

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the March 30, 2005 Meeting

Page 1

A regular meeting of the Carson City Planning Commission was scheduled for 3:30 p.m. on Wednesday, March 30, 2005 in the Community Center Sierra Room, 851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada.

PRESENT: Chairperson John Peery
Vice Chairperson Mark Kimbrough
Craig Mullet
Steve Reynolds
Roger Sedway
Roy Semmens
William Vance

STAFF: Walter Sullivan, Planning and Community Development Director
Lee Plemel, Principal Planner
Jennifer Pruitt, Senior Planner
Sean Foley, Associate Planner
John Givlin, Chief Storm Water Engineer
Mary-Margaret Madden, Deputy District Attorney
Kathleen King, Recording Secretary

NOTE: A tape recording of these proceedings is on file in the Clerk-Recorder's Office, and is available for review during regular business hours.

A. ROLL CALL, DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM, AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE (1-0007) - Chairperson Peery called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. Roll was called; a quorum was present. Commissioner Mullet led the pledge of allegiance.

B. COMMISSION ACTION ON APPROVAL OF MINUTES - February 23, 2005 (1-0024) - Commissioner Semmens moved to approve the minutes. Commissioner Mullet seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.

C. PUBLIC COMMENT (1-0031) - Les Kynett, a property owner at 750 Clear Creek Road, described his Carson-Tahoe Self Storage business adjacent to Fuji Park, and advised that he is also the owner of the business at Champion Speedway. He advised of learning, from a recent *Nevada Appeal* article, that motorcycle racing is returning to Fuji Park. He further advised of having contacted and subsequently met with Mr. Sullivan regarding the same. He advised of also speaking on behalf of Gene Lepire, the owner of Comstock Country RV Park. Mr. Kynett advised that his property on Clear Creek Road "has become quite valuable, especially because of the improvements at Costco, the improvements at Fuji, and the other commercial development taking place across the county line." Recently, a second visit by a hotel developer out of Burlingame, California, indicates the possibility of a hotel development as a gateway to Lake Tahoe. Mr. Kynett advised of the possibility of selling his property within the next 4-6 years. He expressed the opinion that having regularly scheduled motorcycle racing events in the Fuji Park Fairgrounds horse arena "is not at all in keeping with the intent and the use of the park." Mr. Sullivan had informed him that a motorcycle racing use would have to be proven by the promoter. Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Kynett participated in a telephone conference call with Parks and Recreation Director Roger Moellendorf earlier in the day. Mr. Kynett advised that the 8 motorcycle racing events will be regularly scheduled during the summer months. He expressed concern that the events will have a huge impact on his and Mr. Lepire's property

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the March 30, 2005 Meeting

Page 2

values. He discussed Mr. Lepire's difficulty with the kart racing which previously took place at the Fairgrounds. Mr. Kynett advised that Mr. Sullivan had clarified approval of the motorcycle events based on a 1991 decision by the Planning Commission that various types of uses at the Fairgrounds would be acceptable. He listed various examples of the types of allowed uses, and expressed the opinion that the Planning Commission's approval was not to create a "whole venue for a whole new race track here in Carson City." He advised that the promoters are calling their event "Carson City Raceway at Fuji Park. They've acquired sponsorship and participation for billboards, beer sales, and just everything that you would find at Champion Speedway three quarters of a mile to the east." He expressed the opinion that the events represent "an unfair business approach ... considering what we pay in property taxes, what we pay in use permit fees, and things of that nature." He urged the Planning Commission to seriously look into this matter. He requested that the matter be submitted to a public hearing.

Chairperson Peery referred the matter to staff, and advised Mr. Kynett that it would be submitted to the Commission as part of a public hearing. (2-2705) Mr. Sullivan advised that this matter will be addressed at the May Commission meeting.

D. MODIFICATIONS TO THE AGENDA (1-0124) - None.

E. DISCLOSURES (1-0126) - Commissioner Semmens advised that he is a member of Calvary Chapel and would be recusing himself from discussion and action regarding item G-2. Commissioner Mullet advised he is still involved with the Manufacturers Association, and that he recommended their representatives become involved in the master planning process. Chairperson Peery advised the citizens present that item G-7 would begin at 5:15 p.m. and item G-8 would begin at 7:00 p.m. He provided specific titles to the items for the benefit of the citizens present. Mr. Sullivan clarified that because of the specific times attached to the agenda items, they could not be heard any earlier.

F. CONSENT AGENDA - None.

G. PUBLIC HEARING:

G-1. DISCUSSION REGARDING A PRESENTATION/ COMBINED MEETING OF THE HISTORIC RESOURCES COMMISSION AND PLANNING COMMISSION (1-0181) - Ms. Pruitt provided background information on the process for revision of the Carson City Historic District Design Guidelines. She advised of a current vacancy for the building / construction professional position on the Historic Resources Commission. She reviewed methods by which the vacancy had been advertised, and requested interested persons to contact Management Assistant Rose Gardner in the City Manager's Office. She introduced Michael Drews, Chairman of the Historic Resources Commission.

Mr. Drews discussed the commonalities between the Historic Resources Commission ("HRC") and the Planning Commission, and the importance of acting for the good of the community. He referred to the most recent draft of the Historic District Design Guidelines which were included in the agenda materials, and provided an overview of the revisions. He advised that the HRC has begun considering 1950s structures as an integral part of the historic district. He further advised of recently plotting the development of Carson City from the historic district outward, using GIS parcel maps. He noted that development took place in concentric rings in a logical progression. He advised that the National Register of Historic Places considers structures which are 50 years of age and older. He clarified that not all 1950s structures in Carson City will

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the March 30, 2005 Meeting

Page 3

need to be preserved, but explained that the HRC is developing guidelines regarding significant elements pertaining to 1950s architecture and will attempt to integrate those structures into the historic district to demonstrate the logical progression of development.

Mr. Drews advised that another concern of the HRC is the Redevelopment Authority's notion to expand commercial uses outward from Main Street into the historic district. Historic structures will certainly be affected, and Mr. Drews suggested working together with the Planning Commission to develop the best solution as the master plan is updated. He requested feedback from the Planning Commissioners.

In response to a comment, Mr. Drews advised that although the historic district is confined to a specific area, the purview of the HRC extends beyond the boundaries of the district to any historic structure in Carson City which has National Register status. In addition, the HRC considers cultural resources which may be affected by broader development, such as archaeological sites, etc. Mr. Drews advised that a CLG grant is funding update of the Historic District Design Guidelines. In response to a question, he explained the HRC review process for improvements or modifications to any National Register listed property. He advised that the HRC uses the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitation in the review process. In response to a question, he advised that routine improvements, such as new roofs, fences that meet the requirements of the guidelines, can be stamped by the HRC chair or vice chair. He reviewed the expertise of the Commissioners, and advised that a great deal of time is spent with applicants assisting with designs. He advised that the HRC is interested in working with the Planning Commission on variances, parking variances, etc.

Chairperson Peery expressed appreciation for the work of the HRC. Mr. Drews requested the opportunity to meet with the Planning Commission at least once a year. Commissioner Sedway commended the HRC on the Historic District Design Guidelines. He inquired as to how the historic district is identified and the reason Carson Street is not included. Mr. Drews explained that the historic district boundaries were established in 1982. Curry Street and Carson Street were considered; however, the merchants and property owners were concerned over "another layer of government." Property owners, from Curry Street east, refused to be included. The residential property owners were more amenable. Mr. Drews explained that over the last 25 years, people have begun to understand the HRC's role to protect property and ensure the district stays consistent. Carson Street opted out of the historic district when it was first started. Mr. Drews advised that the HRC is conducting historic inventories on the east side of Carson City, and considering inclusion of peripheral properties. He noted that many of the Carson Street properties are National Register listed and, therefore, under the purview of the HRC. Chairperson Peery thanked Mr. Drews.

