

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the May 29, 2002, Meeting

Page 1

A regularly scheduled meeting of the Carson City Planning Commission was held on Wednesday, May 29, 2002, at the Community Center Sierra Room, 851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada, beginning at 3:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Chairperson Allan Christianson, Vice Chairperson Richard Wipfli, and Commissioners Gayle Farley, William Mally, Wayne Pedlar, John Peery and Roger Sedway

STAFF PRESENT: Community Development Director Walter Sullivan, Deputy District Attorney Jason Woodbury, Senior Planners Skip Canfield and Lee Plemel, Senior Engineer Rob Fellows, Parks Planner Verne Krahn, Recording Secretary Katherine McLaughlin, Associate Planner Jennifer Pruitt, and Planning Tech Kevin Veere (PC 5/29/02 Tape 1-0001)

NOTE: Unless otherwise indicated, each item was introduced by the Chairperson. Staff then presented or clarified the staff report/supporting documentation. Any other individuals who spoke are listed immediately following the item heading. A tape recording of these proceedings is on file in the Clerk-Recorder's office. This tape is available for review and inspection during normal business hours.

A. ROLL CALL, DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM, AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE - Chairperson Christianson convened the meeting at 3:30 p.m. Roll call was taken. A quorum was present although Commissioner Peery had not yet arrived. Chairperson Christianson led the Pledge of Allegiance.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - APRIL 24, 2002 (1-0055) - Commissioner Wipfli moved to approve the Minutes as read. Commissioner Mally seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0.

C. PUBLIC COMMENTS (1-0060) - None.

D. AGENDA MODIFICATIONS (1-0062) - Community Development Director Walter Sullivan explained that Items G-9 and G-10 were scheduled for 6 p.m. He assured the audience that they would not be heard before 6 p.m. and may be heard after 6 p.m. Anyone wishing to do so could leave and return at 6 p.m.

E. DISCLOSURES (1-0081) - Commissioner Wipfli disclosed that Cingular Wireless, Item G-4, does business with his firm and that he would abstain on this item. Commissioner Farley disclosed that she had received a telephone call from Judie Fisher regarding the Legislature's metal building. This discussion will have no impact on her. Commissioner Pedlar explained his discussion with local realtor Steven Lincoln regarding F-1, Cinderlite Trucking. It will not impact his decision. Chairperson Christianson referenced a letter in the packet regarding G-9 which indicated he should recuse himself as Bill Crowell is his attorney. Mr. Crowell had been his attorney 12 years ago. Therefore, he would not recuse himself.

F. CONSENT AGENDA (1-0107)

F-1. U-79-30A - DISCUSSION AND ACTION REGARDING THE EXPANSION OF A PREVIOUSLY APPROVED SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR CINDERLITE TRUCKING CORPORATION

F-2. U-01/02-36 - DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON A SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FROM TOM HOFFERT, UTILITIES OPERATIONS MANAGER - Commissioner Peery arrived

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the May 29, 2002, Meeting

Page 2

at 3:37 p.m. (A quorum was present as previously indicated.) Community Development Director Walter Sullivan requested Item F-1 be pulled for discussion. Discussion explained the motion which should be taken. Commissioner Pedlar moved to continue Item F-2, a Special Use Permit application from Tom Hoffert, Utilities Operations Manager, until the June 2002 Planning Commission meeting. Commissioner Wipfli seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.

F-1. (1-0157) Community Development Director Walter Sullivan explained the request for a continuance was based on staff's recommendation of a denial and the applicant's desire to submit additional information. A notice was placed in Sunday's newspaper indicating a request for a continuance. He would like for Ms. Howard to make her statements on the record so that staff could address them with the applicant.

