

CARSON CITY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION  
Minutes of the June 30, 1999, Meeting  
Page 1

A regularly scheduled meeting of the Carson City Regional Planning Commission was held on Wednesday, June 30, 1999, at the Community Center Sierra Room, 851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada, beginning at 3:30 p.m.

**PRESENT:** Chairperson Verne Horton, Vice Chairperson Allan Christianson, and Commissioners Keith Larkin, William Mally, Alan Rogers, and Roger Sedway

**STAFF PRESENT:** Community Development Director Walter Sullivan, Deputy District Attorney Melanie Bruketta, Senior Planner Sandra Danforth, Senior Engineer John Givlin, and Recording Secretary Katherine McLaughlin (R.P.C. 6/30/99 Tape 1-0001)

**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 Horton convened the meeting at 3:30 p.m. Roll call was taken. The entire Commission was present, constituting a quorum. Chairperson Horton lead the Pledge of Allegiance.

**B. DISCUSSION AND ACTION TO APPROVE MEETING MINUTES FOR MAY 13 AND MAY 26, 1999 (1-0013) -** Commissioner Mally moved to accept the Minutes as presented. Commissioner Christianson seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.

**C. PUBLIC COMMENTS (1-0021) -** None.

**D. MODIFICATIONS TO THE AGENDA (1-0030) -** None.

**E. DISCLOSURES (1-0034) -** Commissioner Wipfli indicated that Wayne Chimarusti is his attorney and that he would abstain on this item. Commissioner Mally noted his tenure on the Commission and that he lived within two blocks of the Genescritti's. He then indicated that he had never and would not now abstain on this issue.

**F. CONSENT AGENDA (1-0048)**

**F-1. D-98/99-7 - DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON A REQUEST FROM CARSON CITY ON THE DEDICATION OF STREET RIGHT-OF-WAY**

**F-2. D-98/99-8 - DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON A REQUEST FROM CARSON CITY ON THE DEDICATION OF STREET RIGHT-OF-WAY -** Commissioner Wipfli moved to approve the Consent Agenda Items F-1 and F-2 as read. Commissioner Christianson seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.

**G. PUBLIC HEARING**

**G-1. U-98/99-63 - DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON A SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FROM PONDEROSA BIBLE BAPTIST CHURCH (1-0075) -** Dr. James M. Ranspot, Senior Planner Sandra Danforth, Deputy District Attorney Melanie Bruketta, Senior Engineer John Givlin, Community Development Director Walter Sullivan, (1-0252) Alan Clover, Bob Hilderbrand, Paul Sennett, Roy Robinson, Bill Presswood, Bob Duggan, Deborah Hilderbrand, Gary Handelin, Roxanne Presswood, Janet Riggs, Mary Vanderbeck, Molly Sennett - Dr. Ranspot briefly described the project. Discussion between the staff and the Commission explained that the e-mail in opposition to the project had been based on traffic and the size of the structure. The parcel is two acres. Mr. Givlin explained the Development Engineering's sidewalk requirement which is based on the Code. As it is a rural area, the Commission may wish to override staff on this issue. Ms. Bruketta informed the Commission that as it is a Code requirement, it should be mandated. Mr. Givlin then explained the development agreement process which could delay construction until adjoining property(ies) install sidewalk(s) or until a

CARSON CITY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the June 30, 1999, Meeting

Page 2

specified date. Mr. Sullivan explained that the Commission would have final say over the permit unless the item is appealed to the Board of Supervisors. He wished that staff had spent more time discussing this issue. Rural areas are not normally required to have sidewalks, therefore, the residential areas will not have sidewalks. The church will have the only sidewalk. He did not feel that the Commission should decide the issue. Mr. Givlin again indicated that it is a Code requirement, therefore, it should be a condition on the application. Chairperson Horton noted that the applicant could appeal this condition to the Board if so desired.

