

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the July 25, 2007 Meeting

Page 1

A regular meeting of the Carson City Planning Commission was scheduled for 3:30 p.m. on Wednesday, July 25, 2007 in the Community Center Sierra Room, 851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada.

PRESENT: Vice Chairperson Mark Kimbrough

Connie Bisbee
Craig Mullet
Steve Reynolds
William Vance
George Wendell

STAFF: Walter Sullivan, Planning Division Director

Jennifer Pruitt, Senior Planner
Sean Foley, Associate Planner
Jeff Sharp, Deputy City Engineer
Melanie Bruketta, Chief Deputy District Attorney
Kathleen King, Recording Secretary

NOTE: A recording of these proceedings, the commission's agenda materials, and any written comments or documentation provided to the recording secretary during the meeting are public record, on file in the Clerk-Recorder's Office. These materials are available for review during regular business hours.

A. CALL TO ORDER, DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM, AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE (3:32:17) - Vice Chairperson Kimbrough called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m. Roll was called; a quorum was present. Chairperson Peery was absent. Vice Chairperson Kimbrough wished Chairperson Peery well, and welcomed Commissioner Wendell. Commissioner Wendell led the pledge of allegiance. Commissioner Reynolds arrived at 3:54 p.m.

B. COMMISSION ACTION ON APPROVAL OF MINUTES - June 27, 2007 (3:33:58) - Commissioner Mullet moved to approve the minutes. Commissioner Bisbee seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

C. PUBLIC COMMENT (3:34:31) - None.

D. STAFF PUBLIC SERVICE ANNOUNCEMENTS (3:35:06) - Mr. Sullivan distributed to the commissioners an announcement of the Planning 101 class sponsored by the California Chapter of the American Planning Association. He reminded the commissioners that the American Planning Association National Conference will be held in Las Vegas in April 2008. He expressed an interest in sending as many commissioners to the conference as possible.

E. DISCLOSURES (3:36:49) - None.

F. MODIFICATIONS TO THE AGENDA (3:37:04) - None.

G. CONSENT AGENDA (3:37:22) - None.

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the July 25, 2007 Meeting

Page 2

H. PUBLIC HEARING MATTERS:

H-1. SUP-05-011a ACTION TO CONSIDER REVIEW OF A PREVIOUSLY-APPROVED SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FROM RICHARD REVIGLIO (PROPERTY OWNER: THREE Rs LLC) THAT ALLOWED ADDITIONAL OUTSIDE STORAGE YARD AREA AND REVISIONS TO THE APPROVED SITE PLAN, ON PROPERTY ZONED GENERAL COMMERCIAL (GC), LOCATED AT 5445 SOUTH CARSON STREET (WESTERN NEVADA SUPPLY), APN 009-305-05 (3:38:39) - Vice Chairperson Kimbrough introduced this item. Mr. Sullivan advised that the item had been continued from the June commission meeting due to the applicant's failure to appear. He oriented the commissioners to the location of the subject property, provided background information, reviewed the staff report, and narrated pertinent slides. He advised of having received a telephone call from Coby Rowe, the previous Western Nevada Supply site manager, who expressed the understanding that stacking material adjacent to the fence would be allowed as long as the material was not stacked higher than the top of the six foot fence. Mr. Sullivan read condition of approval 9 into the record, and narrated a displayed diagram.

Mr. Foley advised of having met with Western Nevada Supply representatives over the past month to discuss the landscape plan and existing landscape. He narrated pertinent photographs, and advised that the Western Nevada Supply representative, who was present at the meeting, was aware of the issues and prepared to address them. In response to a question, Mr. Foley reviewed the landscape plan pertinent to the north side of the property. In response to a further question, he advised that the subject item was agendized for review of condition of approval 5. Landscape was approved at the time the building was finally inspected. Complaints regarding landscape would usually be addressed administratively. At Vice Chairperson Kimbrough's request, Mr. Foley explained the administrative correction process.

