. Ms. Pruitt explained the lot sizes for her. Ms. Ihfe felt that allowing the variance would encourage the home owners to extend the patio cover to the fence. The fencing presently gives an open feeling which the closed wood fencing does not provide. The adjacent residents want to keep the open space feel and avoid the look of being overbuilt and crowded. She asked the Commission to retain a ten-foot setback and that the patio be attached to the house and not the fence. She also asked that it not be enclosed. She also indicated that some of the residents have installed patios covers that are larger than that indicated. They cramp the fence. She also assumed that the patios will be individualized and not look identical. She reiterated her request that the setback be held at ten feet. She thanked Ms. Pruitt and Mr. Snyder for the copies of the CC&Rs. Additional comments were solicited but none were given. Mr. Snyder indicated that the concrete area of the patios had varied in size. The lots

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the January 29, 2003, Meeting

Page 8

are not the same size. The houses are different which makes the backyard vary in size and depth. The houses abutting the common area have "see through fencing". Commissioner Christianson pointed out that the CC&Rs and the Architectural Committee will keep the patios compatible and from being enclosed. Five feet is for the covers otherwise half of the property owners will not be able to cover the patios. The cover will fit over the concrete pads that are already there. There is no reason to extend the cover to the fence. He agreed that the covers should not be closer than five feet from the fence. Additional public comments were solicited but none were given. Chairperson Wipfli ruled the comment period closed. Commissioner Kimbrough moved that the Planning Commission approve V-02/03-2, a Variance request from Leroy F. Snyder to vary the required 15 foot rear yard setbacks for attached patio covers to five feet on property zoned Single Family 21,000-Planned Unit Development, SF21-PUD, located in Kings Canyon Meadows with the following APNs to be appended by the Recorder based on seven findings and subject to four conditions of approval contained in the staff report, and with the understanding that any acknowledgements to the Commission by the Applicant may be considered as further stipulations or conditions of approval on this application. Commissioner Allen seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0.

The APNs are: 007-402-01, 007-402-02, 007-402-03, 007-402-04, 007-402-05, 007-402-06, 007-402-07, 007-402-08, 007-402-09, 007-402-10, 007-402-11, 007-402-12, 007-402-13, 007-402-14, 007-402-15, 007-402-16, 007-402-17, 007-402-18, 007-402-19, 007-402-20, 007-402-21, 007-451-01, 007-451-02, 007-451-03, 007-451-04, 007-451-05, 007-451-06, 007-451-07, 007-451-08, 007-451-09, 007-451-10, 007-451-11, 007-451-12, 007-451-13, 007-451-14, 007-451-15, 007-451-16, 007-451-17, 007-451-18, 007-451-19, 007-451-20, 007-451-21, 007-451-22, 007-451-23, 007-451-24, 007-451-25, 007-451-26, 007-451-27, 007-451-28, 007-451-29, 007-451-30, 007-451-31, 007-451-32, 007-451-33, 007-451-34, 007-451-35, 007-451-36, 007-451-37, 007-451-38, 007-451-39, 007-451-40, 007-451-41, 007-451-42, 007-451-43, 007-451-65, 007-451-66, 007-451-67, 007-451-68, 007-451-69, 007-451-70, 007-451-71, 007-451-72, and 007-451-73.

RECESS: A recess was declared at 7:20 p.m. A quorum of the Commission was present when Chairperson Wipfli reconvened the meeting at 7:30 p.m. Commissioners Sedway and Pedlar were absent.

F-5. MPA-02/03-1 - ACTION ON A REQUEST FROM PALMER AND LAUDER ENGINEERING (PROPERTY OWNER: CARSON-TAHOE HOSPITAL); F-6. Z-02/03-2 - ACTION ON A CHANGE OF LAND USE REQUEST FROM PALMER AND LAUDER (PROPERTY OWNER: CARSON-TAHOE HOSPITAL); AND F-7. U-02/03-19 - ACTION ON A SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FROM PALMER AND LAUDER (PROPERTY OWNER: CARSON -TAHOE HOSPITAL) (1-2565) - Principal Planner Lee Plemel, Community Development Director Walter Sullivan, Hospital Chief Executive Officer Ed Epperson, Architects David Moon and Doug Mayoras, Hospital Board Chairperson Caleb Mills, Hospital Board Members Jo Saulisberry and Pete Livermore, Principal of the Sierra Community College Garry Bowen, Senior Engineer Rob Fellows - Discussion noted that Commissioner Sedway had recused himself from these items as he works for the Hospital. Mr. Plemel read the letter dated 1/29/03 from Garth Richards into the record. Mr. Richards supported the applications and requested that the Retail Commercial zoned be for hospital related services only. Mr. Plemel also indicated a desire to read NDOT's letter to Mr. Canfield into the record when the revised Eagle Valley detention basins are discussed. Mr. Sullivan explained that the staff's recommendation is based on the master plan goals and objectives and the Codes. Notices were sent to 35 parcels within a radius of 700 feet. Staff had not received any adverse comments regarding the proposal. In fact, the only correspondence

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the January 29, 2003, Meeting
Page 9

that had been received was from Mr. Richards. It had been read into the record.