Cindy Howard read a prepared statement into the record describing her original contact with Gary Lehman regarding his request to reopen the extraction site. Commitments made at that time were described. A packet of information was distributed to the Commission. (A copy was not given to the Clerk or staff.) The conditions placed on the special use permit were limned. Clarification for the record indicated the pit operation was limited to 7 a.m. to 6 p.m. Monday through Friday and 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. on Saturday. They were to remove only sand, however, the site is also used to obtain rock. There have been no rehabilitation efforts. The hours of operation were changed to 6 a.m. to 6 p.m. Monday through Friday. Copies of complaints were purportedly included within the packet. They related to the hours and speed of the trucks. A 1995 letter from Senior Planner Juan Guzman was read. It cited specific issues which had not been accomplished. She hoped that the bond was for more than the \$5,000 indicated as it will do little to restore the site. The site plan submitted by Mr. Lehman contained an undisturbed area away from the powerlines. The slopes were to be at a three to one grade. The agreement had been for a two to one grade. An old photograph, taken between 1993 and 1994, was shown to illustrate the conditions at that time. A photograph illustrating the current status was also shown. She questioned how the rehabilitation could occur? When are the slopes to be returned to the promised two to one? When will the hours of operation be enforced? The truck volume has increased on their narrow street. The children's safety concerns were noted. They deserve to enjoy the peaceful, quiet of their neighborhood. The scar that is being created can be seen throughout the community. The mineral rights have been withdrawn from BLM lands to protect the scenic quality of the land. She asked staff to do a full site investigation and to place a review of the special use permit on next month's agenda. It is time to grade the area, rehabilitate it, and close it. The residents deserve a quality of life also.

Discussion between Commissioner Mally and Mr. Sullivan pointed out that Mr. Bertognolli had been required to live up to his conditions and that the same should occur here. Mr. Sullivan also indicated that there are additional concerns involved.

Ralph Capurro supported Ms. Howard's comments. He also questioned how Mr. Lehman would be able to live up to additional conditions, if he cannot live up to the ones that are there now. The request to expand from 40 acres to 120 acres will increase the scar and further abuse the property. Tricia Lincoln also supported the comments. Marilyn Musso could not see the present scar but expanding it would make it visible to the entire community. She supported the preservation league. Lee Hobold indicated the site is behind him. He hears noises coming from the pit all the time. They are destroying the area. He opposed the special use permit request.

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the May 29, 2002, Meeting

Page 3

Mr. Sullivan reiterated the request to continue the item to a future Commission meeting. Commissioner Wipfli moved to continue Item F-1 to a future meeting which is to be disclosed by staff. Commissioner Sedway seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.

Copies of Ms. Howard's comments were given to staff. (A copy was not given to the Clerk.) Ms. Howard reiterated her request that staff be directed to investigate it thoroughly as compliance has not occurred since the very beginning. Another pit and expansion should not be allowed. An annual review should be enforced. Mr. Sullivan explained that the current operation would be investigated and additional information submitted on the expansion request. Senior Planner Lee Plemel will be asked to tour the site with Ms. Howard. Discussion indicated the item may return in July. The participants were encouraged to attend the meeting when agenzied.

G. PUBLIC HEARINGS

G-1. RECESS THE PLANNING COMMISSION AND CONVENE THE GROWTH MANAGEMENT COMMISSION (1-0505) - Chairperson Christianson recessed the Planning Commission. For discussion and action on the Growth Management item, please see its folder.

RECESS: A recess was declared at 4:35 p.m. A quorum of the Board was present when Chairperson Christianson reconvened the meeting. Commissioner Farley returned during Chairperson Christianson's reading of the title of the following item. (A that time the entire Commission was present, constituting a quorum.)

G-2. U-01/02-35 - DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON A SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FROM STEVE KASTENS, PARKS AND RECREATION DIRECTOR (1-1096) - Associate Planner Jennifer Pruitt, Applicant's Representative Carol Dotson from Lumos and Associates, Parks Planner Verne Krahn, Senior Engineer Rob Fellows, Parks and Recreation Director Steve Kastens, Gene Lepire, Sr. - Ms. Dotson reviewed the history of the project, its current facilities, Phase I and II of the project, and their concurrence with the findings and conditions. Discussion indicated that there will be some disruption to the use of Fuji Park during construction. Mr. Krahn explained that construction will occur during the late summer and early fall. The location of the other restrooms at the park, their accessibility, and the plan by some of the users to bring in portable toilets were described. Events requiring the amount of parking which will be provided were limned. Mr. Fellows explained the proposal to underground the power lines and remove the power poles as part of Phase II. Phase II is to be completed after the election results are compiled. The users do not wish to spend all of the money on the park and have nothing left for the fairgrounds if it stays at the current location. Mr. Krahn also clarified that the property line that has been drawn is to illustrate where the work will stop. At this time it is an arbitrary line. No work is planned on the creek but some work will be done between the path and the edge of the water. This work includes planting native roses and native grasses to stabilize the bank. The playground is part of Phase II and will be located next to the parking area. Safety screening was described. There will be a five-foot fence around the parameter of the park. The turf area will remain open to accommodate the users.