(3:48:26) Charlie Blair, of Western Nevada Supply, acknowledged he had been provided background information on the subject item and his agreement with staff's recommended motion. In response to a question, he discussed the misunderstanding regarding the method by which materials could be stored in the yard. In response to a further question, he advised of five trees which have died around the retention basin. He discussed plans to cover the retention basin and relocate the drainage subterranean to the back of the lot. He offered to replace the five trees, if necessary, in the meantime. He advised that three trees along the side street could be "replaced as soon as possible." Mr. Sullivan acknowledged Mr. Blair's concessions and requested him to coordinate replacement of the landscape with Planning Division staff. With regard to the materials storage, Mr. Sullivan acknowledged the honest mistake but noted an example in a displayed photograph as to the reason for requiring the setback.

Commissioner Bisbee expressed no objection to storage below the fence line, but noted the 12-foot setback requirement couldn't have been clearer. In reference to a displayed photograph, she noted materials storage "all along that fence line that are going over the fence even if we decide that's an honest mistake." [Commissioner Reynolds arrived at 3:54 p.m.] Commissioner Vance agreed that storage of materials below the top of the fence line should be permissible. He expressed understanding for the misinterpretation of the condition of approval, but requested the applicant to adhere to the rule "absolutely ... so that your neighbors don't see stuff sticking up a foot over the fence here and there because it really detracts from it." Mr. Blair agreed to bring the storage yard into compliance by the end of the week. In reference to public comment provided at the initial special use permit hearing, Commissioner Mullet noted objections voiced "because of the way you stored material" at the previous Western Nevada Supply location on Curry Street.

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the July 25, 2007 Meeting

Page 3

Mr. Blair acknowledged future plans to expand the storage area by covering over the retention basin. Commissioner Mullet expressed concern over the 20-foot maximum storage height “if we compromise here and allow you to use that area for flatter items.” He commented that the storage racks in the center of the yard are “a real eye sore” for the neighbors, and suggested a voluntary reduction of the maximum storage height in the center of the yard. He pointed out that the subject location “is the gateway into Carson.” He acknowledged that Western Nevada Supply is “an old Nevada business” and noted the “issues with the color of the building that changed from our original discussion.” He further noted the good business reputation held by Western Nevada Supply, and expressed the hope that company representatives could compromise to reduce the maximum height of the storage racks if storage is allowed against the fence and below the top of the fence line. Mr. Blair advised that the subject storage racks are “only 16 feet tall.” He suggested the height of the racks may be reduced further, possibly to 12 feet, with the expanded future storage space which would cover the area of existing retention basin.

In response to a question, Vice Chairperson Kimbrough summarized the discussion thus far. Mr. Blair acknowledged an understanding of the direction of the commissioners’ discussion. He further acknowledged an understanding of the original special use permit conditions of approval. In response to a further question, he reiterated that he had not been in his current position during the time of the original special use permit hearing. At Commissioner Wendell’s request, he reviewed his understanding of the direction provided by former Western Nevada Supply Site Manager Coby Rowe and his current understanding of the conditions of approval. In response to a further question, he reviewed the plans to expand the storage yard area. He acknowledged that expansion of the storage yard area would allow for the storage to stay within the 12-foot setback. He further acknowledged the belief that the 12-foot setback was the agreement between Western Nevada Supply Company representatives and the commission at the time of approval of the original special use permit application. Commissioner Wendell expressed an inclination to proceed under the original special use permit conditions of approval.

Vice Chairperson Kimbrough called for public comment. (4:04:42) Bruce Kittess commended Western Nevada Supply Company on their customer service. He pointed out that Western Nevada Supply representatives “read specifications all day long on what they sell,” and expressed surprise that there had been any misunderstanding. He suggested the applicant should be required to “follow the rules.”