Mr. Epperson briefly highlighted the history of the project and introduced the individuals who had worked on the project. Computerized slides illustrating the project were shown and explained by Mr. Mayoras. Discussion between the Commission and Mr. Mayoras explained the reasons for looping the road around the facility. The helicopter pad will be on the north side of roof which should provide some protection from the wind. The building will be structurally sound enough to handle it. The helipad at the present hospital will be moved to the new site. It will have its own drainage system. The buildings will not be vertically expanded in the future. There will be a three-foot roof garden. The truck ramp will be heated for 200 feet. It will have a 12 percent grade. Double and triple trailers will be dropped at the side of the building at the pullout area. It was felt that two trucks/trailers could use the ramp at the same time and that 75 foot units could access it. Commissioner Christianson felt that it would be a tough turn particularly during inclement weather. Mr. Mayoras indicated that they understood his concern and will study the issue. Mr. Mayoras also indicated that there is 90,000 yards of dirt awaiting NDOT's removal and that NDOT could "come and get its dirt any time it wants". The location for the CASCI center was pointed out. Commissioner Kimbrough commended them on their landscaping, the setting and care of the land including the riparian area. Mr. Mayoras explained the efforts undertaken to mitigate the highway noises including the 16-inch concrete tilt up walls, double paned insulated glass windows, and heavy landscaping.

Public comments were solicited. Hospital Board Chairperson Mills stressed that the Hospital is not leaving the community. They are expanding the facility, adding additional services and amenities, and addressing the community's medical needs. The expansion includes increasing its employee base. The Hospital will not in any way cause a delay to the freeway/bypass. Privatization had allowed them to obtain the funds for the facility.

Hospital Board Member Saulisberry indicated that the cancer center will be a big part of the Hospital. The building's colors have yet to be determined. She was certain that it will be visible from the entire valley.

Hospital Board Member Livermore felt that it is an exciting opportunity for the community. The hospital will be an asset of which the entire community should be proud. It will provide locales with high tech services. The projected cost of renovating the current facility is close to the cost of the new structure. Perceived economic benefits of the facility were noted. The value of the Hospital was stressed. He invited the public to attend the grand opening in late 2005. Discussion between Member Livermore and Commissioner Christianson explained the patient and medical service leakage occurring in the community. The facility should help reduce the leakage to between ten and 15 percent. Member Livermore also felt that the private rooms and medical opportunities will encourage patients and new doctors to avail themselves of the facility. Their comments also explained that the present facility is full to capacity several times each month and that growth in the community requires additional services. The Hospital is not planning to compete for trauma patients at this time. It can, however, provide services to 95 percent of the people who leave the area for medical services in other communities. Commissioner Christianson thanked Member Livermore for his service to the community throughout the years including his tenure on both the Parks and Recreation Commission and the Hospital Board. Member Livermore then explained the reasons for selecting the golf course site for placement of the new Hospital. Commissioner Peery felt that the open frontage will make an enjoyable facility to view and attract other businesses to the area. Additional public comments were solicited.

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the January 29, 2003, Meeting

Page 10

Mr. Bowen indicated that he is a member of the economic vitality effort. The Hospital is a large component of the economic vitality effort. He complimented them on the aesthetic presentation and the site location. He encouraged them to provide more environmental protections and to seek alternative energy sources. Chairperson Wipfli indicated that Growth Management will address the water issue which had been agendaized for later this evening. Mr. Mayoras indicated that the mechanical system is the most singularly sophisticated one that could be obtained. It is a remote central plant with chillers, blowers, emergency backup, two power sources, remote cooling towers, and computers who talk to everything. The system has many of the practical energy savers found in hospitals. Air circulation is mandated and must meet certain standards. The specs for the system will include two years of education for the Hospital staff. The tilt-up panels include studs and insulation to provide additional energy efficiency. The windows will meet Nevada's energy standards. All of the cost benefits possible will be used.

Mr. Sullivan explained that staff will be working with the Hospital on the Federal, State, and local stream and discharge regulations. Staff will continue to monitor these operations. The proposed facility is light years ahead of the current operation. It will reduce the energy requirements. Chairperson Wipfli reminded Mr. Sullivan about the light pollution concerns. Mr. Mayoras explained his personal knowledge of the electrical engineer's experience and that they will control the lighting to avoid spillage. Mr. Sullivan indicated that staff had reviewed the conditions with them and felt that the Hospital will meet the conditions. Condition No. 13 was read. It addresses the light pollution issue.

Mr. Moon indicated that he is the Past President of the AIA National Academy of Architecture for Health. It "stays on top of the cutting edge for hospital care design". A new concept is "green hospital design" which he described. They had incorporated this concept in the facility to the extent possible. Additional public comments were solicited but none were given.

