

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the August 30, 2000, Meeting
Page 1

A regularly scheduled meeting of the Carson City Planning Commission was held on Wednesday, August 30, 2000, 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 Alan Rogers, and Commissioners Gayle Farley, Roger Sedway, and Richard Wipfli

STAFF PRESENT: Community Development Director Walter Sullivan, Principal Planner Rob Joiner, Deputy District Attorney Neil Rombardo, Senior Planners Juan Guzman and Skip Canfield, Recording Secretary Katherine McLaughlin (P.C. 8/30/00 Tape 1-0015)

NOTE: Unless otherwise indicated, each item was introduced by the Chairperson. Staff then presented/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 3:40 p.m. Roll call was taken. A quorum was present although Commissioners Larkin and Mally were absent. Chairperson Christianson lead the Pledge of Allegiance.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - 6/28 AND 7/26/00 (1-0027) - Commissioner Rogers moved to approve the Minutes of the June 28 and July 26 as presented by staff. Commissioner Wipfli seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

C. PUBLIC COMMENTS (1-0037) - None.

D. AGENDA MODIFICATIONS (1-0046) - Mr. Sullivan expressed a desire to continue Items F-1a, F-1b, and F-10 following a short presentation on each. He requested Item F-8 be taken after Item F-3a. He also announced that Applicant Nancy Davis had submitted a letter withdrawing her application, which is Item F-9. She will continue operating under her current special use permit that allows her to care for 12 children.

E. DISCLOSURES (1-0079) - Commissioner Sedway indicated he would recuse himself from Items F-1a and b due to his position at the Hospital. The attorney for property owners adjacent to Applicant F-7 is Mike Pavlakis. Mr. Pavlakis is the attorney for the Hospital. He did not feel that this relationship would influence his ability to make a decision on the item. Therefore, he would participate. He also disclosed that he is the foundation chairperson for the college and would recuse himself from Item F-8. Mr. Sullivan disclosed that his in-laws and wife own a parcel adjacent to Item F-7. He had not participated in and would recuse himself from participation at the staff level related to this item. He also indicated that his wife is employed by the College and that he would recuse himself from Item F-8.

F. PUBLIC HEARING (1-0101)

F-1a. Z-00/01-1 - DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON A REZONING REQUEST FROM KIM MASON, DIRECTOR OF FACILITIES SERVICES; AND F-1b. U-00/01-9 - DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON A SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FROM KIM MASON, DIRECTOR OF FACILITIES SERVICES - Community Development Director Walter Sullivan - Commissioner Wipfli moved to continue F-1a and F-1b. Commissioner Rogers seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

F-2. V-99/00-1 - DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON A REQUEST FROM SHELLY ALDEAN (1-0186) - Principal Planner Rob Joiner, Senior Planner Skip Canfield - Mr. Joiner introduced Mr. Canfield. Shelly

Aldean agreed with the staff report. Public comments were solicited but none given. Commissioner Sedway moved to approve a request from Shelly Aldean, property owner: Glenbrook Company, to vary from the maximum height of a second free-standing sign at Southgate Shopping Center on property zoned Retail Commercial/General Commercial for a 12 month final extension based upon seven findings and subject to six conditions of approval as stated in the Notice of Decision dated July 28, 1999, and as approved by the Regional Planning Commission on that date. Commissioner Wipfli seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

F-3. U-94/95-9 - DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON THE ANNUAL REVIEW OF A PREVIOUSLY APPROVED SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FROM STEVE HOLTON (1-0255) - Senior Planner Skip Canfield, Principal Planner Rob Joiner, Senior Planner John Givlin - Discussion indicated the applicant was not present. Public comments were solicited but none given. Commissioner Wipfli moved to approve the annual review of U-94/95-9 for Syncon Homes, formerly Ryder Homes, to allow a subdivision sales office on property zoned Single Family 12,000-Planned Unit Development located at 2505 Roxbury Way, APN 7-382-02, based on seven findings and subject to nine conditions of approval contained in the original 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. Discussion between Commissioner Farley and Mr. Givlin corrected the record to indicate that there are no problems with the channel drainage and maintenance. The project had not been signed off as several "punch list" items remain to be finalized which the applicant is working on today. Commissioner Farley seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