(4:05:25) Tom Yturbide, a neighbor adjacent to the subject property, advised that the stored materials are presently above the Horatio Lane fence. He expressed concern over allowing the yard to be expanded in that “if they can’t take care of what they’ve got, what’s going to happen when they expand it?” He expressed concern over “more of the same.” He advised of having provided testimony during the original special use permit hearing “when the fence was a 12-foot setback ... 16-foot in the perimeter. ... And it went up to 20 before we even left the meeting.” He acknowledged the “limited space” of the property, but suggested that Western Nevada Supply representatives “knew that coming in and there isn’t any reason why the people surrounding them should be paying for it. What you promise is what you should do and they haven’t kept their promise.” In response to a question, Mr. Sullivan advised that the original conditions of approval specified storage of materials was not to exceed the height of the fence “if it was adjacent to the fence, but toward the interior portion of the yard, it could be higher.” In response to a further question, Mr. Yturbide advised of “no problem with it being the height or under the height of the fence, but that’s not the case. And it’s not 12 feet from the fence. It’s three feet from the fence and what you see as you drive by there and look up ... is corrugated pipe and green pipe and several other items of

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the July 25, 2007 Meeting

Page 4

material.” Mr. Yturbide requested that the applicants be required to “do what they agreed to ... and that they do it consistently.” He reiterated that his investment is right across the street from the Western Nevada Supply location.

(4:10:59) Pete Sinnott, a neighbor adjacent to the subject property, thanked the commissioners and staff and commended Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Blair. He read prepared remarks into the record. He objected to the color of the building at the “gateway to the City,” and expressed the opinion that it is “really out of place.” He advised that, in addition to the landscape previously discussed, “there are also eight 5-gallon vines missing on the fences around the perimeter on the back side that would help hide all the lower stuff that’s planted along there. There are at least 12 trees missing.” Mr. Sinnott advised there are “three, bright spotlights on the back of the building that shine directly toward all the properties behind the building.” He further advised of “four, large bright lights on the building that light up all the parking, all the neighbor properties.” He noted specific guidelines in the original conditions of approval which “prohibits that.” He further advised of an original condition of approval for the rear fence to be 8-feet in height rather than 6 feet. He noted that the “lot was originally approved for a certain amount of storage area,” and suggested that Western Nevada Supply has already outgrown the lot. He suggested that another building should be required for expansion in order to store materials appropriately and “have this look acceptable to the community.” He recommended that any addition or expansion request require the applicant to meet all the original criteria and that the building return to the “earth-tone, agreed-upon color which everybody agreed to, including Western Nevada Supply, the owners, and the original representative from there.” He acknowledged that storage of material below the fence would not be a problem. He noted that plumbing wholesale businesses “are very ugly by nature.” He suggested that Western Nevada Supply Company “could probably be amended to actually work in that site but ... it’ll take a building to enclose the type of things that you have there.” He responded to questions regarding the height of the east-facing fence. Vice Chairperson Kimbrough requested Mr. Sinnott to work with Planning Division staff regarding the lighting issues.

Vice Chairperson Kimbrough called for additional public comment and, when none was forthcoming, entertained additional discussion or a motion. Commissioner Vance discussed his original understanding of the conditions of approval with regard to storage adjacent to the fence. He expressed the opinion that the term “stacking” refers to “above the fence,” and that “it doesn’t make any sense at all to say that you can put nothing next to a slatted, essentially a solid fence.” In light of the public testimony provided regarding lighting, landscape, and fencing, Commissioner Mullet suggested the possibility of postponing action in favor of further deliberation at a future meeting. Mr. Sullivan advised that the landscape issues will be resolved administratively. Lighting and fencing requirements will have to be checked by a Planning Division staff person to determine compliance. Mr. Sullivan advised that the color of the building “at this point is a non-issue.” He noted that the only issue before the commission is compliance with condition of approval 9. Commissioner Mullet agreed that storage could be permissible against and below the top of the fence, but requested the applicants to agree to revise the condition of approval allowing materials to be stored up to 20 feet in height in the middle of the yard.

In response to a question, Mr. Blair pointed out, on a displayed photograph, the “white line” depicting a 12-foot clear zone “all the way around the perimeter of the fence ...” He acknowledged that material had been stacked between the 12-foot line and the fence but was not supposed to be stacked higher than the top of the fence line. In response to a further question, he advised that Western Nevada Supply staff will not be allowed to stack things above the top of the fence.