Mr. Sullivan explained that five votes would be needed to approve the master plan amendment. Items F-5 and F-6 are recommendations to the Board of Supervisors. There is a ten-day appeal period for the special use permit which he explained. Once the first three motions have been handled, he recommended a discussion occur on the drainage basins and then the Growth Management issue should be addressed.

Discussion between Commissioner Kimbrough and Mr. Sullivan explained staff's reasons for recommending that the zone be retail commercial. Mr. Sullivan recommended against restricting the retail commercial uses to hospital purposes and indicated that the Hospital and Mr. Richards should address this issue separately.

Commissioner Christianson moved to approve MPA 02/03-01, a Master Plan Amendment application from Carson-Tahoe Hospital and adopt Resolution 2003-PC-1 to change the land use designation of the subject parcels identified in the application from Low Density Residential, Medium Density Residential and High Density Residential/Commercial to Commercial based on the findings contained in the staff report. Commissioner Allen seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

Commissioner Christianson moved to approve Z-02/03-02, a Change of Land Use application from Carson-Tahoe Hospital to change the zoning of the subject parcels identified in the application from Conservation Reserve and Single Family One Acre to Retail Commercial based on the findings in the staff report. Commissioner Peery

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the January 29, 2003, Meeting
Page 11

seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

Commissioner Christianson moved to approve U-02/03-19, a Special Use Permit application from Carson-Tahoe Hospital to allow the construction of a hospital including a helipad and appurtenant uses within the hospital; an increase in the maximum permitted height from 45 feet to approximately 65 feet as presented on the plans submitted with the application; and a community/regional commercial or office center exceeding a total of 50,000 square feet within the Retail Commercial zoning district based on seven findings and subject to the recommended conditions of approval contained in the staff report. Commissioner Allen seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

Public comments were solicited regarding the detention basins. None were given. Commissioner Peery felt that the NDOT letter had addressed the issues as it explains the flow. The proposal does not significantly change the drainage. Mr. Fellows explained that the original design had only one pond. The revised plan has three. It is sized to handle the 100 year event and drainage from the site. If it overflows, it will flow along the roadway to the southeast along the freeway. Chairperson Wipfli indicated that the Hospital is not required to address the entire community's drainage problems.

RECESS THE PLANNING COMMISSION AND CONVENE THE GROWTH MANAGEMENT COMMISSION (2-0680) - Chairperson Wipfli recessed the Planning Commission and immediately convened the Growth Management Commission. (For Minutes of its actions please see its file for this date.) Upon recessing the Growth Management Commission, Chairperson Wipfli immediately reconvened the meeting as the Planning Commission. (A quorum of the Commission was present although Commissioners Sedway and Pedlar were absent.)

F-8. A-02/03-3 - ACTION REGARDING AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CCMC 18.03.010 BY ADDING A DEFINITION FOR TEMPORARY ON-SITE AGGREGATE FACILITY/PRODUCTION AND CHAPTER 18.14.030 TO ALLOW OFF-SITE SALES (2-1020) - Community Development Director Walter Sullivan explained the request for a continuance. Staff had attempted to expedite the ordinance, however, adequate time had not been provided to complete the process. Commissioner Peery moved to continue Item F-8, A-02/03-3, action regarding an ordinance amending Carson City Municipal Code Title 18, Zoning, Chapter 18.03, Definitions, Section 18.03.010, by adding a definition for temporary onsite etc., etc. Commissioner Christianson seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

RECESS: A recess was declared at 9:02 p.m. A quorum of the Commission was present when Chairperson Wipfli reconvened the meeting at 9:07 p.m. Commissioners Sedway and Pedlar were absent.

G. INTERNAL COMMUNICATIONS AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

G-1. STAFF BRIEFING REGARDING THE STATUS OF COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS AND CORRESPONDENCE TO THE COMMISSION (2-1050) - The Board had approved the revised application submittal process. A copy of the new schedule was distributed to the Commission and Clerk. (A copy is in the file.) The Board had made some minor changes to the aggregate ordinance and returned it to the Commission for consideration. This was the item that the Commission had just continued. Reasons for the continuation were noted. A copy of a feature article from the Planning Commission

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the January 29, 2003, Meeting
Page 12

Journal was distributed to the Commission and Clerk. (A copy is in the file.) Mr. Sullivan also indicated that his reassignment comments made at the last meeting should be forgotten and that he would be staying in his present position. No formal action was required or taken on these items.

G-2. FUTURE COMMISSION ITEMS AND DATES (1-1085) - None.

H. ADJOURNMENT (1-1086) - Commissioner Christianson moved to adjourn. Commissioner Allen seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously. Chairperson Wipfli adjourned the meeting at 9:09 p.m. The Minutes of the January 29, 2003, Carson City Planning Commission meeting

ARE SO APPROVED ON April 26, 2003.

/s/
Richard Wipfli, Chairperson