

**CARSON CITY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION, BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT AND  
MASTER PLAN TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**Minutes of the May 6, 1996 Special Master Plan Update Meeting**

Page 1

A special Master Plan update meeting of the Carson City Regional Planning Commission, the Bureau of Land Management, and the Master Plan Technical Advisory Committee was held on Monday, May 6, 1996 in the Community Center Sierra Room, 851 East William Street, Carson City, NV at 6:00 p.m.

**PRESENT:** Chairperson Alan Rogers  
Vice Chairperson Verne Horton  
Allan Christianson  
Maxine Nietz  
William Mally  
Archie Pozzi, Jr.  
Deborah Uhart

**STAFF:** John Berkich, City Manager  
Dorothy Timian-Palmer, Public Utilities Director  
Walter Sullivan, Community Development Director  
Steve Kastens, Parks and Recreation Director  
Jay Aldean, Public Works Director  
Rob Joiner, Principal Planner  
Steve Mihelic, Division Chief, Fire Department  
Juan Guzman, Senior Planner  
Katherine McLaughlin, Recording Secretary  
(PCS 5/6/96 1-0000.5)

**NOTE** - Unless otherwise indicated each item was introduced by Chairperson Rogers. Individuals speaking are identified following the heading of each item. 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** - (1-0005.5) Chairperson Rogers called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m. Roll call was taken and a quorum was present. The pledge of allegiance was recited by those at the meeting.

**B. PUBLIC COMMENT** - None.

**C. MASTER PLAN UPDATE**

**C-1 DISCUSSION AND FINAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL REGARDING THE MASTER PLAN LAND USE ELEMENT TEXT INCLUDING VACANT LAND STUDY, ZONING FRICTION AREAS, GOALS AND POLICIES, IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES, SERVICE AREAS, SERVICE BOUNDARIES, POPULATION ESTIMATES, SPECIFIC PLAN AREA STATEMENTS, AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES AND C-2 FINAL REVIEW OF THE MASTER PLAN LAND USE MAP AND LAND USE DESIGNATIONS** - (1-0025.5) Karen Melby of SEA - Chairperson Rogers clarified this is part of the final review phase of the Master Plan but not the final meeting. Mr. Sullivan said at the last meeting staff had reviewed some issues that the Builders Association had brought to the Commission's attention. He added at that meeting the Commission had suggested that staff and Chairperson Rogers meet and go through the booklet to explain and clarify various issues. He said thus far there have been two meetings with the Builders Association but have only gone through approximately ten pages of the document.

(1-0057.5) Mr. Sullivan noted the information provided to the Commission at this meeting regarding the mission statement, objectives, goals, urban service boundaries, special planning areas, etc. He said staff would like to discuss these and would also like to go over initial comments for the plan. Chairperson Rogers stated as they were going through the document they all had the same feeling that it had something missing as an introduction. He said the first section, the vacant land study, was not quite the introduction they had been seeking. The purpose statement, mission statement, and objectives had been prepared as a result. He noted that they had not yet gotten to the goals which will be developed later. Commissioner Nietz asked about the source of the document.

**CARSON CITY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION, BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT AND  
MASTER PLAN TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**Minutes of the May 6, 1996 Special Master Plan Update Meeting**

Page 2

Chairperson Rogers said it was developed by staff, contractors, and himself.

(1-0131.5) Chairperson Rogers commented on the general adoption of language for the purpose, mission, and objectives and asked that they be included in the document and then they will work on establishing goal statements which will be presented at the next meeting. He solicited goal suggestions from the Commission and asked that they be submitted as soon as possible so that they could be incorporated.

(1-0151.5) Chairperson Rogers then noted the urban service boundary. He added that there had been a lot of discussion regarding what that was and how it would impact development. A decision was made that it needs to be more defined and there are definitions they are working on. It had also been decided there was a need for a procedure to follow which would be agreeable to all the interested parties. Chairperson Rogers also talked about about levels of service in determining the location of the urban service boundary.

(1-0183.5) He then commented on moving the boundary. He said the emphasis is having staff work more with developers when an adjustment is necessary. He explained the process. Commissioner Nietz asked about the Commission ratifying changes and Mr. Sullivan gave details of the procedure staff uses. Mr. Guzman said it is like a preliminary review of a master plan amendment. Discussion ensued on environmental constraints relating to moving the line.

(1-0387.5) The next subject was level of service. Chairperson Rogers said a change could be from a citizen, a department head, a developer, or Community Development. There was an extensive discussion on references made to level of service urban, suburban, and rural tables.