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the July 25, 2007 Meeting

Page 5

Vice Chairperson Kimbrough entertained a motion. Commissioner Vance moved to approve SUP-05-011a, review of a previously-approved special use permit application from Richard Reviglio, property owner Three Rs LLC, that allowed additional outside storage yard area and revisions to the approved site plan, on property zoned general commercial, located at 5445 South Carson Street, also known as Western Nevada Supply, APN 009-305-05, subject to the original findings contained in the December 2005 staff report and the revised conditions of approval contained in the June 2007 staff memorandum, and also to clarify the difference between storage and stacking, where stacking goes with condition 9, and storage below fence level is anywhere they want. In response to a question, Commissioner Vance clarified that storage within 12 feet of the fence line cannot exceed the height of the fence. Mr. Sullivan advised that this clarification would pertain to condition of approval 9, and provided an overview of condition of approval 10. Discussion followed, and Commissioner Vance withdrew the motion. **Commissioner Vance moved to approve SUP-05-011a, review of a previously-approved special use permit application from Richard Reviglio, property owner Three Rs LLC, that allowed additional outside storage yard area and revisions to the approved site plan, on property zoned general commercial, located at 5445 South Carson Street, Western Nevada Supply, APN 009-305-05, subject to the original findings contained in the December 2005 staff report and the revised conditions of approval contained in the June 2007 memorandum, and to change condition 9 to allow storage within the twelve foot perimeter, not to exceed the height of the fence. Commissioner Bisbee seconded the motion.** Mr. Foley noted condition 9a in staff's June 2007 memorandum included in the agenda materials. **Commissioner Vance amended his motion to exclude condition of approval 9a from the June 2007 staff memorandum. Commissioner Bisbee continued her second.** Discussion took place regarding whether to revise condition of approval 10, and consensus of the commission was not to do so. Vice Chairperson Kimbrough called for a vote on the pending motion; **motion carried 6-0.** Mr. Blair acknowledged a willingness to ensure that nothing will be stored above the fence. He requested until the "end of the week" to comply. Commissioner Vance requested Mr. Blair to adhere to the 16-foot maximum height for stacked materials. Mr. Blair agreed to do so, and offered to work with Mr. Sullivan on the landscape and lighting issues.

H-2. SUP-05-221 ACTION TO CONSIDER REVIEW OF A PREVIOUSLY-APPROVED SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FROM RICK CORRELLI (PROPERTY OWNER: CURRY STREET PROPERTIES, LLC) TO ALLOW PERMANENT PLACEMENT OF FOUR METAL STORAGE CONTAINERS, ON PROPERTY ZONED GENERAL COMMERCIAL (GC), LOCATED AT 3640 SOUTH CURRY STREET, APN 009-151-40 (4:34:20) - Vice Chairperson Kimbrough introduced this item. Mr. Sullivan reviewed the staff report, and narrated pertinent slides. Mr. Foley oriented the commissioners to the location of the containers using a displayed aerial photograph, and reviewed the remainder of the staff report. Commissioner Bisbee commended the condition of the site.

(4:39:44) Rick Correlli introduced himself for the record. Vice Chairperson Kimbrough commended him on a job well done and expressed appreciation. Mr. Sullivan commended Mr. Correlli on an outstanding job, and advised that he was in full compliance with the conditions of approval. No formal action was taken.

(4:44:55) Vice Chairperson Kimbrough re-opened this item to public comment; however, none was forthcoming.

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the July 25, 2007 Meeting

Page 6

H-3. U-97/98-65 ACTION TO CONSIDER REVIEW OF A PREVIOUSLY-APPROVED SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FROM LYNN WAGNER (PROPERTY OWNER: CANDYCE BENNETT) FOR A CHILD CARE FACILITY FOR A MAXIMUM OF 21 INFANTS AND TODDLERS, ON PROPERTY ZONED GENERAL OFFICE (GO), LOCATED AT 504 EAST TELEGRAPH STREET, APN 004-234-04 (4:41:01) - Vice Chairperson Kimbrough introduced this item. Mr. Sullivan reviewed the staff report, and recommended discontinuing periodic review of the subject special use permit. He reviewed the public noticing process, and advised that no comments had been received either in favor of or in opposition to the proposal. No other City department had any comment relative to operation of the facility. Mr. Sullivan advised that the operation is in compliance with the eight conditions of approval, and narrated pertinent slides.