(1-0252) Public testimony was solicited. Opposition to the project was due to the impact it would have on the rural area, the parking lot lights, size of the building, the traffic volume, failure to conform with the neighborhood, the lack of a traffic study, the aesthetics, the noise which would be generated by the facility, lack of adequate parking for large church functions, dust concerns, the possibility that a school will be added to the church functions, the size of the congregation, the potential impact on property values, noise created by air conditioning units and during outdoor functions, and the potential that it would open the way for other uses and variances in the neighborhood.

Mr. Presswood requested the fencing requirement be modified to mandate a solid wood fence rather than chainlink. This will reduce the glare from headlights. He also suggested the lighting be placed against the fence and turned to face the church rather than on the church facing the residences. The air conditioning units should be placed on the Damon Road side of the building away from the residences. Clarification indicated that he had signed the petition supporting the application and, based on his current knowledge of the facility, now opposed it. Ms. Presswood suggested the church locate on Snyder or Edmonds which already have churches on them.

Discussion between the Commission and staff indicated that a 12,000 square foot house could be constructed on the one acre parcel if the setback requirements are met. The Code requirements mandate lighting be shielded to reduce the impact on adjacent property. This issue is checked during plan review. The parking requires 111 spaces which is based on the size of the worship area. The plan provides 113 spaces. The plan also indicates that the parking lot will not be generally lighted. The lights will be attached to the building at the entrances. Mr. Givlin explained that the street improvements will provide on-street parking. Weekend church functions normally do not create traffic problems. He agreed that the use will create more Sunday traffic than the neighborhood normally experiences. Commissioner Sedway explained the five foot bollard lighting proposed for the Hospital parking lot.

Dr. Ranspot explained that the lighting will be affixed to the building and directed downward for a short distance from the entrances. It will not be scattered throughout the parking area. The parking area will be very dimly lit. The parking lot will not be solid asphalt. There will be beautifully landscaped areas with trees and other native plants. It will be an asset to the area. Reasons for submitting plans for a 12,700 foot building were based on the inability to enlarge the facility after it is constructed. He had met with a majority of the residents. He felt that the residents should have contacted him so that he could have addressed their problems. He had personally talked with all of the residents within the 300 foot radius of the property lines. He felt that his traffic would be on Sundays from 10 to 12 and 7 to 8:30 and on Thursdays from 7 to 8. Neighborhood churches had always been a concept in the United States as that is whom the churches serve. All church going individuals leave their neighborhood to attend churches in another neighborhood. The church will be a tremendous asset to the community. He offered to work with the community and address all of the problems. There would not be a school at the site. The membership is very "missionary" orientated. Churches are located in Reno, Fallon, and Fernley, Nevada, and Doyle, California. A great deal of his members will be serving in those areas and not at the church on Sundays. The parking area is required by the Code and is based on the size of the inside worship center. He had offered to install a solid wood fence on top of the chainlink fence with slats to the neighbors. He wanted to work with his neighbors. Ninety-nine percent of the activities occur inside. The small youth may be outside on occasion. The majority of the outside youth activities will require busing the children to a park for special events as the majority of the site will be used for the church and parking. Reasons he had selected the site were described.

Commissioner Wipfli noted his original concerns, however, as there had not originally been any neighborhood opposition, he was willing to accept it. He supported the concept of having neighborhood churches. The size of the building may have been "shooting for the moon" and fatal. More communication with the neighbors may have

CARSON CITY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the June 30, 1999, Meeting

Page 3

addressed their concerns before the meeting. The project will create a major change to the neighborhood. He suggested that the applicant attempt to work with the neighbors and return at a future meeting. Commissioner Larkin supported his comments.

Dr. Ranspot indicated that he had talked to a majority of the residents within 300 feet of the property and had circulated the petition. He had also attempted to be available for comments. Discussion compared the landscaping plans for proposed church to that of an existing Baptist Church on Edmonds.