(1-0539.5) Chairperson Rogers then talked about recommendations on special planning areas and how they would be administered. He also talked about a proposal to amend the current ordinance to allow SPAs to be created without a minimum land area. Discussion ensued on the implementation and the final product.

(1-0729.5) George Szabo said, as a planner, it was his impression that the document being considered is a land use plan and that the next step is consideration of special planning areas. Chairperson Rogers said it does change the original concept and that is why an ordinance change is being recommended.

(1-0815.5) Mr. Sullivan said there are two issues. One is what happens if someone wants to do an eight or seven acre SPA. Don't we have something in PUD regulations that says the minimum is five acres but you can do a smaller one with proper planning. He asked what happens when someone who owns a block of land downtown wants to do something custom and yet preserve some of the flexibility. How is this handled.

(1-0837.5) Mr. Sullivan noted that the other issue dealt with voluntarily coming into a SPA and cited the example of Al Bernhard who owns property northwest of the Merchant property. He added that Mr. Bernhard's had been asked if he wanted to go into it and had asked what is coming out of this. Mr. Sullivan said in the meantime that land area was included. He added from a regional aspect staff likes it there. He said the ordinance says the first one that develops in an SPA past the size does all the infrastructure and studies. He noted Mr. Bernhard said he would put his infrastructure in but but if he was the first one in and represented 75 homes, and this is master planned for 750, he wanted to know if he would need to upgrade all the infrastructure by ten times what he would be putting in. He added that there is a question as to whether this should be made voluntary or should the requirements be changed in the SPAs. Chairperson Rogers said Mr. Bernhard's proposed development exceeds ten acres and he could be his own SPA.

(1-0899.5) Utility Director Dorothy Timian-Palmer said that is already being handled through the present way of doing business. She added if Mr. Bernhard is only going to build 75 homes, but the utility costs for the additional 750 homes would be the responsibility of Utilities to require an upsize and then front the costs for the additional expansion. Chairperson Rogers said if Mr. Bernhard wanted to stay within the large SPA then it could be left as it is now and the whole SPA could be planned together as a group. Or he could pull out and do his own development and the ordinance would take care of what he is going to develop. He said the question is can we leave what we have for the SPAs intact and still take care of different scenarios that might come across. He said by making it

**CARSON CITY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION, BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT AND  
MASTER PLAN TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**Minutes of the May 6, 1996 Special Master Plan Update Meeting**

Page 3

voluntary they have the flexibility to look at which one is the most advantageous to them. He noted that a decision has not yet been made. Mr. Szabo said typically an SPA would be done anyway and a developer would submit a phasing plan for the development and there would be triggers as to when utilities would come on based on how many units and traffic there would be. Mr. Sullivan commented that there needs to be some fine tuning.

(1-1005.5) Commissioner Uhart felt there is a problem but there is a way to deal with it. She said it should be within the structure of the ordinance rather than make it voluntary. Commissioner Mally asked isn't this covered by what Ms. Timian-Palmer had said. Chairperson Rogers said he disagreed that a land owner shouldn't have that option to pull out of an SPA to be able to develop any way he wants to. He felt that falls on City departments and staff to make sure that whatever they propose is going to fit within the larger plan. He added it has to fit within the Master Plan and if it was part of an SPA and pulled out then all the Master Plan elements would apply to that land so you have a process in place to take care of those scenarios. He commented that all that is being done is making it flexible enough that staff can do their job working with the developers to make a good project. He also said the complaint at all the meetings had been they want good developments but have put so many restrictions that this cannot always result in the best product.

(1-1045.5) Commissioner Nietz agreed with Commissioner Uhart that if they are going to look at the SPA process as a future process for SPAs not yet in this plan she wanted to make sure that when people come to the Commission they bring something that makes sense from a regional perspective, that it looks like a whole piece of land environmentally, whether it is a piece of low lying land or a particular hillside and makes sense as a single unit to be looked at and planned for. Chairperson Rogers said anyone has the right to bring an application to the Commission without it being usurped by creating an SPA. Mr. Guzman said this is similar to a PUD in that once it is approved if someone doesn't want to proceed because they cannot get financing or have a better marketing tool for developing their land they can request it be dissolved.