(1-1424) Mr. Lepire indicated that he wanted Clear Creek Road done in Phase 1. He wanted the operation period to be restricted to 8 a.m. to 10 p.m. He felt that the RVs and showers should not be allowed due to the

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the May 29, 2002, Meeting

Page 4

problems found with Mills Park restrooms and his experience/knowledge of an incident in Modesto. The exhibitors should use the hotels/motels or RV parks. His concerns regarding the lighting were explained. He also requested a right turn lane from Clear Creek Road be provided.

Mr. Kastens explained that the exhibit hall is open until 1 a.m. Outdoor arena events are not allowed after 11 p.m. The go carts were there until 11 p.m. Bull riding events are scheduled from 6:30 p.m. to 9:30 p.m. RV parking is allowed for some events where they need to remain on the site for animal multi-day events. It costs \$4 per night. The RVs must be self-contained. Electricity is available for grooming purposes only. Dumping should be done at other RV sites. The dog and animal show participants will not come for multi-day events unless their RVs can remain on-site. These shows provide tourist dollars to the community for food/restaurants. Some of the participants come with multi-units and have trainers who remain with the animals while the owners go to the hotels/motels. Staff is considering installing portable showers. The cost for the restrooms and two showers is \$150,000. The showers are only open for special events. He was committed to prohibiting the Mills Park incident described by Mr. Lepire. The events should not create an additional impact to Clear Creek as the proposed improvements are for current needs. Parking will be removed along Clear Creek Road which will improve traffic flow. The parking lot lighting will be hooded and controlled. He guaranteed that it will be less intrusive than the current use. The lights which are there now may be changed to match the new lighting plan. Commission comments pointed out the City's inability to control the lighting at the retail developments south of the county line. It may be that the lighting there will eliminate any concerns regarding Fuji Park.

Mr. Lepire urged the Commission to increase the RV parking fees from \$4 to \$9. He also asked how much revenue is generated and where it is kept. He reiterated his request for the right turn lane on Clear Creek to go south onto Highway 395 and hinted that he may have to litigate the issues in order for him to obtain them. He questioned the need for showers for a two-day dog show and explained his encounter with an individual who had given a dog a bath in his showers. Chairperson Christianson pointed out that his property and entrance were not across from the Park. Mr. Lepire felt that the traffic into his park is impacted by the traffic on Clear Creek.

Mr. Sullivan read the conditions related to Clear Creek Road and Warehouse Way. He also agreed to check into Mr. Lepire's concerns regarding the right turn lane with Mr. Kastens and Engineering. Mr. Lepire felt that a traffic study should be conducted as it will show what is needed. Mr. Kastens suggested that Mr. Lepire participate with the other property owners to develop the right turn lane. Mr. Lepire indicated that he would if and when he needs a Special Use Permit.

Mr. Kastens agreed to the normal construction hours of 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. Monday through Saturday. Clarification indicated that the construction hours had been stipulated to as 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. Monday through Saturday, that Condition 2 addressed the road issue, and that the outdoor areas will be used from 6 a.m. to 11 p.m., overnight RV parking will be allowed when connected to dog/animal shows, and that the exhibit hall closes at 1 a.m. Commissioner Wipfli indicated that he was just checking the hours of operation and that they were not to be considered part of the conditions.