Commissioner Rogers described the influence living next door to a church had had on him as a youth. He felt that the good such facilities provide outweighs the inconvenience experienced by the neighborhood. The inconvenience is very occasional as cited by his personal example. Commissioner Rogers then moved to approve U-98/99-63, a special use permit request from the Ponderosa Bible Baptist Church, Dr. James M. Ranspot, Pastor, Faylor Family Trust Agreement property owner, to allow a church within a Single Family One Acre residential zoning district located at the southeast corner of South Edmonds Drive and Damon Road, APNs 10-133-10 and 10-133-12, based on seven findings and subject to 13 conditions of approval contained in the staff report with the understanding that any acknowledgments to the Commission/Board by the applicant may be considered as further stipulations or conditions of approval, and noted that there had been a comment/stipulation by the Pastor that a solid fence would be agreeable to the church, which he felt was the only change to the conditions. Commissioner Christianson seconded the motion. In response to Commissioner Mally's question, Commissioner Rogers indicated he preferred to allow the applicant to appeal Condition 7 to the Board rather than delete it at the Commission level as the Board has the authority to waive the condition; not the Commission. The motion was then voted and carried 5-2 with Commissioners Wipfli and Larkin voting no. Mr. Sullivan explained that there is an appeal process and urged anyone wishing to appeal the decision to contact his office. The appeal process had to be completed within 15 days.

**G-2. M-98/99-14 - DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON THE AMENDMENTS TO CCMC SECTION 18 (1-0925)** - Senior Planner Danforth, Deputy District Attorney Bruketta, Community Development Director Sullivan, Bill Landry, Chamber of Commerce Vice President Larry Osborne, Dwight Millard - Discussion between the Commission and Mrs. Danforth indicated that families with children could not be precluded from using the facilities. For this reason it was felt that it may be appropriate to require play areas for children. The current and proposed landscaping requirements and the differences between Option I and Option II were discussed. Ms. Bruketta clarified her memo as having related to a previous ordinance draft. Mrs. Danforth felt that Option II gave the Health Department control over the transient lodging facilities. Option I eliminated their ability to inspect the facility(ies). Ms. Bruketta expressed her feeling that the Health Department does not at this time inspect lodging facilities. Mr. Sullivan distributed copies of some flyers he had obtained in Sacramento to the Commission. (These items were to be returned to him after the discussion.) His investigation of the concept was then explained. His reasons for supporting 180 day stays and Option II were noted.

(1-1400) Public comments were solicited. Mr. Landry explained his major plan review for an extended stay hotel at the south end of Carson City and his support for Option I with ten modifications. They were to allow stays of less than one year; eliminate the child play area; eliminate some hotels from the Growth Management requirements; define a kitchen as anything with a wet bar or microwave; landscaping should be 100 square feet per unit plus the other items; transient occupancy should be defined as less than one year; parking to be one space per unit, although he agreed to have the applicant show to staff a designated landscaped area which could be converted at a future date to additional parking spaces and that the market be allowed to dictate when this transfer should occur; flexibility in the requirements so as to allow staff the ability to indicate when a good faith effort by the applicant had been shown by his/her implementation of items above and beyond that required by code to waive/reduce/postpone other conditions rather than require the applicant to appeal staff's conditions to the Commission for a hearing thereby delaying the project; and to reduce the landscaping and setback requirement to a blank wall to five feet rather than the required ten feet. He requested a decision by the Commission this evening due to the time it had already taken to reach this point and desire to move his project forward.

Discussion between Mr. Sullivan and the Commission indicated that the 180 day restriction may be self-regulating. Mr. Landry reiterated his request for action this evening and his reluctance to spend any more money on his

CARSON CITY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the June 30, 1999, Meeting