(4:42:59) Lynn Wagner, owner of Sierra Vista Academy, acknowledged having reviewed the staff report and her agreement with the same. Commissioner Mullet agreed with staff's proposal to discontinue periodic review of the special use permit. He commended the service provided to the community.

Vice Chairperson Kimbrough called for public comment and, when none was forthcoming, entertained additional commission discussion or a motion. **Commissioner Wendell moved to approve review of an existing special use permit to allow a child care facility for a maximum of 21 infants and toddlers, on property zoned general office, located at 504 East Telegraph Street, APN 004-234-04, based on seven findings and subject to the recommended conditions of approval contained in the staff report, and to require no further review by the commission in the future. Commissioner Reynolds seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0.**

H-4. ZCA-07-078 DISCUSSION ONLY REGARDING A ZONING CODE AMENDMENT FROM APPLICANT GREG PETERSEN TO ALLOW A CHANGE OF THE CARSON CITY MUNICIPAL CODE, TITLE 18, ZONING, TO MODIFY THE DEFINITION FOR "PANEL VAN" TRUCK AND AMEND THE GENERAL PARKING REQUIREMENTS TO ALLOW CERTAIN COMMERCIAL VEHICLES (TRUCKS) TO BE PARKED IN RESIDENTIAL ZONING DISTRICTS (4:45:38) - Vice Chairperson Kimbrough introduced this item. Ms. Pruitt reviewed the staff report and the purpose of this item. She provided an overview of letters distributed to the commissioners and staff prior to the start of the meeting, and of the agenda materials. She advised that Planning Division staff had met with concerned citizens regarding this item. She provided an overview of Mr. Petersen's presentation.

(4:51:28) Greg Petersen introduced Joel Cryer, of Carson Dodge, and provided background information on the purpose of the proposed amendment. He provided information on the Sprinter, drawings of which were displayed in the meeting room and included in the agenda materials, and reviewed his proposal to amend the definition of "panel van." He responded to questions regarding the dimensions of the subject panel van, his own box van, and details of the panel van design. He acknowledged plans to purchase a panel van if the amendment is approved. Vice Chairperson Kimbrough commended Mr. Petersen on his initiative, and provided an overview of the commission's process. Mr. Petersen responded to questions regarding a photograph provided as part of the agenda materials. In response to a further question, he advised that his driveway is 27 feet deep.

(5:01:41) Joel Cryer, of Carson Dodge, provided an overview of the panel van product and the various models. He acknowledged that panel vans are sold as recreational vehicles.

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the July 25, 2007 Meeting

Page 7

Vice Chairperson Kimbrough opened this item to public comment. (5:06:52) Bruce Kittess expressed support for “nice neighborhoods.” He commended Mr. Petersen’s character and work ethic, but stated “our homes are our castles.” He referred to the comprehensive master plan objective to maintain and preserve neighborhoods, and expressed concern regarding incremental changes to ordinances over the years. He expressed support for leaving the regulations as they are.

(5:08:38) Gil Yanuck agreed with Mr. Kittess’ comments, and expressed concern over “enough billboards as we drive all around the City as it is.” He expressed opposition to coming “home at night and see one parked next to my home ...” He expressed the opinion that the subject proposal represents “encroachment,” and expressed concerns regarding enforcement. He referred to a *Wall Street Journal* article on “billboards and loopholes” and provided an overview of the same. He expressed opposition to commercial signage in residential areas. He expressed support for entrepreneurial ventures, but noted the importance of limitations and regulations. In response to a question, Mr. Yanuck expressed support for magnetic signage which could be removed upon the owner parking the vehicle. He expressed the opinion that existing size limitations “have worked fine.” He advised of having spent a great deal of time in Europe and that the subject vehicles “are monsters.” He referred to public hearings on the RV ordinance from a couple years ago, and expressed concerns over safety. He expressed support for keeping the definition as it is. He empathized with the applicant’s issue, but pointed out that he had already “found a way to deal with it” by acquiring another space in which to leave his work vehicle. He pointed out that this “is the cost of doing business.” He discussed concerns over those people who would consider loopholes in the ordinance, and reiterated concern over commercial signage in residential areas.

