

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the August 28, 2002, Meeting

Page 1

A regularly scheduled meeting of the Carson City Planning Commission was held on Wednesday, August 28, 2002, at the Community Center Sierra Room, 851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada, beginning at 3:30 p.m.

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

STAFF PRESENT: Community Development Director Walter Sullivan, Senior Planners Skip Canfield and Lee Plemel, Senior Engineer Rob Fellows, Deputy District Attorney Jason Woodbury, Recording Secretary Katherine McLaughlin, and Associate Planner Jennifer Pruitt (P.C. 8/28/02 Tape 1-0001)

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 Christianson convened the meeting at 3:30 p.m. Roll call was taken. A quorum was present. Commissioner Farley had resigned. (See Item D.) Commissioner Kimbrough led the Pledge of Allegiance.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - JULY 31, 2002 (1-0018) - Commissioner Kimbrough corrected the term "V and P" to be "BMP". Commissioner Peery corrected his name on Page 1. Commissioner Peery moved to approve the Minutes as corrected. Commissioner Kimbrough seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

C. PUBLIC COMMENTS (1-0040) - John Wagner explained his belief that the City should check CC&Rs before granting building permits. This would avoid conflicts homeowner associations encounter with individuals who ignore the CC&Rs. Chairperson Christianson explained that the City does not enforce CC&Rs and indicated a desire to explain outside of the meeting his own personal encounter with them. Mr. Wagner claimed that Douglas County and other cities/states control them. Chairperson Christianson explained that the City Codes establish setbacks which are controlled by the City. He reiterated that the CC&Rs are considered a private matter which the City does not control. Community Development Director Walter Sullivan explained that the issue has not been agenzied. He offered to provide a written letter delineating the City's position on CC&Rs for discussion/action at the next Commission meeting. Mr. Wagner reiterated his belief that, while the City does not enforce the CC&Rs, it was undermining them. He believed that this allowed the individuals to do whatever they want without regard for the CC&Rs which indirectly impacts him. Additional comments were solicited but none were given.

D. MODIFICATIONS (1-0107) - Community Development Director Walter Sullivan explained that Commissioner Farley had resigned as she is now residing in Washoe County. He also explained for the audience that Item G-7 had been scheduled for 5:30. It will not be heard before that time. Individuals who wish to leave and return at that time could do so. The Applicant had requested a continuance. Discussion between the Commission and Mr. Sullivan indicated that the Commission would decide at 5:30 whether to receive testimony. Item F-1, the temporary on-site extraction operation, is agenzied for a continuance. Senior Planner Lee Plemel had handouts on

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the August 28, 2002, Meeting

Page 2

it for anyone wanting one. Mr. Sullivan indicated that handouts on the performance standard will be provided when Item G-8, the youth recreation facility, is reached. The Applicant had asked that this item be continued due to a desire to have a public workshop on the standards. Mr. Sullivan explained the request for a continuance of Item G-7 for Dan O'Donnell. The Commission will decide whether to allow the continuance. If it is not allowed, the item will be heard this evening.

E. DISCLOSURES (1-0178) - None.

F. CONSENT AGENDA (1-0181)

F-1. A-02/093-3 - ACTION ON AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CCMC 18.03.101 AND CCMC 18.14

F-2. U-01/02-40 - ACTION ON A SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FROM PARAGON - Due to a desire to discuss the items, they were both pulled from the Consent Agenda.

F-1. (1-0190) Penelope Smith explained the dirt, dust, noise, and vibrations caused by the Paragon extraction operation which is located approximately 20 feet from her residence. The equipment also blocks her vista. Discussion by Chairperson Christianson and Mr. Sullivan explained that additional rocks should not be added to the piles. It was felt that the item would be heard at the next meeting. The proposal is for a temporary operation which will also allow sales of the material. It was hoped that no more night crushing activities will occur. Staff and the applicant are still attempting to develop the language for the ordinance modification. Commissioner Wipfli moved to approve F-1 for a continuance. Commissioner Pedlar seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-1.

F-2. (1-0368) Commissioner Wipfli moved to approve F-2 for a continuance. Commissioner Pedlar seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-1.

G. PUBLIC HEARING (1-0375)

G-1. PRESENTATION ON THE ECONOMIC VITALITY STRATEGIC PLAN - DISCUSSION ONLY (1-0379) - Senior Planner Lee Plemel, Consultant Charlie Long, Shelly Aldean, David Price, and David Ruff - The teams' primary object was to create an economic development section to the master plan. A key recommendation is to liberalize the height restriction to maximize the property along the corridors. Diversification among the committee members was described. A consensus was reached on the corridor needs that will insure Carson City's long-term economic vitality. The plan addresses the challenges of a slower economy and the competition found with Douglas County. The stakeholders are to participate both fiscally and figuratively. The hope is that the group will be able to complete the 31 objectives. The plan recommends that recruitment efforts target those niches that are important to the community while protecting the current manufacturers. Regional cooperation was encouraged. The importance of the corridors was stressed. Participation from all phases of employers and citizens was stressed including the college, schools, hospital, State government, and private industry. The seven objectives of the economic sector were highlighted. It encouraged retention of the current manufacturers, development of alternative energy sources, recognition of the City's assets including the airport and the regional health care facilities, expansion of State government, maximizing the cultural and historical tourist activities, and regional retailing activities. Recognition of regional opportunities and cooperation was supported. Regional support is important for preservation

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the August 28, 2002, Meeting

Page 3

of open space and cultural resources. Preservation of the downtown area was also stressed. Tourist activities are housed there. There are urban landscaping, parking, and traffic issues which need to be addressed. The freeway will take commercial vehicles around the City and will open the downtown area. The 30 events currently held downtown should be built on and expanded. Super blocks were encouraged. Additional transportation methods need to be developed. A plan encouraging the highest and best use of the land through public and private partnerships is needed. The regional retailing area needs to be enlarged. Improvements were suggested to make the former Supply One site more desirable. The coalition and the multiple work groups are private citizens who have now taken on the objectives. More volunteers/assistance are needed. The need for the program to include the community expectations was stressed. This will provide buyin and ensure success of the program. By working together the community will be able to achieve the goals and create community vitality. An individual's time in the area/community should not be used as a reason for failing to participate. The community was encouraged to keep an open mind about the dynamic program. The survey and plan are on the website. The plan will be presented to the Board of Supervisors on September 19th for adoption. Chairperson Christianson indicated that he had not heard the population estimate of 80,000 before. As the buildable area in the community disappears, it is even more important to look toward regionalization for the betterment of all of the counties. He suggested that a survey be conducted to determine the number of tourists who stop here. The importance of getting them to stop when the freeway is completed was noted. Public comments were solicited but none were provided. No formal action was taken or required.