F-4. U-00/01-3 - DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON A SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FROM DANIEL O'BRIEN, P.E. (1-0868) - Principal Planner Rob Joiner, Daniel O'Brien, Community Development Director Walter Sullivan - Discussion between Mr. Joiner and the Commission indicated the property is not in the historic district and did not have any historic value. Sierra Pacific had not responded to the notices. Their plans for their property were unknown. It was felt that they would remain at their site for some time. Concerns were expressed concerning the impact the reduced setback would have on their property and its future uses. Mr. Joiner iterated his reasons for feeling that the reduced setback and future uses of the building would not impact their property. Commissioner Wipfli felt that the reduced setback would not allow an adequate amount of space to provide for a landscaped buffer which would soften the impact of the building. Mr. Joiner noted that the adjacent property owner could provide the buffer, if needed. Commissioner Wipfli felt that this placed an undue burden on that property owner.

Mr. O'Brien did not have an objection to the staff's findings or conditions. He distributed a drawing illustrating a building concept and its elevations to the Commission and Clerk. (A copy is in the file.) The building is to be used for storage but may in the future be used as a business. For this reason adequate parking had been provided. He did not feel that Sierra Pacific would be removing the powerlines or relocating the substation. He hoped that the building would improve the site. The elevations were "pretty generic". He had not discussed any "gingerbread, wainscoting, brick laying, etc." with Mr. Oliver. It will be a steel building with fire walls along the property lines as required by the Building Code. He was unsure whether there would be parapets as the type of construction had not been determined. Public comments were solicited but none given.

Commissioner Sedway moved to approve U-00/01-3, a special use permit application from Daniel O'Brien, P.E., property owner: Everett Oliver, to allow expansion of an existing legal nonconforming use for a 4,975 square foot storage building to be located 17 feet within the required 30 foot front yard setback on property zoned Limited Industrial located at 888 Corbett Street, APN 2-122-12, based on seven findings and subject to six 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 Rogers seconded the motion. The motion was voted by roll call with the following result: Sedway - Aye; Rogers - No; Farley - No; Wipfli - No; and Chairperson Christianson - Aye. Motion died on a 2-3 vote.

Mr. Joiner suggested that a different motion be made with other conditions or findings. Commissioner Wipfli explained that he had voted against the project as it is in an area that is in a huge transition with a lot of good projects in the area. This is a plain building that could have had a lot of other things included on it. The setbacks

could have been done better. We have a chance to improve that area which the project does not do. Commissioner Farley supported his comments as she did not think that the project was good for that area. We should be able to do something better. This will stop anything that we want to do in that area. We should look at the setbacks and design. Commissioner Rogers agreed with their comments. There would be a detrimental impact of putting in a plain steel building in an area that will hopefully be developed into a little bit better quality than that. There is a lot of residential uses nearby and other uses that will be negatively impacted by this kind of a building. Not knowing the future uses of the building, there could be a noise impact and a lot of other impacts. It was hard for him to make a judgement based on our information that we are completely mitigating any future problems at that location. Mr. Sullivan requested a motion to deny.

Commissioner Rogers moved to deny U-00/01-3, a special use permit application from Daniel O'Brien, P.E., property owner: Everett Oliver, to allow expansion of an existing legal nonconforming use for a 4,975 square foot storage building to be located 17 feet within the required 30 foot front yard setback on property zoned Limited Industrial located at 888 Corbett Street, APN 2-122-12 based on two findings: 1. That the proposed development would not be in keeping with the character of the area as far as the type of construction and 2. The possible use of this property could negatively impact the surrounding areas as far as noise, traffic, and dust. Commissioner Wipfli seconded the motion. Motion carried 3-2 with Commissioner Sedway and Chairperson Christianson voting Naye.