G-2a. SUP-04-220 ACTION REGARDING A SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FROM R.O. ANDERSON ENGINEERING (PROPERTY OWNER: CALVARY CHAPEL OF CARSON CITY) TO ALLOW PHASED DEVELOPMENT OF A CHURCH AND SCHOOL, ON PROPERTY ZONED SINGLE FAMILY ONE ACRE (SF1A), LOCATED AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF CLEARVIEW DRIVE AND LINE DRIVE, APN 010-191-14 (1-0383) - Commissioner Semmens stepped from the dais, and left the meeting room. Chairperson Peery introduced this item. (1-0434) Mr. Sullivan reviewed the staff report, and commended Mr. Foley on the phasing plan included therein. He advised of receiving an e-mail, earlier in the day, from Jarrad and Kimberly Adams in support of the project. He modified condition of approval 24 to include a maximum of three concerts or special events per year that would conclude by 11:00 p.m. He advised of staff's recommendation of approval of

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the March 30, 2005 Meeting

Page 4

the special use permit application, based on the findings and the 27 conditions of approval. Since no action would be taken on item G-2b, Chairperson Peery read conditions of approval 6, 7, 8, and 9 into the record for the benefit of the citizens present.

Pat Probster, Pastor of Calvary Chapel, acknowledged having read the staff report and his agreement with the same. He introduced Pastor Gary Least and Chris Johnson, the architect. Pastor Least expressed appreciation for the opportunity to present the plan to the Commission. He advised that Calvary Chapel has also been known as Carson City Christian Fellowship, over the past 13 years. He provided background information on the church's growth, acquisition of the property on Clearview and Edmonds Drive, and development of the proposed plan.

Pastor Least responded to questions regarding parking, and explained that expansion of the parking will take place at the time the building is expanded from phase 1 to phase 2. Mr. Sullivan acknowledged that the special use permit application covers all five phases of the proposed project. Mr. Givlin acknowledged no concerns with regard to traffic conditions or future traffic generation from the site all the way through phase 5. Vice Chairperson Kimbrough expressed surprise there is no ingress and egress lane included in the design. Mr. Givlin explained that it would occur in a later phase. In considering the site two to three years ago, it was thought there would be full frontage improvements including curb, gutter, sidewalk, and pavement widening. The current thought is a rural residential road section with pavement widening and the possibility of a left turn dedicated to a third lane. Mr. Givlin reiterated this would occur during a later phase. In response to a question, he advised that permits will be required, including building permits and for other activities. Mr. Sullivan advised that the special use permit will be reviewed in March 2007 for compliance with the conditions of approval and the Growth Management Ordinance.

Vice Chairperson Kimbrough requested the Calvary Chapel representatives to consider that the current landscape island design will become a barrier to the parking lot. Commissioner Reynolds inquired as to the expected attendance at the school. Pastor Least explained the plan to start very small with a kindergarten and first grade, and then add a grade each year thereafter. He advised that the school "is so far down the road," it's difficult to estimate the numbers of children. The square footage proposed for the school will most likely restrict it to the same size as any of the other Christian schools in the area, such as Capital Christian or Bethlehem Lutheran.

In response to a question with regard to approving all five phases, Mr. Sullivan advised there are safeguards in that status reports will be required of the applicant. He explained that not approving all five phases leaves the applicant with uncertainty. Commissioner Vance referred to a recent, very detailed approval of a facility on the south end of Edmonds Drive. He suggested it would be better to approve some of the phases later with additional information. Vice Chairperson Kimbrough explained that setting out five phases helps to enhance the capital campaign. Pastor Least confirmed this was one of the reasons Calvary Chapel chose to present all five phases. He discussed the importance of making legitimate plans and steering the ministry in that direction. He expressed understanding for the future status reports and requirements. In response to a comment, Pastor Least acknowledged that changes will take place and that Calvary Chapel will not hold the Planning Commission to a previous approval.

Commissioner Reynolds acknowledged that the school plans are far into the future, but inquired as to whether parents would be inclined to pull over on the shoulder at Clearview Drive to drop off and pick up children. Pastor Least expressed the hope that this would not happen, and acknowledged that the possibility

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the March 30, 2005 Meeting

Page 5

will be addressed at the appropriate time. In response to a question, Mr. Foley advised that a reclaimed water line runs along Clearview Drive, will extend to the freeway, and stop there. He did not know the proximity of the line to the subject property, but advised it was discussed with Public Works Operations Manager Tom Hoffert at a recent meeting. Commissioner Mullet noted that the front of the building and parking lots face south toward the adjacent residential area. He expressed concern that, as the project is constructed through its phases, the parking lot and lighting will become more and more obtrusive. He suggested facing the building and parking lots in a different direction. Pastor Least advised that Calvary Chapel is under contract to purchase the 6.75-acre parcel directly to the south. Chairperson Peery called for public comment.

(1-0774) Richard Doke, a resident of 4251 Hillview Drive, noted that this was not the first time Calvary Chapel had appeared before the Commission for a special use permit. He expressed no opposition to the church, but expressed the opinion that Clearview Drive is a “very, very poor choice for a school.” He discussed the speed limit problem in front of Carson High School. He advised of a traffic study, done in 1999, on Clearview Drive, which indicated over 14,000 vehicles were using Clearview Drive. He expressed the opinion that traffic has increased with the increase in population since that time. He advised that Clearview Drive has also been designated as an emergency route, and that it is not unusual to see emergency vehicles driving in excess of 70 miles per hour. He expressed concern with regard to the safety of students. He acknowledged that the freeway bypass should significantly decrease the amount of vehicle traffic on Clearview Drive. He suggested that the freeway, in close proximity to the school, will increase air and noise pollution in the area. He further suggested that special use permits for developments of churches and schools to replace single family one acre zoning is “really talking about a zoning change.” He noted there has never been a church or school property which has reverted back to single family one acre. He anticipates that the church and school will be as large as Capital Christian Center on Snyder, and reiterated the opinion that the proposed special use permit “looks a little bit like spot zoning.” He advised that every neighbor with whom he has spoken in the area is opposed to having a church of that magnitude in the area. He reiterated his concerns with regard to traffic and safety issues. Vice Chairperson Kimbrough advised that the proposed development is an allowable, conditional use within the SF1A zone. Mr. Doke reiterated the opinion that the special use permit amounts to a zoning change. Chairperson Peery commented that the City is running out of room and growing all the time. Densities are increasing in municipalities across the nation. Mr. Doke agreed, and reiterated the opinion that a less traveled road would be a much better place for a school.

(1-0892) Bob Maiden, advised of having lived at the corner of Clearview and Northview Drive since 1972. He discussed the high volume of traffic on Clearview Drive, and expressed opposition to the proposed church school. He expressed appreciation for the church’s vision and plans, but expressed concern about the noise issues. Commissioner Vance suggested that the freeway bypass should alleviate some of the traffic issues.

(1-0957) Mary Byington, a resident of 4184 Northview Drive, advised that her property is one acre away from Clearview Drive. She objected to the school based on past experience of having lived across the street from a church school. She described issues having to do with privacy and property lighting which she anticipates will affect her property. (1-1047) Vice Chairperson Kimbrough encouraged Ms. Byington to speak with the pastor regarding her concerns, because rules could be made to address them.

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the March 30, 2005 Meeting

Page 6

(1-0990) Larry Rothchild, Pastor of Capital Baptist Church, with all deference to the neighbors and their concerns, expressed no objection to the project on behalf of Capital Baptist Church. In response to a question, Pastor Rothchild discussed reasons families send children to private schools. He expressed the opinion that, in spite of difficulties and differences, the Carson City school system does a good job. He acknowledged the right of families to school their children in the manner they feel appropriate. He discussed the difference between schooling and education.

