

CARSON CITY REGIONAL PLANNING BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT, AND
MASTER PLAN TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES
of April 10, 1996, Meeting - Page 1

A special Master Plan Update Meeting with the Carson City Regional Planning Commission, Bureau of Land management, and the Master Plan Technical Advisory Committee was held on Wednesday, April 10, 1996, at the Community Center Sierra Room, 851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada, beginning at 6 p.m.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Vice Chairperson Vern Horton, and Commissioners
William Mally, Maxine Nietz, Archie Pozzi, and
Debbie Uhart

STAFF PRESENT: City Manager John Berkich, Community Development
Director Walter Sullivan, Fire Chief Louis Buckley,
Parks and Recreation Director Steve Kastens, Public Works Director
Jay Aldean, Principal Planner Rob Joiner, Deputy Utilities Director Jay Ahrens, Golf Course Specialist Operator
Tom Kunkle, and Recording Secretary Katherine McLaughlin (S.P.C. 4/10/96 Tape 1-0001.5)

BLM REPRESENTATIVE: David Loomis

CONSULTANTS: Randy Walter and Karen Melby

A. ROLL CALL, DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM, AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE - Vice Chairperson Horton convened the meeting at 6:10 p.m. Roll call was taken and a quorum was present although Commissioner Uhart had not yet arrived and Chairperson Rogers and Commissioner Christianson were absent. Vice Chairperson Horton lead the Pledge of Allegiance.

B. PUBLIC COMMENT (1-0016.5) - None.

C. MASTER PLAN UPDATE - C-1. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON THE DRAFT MASTER PLAN LAND USE ELEMENT TEXT AND C-2. REVIEW OF THE MASTER PLAN DRAFT LAND USE MAP (1-0024.5) - Mr. Sullivan explained a procedure for conducting the meeting. He referenced State Division of Lands Administrator Pam Wilcox and Capitol Engineering letters. Public testimony was then solicited. Ms. Wilcox read her letter into the record. Her concerns regarding State lands held for schools and duties were explained. There are approximately 320 acres of such property in Carson City near the Community College. At a time deemed appropriate by the State and City, this land will be sold at a public auction. She was willing to accept the zoning as proposed, however, indicated that at some future date a request will be made to change the zoning to match the adjacent property. She acknowledged the need to do a lot of work before this time arrives. Copies of this letter were distributed to the Commission and Clerk. (Commissioner Uhart arrived during her comments--6:15 p.m. A quorum was present as previously indicated.) Ms. Wilcox was aware of the open space initiative. Staff had discussed this potential with her. The purpose of the school trust lands and its sale procedures were explained. This would require the public entity to be the winning bidder at the auction or if a "value for value" exchange is made for other lands. She was willing to cooperate with the adjacent property owners in a Special Area Plan and in the infrastructure requirements or any other alternatives so long as the purpose is maintained.

Additional public testimony was solicited. Parks and Recreation Chairperson Jay Meierdierck noted the Commission's previous correspondence on the park sites throughout the City. These sites are not designated on the map as of this date. He requested the V&T Trail be added to the map as the Linear Park is included. Neither of the two recently approved park sites in the Northridge Subdivision are included on the map. The Open Space area east of the ByPass is not indicated correctly. The Mark Way park is not designated. Mills Park's shape should be modified to include the section going toward the High School. As the Board of Supervisors had approved a replacement park for the Jail Park, he felt the replacement site should be designated. He also noted that the Silver Oaks Golf Course had not been designated correctly on the map. (1-0205.5) Additional public comments were solicited but none given.

Mr. Joiner then responded to Capital Engineering's letter. There had been four additional meetings added to the process. A comparison of the previous land use density factors with the proposed land use density factors had

CARSON CITY REGIONAL PLANNING BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT, AND
MASTER PLAN TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES
of April 10, 1996, Meeting - Page 2

been made. The population projections from both plans had been compared. The plans are approximately one hundred individuals different in the projections. This was felt to be miniscular. There had been a misunderstanding about having land use designations on areas outside the service area boundaries. The Commission and staff wish to have these areas designated so that service needs can be addressed when planning the area development. The environmental constraints analysis had been used to justify these designations. The land use goals and policies will be used for all master plan amendments, change of land use, and special use permits involving subdivisions and planned unit developments. Parcel maps and building permits will not require them. The uses of these will force the City to be pro-active in its thinking and planning for future growth. Conflicting land uses will be mitigated as reflected in the design guidelines.

(1-0295.5) Mr. Sullivan remarked that a number of the the Technical Committee were present. He talked about there being commercial adjacent to residential and that there could be an impact in terms of noise, deliveries, fumes, etc. He suggested the possibility of introducing smaller areas of neighborhood business in new subdivisions to cut down on vehicle traffic to and from downtown.