Mr. Joiner indicated that an appeal should be filed with his office within 15 days and encouraged anyone wishing to file an appeal to contact his office. Discussion ensued on whether Mr. O'Brien could redesign and resubmit the application. It was felt that unless substantial changes are made, the application could not be considered for one year. Mr. Joiner indicated an intent to discuss this with the applicant.

F-5. U-00/01-10 - DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON A SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FROM MARGARET BRAND AND LISA DIXON (1-1230) - Principal Planner Rob Joiner, Margaret Brand and Lisa Dixon - Ms. Dixon stated her agreement with the Department's recommendations and findings. Ms. Brand explained the reasons for submitting the request and the response they had received under the temporary business license. Public comments were solicited but none provided. Commissioner Wipfli moved to approve U-00/01-10, a special use permit request from Margaret Brand and Lisa Dixon, property owner: Metcalf Development, to allow a massage therapy business as a conditional use on property zoned General Office located at 755 North Roop Street, Suite 110, APN 4-153-06, based on seven findings and subject to five 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 Sedway seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

F-6. V-00/01-4 - DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON A VARIANCE REQUEST FROM LARRY SALISBURY (1-1320) - Senior Planner Skip Canfield, Robert Burgess - Mr. Burgess indicated he is one of the owners and that only the word "Michael" would be illuminated. This would be done with neon but not "real bright". He had read the staff report and agreed with it. Public comments were solicited but none given. Commissioner Wipfli moved to approve V-00/01-4, a variance request from Larry Salisbury, property owner: GWB LLC, to vary Section 20.06.020 by increasing the amount of signage on the property above the maximum allowable on property zoned Retail Commercial located at 2680 South Carson Street, APN 009-051-09, based on five findings and subject to six conditions of approval in the staff report 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 Rogers seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

Community Development Director Sullivan welcomed Mr. Canfield to his staff.

BREAK: A recess was declared at 5:03 p.m. A quorum of the Commission was present when Chairperson Christianson reconvened the meeting at 5:10 p.m. although Commissioners Mally and Larkin were absent.

F-7. U-00/01-5 - DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON A SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FROM MATTHEW G. WELTER (1-1453) - Principal Planner Rob Joiner, Deputy District Attorney Neil Rombardo, Matthew Welter, Apprentice Eric Butterworth, Mike Pavlakis, Senior Planner Juan Guzman -

Discussion between the Commission and Mr. Joiner explained the issues referenced in a letter regarding the former tenant's (Lyn Marie Trucking) unapproved use of City right-of-way and adjacent property. Staff is only just beginning to work on these issues. Mr. Joiner felt that other ordinances and Departments would address these concerns. The Commission should not consider these civil issues. He agreed that the subject property line should be delineated. Lyn Marie Trucking, the applicant, and property owner Carl Norris had purportedly agreed to use some of the large timbers used in Mr. Welter's business and the boulders located on the encroached property to delineate the boundary. Based on the applicant's offer to assist, the Commission could consider the delineation proposal. Mr. Rombardo limned actions open to the City to resolve the encroachment issues. He supported Mr. Joiner's position that the encroachment is separate from the permit issue. Commission comments noted the disclosure requirements property owner Norris would encounter when the building is removed, the lot combined with others and placed on the market. Concerns were expressed that the lot may be sold before the City can act. The City's investigation was described. A final decision remains to be made on how to proceed. The City may wish to have the property returned to its original grade. Commissioner Sedway explained his reason for feeling that the two issues should be considered together.