Commissioner Wipfli moved to approve U-01/02-34, a Special Use Permit request from Steve Kastens, Carson City Parks and Recreation Director, applicant, Carson City, owner, to allow park improvements at Fuji Park

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the May 29, 2002, Meeting

Page 5

on Assessor's Parcel Numbers 009-303-02 and 009-303-07, property zoned Public, located west of the intersection of Old Clear Creek Road and U.S. 395 South, based on seven findings and subject to 13 conditions of approval contained in the staff report and with the understanding that any acknowledgements to the Commission by the applicant may be considered as further stipulations or conditions of approval on this application. Following a request for an amendment, Commissioner Wipfli corrected the application number to be U-01/02-35. Commissioner Pedlar seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.

G-3. U-97/98-49a - DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON THE REVIEW OF A PREVIOUSLY APPROVED SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR CAPITAL CHRISTIAN CENTER SCHOOL (1-1830) - Associate Planner Jennifer Pruitt, Applicant's Representative Deborah Sisco - Ms. Sisco indicated she had read the report and concurred with it. She thanked Ms. Pruitt for her cooperation on the landscaping. Public comments were solicited but none were given. Commissioner Pedlar moved to approve the one year review of U-97/98-49a, a previously approved Special Use Permit from Harold C. Casper, property owner: Capital Christian Center, to allow as a conditional use an educational facility on property zoned Public located at 1600 Snyder Avenue, APN 010-221-15, with the requested stipulations and original conditions of approval and to direct staff to review this permit administratively in the future only as warranted and allow staff to reserve the right to return this item for Planning Commission review if warranted. Commissioner Wipfli seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

G-4. U-01/02-33 - DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON A SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FROM JOHN YU, CINGULAR WIRELESS (1-1918) - Senior Planner Lee Plemel, Applicant John Yu - Commissioner Wipfli indicated he would abstain and left the room. (5:28 p.m. A quorum was still present.) Mr. Plemel's introduction indicated that the antennas will be painted "Sudan Brown" and corrected the recommended motion in the report to indicate that there were ten conditions of approval. Mr. Yu indicated that he had read the report and agreed with it. There will be six antennas and all of the radios and electronic equipment will be placed inside the building. Maintenance will occur one to three times a month. They will maintain all of the electronic equipment. They had been asked to relocate. The proposed site does not provide the same cellular coverage as the Ormsby House but does provide good coverage in the downtown area and allows for the signal to be transmitted to other signal carriers. The visual impacts of a monopole and lattice pole were noted. The proposed use is an alternative. He supported collocation as provided in the ordinance. He was unsure whether the other antennas were to be moved. They had been asked to move theirs as quickly as possible so that roof work could be performed for venting and air-conditioning changes. Public comments were solicited but none were given. Commissioner Mally moved to approve U-01/02-33, a Special Use Permit application from John Yu, Cingular Wireless, property owner: BOAC Limited, a Nevada LLC, to allow the installation of six wireless communication antennas on an existing building, exceeding the existing building height by 20 feet on property zoned Retail Commercial located at 600 East William Street, APN 002-145-01, based on seven findings and subject to ten conditions of approval contained in the staff report and with the understanding that any acknowledgements to the Commission or Board by the applicant may be considered as further stipulations or conditions of approval on this application. Commissioner Pedlar seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0-1 with Commissioner Wipfli absent.

G-5. U-98/99-27 - DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON THE REVIEW OF A PREVIOUSLY APPROVED SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR SID WILLIAMS (1-2164) - Senior Planner Skip Canfield - Commissioner Wipfli returned during Chairperson Christianson's reading of the title. (A quorum was present.)

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the May 29, 2002, Meeting

Page 6

. Ms. McGee had contacted Mr. Canfield and advised him that they had been good neighbors and that she did not have a problem with the use. Discussion indicated that the restaurant had not panned out and must have gone elsewhere. The applicant was not present. Public comments were solicited but none were given. Commissioner Pedlar moved to approve the one year review of U-98/99-27, for a commercial development on property zoned Retail Commercial/Single Family One Acre located at 4250 Cochise Street, Assessor's Parcel Number 009-261-03, applicant Sid Williams, owner Keith and Janet Williams, based on the original findings and subject to the original conditions of approval contained in the staff report and with the understanding that any acknowledgements to the Commission/Board by the applicant may be considered as further stipulations or conditions of approval on this application and with the understanding that no further yearly reviews are required unless Planning and Community Development determines further review is warranted. Commissioner Wipfli seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.