In response to a question, Mr. Givlin advised of much discussion with regard to using Clearview Drive as a primary route, terminating the freeway nearby, and constructing the last portion at a later time. This has since been revised and Mr. Givlin advised that the latest information is the freeway will be terminated at a cul-de-sac and the traffic volumes will decrease significantly. He explained this was the primary reason for changing the functional classification to a rural collector. He acknowledged the valid traffic concerns expressed, but suggested they may not be concerns in the future. He further acknowledged that NDOT's plans are "in the works." Phase 2 is under design and "things could change radically before 100% design." As of today, Clearview is planned to be a cul-de-sac flow street.

Chairperson Peery entertained a motion. **Vice Chairperson Kimbrough moved to approve SUP-04-220, a special use permit application from Calvary Chapel of Carson City, to allow phased construction of a church, classrooms, and a school facility, on property zoned Single Family 1 Acre, located at the southwest corner of Clearview Drive and Line Drive, APN 010-191-14, based on seven findings and subject to the recommended 27 conditions of approval with the change made by Mr. Sullivan on condition of approval 24. Commissioner Sedway seconded the motion.** In response to a question, Chairperson Peery reviewed the revision to condition of approval 24. He called for a vote on the pending motion; **motion carried 6-0-1, Commissioner Semmens abstaining.**

G-2b. GM-05-026 DISCUSSION REGARDING A GROWTH MANAGEMENT APPROVAL OF WATER USAGE REQUEST TO EXCEED 7,500 GALLONS PER DAY FROM R.O. ANDERSON ENGINEERING (PROPERTY OWNER: CALVARY CHAPEL OF CARSON CITY), PURSUANT TO CCMC SECTION 18.12.070 (COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL PERMITS) OF THE CITY'S GROWTH MANAGEMENT ORDINANCE AND THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS RESOLUTION ON GROWTH MANAGEMENT (2004-R-17) FOR THE REVIEW OF A CHURCH AND SCHOOL (SUP-04-220), ON PROPERTY ZONED SINGLE FAMILY ONE ACRE (SF1A), LOCATED AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF CLEARVIEW DRIVE AND LINE DRIVE, APN 010-191-14 (1-0407) - Chairperson Peery introduced this item. Mr. Sullivan explained staff's initial consideration that expanse of the building would create a growth management concern, exceeding 7,500 gallons of water per day. Based on an analysis, it was determined that the water usage would equate to 5,120 gallons per day, thus Calvary Chapel would not be considered a high water user. Mr. Sullivan reviewed the March 11, 2005 memo from Public Works Operations Manager Tom Hoffert, and advised that this item did not require action by the Planning Commission.

G-3. SUP-05-030 ACTION REGARDING A SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FROM CLAY JORGENSEN (PROPERTY OWNER: IN & OUT LAND CO.) TO ALLOW PLACEMENT OF A METAL STORAGE CONTAINER, ON PROPERTY ZONED RETAIL COMMERCIAL (RC), LOCATED AT 3170 SOUTH CARSON STREET, APN 009-111-05 (1-1141) - Commissioner Semmens returned to the meeting room. Chairperson Peery introduced this item, and Mr. Sullivan reviewed the staff report. Commissioner Vance advised of the location of a trash dumpster on the

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the March 30, 2005 Meeting

Page 7

property, and suggested it may be a traffic hazard. In response to a question, Mr. Sullivan advised that the special use permit is unlimited as to time. He explained the requirements for permanent containers in the commercial zone, and acknowledged that the Development Standards require dumpsters to be enclosed.

(1-1194) Gene Button, on behalf of Clay Jorgensen, acknowledged having reviewed the staff report and his agreement with the same. He explained the purpose for the storage container to store delivered windows rather than lean them against the building. Commissioner Sedway inquired as to a long-term fix which may be more aesthetically unobtrusive. Mr. Button advised that other approaches have been considered but have not worked well. Commissioner Vance inquired as to a better location for the dumpster, and Mr. Button agreed that the dumpster could be moved next to the storage container. Mr. Button responded to questions regarding glass storage. Vice Chairperson Kimbrough suggested a fence to hide the container.

Commissioner Reynolds inquired as to whether allowing the storage container in the permanent location will invite other businesses to locate storage containers on the street. Mr. Sullivan advised that containers can be placed with a special use permit. He suggested that the standards can be revisited if the Commission feels they are a little low. Commissioner Mullet discussed cases where property owners have gone to a great deal of effort to locate storage containers on the back of their property. He agreed that the standards may need to be revisited. Commissioner Sedway expressed opposition to the proposed location of the storage container. He suggested a temporary installation, and that the applicant return with a request for a variance to construct a fence up to the sidewalk. Mr. Sullivan advised of no requirement for a variance to construct a six-foot fence around the container. Commissioner Reynolds suggested approving the special use permit application, and requiring construction of the fence within one year. Chairperson Peery opened this item to public comment; however, none was provided.

Discussion took place with regard to the time period in which to require construction of the fence. Mr. Sullivan suggested adding condition of approval 11, requiring installation of a slatted fence within three months of approval. Commissioner Sedway suggested that any site-obscuring fence would be adequate. Mr. Button acknowledged agreement with the additional condition of approval. Chairperson Peery entertained a motion. **Commissioner Mullet moved to approve SUP-05-030, a special use permit application from In and Out Land Company to allow the placement of one 8-foot by 20-foot, 160 square foot, metal storage container, on property zoned retail commercial (RC), located at 3170 South Carson Street, APN 009-111-05, based on seven findings and subject to the conditions of approval in the staff report, which now includes condition of approval 11, requiring a site-obscuring fence.** In response to a question, Mr. Button advised that a six-foot fence would most likely not obscure the container completely. Chairperson Peery noted that condition of approval 11 requires fencing to obscure either the container or the delivered items. Mr. Button agreed to the clarification. Commissioner Mullet noted the applicant's option to secure the window material behind the fencing rather than in a container. Mr. Button advised that the storage container would be the best approach for security, but that he would need to discuss the matter with Mr. Jorgensen. **Commissioner Mullet modified his motion to indicate that condition of approval 11 will be to provide a site-obscuring fence and/or storage container.** Commissioner Sedway noted Mr. Sullivan's authority to allow the container for 90 days. **Commissioner Mullet further modified his motion to indicate that condition of approval 11 provide for a fence sufficient to obscure the materials to be stored.** Discussion took place with regard to the motion. **Commissioner Vance seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.**

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the March 30, 2005 Meeting

Page 8

G-4. SUP-05-030 ACTION REGARDING A SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FROM D.G. HAND CONSTRUCTION COMPANY (PROPERTY OWNER: EVAN CHAMBERS) TO ALLOW EXPANSION OF A NON-CONFORMING BUILDING, FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF ADDITIONS TO A SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING THAT FOLLOW AN EXISTING NON-CONFORMING 5-FOOT SETBACK, WHERE 10 FEET IS THE MINIMUM REQUIRED, ON PROPERTY ZONED MULTI-FAMILY APARTMENTS (MFA), LOCATED AT 810 SOUTH DIVISION STREET, APN 003-072-06 (1-1536) - Chairperson Peery introduced this item, and Mr. Sullivan reviewed the staff report. In response to a question, Commissioner Vance advised that the residence was constructed in 1963.

(1-1600) Evan Chambers reviewed the project details, including removal of a screened porch and continuing the wall along the five-foot setback. Mr. Chambers acknowledged having read the staff report and his agreement with the eight conditions of approval.