(1-1177.5) Mr. Bernhard said he had gotten involved in the SPA by purchasing land from the Anderson Family. He added at first he was all for that but when he started reading the document and learned it says he has to do all the infrastructure improvements on his property to accommodate the Merchants' property potential buyer who would probably never utilize the things he was being asked to put in. He felt if he had to do those improvements he would have to increase the price of his lots. He said he had brought this to the attention of staff and the Builders Association that they should look at this closer to see this does not happen. He added that he was comfortable with what Ms. Timian-Palmer had said. She then explained the process involved with an oversize project. Chairperson Rogers felt that the consensus he was hearing was a desire to adopt language that says the development ordinances would apply. Mr. Aldean said he understood what Ms. Timian-Palmer had said but roads are all done at the expense of the developer. He noted that eventually the City might see a utility that handles storm water and, whatever the infrastructure might be, at that point he felt it would be a good time to do that for storm drainage as well. He said the City does not currently do that for storm drains. Chairperson Rogers commented that roads would be different because they can be ended at the edge of the development in most cases unless there has to be a connection.

(1-1293.5) Mr. Bawden cited an example and said if you want it to continue the facility does not currently exist but should, especially in an SPA. He said when you are doing major planning if the City wants it ready to go then cooperation with property owners is needed to get it done.

(Commissioner Mally left the meeting at 7:25 p.m. A quorum was present as previously indicated.)

(1-1353.5) An extensive discussion ensued on Mr. Bernhard's position on currently not wanting to be in an SPA and whether there should be a separate SPA in the area. Chairperson Rogers said the Commission's recommendation will either be an SPA as it is designated or a recommendation that it be changed to a subdivision development. He also noted that the Commission has some flexibility in making a decision. Commissioner Nietz expressed her concern that the Commission not create spot zoning. At this point Chairperson Rogers asked for an explanation of the difference between an SPA and a PUD which Mr. Joiner provided.

(Commissioner Mally returned at 7:32 p.m. during the above discussion.)

**CARSON CITY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION, BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT AND  
MASTER PLAN TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**Minutes of the May 6, 1996 Special Master Plan Update Meeting**

Page 4

(1-1628.5) Mr. Bawden reported there had been several meetings with Chairperson Rogers and staff and commended them for their help and noted some problems have been resolved. He also said there has been clarification as to what the document will mean.

**Chairperson Rogers called a break at 7:50 p.m. When he reconvened the meeting at 8:00 p.m. a quorum was present.**

(1-1775.5) Dwight Millard reported he would like to have some of his property in the northern part of the City included in the boundary line adjustment. Mr. Sullivan said they could look at it. However, Mr. Millard said he did not want it included in the Silver Oak SPA. He also noted he has no plans for the property at this time and that it is a DG pit which he wants to keep.

(1-1941.5) Ms. Melby then reviewed Goal 8 in the Parks and Recreation section and said this would also be discussed in the implementation strategies. Discussion clarified several additions, deletions, and changes to this section of the land use plan.

(1-1997.5) Commissioner Nietz had a concern that Goal 9 in the Streets and Highways section did not contain any reference to pedestrian circulation and suggested developing a policy regarding this. An extensive discussion ensued on requirements and the wording.

(1-2427.5) Ms. Melby then reviewed land use implementation strategies in detail with staff and additions, deletions, and changes were made. She also reviewed the Lompa Ranch SPA and the Eagle Valley Childrens' Home SPA with staff and Commissioners.

(1-2681.5) Parks and recreational facilities were then thoroughly reviewed and, as before, additions, deletion, and language changes were made.

**D-1 NON-ACTION ITEMS**

**1. Commissioners Comments** - A discussion ensued on having a special meeting on May 22 to review the changes made at this meeting and then there would be a scheduled vote at the regular May 29 meeting.

**2. Staff Comments** - Mr. Sullivan commented that at the previous regular Commission meeting the K-Mart representative had requested a continuance to the regular May meeting. He said subsequent to that request the Commission had been asked to hold a special meeting on May 14 or 15. Commissioners and staff discussed this and it was decided there were too many conflicts with schedules and there was a question as to whether a quorum would be available. It was then determined that this subject would be agendized for the regular May meeting.

**E. ADJOURNMENT** - There being no further business Chairperson Rogers entertained a motion to adjourn. Commissioner Nietz moved to adjourn. Commissioner Uhart seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0. Chairperson Rogers adjourned the meeting at 9:10 p.m.

The Minutes of the May 6, 1996 special meeting of the Carson City Regional Planning Commission, Bureau of Land Management, and Technical Advisory Committee

ARE SO APPROVED\_\_\_\_September\_25\_, 1996

\_\_\_\_\_  
/s/  
Alan Rogers, Chairperson

**CARSON CITY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION, BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT AND  
MASTER PLAN TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**Minutes of the May 6, 1996 Special Master Plan Update Meeting**

Page 5