(1-1723) Mr. Butterworth requested Condition 7 be modified to make the period run from June 15 to October 15 - 120 days - for outdoor display. He also expressed their feeling that they should not be responsible for the property line delineation and cleaning up the parcels. Lyn Marie Trucking should be held responsible for delineation and clean up. He suggested that they use the boulders to delineate the property line. A chainlink fence is unnecessary and would detract from the property. The chainlink fencing on the subject parcel is used for security. The boulders would be more attractive and match the environment. Discussion between Mr. Joiner and the Commission indicated that the 120 days must be consecutive. Mr. Joiner agreed with the date modification of June 15 to October 15. Mr. Butterworth then corrected the application to indicate that only ten parking spaces are proposed which matches the Code requirements. He also indicated that there is one tree on the site which should be considered as existing landscaping. Allegedly, this tree has been watered and is coming back to life. The only landscaping they had proposed is to place a "planter box" in the parking lot. They did not propose to do any extensive landscaping. The "planter box" should comply with the Code requirements for the parking spaces. He then clarified the second paragraph on Page 2 of the staff report that the materials which would be displayed are "works in progress" or finished products and not "raw materials". Mr. Welter indicated that he did not plan to sell the products at this location except on rare occasions. There is an inadequate amount of space available for a retail gallery. Mr. Butterworth had been in discussion with Lyn Marie on the issues. The issue should not be their responsibility. They are willing to participate at a minimal financial impact to facilitate resolution of the issues. Mr. Welter agreed to cooperate as much as possible. They agreed that Condition 6 should not be revised to be more restrictive. It currently required them to work with staff on the landscaping plan.

(1-1898) Public comments were solicited. Mr. Pavlakis displayed an aerial photograph of the site illustrating the location of his client's property, the City right-of-way for Bennett Street, and the applicant's parcel. He requested mitigation of the encroachment and a fence along the northern boundary. This would stop the historic infringement on their property and clearly mark the boundary. He agreed that the mitigation and cleanup issues were separate from the application. Conditions 4, 6, and 7 supported his contention that the fencing was a reasonable requirement as they relate to the effects on City and adjacent properties. He was willing to discuss the type of fencing but rejected the placement of boulders along what may or may not be the boundary line.

Mr. Welter suggested that signs be posted indicating private property and prohibiting parking along the delineation line. Discussion between Mr. Welter and Chairperson Christianson indicated that Mr. Welter did not need the area for any reason. There will be ten parking spaces on the north side of the building. This area could be accessed without crossing the Barbettini Trust or City property. Mr. Rombardo indicated that if the Commission wished to make these findings, they were appropriate.

Commissioner Rogers suggested that, as the Barbettini Trust property is to the north of the applicant's parcel, it should be posted/fenced by the Trust to keep trespassers out. Mr. Pavlakis indicated his desire to have a clear indication from the Commission/staff concerning the fencing/boundary delineation. Commissioner Rogers felt that Condition 6 requiring Mr. Welter to work with staff should be adequate and that Mr. Welter should not be required to fence the Trust/City property. If the area was more developed, then he could justify the requirement.

Mr. Joiner felt that Mr. Pavlakis was requesting an impediment to trespassing. The current condition of the area was described to indicate reasons for his request. It encourages people to illegally dump materials on the site as indicated by a stack of tires which were recently left. Once Lyn Marie removes the remaining materials and returns the property to its base, the signage and boulders may prohibit this dumping. These issues are just now being explored by City staff along with environmental and degradation concerns. A fence may or may not solve the problem. He also hoped that Mr. Welter and his clients are not held responsible for illegal dumping by others.

Chairperson Christianson suggested that Mr. Welter place totem poles in process along the boundary. Mr. Welter felt that if he had finished works, he would display them on the south side of the building as it is more visible from the highway. (1-2192) He could see "storing the poles laying down" along the boundary. They would not be standing. If needed they would be replaced with another pole. His raw materials could be laid end to end as a delineation. If one is removed, it would be replaced. Chairperson Christianson indicated this was a stipulation. Mr. Joiner stated that Lyn Marie could place the logs and had agreed to place the boulders. The boulders could be placed in such a manner as to secure the logs. This would make them difficult to be removed/replaced. Clarification by Chairperson Christianson indicated that this would be south of the City property. Mr. Joiner agreed to work with the applicant on this concept.