Chairperson Peery opened this item to public comment and, when none was provided, entertained a motion. **Commissioner Semmens moved to approve SUP-05-032, a special use permit application from Evan Chambers to allow expansion of a non-conforming building for the construction of additions to a single-family dwelling that follow an existing, non-conforming five-foot setback where ten feet is the minimum required, on property zoned multi-family apartment (MFA), located at 810 South Division Street, APN 003-072-06, based on seven findings and subject to the recommended conditions of approval contained in the staff report. Commissioner Vance seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.**

G-5a. SUP-04-157 ACTION REGARDING A SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FROM T-MOBILE (PROPERTY OWNER: J. SCOTT AND NANCY FORD) TO ALLOW CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF A WIRELESS COMMUNICATIONS FACILITY (PINE TREE MONOPOLE), ON PROPERTY ZONED SINGLE FAMILY 5 ACRE (SF5A), LOCATED AT 5364 SIERRA HIGHLANDS DRIVE, APN 007-051-66; and G-5b. VAR-04-158 ACTION REGARDING A VARIANCE APPLICATION FROM T-MOBILE (PROPERTY OWNER: J. SCOTT AND NANCY FORD) TO ALLOW A REDUCTION FROM THE REQUIRED 50 FOOT SETBACK TO 13 FEET IN ORDER TO CONSTRUCT A WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITY (PINE TREE MONOPOLE), ON PROPERTY ZONED SINGLE FAMILY 5 ACRE (SF5A), LOCATED AT 5364 SIERRA HIGHLANDS DRIVE, APN 007-051-66 (1-1671) - Chairperson Peery introduced these items. Mr. Plemel reviewed the staff report, and narrated slides pertinent to the items. In response to a question, he explained the requirement for one mile separation between facilities. Part of the encouragement of co-location on wireless facilities is to limit the need for construction of additional facilities and towers. He didn't anticipate other applications; however, any other applicant would have to prove the need for an additional facility.

(1-1800) Rama Sethi-Gulati, of T-Mobile, advised of having read the report and of her agreement with the conditions of approval. She acknowledged recent approval of a monopole in Douglas County, and plans to co-locate on that pole which is not owned by T-Mobile or Cingular. The facility would serve as part of the coverage network for the entire area. Ms. Sethi-Gulati advised of having appeared before the Commission at a previous meeting. She noted that the proposed facility would provide needed communication service in the subject area, particularly for emergency services and for the residents. She advised that the facility will be designed as a pine tree in order to blend with the subject area. The proposed

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the March 30, 2005 Meeting

Page 9

height is 105' and there are existing trees in the area at heights of 80' to 120'. Ms. Sethi-Gulati anticipates that the facility will "become part of the landscape." She advised that a "very high end, high quality tree pole" is proposed for the area, and requested the Commission's approval of the special use permit application.

In response to a question, Ms. Sethi-Gulati explained that concerns over raptors and other birds are usually associated with towers anchored by guide wires rather than free-standing poles. Commissioner Mullet noted that Douglas County could approve a pole location closer than within one mile of the subject monopole. Mr. Plemel advised that a recently approved pole is closer to the ridge line a couple miles away. Ms. Sethi-Gulati acknowledged that a pine tree monopole will be installed rather than an aspen monopole. In response to a question regarding the construction time line, she advised that the next step will be to obtain a building permit. She anticipates the facility will be constructed and operational by the end of the year. In response to a question, she explained the benefit of co-location for other wireless telecommunication providers.

Chairperson Peery opened this item to public comment and, when none was provided, entertained a motion. **Commissioner Semmens moved to approve SUP-04-157, a special use permit application from T-Mobile, (property owners: J. Scott and Nancy Ford) to allow construction and operation of a wireless communications facility, including the construction of a monopine communications tower structure and appurtenant equipment, on property zoned single family five acre, located at 5364 Sierra Highlands Drive, APN 007-051-66, based on seven findings and subject to the conditions of approval contained in the staff report. Commissioner Reynolds seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.**

Commissioner Semmens moved to approve VAR-04-158, a variance application from T-Mobile, (property owners: J. Scott and Nancy Ford) to allow a reduction from the required 50-foot rear yard setback to 9 feet and a reduction from the required 100-foot front yard setback to 70 feet for a wireless communications facility, as presented in this application, on property zoned single family five acre, located at 5364 Sierra Highlands Drive, APN 007-051-66, based on three findings and subject to the conditions of approval contained in the staff report. Commissioner Vance seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.

Chairperson Peery noted that three letters of objection to this proposal were received as opposed to 14 in support. He further noted that the public comment received was overwhelmingly related to public safety.

G-6. MPA-05-033 AND ZMA-05-034 ACTION TO DIRECT STAFF ON THE INCLUSION OF ADDITIONAL, SURROUNDING PROPERTIES IN AN APPLICATION TO CHANGE THE MASTER PLAN DESIGNATION OF THE PROPERTIES FROM INDUSTRIAL TO COMMERCIAL, AND TO CHANGE THE ZONING OF THE SUBJECT PROPERTIES FROM GENERAL INDUSTRIAL TO GENERAL COMMERCIAL, GENERALLY LOCATED IN THE LEPIRE DRIVE AREA, EAST OF NORTH EDMONDS DRIVE (1-2017) - Chairperson Peery introduced this item, and Mr. Plemel reviewed the staff report. Commissioner Vance agreed that the area needs to be reviewed and discussed. Mr. Sullivan clarified a displayed map, and advised that the applicant had applied for a zone change. The applicant and staff are requesting the Commission to direct that all the

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the March 30, 2005 Meeting

Page 10

parcels be included in the zone change. Mr. Sullivan advised that a zone change can be requested by a property owner, the Board of Supervisors, and the Planning Commission. He explained the request for the Commission to direct staff to notify every property owner in the area that a zoning change would be considered.

In response to a question, Mr. Plemel advised that all current uses would have to be reviewed. Mr. Sullivan acknowledged that existing, conforming uses which may become non-conforming would be grandfathered. Concerns were expressed with regard to future pressure on existing property owners if the area becomes redeveloped. Mr. Plemel advised that if the zoning is changed, any legal, non-conforming use would be allowed to continue. Market forces would be the only pressure to change a use; none would come from the City.

Mr. Plemel acknowledged the applicant and staff would like to agendaize discussion and possible action to rezone all the parcels currently designated general industrial to commercial. He acknowledged that a zone change would not affect the legal status of the current uses. Staff acknowledged that a map could be provided to the Commissioners before discussion is agendaized. **Vice Chairperson Kimbrough moved to direct staff to include APNs 10-351-03, -06, -07, -10, -14, -15, -16, -18, and -90 with applications MPA-05-033 and ZMA-05-034 for review by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors for possible changes to master plan and zoning designations from industrial to commercial and general industrial to general commercial, respectively, on property generally located in the Lepire Drive vicinity, east of North Edmonds Drive. Commissioner Semmens seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.**

Chairperson Peery recessed the meeting at 5:35 p.m. and reconvened at 5:42 p.m. He reminded the citizens present that item G-8 would not be heard until 7:00 p.m.

G-7. MPA-05-044 DISCUSSION ONLY REGARDING A SPECIFIC PLAN AREA TO CHANGE THE MASTER PLAN DESIGNATION OF SPECIFIC PROPERTIES FROM SUBURBAN RESIDENTIAL TO MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF A RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION, ON PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED IN THE VICINITY OF RACE TRACK ROAD BETWEEN CENTER DRIVE AND SCHULZ DRIVE (1-2230) - Chairperson Peery introduced this item. Mr. Plemel provided an overview of the presentation process for this item, reviewed the staff report, and narrated a PowerPoint presentation.

(1-2510) Mark Rotter, of Capital Engineering representing Reynen and Bardis and Barker-Coleman Homes, introduced Ed Davis, of Reynen and Bardis Communities, Karl Mattsel of Barker-Coleman Communities, John Griffin, and Susan Banovich of Capital Engineering. Mr. Rotter provided an overview of his presentation. He discussed the significance of removing the race track and provided an overview of the area using a displayed aerial photograph and a series of slides. Mr. Rotter provided background information on how the proposal came to be included in the specific plan area. Following discussion of numerous issues with City staff, including traffic, water / sewer, parks, and housing types and needs, a decision was made to propose a medium density residential development. Mr. Rotter discussed the issues brought forward at a neighborhood meeting held in December 2004. He advised that two main concerns

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the March 30, 2005 Meeting

Page 11

expressed were over the proposed increase in density and impacts to existing wells. Mr. Rotter explained that the two concerns are somewhat conflicting because development of the area will require extension of water and sewer facilities. He advised that higher density lots provide the opportunity for more improvements and amenities to the area.