(1-0320.5) Mr. Joiner went to Policy 10.1 and said a project applicant can be required to expand the inventory of identified historic architectural and archeological resources as part of the application for development. If so, at what level will the requirements be implemented, e.g. a Master Plan amendment, change of land use, special use permit, subdivision or PUD, parcel map, or building permit. He said they are working on the historic element of the Master Plan and expanding it and that archeological issues are part of it. He said they will be addressing processes and ways of implementing this.

(1-0350.5) Mr. Joiner talked about Policy 12.2 with respect to noise contours around the Carson City Airport. He explained the conditions, one being the definition of LDN criteria which was obtained from the FAA. He also talked about the existing noise contour maps reflecting the 65 LDN contours.

(1-0367.5) He said Policy 12.3 regarding the buffer zones suggested one mile around the airport and what approval would be required from the airport authority for requests for changes in land use or requests for development for projects in the suggested one mile buffer zone. Mr. Sullivan noted that within the one mile buffer around the airport he would refer matters to the Airport Authority for their input and they can make recommendations back to this Commission or the Board of Supervisors. He added that on development type projects they can ask for what is actually an easement which prohibits certain types of lighting that may be distracting to pilots as they are landing and they have the ability to mark the red beacons. Mr. Joiner noted the next question was do you foresee the possibility of the Airport Authority denying a project where proper zoning already exists and could this be construed as a taking. He said that is a legal issue which would be referred to the District Attorney.

(1-0397.5) Mr. Joiner said Policy 13.3 had been put into Title 18 which was the process for Specific Plan Areas (SPA). He felt the size is a minimum of ten acres and that someone can come in and do an SPA.

(11-0401.5) Land use plan implementation strategies were the next subject. Mr. Joiner noted that would be at the discretion of the Planning Commission for subdivisions, PUDs, variances, and special use permits.

(1-0425.5) Policies 1.7.3 and 1.7.3a related to Community Development being responsible for enforcing the alternative design guidelines adopted to minimize and mitigate land use conflict. Mr. Joiner said they would enforce the guidelines as they do now in the Historic District and Downtown Design Guidelines. He added if they expand areas to include other districts or other mechanisms such as multi-family apartment it yet needs to be determined if it would be administrative or discretionary by the Planning Commission.

(1-0431.5) The next question was if a special use permit is required for the eight foot minimum height masonry wall. Mr. Joiner said this is something in design criteria and that they are recommending in certain zoning conflict areas that there be a minimum six foot wall which is allowed before a building permit or special use permit could be issued. He said this is something they would be requiring as a mitigation and perhaps there should be an administrative review by staff instead of having to come before the Planning Commission.

(1-0443.5) The next issue was setbacks that were recommended in design criteria between single family residential

CARSON CITY REGIONAL PLANNING BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT, AND
MASTER PLAN TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES
of April 10, 1996, Meeting - Page 3

and an adjacent industrial project or a major arterial because of mitigation. He said staff is looking at that because they had recommendations for the setback being from the edge of the residence to the edge of the pavement and there were situations where the right-of-way was not completely developed out.

(1-0460.5) Mr. Joiner referred to 1.7.4 and noted there should be a definition of marginal and inappropriately located commercial and/or industrial zoned areas and that they will be looking at standard language.

(1-0490.5) In 2.4.2 the exploration of a transfer of development rights program is being considered. Mr. Joiner remarked it would be something they could do after the adoption of this plan in order to implement some of the mitigations and incentives that have been discussed as to how the program would work.

(1-0501.5) In 2.4.3 the question was how would density bonus incentives be reviewed and implemented for better quality design of multi-family development. Mr. Joiner said that is under discussion and provided details.

(1-0531.5) Mr. Joiner said they are considering deletion of the on-street parking referred to in 2.4.4. He added they had tried to create incentives but, with the exception of downtown and other areas where there is public parking, it might not be a thing to do.

(1-0560.5) Mr. Joiner said they are not proposing any changes to 3.2.1 with regard to the Growth Management Commission. He added that the policies and procedures are in place.

(1-0593.5) The next question related to how the balance between employment and housing could be maintained. Mr. Joiner said that had not been reviewed in ten years and is something they should be reviewing on an annual or semi-annual basis.

(1-0599.5) Mr. Sullivan then commented on how often the Master Plan should be updated. He did not feel that anything less than five years would reflect significant changes. However, he felt they cannot wait like they did before, the last update having been in 1983. He felt that staff could perhaps have some type of internal review so that on yearly basis they could collectively recommend changes.

(1-0653.5) Mr. Joiner then referred to 6.1.1 and the question was who will be responsible for compiling the wide-wide environmental analysis to identify sensitive archeological, cultural, and historic sites and view corridors. He said everything except the view corridors will be covered under the state NRS requirement for keeping an action plan and a Master Plan element for historical and cultural sites. He commented that these will be reviewed in the next few months as they start that Master Plan element.

(1-0679.5) 6.1.2a referred to adoption of the environmentally sensitive land development review criteria. Mr. Joiner said Exhibit A states that all private land in a rural area outside the urban land use area plan is categorized as environmentally sensitive.