Mr. Pavlakis expressed a willingness, as a good neighbor, to work with staff and the applicant so that the City's property is protected. The tenant will know exactly where the boundary line is and what the customers and he can use. He agreed that his clients could fence, however, the applicants and their clients needed to understand the limits of his parcel. Mr. Welter felt that this could be accomplished without a fence. Chairperson Christianson agreed with Mr. Pavlakis and felt that as long as everyone knew where the line is and people are not driving through the other properties, it should be acceptable. Mr. Welter iterated that he would not need that area. Additional public comments were solicited but none given.

Commissioner Farley moved to approve U-00/01-05, a special use permit application from Matthew G. Welter, property owner Carl Norris, to allow outdoor display of merchandise for a period not to exceed 120 days on property zoned General Commercial, located at 5100 South Carson Street, APN 9-301-06, 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 Rogers seconded the motion. Following a request for an amendment, Commissioner Farley amended her motion to include a change to Condition 7 from May 15 to June 15 and to August 15 to October 15. Commissioner Rogers concurred. Mr. Joiner stated for the record that the applicant had stipulated to cooperating regarding putting the logs down for delineation of the property line and, although there was no one present to agree to it, he wished to put on the record that Lyn Marie Trucking had agreed to putting the boulders back to secure those. Commissioner Rogers indicated his understanding that Condition 6 on the landscaping plans which must be approved by staff included this stipulation. Mr. Joiner expressed his desire to have it clearly on the record as Mr. Pavlakis had requested it. Commissioner Christianson felt that the record was clear enough. Commissioners Farley and Rogers concurred. The motion was voted and carried 5-0.

F-8. U-00/01-4 - DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON A SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FROM HELAINE JESSE, REPRESENTING WESTERN NEVADA COMMUNITY COLLEGE (1-0315) -

Vice President of Institutional Advancement for Western Nevada Community College and Applicant Helaine Jesse, Architect Max Hershenow, Principal Planner Rob Joiner, Attorney Scott Heaton who represented the Charles Herman Estate, Senior Planner Juan Guzman, Senior Engineer John Givlin - Commissioner Sedway stepped from the room during Chairperson Christianson's reading of the title--3:57 p.m. (A quorum was still present although Commissioners Larkin and Mally were also absent.) Ms. Jesse briefly described the request and expressed her agreement with staff's findings with the exception of two conditions. Mr. Hershenow highlighted the project's consistency with the master plan which were included in staff's findings. His comments included a brief description of the project. Ms. Jesse displayed a model of the observatory and described/illustrated its state of the art features. Discussion between Ms. Jesse and Chairperson Christianson explained the location proposed for the facility. Ms. Jesse clarified the area to be bermed as that where the parking lot and observatory are. They would not berm the entire western slope of Nye Lane as indicated in the staff report. She also noted that Murphy Drive is in a RTC paving master plan program and that the College would not pave it. The college would pave

West Nye Lane to the access roadway. The access route was noted. Mr. Joiner then highlighted the staff report including the mitigation efforts undertaken to minimize the adjacent property owner's concerns.