Mr. Rotter advised that another concern was traffic. He further advised that Douglas County has designated Topsy Lane as part of their own specific plan area, which includes a large commercial development planned between Topsy Lane and Sunridge Drive. The developers then discussed the possibility of extending Topsy Lane to Center Drive. Discussions with Street Department representatives, in Carson City and Douglas County, indicated the likely connection. Mr. Rotter advised that a two-lane street, with three lanes at intersections for left-hand turn pockets, are likely to be appropriate. He advised of spending a considerable amount of time with City Parks Department staff to discuss their vision for the area. He pointed out the location of a proposed linear park facility along the southern edge of the Topsy Lane interconnection, which would include bike lanes. A 3 - 5 acre park is proposed to be centrally located within the development. Detention facilities would be required for the northern and southern portions of the site. The northern portion of the site is immediately adjacent to Clear Creek. The Parks Department suggested a passive park facility in that location, which would be a little over one acre. A proposed pathway, in a north / south direction, would connect the main park to the passive park and provide a connection across Clear Creek. A proposed southern pathway would provide connectivity to the detention facility as well as for the neighbors to the south to the park facility. Mr. Rotter pointed out a proposed configuration, which provides both east / west connection to open space and to the proposed park facility.

Mr. Rotter advised of the significant concern over changes in density, particularly with regard to changing the rural setting. He advised that of the 90 existing units, there are 18 lots which currently keep horses. He pointed out certain lots on a displayed parcel map, and advised of discussions which took place with regard to buffering. The developers have proposed property lines which will be adjacent to existing property lines. Setbacks would be the same as those designated in the SF1A zone, which is 30 feet. Mr. Rotter pointed out and described the proposed effect to several lots on the parcel map. He advised that the owners of the 8-acre parcel have expressed a willingness to provide the same kind of buffering. He further advised that disclosures would be included in the documentation with regard to livestock, primarily horses.

Mr. Rotter pointed out lot sizes which range from 1/3 to 3/4 an acre, depending upon the adjacent widths and depths. The developers propose to accomplish the same type of streetscape and backyard if there were one-acre lots. Mr. Rotter referred to the interior of the site, and noted the language regarding type of house product, various setbacks, various architectural features, and various lot sizes, the purpose for which was to accommodate the need for housing in Carson City as part of the City's overall master plan goals. He explained that four neighborhoods would be identified around the centralized park, with the more dense neighborhood being in the northwest area of the site, furthest away from the existing developed lots, with degrees of less density in the areas which move closer to the existing developed lots. He advised that Topsy Lane would be the primary access into the development from Highway 395.

With regard to equestrian trails, Mr. Rotter referred to the aerial photograph. He reiterated concerns over increased traffic, and expressed the opinion that the traffic will move more to the west than to the east. The Douglas County area is becoming urbanized as well. He pointed out the routes used by equestrians, including Rabe, Schulz, Race Track, Bigelow, and Snyder, to access the Carson River and the BLM / Prison Hill areas. He advised that discussions with City staff indicate the likelihood of incorporating

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the March 30, 2005 Meeting

Page 12

designations for equestrian trails along those roadways in the City's overall trails plan. He advised of adequate width along Bigelow and Snyder to accommodate equestrian trails. He expressed the opinion that equestrian trails would be inappropriate as part of the park site, and advised that Parks Department staff agreed. He further advised that the proposed development doesn't impact the existing situation. He acknowledged that there will be slightly more traffic, but reiterated the expectation that it will move more toward the west. He advised that modeling will be done to demonstrate the impacts.

Mr. Rotter advised of requests by some of the property owners to split their properties if higher density is allowed on adjacent properties. Mr. Plemel designated this as Area B, and identified it as a transition area in which the property owners would be able to split their parcels. Coupled with the buffering proposed by the developers, Mr. Rotter expressed the opinion that a good transition is provided back to the one-acre lots to the south. He reiterated the concerns over water and sewer, particularly with regard to ground water impacts. He advised that the Utilities Department has no intention to construct a well in the area. He pointed out the location of a well being drilled in Douglas County. In addition, there were concerns over required water / sewer connections by the current property owners. As Mr. Plemel indicated, required connections will only occur through the process of failure of existing wells and septic systems. In response to an additional concern over the capability of the City's water / sewer system to serve the area, Mr. Rotter advised that the Development Services Director had assured him of plans to increase the City's system. Mr. Rotter advised of concerns over school impacts, and anticipates that School District Director of Operations Mike Mitchell would be able to address them.

Mr. Rotter advised of having worked very hard over the past six months with the City and with the neighbors. He anticipated hearing, from the citizens present, some of the same concerns addressed in his presentation, and expressed the hope that the Commissioners would consider the concerns have been adequately addressed. He stated that eliminating the race track and providing for housing in Carson City amounts to a good plan.

Commissioner Sedway thanked Mr. Rotter for his presentation. In response to a question, Mr. Plemel explained that the density range within the medium density residential designation is 3 - 8 units per acre; however, the allowed zoning is SF6,000 and SF12,000. Part of the subject request is to rezone the property to SF6,000. In response to a further question, Mr. Plemel advised that the proposal is for all single-family, detached structures, not apartments. In response to an additional question, he advised that Area B would be low density residential, SF21,000. It would be a transition from approximately one-half acre between the proposed density and the remaining one-acre parcels. In response to a further question, Mr. Plemel advised that the document would be revised, based on the testimony and input received at this meeting. He requested the Commissioners and the citizens to provide any information which may be missing. He explained the importance of the workshop session in order to address any issues which may come up.

Chairperson Peery discussed the need for further clarification over issues such as water / sewer hookup. In response to a question, Mr. Plemel pointed out the county line on a displayed map. In response to a further question regarding lot size, he advised that the subdivision layout had not yet been considered. The SPA document was intended to provide policy for the developers to present a proposed subdivision; a common open space development with a variety of lot sizes, clustering, parks, etc. In response to a question regarding the park, Mr. Plemel advised that Carson City is a little below the national average in terms of neighborhood parks per population. The proposed park is an attempt to bring Carson City to the national average. In terms of the proposed park, the area would be better served than many of the other

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the March 30, 2005 Meeting
Page 13

parts of the City. In response to a further question, Mr. Plemel advised that the flood plain would be identified as part of the subdivision map. The developers' proposal would keep the development out of the flood plain altogether. Mr. Plemel advised that detention / retention basins are required as part of any proposed subdivision development, in response to an additional question. He advised that the main park facility is intended to be centrally located. This item will be agendaized for the Parks and Recreation Commission's April 5th meeting. The retention areas will provide for access and more passive activities.

Commissioner Semmens referred to page 8 of the staff report, and inquired as to where the 2,500 square foot lots are proposed. Mr. Rotter explained the reason for the language in that the density would be the same as for SF6,000 zoning. The number equates to roughly 500 units for the area. With a common open space development, removing the buffering areas and the park areas leaves the same density with smaller lot sizes. If there are smaller lot sizes, the developers propose to place them in the northwest corner, and 4,500 square feet is being considered. Mr. Rotter explained the reason for considering smaller lot sizes is the numerous discussions over the need for entry level housing. He advised that the southwest, the northeast, and the southeast would have increased density; however, it would be limited by the SF6,000 zoning. There would be an exchange of density, larger lots for buffering, creation of some lots that are actually larger than 6,000 square feet in addition to the buffering lots, and decreased lot sizes. He reiterated that the developers have been initially considering 4,500 square foot lots. The developers are considering different size lots to determine the resulting densities, layouts, etc. based on the goals and policies.