G-2. A-02/03-4 - ACTION ON AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CCMC 18.03.010 (1-0925) -

Senior Planner Lee Plemel, Ron and Beverly Gutzman's Attorney Chris McKenzie, Darren Selby, Betty Brinson, Community Development Director Walter Sullivan - Discussion between staff and the Commission explained the Board of Supervisors direction to the Commission regarding the ability to use the special use permit and other findings to address concerns rather than the 500-foot prohibition in residential areas. Chairperson Christianson indicated that the record should indicate that he may vote for the removal of the 500-foot rule although he felt that there had been a valid reason for the prohibition years ago. He acknowledged that it may not be defensible in a court of law but it had made sense when originally implemented. The only way he could support removal at this time is if they are allowed to look at each application on a case by case basis and ensure that it makes sense to grant the application. If the neighbors do not want the facility, they should say so based on the size, number, traffic, streets, etc. Public testimony was solicited.

Mr. McKenzie asked that the restriction be eliminated from just the commercial district and that a needs assessment be used to determine the need if there is another facility in the neighborhood. He supported the current 500-foot restriction.

Mr. Selby alleged that Carson City is the only community with the restriction. The surrounding counties review the application on a case by case basis. He also felt that Mr. McKenzie had testified before the Board of Supervisors meeting that neither he nor the Gutzmans would oppose the elimination of the 500-foot restriction. Discussion reiterated that Mr. McKenzie's testimony had been to eliminate the restriction in the commercial district only and that he was concerned about the removal in the residential district. Mr. McKenzie felt that his testimony before the Board had indicated it would be less distasteful to them to have the 500-foot restriction removed from all areas and that the Gutzmans do feel that they are being singled out. Clarification indicated that the requirement that the child care facility

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the August 28, 2002, Meeting
Page 4

in a residential area must be used primarily as a residence has been the standard for 17 years. Any special use permit issued for a child care facility in a residential district before that time will be grandfathered.

Ms. Brinson felt that she is being held responsible for the children at the child care facility across the street from her facility as indicated by an incident she explained. Her children are kept behind a wooden fence or in her building. She was also concerned about the increased traffic found when childcare facilities are close together as the children are all dropped off and picked up at the same times. She urged the Commission to retain the 500-foot restriction. She has had her special use permit for 35 years. Chairperson Christianson explained that other criteria will be used to evaluate any applications for child care facilities if the 500-foot restriction is eliminated. This includes traffic issues. Ms. Brinson also pointed out that the Commission had considered the issue on three separate occasions with the Board denying and returning it to the Commission each time.

Discussion between the Commission and staff indicated the Board had returned the item to the Commission due to the manner in which it had been ajenized. The Board had also questioned the reasons for the 500-foot restriction. The applicant should prove that the facility will not create a negative impact on the surrounding neighborhood. Commissioner Wipfli explained his support for having small childcare facilities in residential areas. He also supported considering the applications on a case by case basis. Some areas can support and need larger facilities. They are in commercial areas or where there are a lot of employees. He also noted that some areas could not support two facilities within 5,000 feet of each other. Commissioner Pedlar supported his comments as the merits of the application will be considered on a case by case basis. Commissioner Peery felt that it is the Commission's role to address the issue. The Board had indicated a desire to remove the restriction. He supported its elimination. Commissioner Kimbrough also supported its removal. Commissioner Sedway could not support removal of the restriction as a previous Supervisor had put it in the Code. The packet does not include the Minutes from that meeting. He also felt that Finding No. 1 had not been met to support the elimination. The Board of Supervisors could change the ordinance without a recommendation from the Commission. Commissioner Pedlar moved to approve an ordinance amending the Carson City Municipal Code Title 18, Zoning, deleting Section 18.11.020 to eliminate the 500-foot separation requirement for Child Care Facilities; and revising the Carson City Development Standards, Section 1.6, Land Use and Site Design, Child Care Facilities Performance Standards relating to Child Care Facilities and other matters properly related thereto. Commissioner Peery seconded the motion. The motion was voted and carried 5-1 with Commissioner Sedway voting Naye.

G-3. U-02/03-4 - ACTION ON A SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FROM IRIS BREWER (1-1412) - Associate Planner Jennifer Pruitt - The applicant was not present. Public comments were solicited but none were given. Commissioner Sedway moved to approve U-02/03-4, a Special Use Permit request from Iris Brewer to allow an expansion of a non-conforming use of land on property zoned Mobile Home 12,000 located at 2869 Sherman Lane, APN 8-174-02, based on seven findings and subject to seven conditions of approval contained in the staff report and with the understanding that any acknowledgements to the Commission/Board by the applicant may be considered as further stipulations or conditions of approval on this application. Commissioner Wipfli seconded the motion. The motion was voted and carried 6-0.

G-4. U-2/03-4 - ACTION REGARDING A SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FROM VERNE KRAHN, PARKS PLANNER (1-1492) - Associate Planner Jennifer Pruitt, Parks and Recreation

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the August 28, 2002, Meeting

Page 5

Director Steve Kastens, Attorney Scott Heaton who represented various property owners from the surround area, Community Development Director Walter Sullivan - Slides of the area were shown by Ms. Pruitt. Comments pointed out that the shotguns blasts are noisy. Discussion among Ms. Pruitt, Mr. Kastens and the Commission explained that the targets are thrown toward the individual. The City owns the facility and leases it to the club. Mr. Heaton indicated that his clients do not oppose the expansion, however, wish to be kept apprised of any expansions as it is their understanding that the facility will be relocated at some future date. The industrial area is growing and the club activities are noisy and disturbing to the neighbors. He asked that the record indicate that they will move as represented by the City and that silence regarding the issue is not an acquiescence in the future to allowing them to stay due to the growth. Mr. Kastens indicated that he wanted the record to be clear that he had not personally stated that they were or would be relocating in the future. He questioned who had stated they were moving. He did not wish to be tied to a condition requiring the relocation. Mr. Heaton indicated that John Serpa had been told that the club would be relocated. He was unsure who had made that statement to him. Chairperson Christianson asked him to work with Mr. Kastens on this issue. Additional comments were solicited but none were given. Commissioner Wipfli moved to approve the U-02/03-5, a Special Use Permit request from Verne Krahn, Parks Planner, to allow the placement of two aerial poles at the Carson City Trap Range located at 3590 Arrowhead Drive, APN 8-202-12, based on seven findings and subject to eight conditions of approval contained in the staff report and with the understanding that any acknowledgements to the Commission/Board by the applicant may be considered as further stipulations or conditions of approval on this application. Commissioner Kimbrough seconded the motion. Discussion indicated that Pole A is to be installed within a year or the applicant can obtain an extension for one more year. There is no time restriction on installing Pole B. The motion was voted and carried 6-0. (Commissioner Sedway stepped from the room following the vote—5:10 p.m. A quorum was still present.)