G-6. U-01/02-30 - DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON A SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FROM LORNE J. MALKIEWICH, PROPERTY OWNER: LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL BUREAU, STATE OF NEVADA, TO ALLOW ERECTION OF A STEEL WAREHOUSE STRUCTURE, APPROXIMATELY 9600 SQUARE FEET IN SIZE, ON PROPERTY ZONED DOWNTOWN COMMERCIAL (DC) LOCATED AT 201 EAST SIXTH STREET, APN 004-065-01 (1-2240) - Senior Planner Skip Canfield, Lorne Malkiewich, Chief Deputy District Attorney Mark Forsberg, Redevelopment/Economic Development Director and Downtown Design Review Hearings Examiner Rob Joiner, Judie Fisher, Bill Miles of Miles Construction - Mr. Canfield asked that Mr. Malkiewich discuss the State's master plan. Wainscotting had not been included on the drawings in the packet. Redevelopment Authority Citizens Committee had required the Wainscotting. Staff is to work with Mr. Malkiewich on the exterior design and had committed to attempting to make the building look like the Sedway Building.

Mr. Malkiewich distributed new computerized renderings of the building to the Commission and Clerk. (A copy is in the file.) Efforts to improve the building's appearance since the last meeting were described. He committed to continuing to working with staff on the exterior. The building is to be ancillary to the Sedway Building. This is the reason for the attempt to make it look similar to it although the columns are more suggestive of the Legislative Building. Other attempts to mitigate the impact included moving the structure to the north end of the lot and closer to the Sedway Building. There will be a large landscaped buffer and additional parking provided on the south side of the new building. Discussion between Mr. Malkiewich and the Commission indicated that the roof mass will have the largest impact. It will be made from steel material with a "burnish slate" color. Commissioner Wipfli pointed out the sensitive nature of the location and suggested that the building be located on NDOT property to the southeast. Even though the building and landscaping will be a significant investment, the location and redevelopment that have occurred in the surrounding area should be considered. Mr. Malkiewich explained that the Council owns the proposed site. The long-term plans include expansion into the area. It may be possible to relocate the building to the NDOT site when it is moved in the future. It is hoped that the value of the building could be repaid in six or seven, at the most ten, years. It will be "great" if the building can be relocated at that time. The long-range plan is to have an office building and parking lot on the site. The original plan had been to renovate the Senator Apartment complex. This was not feasible as they discovered after it was purchased. He proposed to go to the Legislature in a few years for planning money. This may be in 2007. He committed to seeking the funds for planning and development of an office building on the site. The actual date will depend on when the State is in a good economic situation. Funding will then be sought for its replacement. The building will meet the

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the May 29, 2002, Meeting

Page 7

LCB's short term needs by saving the \$500,000 investment and providing storage ancillary to the Legislative Sedway Building. He also felt that the building and site will look better than the majority of the surrounding property. The building could not be located at NDOT's site until the Legislature approves the use of the funds for that purpose. This could occur in 2003. The State and Legislature control the NDOT property. He controls only the proposed site. Commissioner Wipfli felt, as a taxpayer, that the figures do not work out for the removal of the building in five years. Mr. Malkiewich explained that they are currently paying \$60,000 per month for off-site rental. Commissioner Mally supported Commissioner Wipfli's comments due to his feeling that it would be a waste of money to construct and remove the building. He suggested that the building be placed on a site where it could remain permanently. Mr. Malkiewich reiterated the cost of the current storage rental. The proposal allows them to use the building, make the proposed site look better than an empty lot, and recover the investment plus having the convenience of on-site storage. He reiterated the original intent as having been to renovate the Senator Apartments. The building(s) were to be converted to storage, offices and a possible daycare. The condition of the building(s) was such that this was not possible, therefore, the building(s) was removed.

Mr. Forsberg reminded the Commission that the discussion was off of the agenda. The Commission's role is to determine if the planned use or land use item is sensible. The money issues related to the acquisition and use cannot be considered. Chairperson Christianson supported his comments. Mr. Malkiewich explained that the acquisition had been based on the master plan. The building had required the special use permit, therefore, an application had been submitted.