Page 4

project until the ordinance amendment is adopted. Commissioner Christianson explained the reasons the Growth Management restriction could not be removed. Mr. Sullivan indicated that if the Commission adopts Option I Growth Management is required. Option II does not change the current Growth Management requirements--only hotels using more than 7,500 gallons of water a day must be approved by the Commission. Apartments must meet Growth Management requirements on an allotment bases of one for one. Mr. Landry then explained his definition of a hotel which is to provide lodging for planned, unstipulated stays ranging from one day to less than one year. Differences between hotels and apartments were listed--short notification periods prior to leaving, i.e., one day versus 30 days; one day minimal periods of stay as compared to a lease requirement ranging from 30 days to six months; reservations for a hotel room are for a room rather than a specific room whereas apartment numbers are specified in leases; the lack of a deposit requirement, etc. Hotels provide more flexibility. He was also concerned that the lack of regulations in Reno and South Lake and the imposition more stringent regulations by Carson City could place him at a competitive disadvantage. Commissioner Wipfli responded by expressing his desire to make it advantages for transients to reside in apartments and avoid granting too much leeway so that the facility does not have adequate parking, landscaping, etc. Mrs. Danforth explained her reasons for not having provided a response to Mr. Landry's suggested modifications. She could not support the proposal to allow stays of less than one year. The need for a child play area was left to the Commission. She was unsure whether to support the Growth Management recommendation, however, the units would be serving as an apartment. The definition of a kitchen was provided which is in the Code. She did not wish to include a wet bar in the description. A microwave and a hot plate are considered a cooking utility. Staff recommends 180 days. Mr. Landry wanted less than one year. She supported having an adaptable use area available which could provide additional parking spaces if needed at a future date. She supported his recommendation that staff be allowed to determine when the area should be converted as the number of complaints/the amount of on-street parking would dictate the conversion date. Mr. Landry explained his reasons for recommending five feet of landscaping adjacent to a blank wall. Mr. Sullivan indicated his support of Mrs. Danforth's comments.

Commissioner Rogers suggested a third alternative which would have the issues discussed and resolved by staff. The items which had been presented should be developed into guidelines with incentives. He suggested retaining the current ordinances and creating a conditional use for an extended stay. This would allow the developer to work out the plan with staff and present it to the Commission for review. This would leave the Commission to determine the period of time for an extended stay facility. Advantages of the program were noted. (Commissioner Mally stepped from the room during his comments--5:15 p.m. A quorum was still present.) Mrs. Danforth indicated that the committee had analyzed this option. She explained the time which had been spent on the concept and the reasons it was rejected. Commissioner Rogers felt that the flexibility provided by a conditional use would make it easier for a developer to provide a better product. Mr. Landry urged the Commission to support his proposal granting staff flexibility due to the time which had been taken to reach this point. (Commissioner Mally returned--5:19 p.m.)

(1-1896) Public testimony was solicited. Mr. Osborne indicated that the Chamber had been involved in the process. The original concept had created a lot of confusion. Several hotels/motels had not been aware that they could not rent beyond 28 days. (Commissioner Wipfli stepped from the room during his comments--5:21 p.m. A quorum was still present.) He suggested that a third category of establishment be created. This would leave the current ordinances for hotels and apartments as they are. His members supported the second draft. The length of stay should be established by the Commission. He also noted that the current 28 day period is not enforced at this time. He did not feel that the 180 day stay would be enforced. The market place will assist in determining the parking requirements and demand for this type of facility. Hotels are more expensive over time than apartments. Apartments require a larger upfront deposit. Concerns with option I were noted. He expressed a willingness to continue working with staff on the concept. He supported Mr. Landry and his project as there is a need for this type of a facility but it should have a level playing field with the other operations. He supported alternative II. He also indicated that Mr. Landry felt that he could start his project until option II. Discussion indicated that if option I is implemented and a current hotel operation decides to provide extended stay services, it must retrofit its establishment in order to convert to an extended stay provider. The Chamber had not considered Commissioner Rogers' suggestion of a conditional use. (Commissioner Wipfli returned at 5:25 p.m. The entire Commission was present constituting a quorum.)

(1-2048) Mr. Millard suggested that option II on page 6 be modified to define transient occupancy as a period not

CARSON CITY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the June 30, 1999, Meeting

Page 5

to exceed 28 days. This is less than one month which indicates a transient. Stays over 28 days are exempt from room tax. He also suggested a definition for extended stay occupancy which means for the purposes of title 18 occupation of a hotel facility on a non-permanent basis not to exceed 180 consecutive days. Permanent would be anything longer than six months. This would mean that business licenses would be issued for hotels/motel or an apartment house. A hotel should be defined as someone who offers extended stay or 50 percent of the rooms will be offered for transient lodging on any given day. (Commissioner Sedway stepped from the room at 5:35 p.m. A quorum was still present.) Examples of these definitions were provided. Option I is not workable as indicated by the suggestion that land be held for future parking. Discussion indicated that he has motels and apartments. He offers both six month leases and leases for shorter periods. He also indicated that it may not cost more to stay in an extended stay facility than to rent an apartment. He could rent his apartments by the week if he chose to do so. Concerns regarding the Building Code were noted. Examples of the need for an extended stay facility were also cited. (Commissioner Sedway returned at 5:40 p.m. The entire Commission was present constituting a quorum.)