G-5. U-02/03-6 - ACTION ON A SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FROM

FILIBERTO ANGUIANO (1-1685) - Senior Planner Skip Canfield - During Mr. Canfield's introduction Commissioner Sedway returned (5:12 p.m.) and Commissioner Peery stepped from the room (5:12 p.m. A quorum was still present.) Mr. Canfield justified the reasons for the one year review and described the parking area which would be used for the outdoor restaurant. It was felt that there would be adequate parking on the site to meet the needs without this space. The applicant had intended to be present during the meeting, however, he had a personal emergency and could not appear. He allegedly supported the conditions and staff's report. Chairperson Christianson and Mr. Canfield indicated the plan for separating the outdoor seating/cooking area and the parking area must be submitted to City staff prior to obtaining the "CofO". Public comments were solicited but none were given. Commissioner Kimbrough moved to approve U-02/03-6, a Special Use Permit request from Filiberto Anguiano and Stanton Park Development to allow outside seating and cooking activities on Assessor's Parcel Number 10-445-02, property zoned Neighborhood Business located at 933 Woodside Drive based on seven findings and subject to 12 conditions of approval contained in the staff report and with the understanding that any acknowledgements to the Commission/Board by the applicant may be considered as further stipulations or conditions of approval on this application. Commissioners Pedlar and Wipfli seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0 with Commissioner Peery absent.

G-6. M—02/03-2 - ACTION REGARDING A REQUEST FROM ROBERT LUCE FOR A REVIEW OF THE LANDSCAPING CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR THE LONG RANCH ESTATES (1-1768) - Community Development Director Walter Sullivan, Parks and Recreation Director Steve

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the August 28, 2002, Meeting

Page 6

Kastens, Robert Luce, Dr. Ted Damico, John Vettel, Karen Blow - During Mr. Sullivan's introduction Commissioner Peery returned--5:15 p.m. (A quorum was present.) The Parks and Recreation Commission's (P&RC) remedies were discussed with staff. The P&RC wants the improvements completed as quickly as possible and can withhold Residential Construction Tax funds if they are not. The Planning Commission does not have any control over these funds. The tentative map does not contain a condition regarding these improvements. Therefore, Community Development and the Commission have little control over when the developer completes the items. Steps which are being taken to avoid a repeat of this problem were noted. Mr. Sullivan indicated that the Commission could defer action on the item if desired as the P&RC had already taken action. Mr. Luce had asked that the Planning Commission support the P&RC's action which was to direct staff to take action or withhold the Residential Construction Tax funds. The Residential Construction Tax program was limned. The City maintains the landscaping once it is accepted and releases the contractor/developer. The Northridge and Silver Oaks developments were described to illustrate the normal procedure. The Long Ranch program was among the first to be used by the City. Parcel maps had been used before the 1990s as the State Water Engineer would not sign off on Subdivision Maps. The Lewis Homes on South Saliman had been developed using the parcel map process. This is the reason there are 400 homes in the subdivision and no parks. A meeting was held with the developers at 3:30 p.m. today. They have committed to doing the improvements on the south side by October 1, trying to complete Phase 4 of the Long Ranch Subdivision, which is the northern end, by October 15, and completing Phases 5 and 6 by November 15. Mr. Kastens was unsure whether Phases 5 and 6 will be done as indicated. Mark Rodder represents the developer. He is to provide a written schedule which will provide to the Commission as well as anyone else requesting a copy. If this program does not work, Mr. Kastens will work with the District Attorney's office, Development Services and Community Development to apply whatever leverage is available. The developer is unhappy about the unfavorable publicity the development has been receiving and is committed to turning it around. They want to transfer the responsibility to the City. Mr. Kastens indicated that he could "handle it", however, could not do so while they are involved.

Mr. Sullivan explained his support for the outlined program and described a telephone call he had received from an individual who had difficulty negotiating the islands at night due to the lack of reflective markings/lighting. Street Sign Technician Curtis Fisher had painted the islands to make them visible at night. Mr. Sullivan also explained his intent to give Mr. Kastens a flyer on "poly-pavement" that allegedly withstands weeds and abuse.

Mr. Kastens explained his Department's experience with both the new contractor and the original contractor. He felt that both were reputable firms with whom his Department has work with before and that they will complete the work as indicated.

Mr. Luce explained his skepticism and distributed copies of his comments to the Commission, Mr. Sullivan, and the Clerk. (A copy is in the file.) He had not read the staff report or he would have contacted Mr. Sullivan regarding it as he has concerns with it. He felt that it failed to address all of the issues. The homeowners have been overlooked in the process. Many of them were present this evening. The location of his residence was described. He had heard the promises including the one to provide a schedule for completion. He had been working since May to get something done about the situation. Although Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Kastens had sent a letter to Capital Engineering requesting action, nothing had been done on the walking paths to date. He had lived in the subdivision for three years. Phase I was built out five years ago. In May or June they had hired a landscape architect whom two weeks

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the August 28, 2002, Meeting

Page 7

ago landscaped medians. The plans for the walking paths had purportedly been submitted to Engineering in 1996. Since then nothing but grading to maintain them has occurred. The walking path on the north side has not been graded. He was very skeptical as to whether they would meet the October commitments.

Mr. Sullivan referenced his and Mr. Kastens' joint letter to Mark Rotter of Capital Engineering. (A copy is in the file.) It is his understanding that plans have been submitted for the landscaping and irrigation of the median/center islands. The concerns regarding the decomposed granite paths and the issues related to completion of Phase I of the subdivision were read. It was his understanding that plans have been submitted to the Parks Department. They have allegedly been approved by the Parks Department and returned to the engineer. The project is purportedly out to bid. The project engineer allegedly has indicated that construction should start soon on the improvements.