(1-0705.5) The next question asked was if Community Development would be responsible for reviewing site analysis for any different projects and is there sufficient staff already on board to accomplish these reviews. Mr. Joiner said they feel there is but if it expands to the point where they are doing more and more reviews it would be an issue they would have to take up with the Board of Supervisors.

(1-0729.5) Mr. Joiner referred to 6.1.5 which said it is the City's intent to adopt ordinances to protect the natural resources and vistas and archeological resources. He noted these would be identified in the implementation strategy.

(1-0739.5) On the urban growth policy Mr. Joiner said this would be applied to projects already within the urban service area of the City. He said they would be required to meet the level of service criteria identified prior to being approved. Discussion ensued on this.

(1-0927.5) Mr. Joiner again referred to staffing requirements. This had to do with implementation, specifically on review of projects if they extend the timeframe for review. He noted that they are looking at the fee structures

CARSON CITY REGIONAL PLANNING BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT, AND
MASTER PLAN TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES
of April 10, 1996, Meeting - Page 4

from time to time and, if need be, they would speak to the Board of Supervisors about this.

(1-0990.5) The next area was administrative review and variance. Mr. Joiner posed the question if this is something that could be handled administratively instead of coming back to the Commission for a public hearing. He felt that is something that will have to be decided. He said they have suggested to the Commission that they might want to suggest to the Board of Supervisors that they might want to amend the code so that some of these can be done administratively to save the Commission's time and that of staff and the developers.

(1-1006.5) Product applications was the next issue. Mr. Joiner said this would be implemented with workshops to inform the developers of the changes that have been recommended.

(1-1050.5) Ms. Melby pointed out some policies in the latest version which they had added in response to comments received from staff and the Commission. She said she would take the latest round of comments from staff, the Commission, BLM, and the public and add them to the document. This would result in another document for the April 25 meeting incorporating this evening's comments. She detailed changes being implemented and noted that some are only in the language.

(1-1223.5) At this point Vice Chairperson Horton solicited further comments from the public. George Szabo asked about getting copies of the amended document that would be discussed at the April 25 meeting. Ms. Melby said she would have the changes done by April 10 and would have copies to staff by April 15 or 16 at which time they would be available to him.

(1-1285.5) Mr. Aldean had a concern with property owners who are not willing to deal with maintenance as noted in section 2.4.7 of Implementation Strategies. He cited problems with some owners and suggested careful attention to this section.

(1-1343.5) Bud Herring said he had a parcel he wished to split and had a concern with requirements associated with possible septic systems if residences are built on those parcels. Mr. Sullivan noted that the Board of Supervisors had adopted an ordinance that says if someone is on well and septic and propose to do a parcel there are certain requirements that need to be fulfilled. He suggested that Mr. Herring meet with Jay Ahrens of Public Works for more details. There being no further public comments Vice Chairperson declared public testimony closed. No formal action was taken.

(Commissioner Pozzi left the meeting at 7:40 p.m. A quorum was still present.)

C-2 REVIEW OF THE MASTER PLAN DRAFT LAND USE MAP - (1-1481.5) Commissioner Nietz commented that working out from the central core of the City the densities decrease as they go out. However, she felt there were some areas that were not consistent with that. Staff noted they had allocated the land based on the approved projects. Mr. Sullivan stated this was in the northeast portions off of Highway 50 due west of the river. She also had a concern with a narrow area of high density adjacent to a buffer zone which she pointed out on the map. She also had a concern with an area where the ByPass starts to come back to 395 which she visually identified. She felt the density should be lowered as it leaves the center of the City. She suggested further study on these subjects. Vice Chairperson Horton solicited public comment. There being none he declared public testimony closed. He then sought comment from Commissioners. Commissioner Nietz noted that to date the Builders Association had not come forward at these Master Plan meetings to make comments on their position on the document. Mr. Joiner reported they had been at a previous meeting but were not able to stay. They had advised they would get comments to staff prior to this meeting. However, he reported staff had not received them as yet.

D. NON-ACTION ITEMS

1. **Commissioners Comments** - None.
2. **Staff Comments** - Mr. Joiner said the next regular meeting was scheduled for April 24 and

CARSON CITY REGIONAL PLANNING BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT, AND
MASTER PLAN TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES
of April 10, 1996, Meeting - Page 5

the next special meeting on the Master Plan was scheduled for April 25.

E. ADJOURNMENT - There being no further business Vice Chairperson Horton entertained a motion to adjourn. Commissioner Nietz moved to adjourn. Commissioner Uhart seconded the motion. Motion carried 4-0. Vice Chairperson Horton adjourned the meeting at 7:50 p.m.

The Minutes of the special April 10, 1996 meeting of the Carson City Regional Planning Commission, Bureau of Land Management, and Master Plan Technical Advisory Committee

ARE SO APPROVED _____, 1996

Alan Rogers, Chairperson