Mr. Sullivan indicated that he did not wish to enforce the length of stay restriction. Mr. Millard's suggestions had merit. He was aware of Mr. Landry's desire to commence construction. He suggested a clause be added to the revisions which would allow the manager to remain beyond the period of time which is specified. Discussion ensued concerning whether one parking space per unit was adequate. Commissioner Wipfli expressed his desire to require compliance with the Growth Management regulations due to the impact the use would have on schools, Fire, etc. He did not wish to provide a low cost housing unit which did not meet its standards. Mr. Millard agreed that it would provide an impact on the community and had not thought about the other impacts on the community beyond water. Commissioner Wipfli supported option II with a one year review and having staff deal with the other issues. Mr. Millard supported having another meeting on the topic and for the developer to make his presentation. Commissioner Wipfli also expressed the desire to assist Mr. Landry. Commissioner Rogers expounded on his reasons for wishing to have a review period. He was concerned about having the Health Department perform an inspection and having quality projects.

(1-2352) Additional public comments were solicited but none given.

Chairperson Horton expressed a desire to continue the matter even though he understood the problems which may be imposed upon Mr. Landry. He supported having staff explore Commissioner Rogers' idea. Discussion ensued concerning when a special meeting could be held on this topic. As staff had submitted the application, Mr. Sullivan indicated a willingness to continue the matter to the next regularly scheduled meeting. Consensus supported having a review process such as that used by the special use permit, including in the definitions one for a transit hotel for a 28 day period and an extended stay of 180 days with apartments handling any over that period, and the 50 percent rental to transients, and to have a clause regarding manager's units. Commissioner Wipfli moved to continue the item to the next regularly scheduled meeting. Commissioner Mally seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.

BREAK: A seven minute recess was declared at 5:48 p.m. The entire Commission was present when Chairperson Horton reconvened the meeting at 5:55 p.m., constituting a quorum.

**G-3. DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON A REQUEST TO AMEND THE RESIDENTIAL DESIGN GUIDELINES FOR SILVER STATE CONSULTANTS (1-2475)** - Senior Planner Juan Guzman, Rita M. Lenart Hoppe - Clarification indicated that aluminum siding could be used for the roof of the structure. The use of fiberglass for a window is prohibited. Mr. Larkin indicated that he had forgotten about this issue when disclosures had been requested earlier. His company works for Silver Oaks on occasion. He is not under contract to them at this time. This relationship would not impact his decision. He then explained his knowledge of the material which indicated that instead of using redwood, the aluminum siding is painted to look like redwood. Mr. Guzman then explained the telephone calls received on this item which were handled by staff and involved clarification of the request. He did not feel that there had been any opposition voiced about the item.

(1-2555) Public testimony was solicited. Chairperson Horton and Commissioner Christianson explained for Ms. Hoppe that the Commission was considering a CC&R issue rather than the homeowners association is due to the City guideline restrictions on the use of fiberglass and aluminum siding. The CC&R issue with the homeowners

association does not involve the City. Silver Oak may still control the homeowners association as the development has not been fifty percent sold out. Additional public comments were solicited but none given.

Discussion ensued on whether to restrict the aluminum to redwood like or to allow any type of aluminum. Mr. Guzman felt that the design review committee could control the appearance without the restriction. Chairperson Horton expressed a desire to not have any aluminum with an "Alcoa" appearance. Commissioner Mally moved that the Planning Commission accept the proposed change to Section 5.8 Accessory Structures by allowing the use of aluminum as a construction material in order to create shade on patio and garden structures only if located within the rear yards. Commissioner Wipfli seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.