Mr. Luce indicated that the landscaping plans were for the medians. Allegedly, the plans for the walking paths had been submitted in 1996. They should have been completed before now. He also indicated that the paths are incomplete or having missing sections. The landscaping is not the only concern. The general condition of the ridge area and the lack of landscaping for Phases 3, 4, 5, and 6 were noted. He also expressed his concern about the City's process which he felt had failed to protect the homeowners/buyers. The development agreement had purportedly been reviewed by everyone when originally approved. It now appears to lack any teeth and provides only the withholding of the residential construction tax funds as an enforcement tool. There is not a lot of money left to enforce the agreement. He questioned what would happen if the developer fails to complete the improvements and the funds are inadequate to provide the promised amenities. Chairperson Christianson explained that this issue could not be addressed by the Commission. The P&RC had already taken action on it. Mr. Sullivan agreed that he is the "process owner". His Department takes responsibility for bringing the tentative map to the Commission and the Board of Supervisors. He is dealing with a ten-year-old agreement and cannot at this time add new regulations. He agreed that there are other concerns with the development. They were attempting to work through them as they had with the island. Mr. Kastens is attempting to work through the items under his preview. Success is occurring. It is on the record that the improvements will be completed by October 1. He asked that Mr. Luce meet with him on the other issues. Chairperson Christianson explained that the matter should be returned to the staff and an update provided at the next meeting. The Commission could not act on the item this evening. Mr. Sullivan explained the need to review the records on the other items. Mr. Luce reiterated his concern with the development that was created by the lack of action over the life of the project. The developer's performance was disgraceful. They had spent a lot of money on their homes. His attempts to obtain compliance by the developer had been a frustrating three year period. Chairperson Christianson asked Mr. Luce to meet with Mr. Sullivan and discuss his issues due to the need to hear from other individuals and to move onto other issues. He was unsure whether the Commission had a large enough hammer but was certain that the work would be done. Mr. Luce agreed to return and reiterated his concerns that the process had failed. He hoped that when they return at the next meeting he would not have any concerns although there may be other residents who have some. He then asked the Commission to return his handouts so that he would have them available for the presentation if necessary at the next meeting. Chairperson Christianson thanked him for his indulgence and asked that he include both Mr. Kastens and Mr. Sullivan in his discussions. Mr. Luce agreed to do so and expressed his disappointment that so many of the residents had turned out for the meeting without having the issues resolved. The audience was polled to indicate the number that had attended the meeting due to this item. Additional public testimony was solicited.

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the August 28, 2002, Meeting

Page 8

Dr. Damico explained his concern with the island which he felt was very dangerous. The cost of the homes was limned. There had been lots of homes constructed and sold. The developer had made lots of money on the project. He had been in the community for some time. He appreciated City staff's painting of the island. The landscaping plan is good. He had been attempting to obtain answers for some time but was merely sent in circles. He felt that there is a serious problem with the process when a developer could get away with failing to live up to the community standards. The residents wanted a fair shake and presently feel violated. He hoped that teeth could be added to the process for the future. He thanked the Commission for its help. Discussion between Commissioner Sedway and Mr. Sullivan indicated that the developer was Syncon Homes. The hammer should be to withhold building permits. Mr. Sullivan indicated that there are no conditions on the original tentative map relating to the landscaping. According to his records Dr. Damico had contacted him on July 18th. It had taken time to get staff to paint the curb.

Mr. Vettel explained that J. S. Devco is the developer and that Syncon Homes is the builder. The previous builder had been Ryder. The process is a City concern. There were agreements made which had not considered legal concerns. Contracts should be reviewed by the District Attorney's office. They should include specifications which are enforceable, a performance schedule, a payment schedule and a non-performance schedule. He hoped that the City had learned from the process and revised its business plan.

Ms. Blow felt that there were issues with the developer regarding control over the water drainage, improperly graded areas along the walking trails, and erosion issues between Waterford and Bedford west of Longview. She had advised the Utilities Department about these concerns but they have limited capacity to deal with these issues. She also indicated that there are standing water/erosion issues which should be on the record. Clarification indicated that J. S. Devco is John Serpa. Public comments were then closed.

Mr. Sullivan indicated that he would meet with Mr. Luce and address his concerns. He will contact Mr. Kastens and Mr. Werner regarding the standing water issues. Next month he and Mr. Luce will bring back a report on the status and process.

Commissioner Peery suggested that in the future a surrenderable bond be provided. If the work is not completed, it could be called. Mr. Sullivan felt that such a bond would work and that staff had learned a lot over the years. They now require the newer developments to provide schedules, bonds, and spell out the how, when and why in the agreements. A bond is required to backup the performance and is in the conditions of approval. The City can call the bonds when they are not kept. Commissioner Pedlar felt that the discussion was evidence that the process works as it has staff's attention. They should learn from the past errors. He commended Mr. Luce for bringing the concerns forward. They could not change the process that was established ten years ago. He assured the public that the Board of Supervisors is aware of when the public attends the Commission meetings and commended them on their persistence.

Commissioner Wipfli moved to continue the Item, Item G-6. Commissioner Pedlar seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0.

RECESS: A recess was declared at 6 p.m. The entire Commission was present when Chairperson Christianson

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the August 28, 2002, Meeting
Page 9

reconvened the meeting at 6 p.m., constituting a quorum of six.

G-7. P-02/03-1 - ACTION ON A TENTATIVE MAP APPLICATION FOR A PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT (1-001-A) - Senior Planner Skip Canfield, Applicant's Representative Carol Dotson, Loreen Hautekeet, Phil Patton, Donn Simons, Pat Puchert, Lou DeBottari, James Earl Barney, Clarence Skau, Herb Jesse, Bill Hartman, Kim Aglietti, Lee Moore, Bill Ballard, Fred Brown, Don Reasons, Gil Yanuck - Ms. Dotson explained Friday's decision to seek a continuance in order to continue discussions regarding the development in the hope that the infrastructure and engineering issues can be resolved. She also planned to meet with the area residents in an attempt to answer their questions and concerns. The project engineer was present to answer any detailed questions the Commission may have. Commissioner Sedway recommended that the item not be agendaized until all of the issues have been addressed. Continual requests for a continuance should not be allowed as it flaws the process. If the notices have been sent out, the people should be allowed to address the items. He also indicated his unwillingness to grant another continuance at the next Commission meeting. Commissioner Peery supported his comments due to his feeling that the Commission should not be used as a barometer to determine whether a project should be moved forward. He indicated that he would not vote for another continuance unless things are "squared away".

Public comments were solicited. Ms. Hautekeet opposed the plan due to her belief that it was overbuilt. She had purchased her home for the open space. She did not want to have the "California" feeling. She urged the Commission to retain the current zoning as there are water and traffic problems in the area. The developer should be allowed to develop his property but not at the purposed number. She expressed a desire to attend Ms. Dotson's neighborhood meeting.

Ms. Dotson indicated that there will be a signup sheet at the back of the room for individuals who wish to be contacted about the meeting. Discussion explained the inability to post notices on the mail boxes.