Vice Chairperson Kimbrough expressed the opinion that Center Drive is "a little ignored." He inquired as to future plans for Center Drive in the City's regional transportation plan. Mr. Plemel advised that a traffic study will be included in the development plan, together with an evaluation of the capabilities of the existing roadways and any need for improvement. He acknowledged that Center Drive will be an egress route. Commissioner Vance inquired as to the sizes of the buffer lots. Mr. Rotter referred to the parcels along Schulz Way, and advised that a majority of the homes are at the 30' setback. The developers have proposed matching up the lot lines. Mr. Rotter responded to additional questions regarding lot dimensions and lot sizes.

Mr. Plemel responded to questions regarding the proposed plan. He acknowledged that the ramifications of changing zoning in Area B have been explained to the property owners. He expressed the opinion that a more detailed analysis of the impacts should be included in any future discussion. In response to a question, he advised that Area B is proposed for low density residential.

Chairperson Peery opened this item to public comment. He reminded the citizens this item was not agendaized for action. He reserved the right to limit the time for comments, and requested the citizens to not repeat the position of others.

(2-0165) Dyonne Modarelli inquired as to a well being drilled at Center Street. Mr. Plemel advised that the portion of Center Drive upon which the well is being drilled is in Douglas County. Ms. Modarelli anticipates that 2.4 vehicles will accompany the proposed 500 homes. She advised that Center Drive doesn't carry much traffic at all. She expressed the opinion that infrastructure should be constructed prior to considering home construction. Mr. Givlin acknowledged that traffic studies will be conducted prior to proceeding with the proposal. Ms. Modarelli inquired as to how close the homes will be constructed to Clear Creek and expressed concern over the resulting impact.

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the March 30, 2005 Meeting
Page 14

(2-0207) Patricia Puchert advised of having owned property in the general area for 25 years. She wondered why anyone would want to construct 500 homes in “that specific little area.” As a property owner, and experiencing the change of zoning associated with the Southridge development, she expressed the opinion that the traffic will be unmanageable. She expressed the further opinion that the Utilities Department will not be able to meet the water demand. She expressed opposition to changing the zoning, and to “being packed in like little rats.” She discussed the importance of preserving the lifestyle to which the existing residents have become accustomed. She expressed concern with regard to the residents’ investment in their property.

(2-0255) Kenneth Morton inquired as to the proposed zoning. Mr. Plemel explained that the zoning would prevail at a 21,000 square foot minimum lot size.

(2-0271) Rich Wontorski advised of having moved to the area a couple years ago, and that he has six horses on his property. He pointed out his property on the displayed parcel map, and inquired as to the architectural style of the proposed houses. He acknowledged his preference for single story, ranch style homes which will not block existing views. He offered to take the developers and City staff to visit the horse trails. He inquired as to whether livestock will be grandfathered. He expressed concern with regard to the increase in water rates in Carson City, and how they may increase with additional wells being drilled.

(2-0315) Bob Bateman reminded the Commissioners that the area is zoned for one-acre homes, and suggested that the developers “could build one-acre homes right now.” He acknowledged the need for high density subdivisions in Carson City, and suggested there are “other places to build those high density homes.” He pointed out that the high density subdivision is being planned approximately one mile from the retail commercial properties in Douglas County. He expressed the opinion that the residents will be spending their money in Douglas County, and requested the Commissioners’ consideration of this point. He expressed the opinion that “no one in that plan B section is jumping on the bandwagon to subdivide.” He expressed the further opinion that Carson City will “end up being like Boulder City, Colorado with college development, with the state workers,” and that most people will purchase starter homes in Dayton and, as they build equity, move into Carson City. He expressed opposition to the presentation indicating that the proposal will help Carson City with providing affordable housing. He reiterated the request for the Commissioners to consider where the residents of this proposed subdivision will spend their money. Chairperson Peery provided background information on the concern regarding affordable housing. Mr. Bateman agreed there is a need, but suggested there are other locations where the zoning would not have to be changed.

(2-0408) Julie McKean agreed that the proposed homes will not be affordable for the average homeowner. She advised that there is no Carson City phone line available which creates problems in emergencies. She pointed out her property on the displayed parcel map, and discussed concerns over traffic issues. She expressed a preference for single-story structures. She advised that the developers could build on one-acre lots and still connect to City water. She expressed concern over how the race track area can be cleaned up.

(2-0472) DeeDee Foremaster advised of having purchased property in the area approximately 20 years ago. She discussed the uniqueness of the area’s scenic value, and suggested it is one of the only pristine areas left in Carson City. She expressed the opinion that constructing high density homes in the area “is an absolute crime.” She expressed the further opinion that “Carson City missed the boat ... should have put a fairgrounds in over there.” The property purchased by the car dealerships “should have been our

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the March 30, 2005 Meeting
Page 15

convention center that we shared with Douglas County.” Ms. Foremaster advised of having lived in Carson City since 1968, and looked for property for more than five years before purchasing. She reiterated that a fairgrounds should be constructed in the area, and advised that baseball / football facilities are available at the Stewart Indian School. She disagreed with constructing a park “in a rural area,” and suggested more consideration should be given to equestrian trails. She stated that “this is a rural area where we have our homes, where people have lived there for years.” She reiterated the opinion that it would be a crime to the children and to the City to destroy the area by constructing high density homes.

(2-0558) Lisa Young expressed sympathy for the concerns expressed by her neighbors, and agreement that the area is beautiful. She advised of having lived in Carson City for approximately 28 years, during which time she has seen tremendous changes all involving “growth and houses for people.” She expressed the opinion that the economy is healthy “because we make room for people.” She expressed support for the development, and discussed the importance of affordable housing. She noted that change is difficult, and that Carson City only has so much land left. She expressed support for the offer to the property owners in Area B to be included in the higher density area. She expressed the opinion that Carson City residents patronize stores in Douglas County regardless of where they live.

(2-0658) Phyllis Bateman advised of no interest in property value “per se because that implies that [she] would sell [her] home.” She advised that she wants to live there and is not interested in selling her property. She expressed concern to hear that the parcels in Area B may be allowed to subdivide. She suggested this will crowd out those property owners who were looking for living circumstances which were other than urban.

(2-0685) Jon Nowlin advised he does not live in the area. He expressed concern with regard to a procedural issue, and referred to the City’s master planning process. He suggested tabling this matter until the master planning process is completed. He noted that the proposal represents a significant change in land use, in the quality of life of the subject area, and in the visual aspects of the valley. Chairperson Peery explained that “this is the process;” that the Commission would not be approving anything at this meeting. Mr. Nowlin recommended delaying further action on the project until the community at large has gone through the process of developing their vision for changes to the valley and developing a new master plan.

(2-0733) Betty Farris advised of having lived in the area for approximately 30 years. She expressed the opinion that the proposed change to the master plan is incompatible. She noted that the parcels from Koontz Lane to the southern border of Carson City “are all one acres.” A subdivision in the middle of the one-acre parcels will cause problems with traffic and the residents. Ms. Farris suggested that the proposed park is “ironic” as each of the one-acre parcel owners “have a park.” She discussed flooding and drainage issues associated with Clear Creek.

(2-0763) Lynn Roby advised of having lived on Rabe Way for 32 years. He expressed the opinion that the 1975 master plan should be adhered to. He discussed flooding issues, and concerns over the high density housing.

(2-0825) Ken Swift discussed details of the last flood. He distributed a list of questions to the Commissioners and staff. He advised of having moved to Carson City from Reno in 1944, and of having attended school in Carson City. He described his property, and advised that there is no traffic or noise. He described the area as a “pristine, rural area ... gorgeous the way it is.”

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the March 30, 2005 Meeting
Page 16

Chairperson Peery thanked all the citizens for their attendance and participation. He recessed the meeting and reconvened at 7:37 p.m.