**G-4. U-98/99-65 - DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON A SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FROM CITY PARKS AND RECREATION DIRECTOR (1-2664)** - Senior Planner Guzman, Parks and Recreation Director Steve Kastens, Community Development Director Sullivan - There are not earthquake faults at the site. Discussion explained the purpose of the facility and noted its "ugliness". Mr. Sullivan recommended deletion of Condition 8. Mr. Kastens agreed to the remaining conditions of approval. Mr. Sullivan noted the condition restricting construction hours to 7:30 a.m. to 7:30 p.m. Mr. Kastens agreed. Mr. Sullivan also indicated that the landscaping plans were not required at this stage of the process, however, would be required when a building permit is requested. Mr. Kastens again agreed. Public testimony was solicited but none given. Commissioner Rogers moved to approve U-98/99-65, a special use permit for Carson City allowing the development of a communications/dispatch center on property zoned Public located on the west side of Ross Gold Park, APN 9-166-01 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 and eliminated Condition No. 8. Commissioner Christianson seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0. Mr. Sullivan indicated for the record that notifications had been sent to all of the property owners within 300 feet which required notification to 20 adjacent properties as it is in a single family one acre area. No comments were received in response to the notification.

**G-5. U-98/99-36 - DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON A SIX MONTH REVIEW OF A PREVIOUSLY APPROVED SPECIAL USE PERMIT FROM FRANK L. GENESCRIPTI (1-2815)** - Senior Planner Guzman - Discussion indicated the special use permit had six months remaining on it before it expires. This is the timeframe for compliance. Neither the applicant nor his representative were present. Public testimony was solicited but none given. Chairperson Horton supported sending the letter as staff had suggested and that it be worded in such a fashion that it indicates the Commission's expectation of cooperation and disappointment that more effort has not occurred. Discussion indicated that the building permit had expired and that Mr. Genescritti would have to reapply for one. The special use permit expires on December 2. Mr. Guzman felt that staff would ask the Board to take enforcement action at that time if compliance does not occur. Commissioner Rogers pointed out that Commission action on the suggested letter is not necessary and suggested that staff proceed with the letter. No formal action was taken on the item based on the direction provided.

**G-6. U-98/99-62 - DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON A SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FROM BETH SKIPWORTH (1-2980)** - Community Development Director Sullivan, Beth Skipworth - Discussion noted the Code revision which would allow this use in the downtown area. Ms. Skipworth had read the staff report and concurred with it. Discussion noted her plan to open on July 1. Public testimony was solicited but none given. Commissioner Wipfli moved to approve U-98/99-62, a special use permit application from Beth Skipworth, Encore Consignment, property owner: First National Bank of Nevada Trust in care of Wells Fargo Bank Trustees, to allow a used clothing store on property zoned Downtown Commercial located at 208 North Carson Street, APN 3-213-02, 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 or Board by the applicant may be considered as further stipulations or conditions of approval on this application. Commissioner Mally seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.

**G-7. U-98/99-64 - DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON A SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FROM LES KYNETT (1-3110)** - Community Development Director Sullivan, Les Kynett - Mr. Kynett indicated he liked the staff report. Public testimony was solicited but none given. Commissioner Christianson moved to

CARSON CITY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the June 30, 1999, Meeting

Page 7

approve U-98/99-64, a special use permit request from Leslie and Joanne Kynett to allow expansion of an existing nonconforming use by allowing construction within the required side and rear yard setbacks on property located at 408 West Third Street, APN 3-122-04, 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 Wipfli seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.