Mr. Patton explained the cost of his two-acre parcel. It is disturbing to him that the developer could reduce the lot sizes across the street. He also explained a lack of water pressure found with the area during the summertime and questioned what could be done about it.

Mr. Simons explained that he does not live in the area but wished to point out the impact the project could have on the College observatory. He asked that the development's lighting consider this impact as it could limit the ability to see the night lights.

Ms. Puchert explained her objection to the change from one acre zoning based on her own experience which allowed cluster homes to be constructed in her area. She wished to retain the Nevada experience and avoid the California clustered look. She urged the residents to fight the change.

Chairperson Christianson polled the audience to determine the number who were from California and not native Nevadans.

Mr. DeBottari pointed to the water restrictions imposed during the summertime to indicate that the City currently has

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the August 28, 2002, Meeting

Page 10

a water problem created by growth and to question when it will be fixed. Approving new housing development without any concern about the impact on the infrastructure is not in the best interest of the citizens. The development will require an increase in the infrastructure delivery system to the housing developments already in the area. He asked that a City licensed engineer in charge of the Water Utility state that there is no need to increase the delivery stem and that there is more than enough water rights available for the current growth without increasing the water fees. He understood that the City has water rights but felt that they are very difficult and expensive to access. The proposed project will require approximately 30,000 gallons of water each day without any water being allocated to landscaping. He then explained what he felt was wasteful spending of taxpayer funds, albeit paid by NDOT, for a storm drainage project located in his area. The first plan was discarded due to its failure to comply with FEMA requirements. His questions regarding the second plan have not yet been answered. It had purportedly not provided for any growth in the area. He was concerned that the Planning Department had not been involved with the design and planning for the flood control project. He questioned whether the developer had developed flood mechanisms within the project. The project will change the alluvial flood plain, which has allowed water to sheet flow over the area, by focusing the runoff into either Combs Canyon or the open space. The trails will also focus the flows and create a significant impact on properties to the east of the project. It will increase the runoff and impact the lower retention ponds and water channels. He felt that using a local company to set the flood control requirement and do the design was like the fox watching the hen house. He questioned the impact the development will have on the increased downstream flow. He also questioned the reasons the developer was being granted a bonus for providing open space. The open space slopes being provided are not suitable for building. If a bonus is to be given, it should use the area of the site that is suitable for building and reduce the number of homes. The majority of the lots are smaller than the average lot according to the drawing. Using one large lot plays games with the numbers. He was also concerned about the increased traffic on Combs Canyon particularly since the College now has a direct access/egress onto it. This has increased both the morning and evening traffic. The proposed project will create a minimum of 180 trips each day on the two lane highway. He questioned who will pay to increase the width of the highway and suggested that the developer pay for it.

Mr. Barney indicated that Mr. DeBottari had covered his points. Copies of his comments were distributed to the Commission and Clerk. (A copy is in the file.) He also felt that there is a serious flood problem with the area. Placing smaller lots adjacent to larger lots is against the master plan. He urged the Commission to deny the application.

Mr. Skau explained his background and address. He felt that the water situation had been amply stated. None of the work regarding the peak flows and durations in the streams had been included in the plan or the drainage considerations. The open space area is a fire hazard and will burn. It is not advantageous to retain it. He suggested that it be made into one acre homesites with defensible spaces around them. The willows in the stream provide a winter habitat for the deer.

Mr. Jesse supported having the residents involved in the process and that lists of the pros and cons by both the developer and the residents be presented to the Commission. Chairperson Christianson explained that the Commission had not seen the plans. The meetings should detail the plans.

Mr. Hartman asked that the Commission deny the request as it is inconsistent with the housing that is already in the

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the August 28, 2002, Meeting
Page 11

area. The character and value of the current residences should be maintained. Allowing the developer to build on the lower part and leaving the remainder open will put the homes on the cheaper lots. He urged the Commission to maintain the current lot sizes and setbacks as found in Timberline and University Heights. The number of units should be restricted to 82. Chairperson Christianson explained that the hillside ordinance had been the primary reason staff recommended denial of the application. It had supported no more than 70 homes. Mr. Hartman also pointed out that the spec homes carry more risk for the developer and encouraged the developer to maintain the character of the area.

Ms. Aglietti explained the location of her home and the traffic problems she has encountered/seen. She had requested speed bumps and deputies to patrol the area in the past to no avail. The development will create even more traffic problems. She reminded the Commission of the fire problem experienced several years ago to illustrate her concern with the lack of accesses to the area, the water pressure problems, and the lack of an evacuation plan. Development in the area had been denied previously purportedly due to the lack of egress/access. The developer knew about this when he purchased the property. There have been no changes in the canyon to warrant approval of the project.

Mr. Moore felt that the increased number of residents would add between 300 and 350 cars to the present traffic problems. Combs Canyon is a race track now. The additional traffic will further impact Winnie and College Parkway. Mitigation of the infrastructure problems should occur before the development is approved. The Fire Department has wanted a second access/egress road in case a fire occurs in this area. Another road is necessary. Giving the developer a carrot for undevelopable land is not a good idea. He urged the community to consider a recall. He encouraged the residents to obtain copies of the staff report so that the questions can be answered when another meeting is held.

Mr. Ballard pointed out that the property has three springs located on it. He also felt that some archeological components may be on the site.

Mr. Brown explained his belief that Combs Canyon Road is dangerous in the wintertime. It is poor planning to allow 100 homes on one acre. He urged the Commission to reconsider the project.

Mr. Reasons noted the water concerns. He liked the character of the area and the one acre lots. He did not wish to meet with the engineer. He urged the Commission to retain the one acre zoning.

Mr. Yanuck referenced his four page letter which is in the file. He felt that no one had raised the cost benefit ratio issue. He asked who benefits most, the City or the developer. Public comments were then closed.

Commissioner Sedway moved to continue P-02/03-1, Combs Canyon PUD to when the details are worked out so that we do not have the same condition. If it can be done in September, this is fine. If it has to be October or November, so be it. Ms. Dotson concurred with the motion and indicated that she would be at either the September or October meeting. Mr. Canfield indicated that staff will again notice all of the residents. Commissioner Sedway concurred with amending his motion to include the renoticing. Commissioner Peery seconded the motion. Commissioner Pedlar indicated that he would support the motion but not another continuance. He expected it to be

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the August 28, 2002, Meeting
Page 12

ready for a decision when the item is brought back. The public has a great interest in the project and should not have to keep coming back repeatedly. The motion to continue the item was voted and carried 6-0.