Mr. Heaton described his clients' concerns regarding the impact on the residence across the street from the project site and its property value. Purportedly real estate brokers and potential buyers have expressed concerns about the extension of West Nye Lane. This would place the street in front of the Herman residence literally adjacent and next to the house. Phase 2 of the project creates a 51 space parking lot with an exit adjacent to the house. This was a large impact on the residence. He suggested that the street not be extended and that access/egress be from the current terminus of Nye Lane. His contact with contractor Ron Kipp indicated that the project could be located more than the indicated 100 feet. He urged the Commission and applicant to move the facility as far as possible from the right-of-way. This would reduce the impact on his clients. If the building is built into the hillside, this would also reduce the impact on the aesthetics. The residence had been appraised and was valued at \$450,000 in the IRS estate documents. Discussion with the Commission indicated that Murphy Lane is not currently connected to Nye Lane. The access could not be from Murphy Lane due to the V&T right-of-way and is not considered practical. Discussion indicated that if the western portion of the parking lot access loop is eliminated, the traffic impact would be reduced. The residence had been on the market for \$450,000 for over a year. The price was recently reduced to \$397,500. Commissioner Farley noted that some homes do not sell at the appraised value and that this could be one. Mr. Heaton indicated that a second appraisal had not been obtained. Brokers and potential buyers had voiced the development as a concern. He did not feel that an appraiser in Carson City would point to the College project as a negative impact on a residence's value. If the estate's executor had known that construction was imminent, the appraiser would have been asked to consider it in the valuation. The estate must maintain the value due to the estate documents. His personal tour of the site indicated that if Nye Lane is not extended and the setback is increased, there would be some individuals who would be interested in living in the area. Commissioner Rogers explained the need to have a loop for buses. Mr. Heaton's suggestion eliminated the loop. Mr. Heaton indicated he had suggested to Mr. Guzman that another access point be provided as the College has a lot of property in the area. If the building is moved 150 to 200 feet further back, a second access could be provided from Nye Lane with the loop. They had not hired an engineer to analyze the feasibility of this suggestion. Phase 2 may also provide another access which would not be from Nye Lane. Additional public comments were solicited but none provided.

Ms. Jesse expressed a willingness to work with Mr. Heaton on the issues. She was willing to access the observatory from one access for Phase 1 and not extend West Nye Lane; however, she wished to reserve the right to extend West Nye Lane to the property for Phase 2. Efforts are underway to develop an access through State Lands' property from Timberline. The building could not be relocated. Low lighting, berming, landscaping, a lowered pad level and the single entrance from the roadway had been included in an attempt to mitigate the impact. The College had been deeded the property in 1972. The Hermans acquired their parcel in 1975 and built on it in 1978. The classes will be conducted at night and have between 20 to 30 individuals per class. The use is very quiet and should create the least amount of intrusion. The Fire Department had approved the project so long as the Code is followed.

Mr. Hershenow described the ADA requirements. The loop allows handicapped parking/unloading as close to the building as possible. It also provides bus loading/unloading. The grade was described and could impact the ability to meet these needs if the loop is eliminated. The observatory and the parking lot were in the first phase of the project. The bus drop for the planetarium has yet to be designed. Issues which would have to be evaluated in order to meet the access and turnaround requirements were noted. Access from Timberline will require a major structure. Commissioner Rogers indicated his understanding of the Applicants' comments as being that the applicants were willing to accommodate the request in the first phase and try during the second phase but reserve the right, if there is no other option, to extend the street. Ms. Jesse agreed. Mr. Guzman indicated that this was a stipulation.

Mr. Givlin indicated he did not have a problem with phasing the improvements. Nye Lane has been identified as a corridor for other improvements in the foreseeable future. The special planning area for hillside development has designated Nye Lane as a critical component for the development of the area to the west. The College may wish to reserve a portion of their property in that area for future expansion which will require the extension of Nye Lane. He did not feel that it is appropriate to deny the extension for one residence. Efforts had been undertaken to

minimize the impacts.