**G-8. V-98/99-16 - DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON A VARIANCE REQUEST FROM WAYNE CHIMARUSTI (1-3238)** - Community Development Director Sullivan, Wayne Chimarusti - Commissioner Wipfli left the room at 6:28 p.m. (A quorum was still present.) Mr. Chimarusti concurred with the staff report and indicated he had contacted all of his immediate neighbors who had signed off on the project. A copy of their signatures was provided to the Commission and Clerk. Public testimony was solicited but none given. Commissioner Mally moved that the Planning Commission approve V-98/99-16, a variance request from Wayne and Sally Chimarusti to vary seven feet from the required ten foot rear yard setback and to vary three feet from the required ten foot side street yard setback on property zoned Single Family 6,000 located at 610 North Phillips Street, APN 3-275-02, based on five findings and subject to five conditions of approval contained in the staff report and with the understanding that any acknowledgements to the Commission or Board by the applicant may be considered as further stipulations or conditions of approval on this application. Commissioner Christianson seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0-0-1 with Commissioner Wipfli absent.

**G-9. V-98/99-17 - DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON A VARIANCE REQUEST FROM PETE SEARS (1-3416)** - Community Development Director Sullivan, Pete Sears - Commissioner Wipfli returned to the dais--6:33 p.m. (The entire Commission was present constituting a quorum.) Mr. Sears explained the need for a second sign and the location. Commissioner Larkin explained that his firm had worked on the building but did not feel that this would create a conflict of interest. Public testimony was solicited but none given. Commissioner Christianson moved to approve V-98/99-17, a variance request from Pete Sears, property owner William Schneider, to exceed the height allowance within a shopping center development on property zoned General Commercial located at 4349 South Carson Street, 135 East Clearview Drive, APNs 9-161-15, 16, and 17, based on five 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 and Wipfli seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.

**G-10. M-98/99-12 - DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON THE STATUS OF REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION DECISIONS APPEALED TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS (1-3465)** - Community Development Director Sullivan explained the Board's request for a status report on the number of appeals which had been made of Planning Commission decisions. Between five and six percent of the Commission items are appealed to the Board. The Board upholds the Commission's action 67 percent of the time. On occasion the Board will return items to the Commission for reconsideration. A comparison to Reno, Sparks, Washoe and Douglas was explained. A five year review indicates an average of five percent of the items are appealed to the Board. Seventy-nine percent of the appeals are filed by the applicant. Twenty-one percent are appealed by the neighbors. The Board's review of 32 appeals upheld 19, reversed six, and returned six to the Commission. It is estimated that the Commission's ability to take final action on these applications saved the Board approximately 53 hours if an average discussion period of one-half hour is used. This would require a third meeting every month for just the Planning Commission items. Discussion also noted the time advantage provided the applicants by the process. No formal action was required or taken on this item.

**H. INTERNAL COMMUNICATIONS AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS (NON-ACTION ITEMS) (1-3425)** - Health Director Winkelman explained his conflict in meetings and apologized for not having been present during the discussion regarding the transit occupancy item.

**H-1. STAFF BRIEFING ON STATUS OF COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS AND CORRESPONDENCE TO THE COMMISSION (2-0078)** - Mr. Sullivan reported on the status of the abandonment revisions which should be ready for Commission consideration at the next regular meeting. He then reported on Northridge and Mountain Park final maps including the status of their

CARSON CITY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the June 30, 1999, Meeting

Page 8

landscaping improvements, the Hospital's change of land use application, the fee waiver granted to the Ponderosa Bible Church, the change of land use request for Pineview Way, the Hospital change of land use requests for their parking lots, and the change of land use request for the area east of Clearview and south of Koontz.

**H-2. FUTURE COMMISSION ITEMS AND DATES (2-0110)** - Mr. Sullivan announced the technical training meeting scheduled for Monday, July 26, and encouraged the Commissioners to attend. The regular meeting is scheduled for July 29. The master plan revisions will be discussed at that meeting. Chairperson Horton also encouraged the Commissioners to attend the training session. Mr. Sullivan briefly explained several of the items which would be covered at the session.

**I. ADJOURNMENT (2-0155)** - Commissioner Wipfli moved to adjourn. Commissioner Christianson seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0. Chairperson Horton adjourned the meeting at 6:50 p.m.

The Minutes of the June 30, 1999, Carson City Regional Planning Commission meeting

ARE SO APPROVED ON\_\_August\_25\_\_\_\_,

1999.

\_\_\_\_\_/s/\_\_\_\_\_

Verne Horton, Chairperson