(5:13:27) Gloria Levy expressed opposition to a business truck being allowed to park in a residential area. In response to a question, she advised of an objection to any large vehicle. She advised that none of her neighbors have large RVs parked on their properties.

(5:16:49) Chet Alexander expressed opposition to “living in a construction zone.” He expressed support for quiet, residential areas.

(5:17:33) Patrick DeGross advised he lives “directly across the street from Mr. Petersen,” and that he purchased his home “and the acre next door with Mr. Petersen’s truck parked there.” He advised that the Petersens are some of the best neighbors he’s ever had. He noted the benefit of having a plumber in the neighborhood. He suggested the subject proposal represents a “golden opportunity to make a modification to existing rules.” He discussed “evolution ... in motor vehicles” in consideration of “fuel consumption” issues. In response to a question, Mr. Cryer provided information on the fuel consumption of the panel van vehicle and Mr. Petersen provided information on the fuel consumption of his box van vehicle. Mr. DeGross requested the commission’s open-minded consideration of the request. He advised of having seen three of the panel van vehicles on his way to this meeting.

(5:19:18) Barbara Eiche, a neighbor of Mr. Petersen’s, expressed the belief that her “neighborhood was zoned residential for a reason ...” She expressed opposition to “living next to somebody with a commercial vehicle that’s there all the time.” She acknowledged having provided written comments.

(5:20:09) Dean Giachino, a Carson City resident, objected to a commercial vehicle being parked in the neighborhood. He advised “it’s been a long fight just to get it out of the neighborhood. I certainly want to keep it out.”

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the July 25, 2007 Meeting

Page 8

(5:20:55) P.J. DeGross provided historic information on her residence in the neighborhood, and her experience with the Petersens and the commercial vehicle. She expressed concern over the commission “being used as part of a personal vendetta.” She advised that, at the time she moved into her home, “no one in the neighborhood had a problem with that vehicle being there.” She provided additional historic information on the neighborhood experience with Mr. Petersen’s commercial vehicle. She advised of representing Maggie Nolan, whose husband has a home-based business. She agreed with earlier comments that magnetic signage which could be removed while the vehicle is parked in the neighborhood would be a solution. She noted that the panel van would be allowed to be parked in the neighborhood if it was used as a recreational vehicle. She requested the commissioners’ support of small business in Carson City.

Vice Chairperson Kimbrough called for additional public comment and, when none was forthcoming, requested individual input of the commissioners. Commissioner Mullet suggested that review of the ordinance may be required at some point in the future if similar style vehicles are used as RVs or personal, multi-passenger vehicles. He further suggested that the commercial use seems to make the subject proposal unpalatable. In reference to the existing ordinance language, Commissioner Reynolds suggested it may have been drafted to allow people “to drive a vehicle home from work and back to work ... as opposed to operating a business out of your home.” He suggested contemplating “what the rules have been or maybe what they should be about operating a business out of the home.” He expressed support for small business, and suggested considering this aspect as part of a future agenda. Commissioner Vance advised of having seen Mr. Petersen’s vehicle parked on Crane Street, and expressed opposition to allowing a commercial vehicle to park in a residential area. In consideration of the fact that the revision would be city-wide, he suggested leaving the ordinance language as it is. Commissioner Bisbee expressed support for small business, and opposition to allowing a commercial vehicle to park in a residential area. She didn’t see any problem with the existing ordinance language. Commissioner Wendell referred to the letter from John and Barbara Eiche, which was provided to the commissioners and staff prior to the start of the meeting, and suggested that even if the commission was to recommend revising the ordinance, the CC&Rs in the subject neighborhood would still prevent Mr. Petersen from parking his commercial vehicle in the neighborhood. Vice Chairperson Kimbrough expressed the opinion that the commission didn’t seem to be too interested in considering revision of the ordinance. He expressed opposition to a commercial vehicle being parked in a residential area. He expressed appreciation to Mr. Petersen for bringing the issue forward.