G-8. A-02/03-1 - ACTION ON AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CCMC SECTIONS 18.03.010 AND 18.04.075 AND DESIGN STANDARDS DIVISION 1. BY ADDING SECTION 1.16 YOUTH RECREATION FACILITIES PERFORMANCE STANDARDS (1-2841) - Senior Planner Lee Plemel, Applicant Carol Dotson, Community Development Director Walter Sullivan, Howard Riedl, Nicki Stedman - Mr. Plemel's introduction included his support for a continuance to allow time to conduct a public workshop. Ms. Dotson described the effort undertaken to develop the definitions and performance standards. There is lots of public interest in the process which warranted conducting the workshop(s). A map delineating all of the areas that are Single Family 6,000 in the community with larger parcels than five acres marked. If the public reviews the draft standards and the workshop(s) is held, it may be possible to have a tidy set of performance standards. Discussion between Ms. Dotson and Commissioner Wipfli indicated the belief that the facility would require a minimum lot size of five acres. The Club's proposed site contains 17 acres. Copies of the draft standards were given to the Commission. (A copy was not given to the Clerk.) A satellite site could be as small as two acres. Commissioner Wipfli expressed his concern that if the ordinance is too restrictive, it may not be possible for the community to live with it. He also disclosed his tour of the facility and his impression of it. Ms. Dotson agreed to consider his point and expressed her desire to obtain feedback on the standards. She pointed out that there are buffering details contained in the packet. Parking will be separated from the residential area. She also explained for Commissioner Sedway that the Boys and Girls Club could not own a parcel designated as publicly zoned property. Mr. Sullivan explained that the City could own the parcel and lease it to the Club, however, the Club needs to own the parcel in order to move forward with its development plans. Public zoning does not allow this use. It will require an ordinance change to amend the Code. Therefore, the ordinance change was proposed. A special use permit will be required before construction can occur. Schools or churches could meet the criteria for similar uses in the future. Changing the zoning for the one parcel would be spot zoning which is not allowed. Justification for using the SF6,000 zone was based on the need and number of children who reside in that zone. Commissioner Pedlar disclosed his tour of the facility and discussion with the Executive Director which indicated she had received calls from the Y and other similar 501c3 facilities who wish to locate in Carson City and want to be in the Single Family 12,000 or One Acre areas. The Commission must consider all similar uses for nonprofit organizations. He suggested that all of the residential districts allow the use. Mr. Sullivan reiterated the request for a continuance so that a workshop could be held before the Commission considers the ordinance and performance standards.

Public comments were solicited. Mr. Riedl felt that it was a zoning change for just the Boys and Girls Club for a specific site that is clearly marked as the site for the future Club. He suggested that the multi-family zoning districts be considered as those districts have more children and a higher density. The draft standards had indicated that 20 acre sites could also be used. His concern with the traffic which would be generated for this size of a facility was expressed. He did not believe that the children would walk to one large mega facility nor would the proposed location serve the entire area. He felt that the proposal targeted one site which is spot zoning. He had offered to help the applicant be an advocate for a facility in his neighborhood. This has not happened. He felt skeptical about the public process and suggested the alternatives be broadened to allow the use in other areas besides SF6,000. Commissioner Sedway explained that the participation and site specific discussion will occur later in the process when neighborhood meetings will be conducted to address specific issues. He also agreed with Mr. Riedl that the concept

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the August 28, 2002, Meeting
Page 13

should in areas where there is a higher density and that it should not be restricted to one area.

Ms. Stedman explained that the Club owns the property and is attempting to build on it. She and her husband had purchased their home a few houses away from the site and planned to live there forever. They did not wish to listen to children screaming. They had accepted the SF6,000 zoning district but putting 2,000 children on the site is unfair. If the proposal passes, the Club will be looking at only this one site. Lompa is a long way from where children reside. Public testimony was then closed.

Commissioner Peery moved to continue A-02/03-1, the Youth Recreational Facilities Ordinance. Commissioner Wipfli seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0.

RECESS: a recess was declared at 7:15 p.m. The entire Commission was present when Chairperson Christianson reconvened the meeting at 7:20 p.m., constituting a quorum of six.

G-9. M—02/03-1 - ACTION ON AN APPEAL OF A STAFF DECISION ON A NON-CONFORMING SIGNAGE AT THE EVERGREEN CENTER (1-3535) - Senior Planner Lee Plemel, Community Development Director Walter Sullivan, Applicant Nick Galakatos, Deputy District Attorney Jason Woodbury, Kate Schulz, - Commissioner Wipfli explained his involvement with the sign ordinance. He felt that the two illegal signs on the property would have to be removed. He also explained his personal tour of the site. He felt that the building is very large with a lot of people in it. The success of the landscaping effort created problems for individuals looking for the building. For economic vitality it is important that they be seen. Although he wished to support staff, who had done what they had been directed to do, he felt that it would be detrimental to the building to reduce the height of the sign. The latitude given to the casinos was used to illustrate the need to support a business' economic vitality and success. Mr. Canfield explained that the special use permit process allows new signs such as those for the casinos. The same mechanism is not there for signs that may have been legal when installed but are now out of conformity. The Code requires these signs to be brought into compliance when the ownership changes. Commissioner Wipfli felt that the sign should be grandfathered and allowed to stay due to the large building and the number of tenants. Mr. Canfield felt that the purpose of the Code was to eliminate grandfathered signs. (2-0038) Clarification for Commissioner Pedlar indicated that the applicant could apply for a special use permit to allow the sign if it was a new sign. The ordinance does not allow existing signs to have this leeway. Mr. Sullivan explained the concern that arbitrary standards are being used to allow leeway in the signs. He felt that the special use permit is a step in the right direction with extra guidance from the Commission. Staff is now in the process of looking at the sign ordinance with the assistance of the public. Some revisions have already been suggested. A more definite standard on which to judge the signs needs to be established to avoid being arbitrary. Discussion between Commissioner Peery and Mr. Sullivan explained the need for the signage to be in the front of the building rather than on the side of the building. Commissioner Sedway pointed out the Commission's decision to allow a special use permit for a sign across the street, which was even larger. There are signs all over town that are out of compliance. This is the first one to come in under this Code. This is a true indication of how unworkable the sign ordinance is. He applauded staff for its effort and asked that the applicant understand the quandary staff was placed in due to the ordinance. The District Attorney's office had supported staff's interpretation, however, it is unfair to the new owner when there is a larger sign across the street. Mr. Sullivan indicated that this is going to be the test case for the ordinance and the need for clear direction from the Commission. In order to allow its continued use, an ordinance

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the August 28, 2002, Meeting

Page 14

amendment must be developed and adopted. Staff will hold the business license application in abeyance during this process. Commissioner Pedlar pointed out that if the sign was removed, the applicant could reinstall it after obtaining a special use permit. He suggested that the new owners be allowed to apply for a special use permit which would be similar to that required for other large signs. Staff had interpreted the Code correctly. He supported the code amendment and holding the business license in abeyance until it is adopted. Mr. Canfield explained that he had discussed the issue with former Redevelopment Director Rob Joiner who had indicated that the building signs for a mall on West Winnie Lane had been removed to comply with the Code. Commissioner Pedlar explained the Chamber of Commerce's feeling that the sign ordinance creates the largest amount of dissatisfaction about its interpretation and enforcement. This is the reason a task force is working on the ordinance.