G-8. SUP-05-035 ACTION REGARDING A SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FROM HELAINE JESSE, WESTERN NEVADA COMMUNITY COLLEGE (PROPERTY OWNER: BOARD OF REGENTS) TO ALLOW CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF A BASEBALL STADIUM, ON PROPERTY ZONED PUBLIC REGIONAL (PR), LOCATED AT 2201 WEST COLLEGE PARKWAY, APN 007-521-01 (2-0882) - Chairperson Peery introduced this item, and Ms. Pruitt reviewed the staff report. She circulated a sample of the turf material, together with descriptive information. She advised that the hours of use are anticipated to be daylight only. No field lighting is associated with the special use permit. She further advised that WNCC representatives conducted a neighborhood meeting on Saturday, March 26th which approximately 40 people attended. A good exchange between area property owners and college representatives took place, and Ms. Pruitt commended WNCC on their outreach to the residents, who may be directly affected by this project.

Ms. Pruitt advised that the WNCC master plan was updated in 2001, pertinent portions of which were included in the agenda materials. She referred to the letter of concern from Mrs. Jeanne Yapple, included in the agenda materials and provided to staff, the applicant, and the City's Engineering Department. She advised of having received phone calls in the Community Development Department, and that staff reports were provided to concerned citizens. She narrated slides pertinent to this item.

Ms. Pruitt advised that City staff has been in contact with WNCC representatives regarding the staff report, and that copies of the conditions of approval were provided to the design team. She noted two conditions of approval over which WNCC representatives had concerns, #8 and #22. Alternative language was provided in revised conditions of approval distributed to the Commissioners and staff prior to the start of the meeting. Ms. Pruitt read the revised language into the record.

In response to a question regarding condition of approval 19, Ms. Pruitt deferred to Mr. Givlin. With regard to condition of approval 15, Commissioner Sedway inquired as to the intent of the traffic study. Ms. Pruitt advised that the language of condition of approval 15 was provided by Senior RTC Engineer Harvey Brotzman. Mr. Brotzman indicated that the subject use may not warrant a traffic study; however, the traffic study was required for the college as a whole. Ms. Pruitt advised that the traffic study has been a topic of discussion since the time the WNCC master plan was updated in 2001. Commissioner Sedway suggested that the traffic study should be conducted at the time of master plan revisions and updates. Ms. Pruitt advised that initial conditions of approval included an update to the campus master plan with any additional special use permit. She further advised that staff is comfortable with the language of the conditions of approval, and expressed understanding that an updated master plan will be submitted in 2006. She explained that Mr. Brotzman was not aware of her conversation with Helaine Jesse.

Vice Chairperson Kimbrough inquired as to why grading had begun without the special use permit having been approved. Commissioner Vance advised that the residents of Silver Oak were provided notice of the meeting and their opportunity to provide input "after the dirt work started." Ms. Pruitt expressed understanding for the concern. She advised that the design team was present to provide explanation over permits which have already been pulled. She further advised that staff had received many phone calls, and noted that a great deal of work is taking place in the area. She explained that the City has two ongoing projects, multiple wells are being drilled in the area, and the City is constructing a drainage facility to the

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the March 30, 2005 Meeting
Page 17

south. She advised that staff has worked very closely with WNCC, the design group, and with the neighbors. She advised of having spoken with no one who had the perception the project had been approved through some type of back door effort. She deferred questions with regard to grading to the WNCC representatives and their design team.

Mr. Sullivan advised of abstaining from participation in this project because his wife is a WNCC employee. He further advised of having received a telephone call requesting to begin grading early. He responded with the standard "no" because of the possibility that the Commission may deny the project. He commended Ms. Pruitt on her efforts in working with WNCC and the neighbors.

(2-1187) Helaine Jesse, Vice President of Institutional Advancement for WNCC, introduced Terry Reynolds, of Wingfield Nevada Group. Mr. Reynolds explained that the State Public Works Board and Carson City have been involved in this process. He provided background information on the City's special use permit application process and on discussions with the State Public Works Board. He advised of having requested permission from the State Public Works Board to begin grading, which permission was provided in writing. He advised of an agreement that if the project was not approved, the area will be reseeded and revegetated. He advised of having received air quality and storm water permits for the property. He commended City staff on their assistance. He advised that the project calls for field turf, which has a "very narrow window" for installation by the contracted company. He presented the WNCC Baseball Field project, as outlined in the written materials provided to the Commissioners and staff. He referred to a color rendering displayed in the meeting room.

In response to a question, Ms. Jesse committed to maintaining a pathway from the Silver Oak subdivision to the V&T Trail. She further committed to creating an access point to the V&T Trail from the WNCC campus. She could not commit that the path will be straight from Desert Peach. Commissioner Vance described the existing path. (2-1423) D.J. Whittemore advised of a 10'-wide path on the south side of the fence that encircles the outfield fence. Ms. Jesse acknowledged that the path could tie into the V&T Trail. She further acknowledged that the path exists on WNCC property. Commissioner Sedway suggested that an easement will be required to cover liability concerns. Ms. Jesse described existing uses in the area, and expressed the hope there will be no need for liability agreements. She anticipates that the development will decrease the amount of off-road vehicles and OHV use in the area. She advised that WNCC is very amenable to people accessing the property.

In response to a question, Ms. Jesse referred to the state-of-the-art observatory in the northwest corner of the WNCC property, and advised that WNCC has worked extensively with the City to implement dark skies lighting guidelines for all kinds of development within the City. The WNCC president and staff did not want to have the baseball field lighted. For the record, Ms. Jesse advised there may be lights at the baseball field at some point. She advised that the parking lot lights were recently retrofitted to maintain dark skies in the area. In response to an earlier question, she advised there is no funding yet for bleachers. All of the field accouterments will be added as donations are received. She acknowledged that any future lighting would have to be submitted to this Commission. She expressed a preference that the entire project be approved in order to proceed with construction.

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the March 30, 2005 Meeting
Page 18

In response to a question, Ms. Jesse advised that 300' separates the ball field from the nearest residence. Commissioner Reynolds suggested that the traffic study should be tied to condition of approval 22. Ms. Jesse advised that the 2001 master plan has not changed. She suggested that a traffic study would be more appropriate with construction of the next building.

Commissioner Sedway expressed confusion over condition of approval 12 because all the drawings presented seem to depict a complete ball park. Ms. Pruitt explained that staff has been in conversations with WNCC representatives and their design consultants for months. Discussions have included utilities, lighting, noise, etc. She discussed the importance of time frames associated with project phases, and advised that there were no time frames specifically associated with the project phases. Commissioner Sedway inquired as to where phase 1 is specifically identified. He noted that condition of approval 12 identifies items excluded from the subject special use permit, including bleachers. Ms. Pruitt explained that the recommended motion specifically designates the baseball park, fields, dugouts, and the access road as items included in phase 1. She acknowledged that the project could have been approved at once if specific time frames had been included for each phase. The idea was to ensure every single facet was covered, to ensure mitigation measures, etc. Ms. Jesse expressed agreement with Ms. Pruitt's explanation.

Commissioner Mullet referred to the layout of the entire property, and inquired as to plans for parking on the north side of Combs Canyon Road. Ms. Jesse explained that this was part of the master planning process. There are no plans to build on the seven acres across from Combs Canyon. WNCC has been working with the City and the Division of State Lands on a potential lands exchange for property above the observatory in order to protect the dark skies. Ms. Jesse discussed the close working relationship with the City, and provided specific examples. Mr. Givlin commented that Ms. Jesse and Dr. Lucey have been wonderful partners with regard to the City's storm drainage issues. Commissioner Mullet referred to the fenced in area on the north side of the WNCC shop buildings. He suggested screening the three storage containers outside the fenced area. Chairperson Peery opened this item to public comment.

(2-1762) Julio Sandoval, an adjacent property owner, Board member of the Silver Oak Homeowner's Association, and project engineer for Silver Oak, expressed support for the baseball field project. He expressed concerns over dust control, and suggested that the dust be watered more frequently. He discussed the "disaster" which occurred Easter Sunday for all homeowners and property owners in Silver Oak because of the high winds. He reiterated the request that WNCC stay on top of the dust problem. Mr. Sandoval acknowledged that the Waterfall Fire burn area was also blowing dust on Easter Sunday.