Mr. Sullivan recalled that the ordinance language had been changed in the late 1990s. He suggested that carrying the issue further should consider perspective in light of the “one acre or larger” provision. Commissioner Vance noted the difference in requirements between parking a commercial vehicle on a one-acre parcel and on a residential parcel. Vice Chairperson Kimbrough thanked the applicant and the citizens for their attendance and participation. He recessed the meeting at 5:35 p.m. and reconvened at 5:40 p.m.

H-5. SUP-04-090a ACTION TO APPROVE A SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FROM GRANITE CONSTRUCTION COMPANY (ORIGINAL FILE #U-79-6) TO ALLOW A CONCRETE BATCH PLANT FACILITY OPERATION AND A REQUEST FOR AN APPROXIMATE 67.5-FOOT BATCH PLANT STRUCTURE PLUS 4-FOOT HIGH SAFETY RAILINGS WHERE 45 FEET IS THE MAXIMUM HEIGHT ALLOWED, ON PROPERTY ZONED GENERAL INDUSTRIAL (GI), LOCATED AT 5855 SHEEP DRIVE, APN 008-522-06
(5:41:12) - Vice Chairperson Kimbrough introduced this item. Mr. Sullivan oriented the commissioners to the subject site using a displayed aerial photograph. He noted a correction in that the existing concrete

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the July 25, 2007 Meeting

Page 9

batch plant is no longer in operation, and clarified that the use permit will be available for the asphalt batch plant. He reviewed the staff report and noted staff's recommendation of approval.

Mr. Sharp advised that the condition of approval requiring extension of the sewer line across the project frontage had been deleted. He provided historic information on extension of the sewer line to the subject site from Deer Run Road in 1997. He advised that the asphalt batch plant use will be no different than the previous use. Following discussion with Public Works Department staff and the City Engineer, he advised there is no need to extend the sewer line further to the east at this time. Mr. Sharp reviewed slight modifications to the condition of approval regarding roadway frontage improvements, eliminating the requirement for sidewalk construction along the frontage. Curb, gutter, and pavement widening was recently completed on Sheep Drive. If and when sidewalks are ever constructed, it should be done as an improvement for the entire street. In response to a question, Mr. Sharp pointed out the location of the sewer line.

(5:50:38) Granite Construction Company Environmental and Permitting Manager Tom Walbom expressed appreciation to Planning Division staff for their willingness to assist with the application. He expressed excitement over the benefit to the City of the state-of-the-art batch plant, and provided background information on the operation. He acknowledged having reviewed the staff report and his agreement with the same, including the modified conditions of approval and amendments as reviewed by Mr. Sullivan. He further acknowledged that Capitol Concrete is a subsidiary of Granite Construction Company.

Vice Chairperson Kimbrough called for public comment and, when none was forthcoming, entertained a motion. **Commissioner Bisbee moved to approve SUP-04-090, a special use permit application from Granite Construction Company to allow a concrete batch plant facility operation, including an approximate 67.5-foot batch plant structure plus 4-foot high safety railings where 45 feet is the maximum height allowed, on property zoned general industrial, located at 5855 Sheep Drive, APN 008-522-06, with the modified conditions of approval discussed. Commissioner Vance seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0.**

I. STAFF REPORTS

I-1. COMMISSIONERS' REPORTS / COMMENTS (5:56:08) - Commissioner Reynolds congratulated Commissioner Mullet on his reappointment and Commissioner Wendell on his appointment to the commission.

I-2. STAFF REPORTS / COMMENTS

DIRECTOR'S REPORT TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION (5:57:00) - Mr. Sullivan reported that all the recommendations forwarded by the commission to the Board of Supervisors have been approved. The commission's decision on the request for the billboard along Highway 50 West has been appealed. Mr. Sullivan provided to the commissioners an APA publication on CD regarding planned unit developments, and requested them to review the same.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS (5:58:33) - Mr. Sullivan anticipates a fairly full agenda for the August commission meeting.

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the July 25, 2007 Meeting
Page 10

J. ACTION ON ADJOURNMENT (5:58:53) - Commissioner Wendell moved to adjourn the meeting at 5:58 p.m. Commissioner Vance seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0.

The Minutes of the July 25, 2007 Carson City Planning Commission meeting are so approved this 29th day of August, 2007.

JOHN PEERY, Chair