Mr. Galakatos felt that the sign is in proportion to the building. He could understand the point if it was a smaller building. He was not told about the problem until after he had purchased the building. He felt that the seller had not been forced to change the sign due to the amount of money he had. It will be a large burden to replace the sign. The building is half empty now. A lawsuit he had been involved within California was explained to show the amount of time and cost involved with one. The sign was there first. Half of the City does not conform to the ordinance. He questioned the fairness of having to deny half of the City.

Commissioner Wipfli explained that the Commission was on his side. Reasons for the change were described. Staff had been told to enforce the Code. His situation is a large building with a small amount of signage which the landscaping hides. The Commission is attempting to change it. Mr. Galakatos felt that he should have been told about the problem originally. The seller had failed to advise him of it. Commissioner Wipfli explained that this is a great town. Mr. Galakatos will be glad he is here and that the City staff will work with him. They had only done what the Commission had directed.

Clarification between Commissioner Pedlar and Mr. Woodbury indicated that the appeal should be continued and staff directed to rewrite the ordinance to allow the new owner to apply for a special use permit. There is no timelimit on the appeal. Commissioner Pedlar explained to Mr. Galakatos that the sign is nonconforming. The Commission needs to change the ordinance to allow the special use permit process. If the item is continued, it will work. Staff was required to make its recommendation based on the Code. Discussion between Commissioner Pedlar and Mr. Woodbury indicated that the Commission should not overturn staff's recommendation as it will violate the ordinance. Mr. Sullivan explained staff's attempt to find a solution but could not due to the Code. The revision should be back to the Commission in September. The business license is under review and is in a suspended state unless there are health, welfare or safety infractions. **Commissioner Pedlar indicated that the ordinance is clear and moved that the appeal of the staff's decision regarding the Evergreen Center sign be continued to the September 25 Planning Commission meeting. Commissioner Sedway seconded the motion.** Commissioner Kimbrough pointed out that when the sign ordinance was adopted there had been public comments and figures and numbers included in the discussions. The sign is close in square footage to the requirements but six times larger in size and there are two illegal signs. The sign restriction should be implemented with a change in the ownership. He was unsure of the costs to fix it and the impact on Mr. Galakatos. It may be expensive to fix. This is the first appeal. The discussion indicates an intent to create an exception to the rules. The public has voiced concerns with making exceptions and changing the rules. He could not support the continuance as there must be a first test case. Commissioner Wipfli explained that he had not seconded the motion due to his desire to overrule staff's decision as

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the August 28, 2002, Meeting
Page 15

suggested by Commissioner Sedway. The little sign(s) should be gone. The balance was provided by the building being more than 50,000 square feet and its need for additional signage. He was willing to approve the sign as an exception if the two small "realtor" signs at the bottom are removed. The ordinance has a lot of good parts. Commissioner Pedlar explained that his problem is that the ordinance is clearly written. The Commission cannot overrule staff. The sign should remain. The motion will allow the appeal to be continued until the ordinance is modified. The Commission will violate the Code if it overturns staff. Commissioner Wipfli indicated that it is an emotional issue for him. He wished to support the motion due to the size of the building and desire to keep the sign. Discussion with staff pointed out that the Code is clear. The Commission should not overturn staff. The standards will be revised and the special use permit added. There may be some other options provided. If the Code has been interpreted correctly, staff should not be overruled. The business license will be placed on hold pending the Code revisions. If the Commission overrules staff, there will be a lot of appeals. Commissioner Wipfli then indicated that he would support the motion although he thought originally that the request had been for only this one appeal. Commissioner Peery indicated that the height is an issue and that the sign(s) below should be removed. Staff had made the right decision based on the Code. The purpose of the Commission is to grant exceptions and should do so in this case without changing the Code every time.

Public comments were solicited. Ms. Schulz indicated that the Evergreen Center has personality and is a center. Neither the Park Lane Mall nor the Meadowood Mall list all of the tenants in the mall. When all of the trees are in bloom on South Carson Street, it creates a beautiful area. There are few signs south of Musser. North of William/Highway 50 there are too many signs. A business or center should have a sign. Businesses do not have the street number on the signs. She supported staff's recommendation. The community is taking on a glory that should be supported by maintaining the ordinance. She had not been aware of the sign change at Frontier Plaza. She understood the grandfathered issues and supported staff.

Commissioner Pedlar repeated his motion as being that the Commission continue the appeal to the September Planning Commission meeting. He also indicated that the Commission's comments had directed staff to revise the ordinance to allow the applicant to apply for a special use permit. **Commissioner Sedway concurred. The motion was voted and carried 4-2 with Commissioners Kimbrough and Peery voting Naye.**

G-10. V-02/03-1 - ACTION REGARDING A VARIANCE REQUEST FROM SILVER STATE CONSULTANTS (2-0626) - Senior Planner Skip Canfield, Applicant's Representative Julio Sandoval - Discussion between Commissioner Peery and Mr. Canfield indicated that the major project review process had indicated there are no concerns with the setbacks. Mr. Sandoval agreed to move forward with the project when the variance is granted. The building plans have been submitted to the City for review. The building permit cannot be issued until the variance is granted. Public comments were solicited but none were given. Commissioner Peery moved to approve V-02/03-1, a Variance request from Silver State Consultants, Eugene Lepire, Jr., William Kugler and Colleen Coffey, owners, to vary the minimum lot width on three parcels zoned General Industrial, Assessor's Parcel Numbers 010-351-05, 08, and 09, located at 4024, 4060, and 4072 Lepire Drive based on five findings and subject to six conditions of approval in the staff report and with the understanding that any acknowledgements to the Commission/Board by the applicant may be considered as further stipulations or conditions of approval on this application. Commissioner Wipfli seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0.