(2-1861) Jeanne Yapple emphasized the importance of pedestrians having continued access through Desert Peach up to the existing trail to the V&T. She agreed that dust has been a problem, and requested as much mitigation as possible for both projects.

(2-1885) Laura Briscoe, an adjacent property owner, expressed appreciation for Commissioner Vance's comments with regard to the grading having already begun. She echoed the comments about dust.

In response to a question, Mr. Reynolds advised that a water truck is on site and that he would ensure the dirt is frequently watered. He offered his cell phone number for complaints with regard to dust. In response to a question, he advised that the chain link fencing will have vinyl slatting, very similar to UNR's baseball field perimeter fence. Vice Chairperson Kimbrough discussed vinyl coating for chain link fencing. Mr. Reynolds advised that he will look into ensuring the fence is not shiny in appearance.

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the March 30, 2005 Meeting
Page 19

Chairperson Peery acknowledged a good point on the part of Commissioner Vance, who noted the project seemed to have begun prior to the process of approval. Mr. Sullivan had already indicated his admonition is always to recommend waiting for permission. The newspaper article in the Commission agenda materials indicates that construction began this week. Chairperson Peery acknowledged that time was an element for the particular turf product. He expressed a preference for waiting to begin projects until after they are approved. Ms. Jesse acknowledged the acceptability of the conditions of approval, as amended.

Commissioner Reynolds reiterated the suggestion to tie the traffic study to the January 1, 2006 date designated in condition of approval #22. Mr. Givlin was unaware as to the significance of this matter with the City's transportation engineers. He anticipated that the suggested revision would be satisfactory. Commissioner Sedway reiterated the concern with regard to approving the entire project. Ms. Pruitt referred to the special use permit application included in the agenda materials, and reviewed the various amenities listed therein which will require mitigation measures. She advised that the Planning and Community Development Department was very clear, as information was provided to the public, that phase 1 would be specifically the field, the fencing, and associated development. Once WNCC decides funding is available for the other amenities, their representatives will return to the Commission. Chairperson Peery suggested striking condition of approval #12 at this time.

(1-2125) Mr. Whittemore explained the purpose for phasing the project. Mr. Reynolds noted the other partner in the project, the State Public Works Board. He advised that all proposed facilities are required to be approved and inspected by the State Public Works Board jointly with Carson City. He noted that Carson City approves the special use permit, but the State Public Works Board has final authority on inspection of facilities because, as they are built and dedicated back, they become State facilities. He advised that the inspections and approvals will need to take place simultaneously with the next round of the special use permit.

Chairperson Peery entertained a motion. **Commissioner Sedway moved to approve SUP-05-035, a special use permit request from Helaine Jesse to allow construction of the Western Nevada Community College Baseball Park, consisting of mass grading, baseball field, dugouts, access road, stadium seating, fencing, concession stand, hitting facility, plaza, dugouts, and press box, as presented, on property zoned public regional, located at 2201 West College Parkway, APN 007-521-01, based on seven findings and subject to the conditions of approval, as amended for #8, striking #12, and for #22, with item #15 to be included as part of #22 with regard to the traffic study being part of the master plan after January 1, 2006, with the understanding that any acknowledgments to the Commission / Board by the applicant may be considered as further stipulations or conditions of approval on this application. Commissioner Vance seconded the motion.** In response to a request for clarification, Chairperson Peery explained the motion. Commissioner Sedway acknowledged including the amenities for which staff had recommended submission of a subsequent special use permit. Ms. Pruitt noted that the other amenities were not part of the recommended motion, and reiterated the concern regarding mitigation measures and other issues which should be presented to the Commission. In response to a question, she referred to the amenities listed in condition of approval #12. She noted, for the record, that staff was relying on the opportunity to address mitigation measures for those amenities. Ms. Madden advised that the public was not provided notice these amenities would be discussed at this meeting. The notice specifically states the amenities listed in condition of approval #12 will be brought up in subsequent phases. Discussion took place with regard to the same.

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the March 30, 2005 Meeting
Page 20

In response to a question, Ms. Madden expressed the opinion that condition of approval #12 is clear. Ms. Pruitt referred to page 16 of the agenda materials, and provided an overview of the executive summary submitted by the applicant. She advised of two submittals from the applicant, and that the submittal dated March 2nd indicates the intention to construct the field in phases. Commissioner Sedway acknowledged his awareness, and suggested there was no difference between this project and an earlier approved project which had five phases. He inquired as to the reason for requiring the special use permit to be approved in phases. Mr. Sullivan discussed the differences between the earlier approved project and the subject project. He advised of a public perception problem associated with the subject project. (2-2391) Ms. Jesse advised of a willingness to come back before the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Sedway withdrew his motion. Commissioner Vance moved to approve SUP-05-035, a special use permit request from Helaine Jesse to allow construction of the Western Nevada Community College Baseball Park, consisting of mass grading, baseball field, dugouts, and access road in the first phase, on property zoned public regional, located at 2201 West College Parkway, APN 007-521-01, based on seven findings and subject to the conditions of approval contained in the staff report, and with the understanding that any acknowledgments to the Commission / Board by the applicant may be considered as further stipulations or conditions of approval on this application, with the amendments to conditions of approval #8 and #22, to include the January 1, 2006 traffic study. Commissioner Mullet seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-1.

G-9. ACTION TO APPROVE THE PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIVISION BUDGET REQUEST TO INCREASE THE PLANNING COMMISSION TRAVEL AND TRAINING BUDGET TO \$5,000 ANNUALLY (2-2467) - Mr. Sullivan presented this request. The Commissioners presented Mr. Sullivan with a duffle bag from the American Planning Association Convention in San Francisco. Chairperson Peery expressed appreciation for Mr. Plemel's driving and navigational skills during the trip. Mr. Sullivan advised that he is also requesting an increase to \$5,000 for the Historic Resources Commission travel and training budget. Commissioner Mullet moved to direct staff to request an increase in the annual budget for Commission training to \$5,000. Commissioner Semmens seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.

H. STAFF REPORTS:

H-1. REPORT ON BOARD OF SUPERVISORS' ACTION ON PRIOR PLANNING COMMISSION APPLICATIONS, and H-2. STATUS REPORTS ON IMPROVEMENTS TO GONIROAD (2-2564) - Mr. Sullivan advised that an appeal on the duplex in a commercial zone adjacent to a single family residential zone will go forward to the Board of Supervisors at their first meeting in April. The second reading on the wireless communication facilities and equipment ordinance took place at the March 17th Board of Supervisors meeting. It was approved on a vote of 5-0. Mr. Sullivan reviewed the status of various bills regarding mobile homes and RVs. He referred to a hearing on the Cinderlite special use permit several months ago, wherein comments were received with regard to improving the shoulders of the road. He advised that the work began in December, and is nearly complete.

In response to a question, Mr. Sullivan advised of a statute which provides for state agencies to comply with local zoning ordinances. Building permits would be pulled through the State Public Works Board.

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the March 30, 2005 Meeting
Page 21

H-3. MPA-04-127 PRESENTATION, DISCUSSION, AND PUBLIC COMMENT TO UPDATE THE PLANNING COMMISSION ON ACTIVITIES RELATED TO “ENVISION CARSON CITY,” THE UPDATE OF THE CARSON CITY MASTER PLAN AND THE PARKS, RECREATION, AND TRAILS PLAN (2-2716) - Mr. Plemel advised that staff is working to schedule the next master plan workshops, refining scenarios, and considering certain areas in more detail. More information will be forthcoming, and he provided the master plan website information.

I. ACTION ON ADJOURNMENT (2-2729) - Commissioner Semmens moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:02 p.m. Commissioner Vance seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.

The Minutes of the March 30, 2005 meeting of the Carson City Planning Commission are so approved this 25th day of May, 2005.

JOHN PEERY, Chair