Commissioner Rogers suggested that Condition 9 be amended that future landscaping and parking lot plans will be reviewed by staff for approval. This would give the College an option to work with staff on those issues rather than committing to a specific solution. This could also involve the property owner(s). Ms. Jesse agreed. Commissioner Rogers moved to approve U-00/01-4, a special use permit application from Helaine Jesse, representing Western Nevada Community College, property owner: Board of Regents, to allow the construction of an observatory building approximately 2600 square feet and an exploratorium/planetariums building approximately 6000 square feet on property zoned Public located at 2201 West College Parkway, APN 7-092-82, based on seven findings and subject to nine conditions of approval contained in the staff report with a modification of Condition No. 9 that a sentence be added that Phase 2 development for parking and landscaping, that staff will participate in the development and planning phases of the parking and landscaping in Phase 2. Ms. Jesse questioned whether this included financial participation. Commissioner Rogers amended the motion to remove participate and added consult. Ms. Jesse agreed. Commissioner Wipfli seconded the motion. Motion carried 4-0-1-2. Commissioner Sedway returned--4:32 p.m. (A quorum was present although Commissioners Larkin and Mally were absent.)

F-9. U-99/00-20a - DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON A REQUEST FROM NANCY C. DAVIS (1-0046) - Withdrawn.

F-10. A-00/01-1 - DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON A REQUEST FROM BRUCE LANGSON TO AMEND CCMC 18.06.270 (1-2310) - Deputy District Attorney Neil Rombardo explained that the item should be continued due to pending litigation. Senior Planner Juan Guzman agreed. (Commissioner Sedway stepped from the room during the discussion--5:53 p.m. A quorum was still present although Commissioners Larkin and Mally were absent.) Commissioner Rogers moved to continue Item F-10 until the City brings it back. Commissioner Wipfli seconded the motion. Motion carried 4-0.

F-11. V-98/99-15 - DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON A REQUEST FROM JEFF WILLIAMS (1-2355) - Community Development Director Walter Sullivan, Jeff Williams - Commissioner Sedway returned during Mr. Sullivan's introduction--5:56 p.m. (A quorum was present although Commissioners Mally and Larkin were absent.) Mr. Williams indicated he had read the report and explained the need for the extension. Public testimony was solicited but none given. Commissioner Wipfli moved to approve a one-year extension of a previously approved variance to May 2001, V-98/99-15, a request from Jeff and Michelle Williams to vary from side yard setbacks on property zoned Single Family One Acre located at 3793 Meadowood Road, APN 7-194-09 subject to the original variance conditions of approval. Commissioner Sedway seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

Mr. Sullivan indicated that the special use permit will be brought back for an extension. Mr. Williams indicated he understood that the extension is to May 2001.

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 (1-2494) - Community Development Director Sullivan explained the Board's action regarding the change of land use ordinance from mobile home to retail commercial on second reading. The three abandonments for Silver Oaks and the Weikel tentative subdivision map are to be considered on September 7.

(1-2550) Commissioner Sedway thanked staff for the planning law book which he received in the mail. Mr. Sullivan explained that Mr. Canfield had compiled the book. No formal action was required or taken.

2. FUTURE COMMISSION ITEMS AND DATES (1-2423) - Mr. Sullivan requested a special workshop be held during the month to discuss the staff presentation process and format. Chairperson Christianson indicated he would not be available September 15 and 16. The Commissioners were to check their calendars and

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the August 30, 2000, Meeting
Page 8

contact Mr. Sullivan's office. Mr. Sullivan suggested that the pertinent laws contained in the planning law book be covered during the workshop. Chairperson Christianson asked that 10 or 15 minutes at a future meeting be dedicated to conflict of interest. Comments indicated that the workshop could include this item. Mr. Rombardo explained a previous discussion concerning amending the By-Laws and offered to work with the Commission on it. The By-Laws included a higher standard for conflict of interest than mandated by the Statutes. No formal action was taken or required.

H. ADJOURNMENT (1-2622) - Commissioner Wipfli moved to adjourn. Chairperson Christianson seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously. Chairperson Christianson adjourned the meeting at 6:05 p.m.

The Minutes of the August 30, 2000, Carson City Planning Commission meeting

ARE SO APPROVED ON__September 27__,

2000.

_____/s/_____

Allan Christianson, Chairperson