G-11. U-92/93-15a - ACTION TO AMEND CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL OF A PREVIOUSLY APPROVED SPECIAL USE PERMIT FROM CHROMALLOY NEVADA (2-0705) - Community Development Director Walter Sullivan, Scott Heaton, Deputy District Attorney Jason Woodbury - Mr. Sullivan explained the need to continue the item as the wrong address had been used in the agenda. Mr. Heaton explained his representation of the adjacent property owners. They did not have a problem with the application, however, wanted the applicant to cleanup his property as it was making it difficult for them to rent or sell their facilities. He requested an additional condition be imposed upon the applicant requiring them cleanup the property. Photographs of the property were given to Mr. Sullivan. Mr. Sullivan explained that he had told the applicant it would not be necessary for him to remain. Mr. Heaton indicated that this was fine so long as the record included his remarks. Mr. Heaton explained that former Senior Planner Juan Guzman had work with them in an attempt to address the situation with Chromalloy without success. They hoped that something will be done to mitigate the situation. Additional public comment was solicited but none was given. No formal action was taken.

G-12. U-01/02-18 - REVIEW AND DISCUSSION REGARDING A STATUS REPORT ON A PREVIOUSLY APPROVED SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR CHAMPION SPEEDWAY (2-0778) - Senior Planner Lee Plemel, Compliance Officer Alan Biddle, Glen Martel, Kate Schulz - Mr. Plemel's introduction included reading David Pflum and Barbara Myers' letters into the record. (Copies are in the file.) Discussion indicated that the racetrack was to monitor its activities and report to the staff/Commission. Mr. Biddle had also conducted some independent monitoring regarding the noise and closing hours. His monitoring indicated that the racetrack had complied with the timeframes. Commissioner Peery pointed out the need for additional compliance officers. Mr. Biddle explained his random unannounced checks of the facility. His general opinion was that the hours of operation coincided with the requirement and the dust was being controlled. They use water and chemicals to control the dust. Although efforts were made to control the noise, additional efforts and programs need to be used. Mr. Sullivan explained that a meeting with the operator had been held on Mr. Biddle's investigations. Some of the racing classes have exceeded the noise level. He recommended these races be conducted earlier in the day and that other muffling efforts be undertaken.

Mr. Martel indicated that the two noisy classes were recognized and that efforts were being made to reduce their noise level. He asked that no changes be made during the remainder of the year and that discussions occur regarding next year's schedule. There is time to work out the problems before next year's racing begins. He was not aware of any dust complaints. They have been using a chemical treatment to assist in controlling the dust. There had been one complaint regarding the noise which he felt had been regarding the super modified race. The facility had been closed by 1 a.m., if not earlier. The announcer has repeatedly reminded the attendees to be respectful of the neighbors. Progress has been made. They will continue to work on improving the situation. The gate is closed. Keys are available for anyone requesting one. To date no one has requested one.

Ms. Schulz expressed her belief that the area is in transition and that the land is more valuable. She felt that the special use permit had decreased the value of her property and objected to the City's granting the special use permit. Only the stock car racing should have been approved. The go carts have purportedly moved to Moundhouse. The Commission should not have given the operator the ability to race all kinds of vehicles. Chairperson Christianson indicated that this had not happened and questioned how the property had been marginalized by a racetrack that had been in the area for 30 years. Ms. Schulz felt that no one had cared when the track was used on Saturday evenings

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the August 28, 2002, Meeting
Page 17

from Memorial Day to Labor Day. The permit allowed racing 24 hours a day, seven days a week, 365 days a year. Chairperson Christianson again indicated that this had not happened. Ms. Schulz gave the Commission a copy of a news article from the Reno Gazette Journal. (The copy was given to the Clerk and is in the file.) This article allegedly indicated that go cart racing had moved to the race track one year ago. Commissioner Pedlar pointed out that the Special Use Permit had also been approved by the Board of Supervisors and that the process had been followed. The racetrack had been there for 50 to 60 years. Her comments/complaints may be due to her loss. Ms. Schulz asked that her article be made a part of the record. Chairperson Christianson read the news article into the record. Additional comments were solicited but none were given.

Discussion indicated that staff will review the status after the season ends and agenize it for a special review by the Commission. Mr. Martel expressed his willingness to meet with the track management after the Nevada Day race and submit a written report to staff in November. He will then followup with a meeting with staff. Discussion indicated that the special use permit does not require an annual review. The review was part of the special use permit for the commercial coach that had been added to the facility. Any concerned citizens could request a review the same way that the residents in Long Ranch Estates had. No formal action was required or taken.

H. INTERNAL COMMUNICATIONS AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS - NON-ACTION ITEMS (2-1325)

H-1. STAFF BRIEFING ON THE STATUS OF COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS AND CORRESPONDENCE TO THE COMMISSION - The Board had considered and approved several grants which are not reviewed by the Commission. Filiberto Anguiano's special use permit and Code amendment were approved. Commissioner Farley's resignation was noted. Personnel had been contacted and has started recruiting for a replacement.

H-2. FUTURE COMMISSION ITEMS AND DATES - Commissioner Sedway expressed a desire to discuss the Commission's policy regarding how to handle continuances. He felt that the applicants should be required to proceed with the applications once the notices have been mailed. The current process is being abused. Chairperson Christianson supported his comments. Mr. Sullivan explained the current process which allows the applicants to review the staff report and continue an item if they do not like the report. His policy had been to avoid negotiations at the Commission level as it does not provide the best decisions. He agreed to agenize the item. He also felt that a deadline should be established for requesting a continuance unless something unforeseen occurs. He had not been aware of the wrong address on this evening's agenda and took responsibility for it. Comments indicated that the Commission could deny a request for a continuance. This would send a different message to the applicants. Commissioner Pedlar was concerned about the number of continuances being granted to the applicants. If the applicant is denied, he can appeal to the Board. The timeline for submitting information was described. Commissioner Sedway felt that the applicants were in a hurry to submit the applications and then they negotiated through the continuances for a better position. The burden should be on the applicant and all of the information should be submitted at one time. Commissioner Sedway also suggested that the sign ordinance be reviewed due to the feeling that the current Code is unfair in light of the fact that there is a large sign across the street from the one discussed earlier this evening.

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the August 28, 2002, Meeting
Page 18

I. ADJOURNMENT - Commissioner Peery moved to adjourn. Commissioner Pedlar seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0. Chairperson Christianson adjourned the meeting at 8:50 p.m.

The Minutes of the August 28, 2002, Carson City Planning Commission meeting

ARE SO APPROVED ON October 30, 2002.

/s/

Alan Christianson, Chairperson