Commissioner Sedway expressed his appreciation of the effort to make the building look better. He questioned the function of the building as it will be used as a warehouse. The proposal places it in a sensitive area of the community. He would like to see the master plan and to have a definition of temporary that could be added as a condition. Mr. Malkiewich explained that he could not commit the Legislature. He committed to seeking design funds in 2007. Once they are obtained, he will seek construction funds in 2009 or 2011. The site will be used for a staff office building. The need for this building was limned. The storage facility allows them to recover the rent/lease funds until the time is right to take the next step. Commissioner Sedway acknowledged his lack of control over the Legislature and pointed out the Commission's control over the conditions placed on a special use permit.

(1-2795) Public comments were solicited. Mr. Joiner explained the Downtown Design Review (DDR) and Redevelopment Authority Citizens Committee (RACC) recommendations. He felt that the improvements made to the design made it a better-looking building. Efforts to establish mixed uses in the area were noted. The building will be heavily landscaping. His examples illustrated that the Legislative Council Bureau has always supported and partnered with the City. He felt that Mr. Malkiewich would stand on his word to replace the building to the best of his ability. Discussion between Mr. Joiner and the Commission explained that Mr. Malkiewich is an at will employee and his commitment to the project. It was also pointed the "hodge podge" of different buildings styles, businesses, and underdeveloped properties found in the vicinity. Improvements which the State had made in the vicinity and the time they had taken to accomplish them were also limned. The six to ten year commitment was felt to be doable. Redevelopment may be able to assist with a public-private demonstration project or a lease-purchase project. The building will not be a loss to the taxpayers if it can be relocated when the site is rehabilitated. Mr. Joiner committed to watching over the next phase of the partnership to ensure that something good looking will be provided. Mr. Joiner also indicated that the

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the May 29, 2002, Meeting

Page 8

Legislature may not be interested in a public-private building but that Mr. Malkiewich has expressed his willingness to consider it. Justification for the DDR and RACC recommendations was provided. Commission concerns regarding the precedent that would be established if a warehouse is allowed were voiced. Commissioner Pedlar felt that the State had been a good neighbor and it is their property. Attempts were being made to mitigate the impact. They cannot build on the NDOT property. Additional funding is not available at this time. The State needs and uses warehouses. Mr. Joiner felt that RACC had supported his points and noted the cost of the design improvements proposed for the building. RACC wishes to continue working with Mr. Malkiewich. Commission comments pointed out that the Carson Valley Oil and Copeland Lumber buildings were in the district before RACC and DDR efforts began. Allowing a warehouse after all the other redevelopment efforts would be sending a mixed message. Mr. Joiner felt that it is not discriminatory to allow different uses for the State and the casinos. He also pointed out the time restriction placed on Copeland's expansion and suggested that this use also be conditioned.

Ms. Fisher commended the State on the changes that had been made to the building's facade. Attempts were being made to entice new businesses to the community to provide a stronger tax base. The proposal will place a storage facility within two blocks of the State Capitol. It will not be beneficial to the area. She questioned the term "temporary". Mr. Malkiewich may be speaking from his heart, however, he could leave at anytime. What will happen then? The money was for office space and not storage. The new drawings do not include an office. She felt that there had been a contractor who was willing to create a "brick and stick" building for the same price. Although the State needs storage space, it does not fit the ambience of the area.

Mr. Miles explained the occupancy rating for the building and the 1997 UBC Code describing the term "B occupancy". The State Library is technically a storage facility. Office use is normally allowed in such buildings along with record and accounts storage. Building examples were provided. The building is portable. His experience with this type of building began in 1978 with the relocation of one in Southern Nevada. It is portable and should not be destroyed. He felt that the Ormsby House parking garage is 10 times worse in appearance than the proposed building. Discussion indicated the building would contain 9600 square feet as it is 90x120. There will be a mezzanine in the middle with an office for research. Clarification indicated the building should not be compared to the State Library beyond its occupancy and use as the Library is a beautiful building. Commissioner Wipfli expressed his respect for Mr. Miles' projects.

Mr. Malkiewich restated the plan to place the building on the northern half of the block and the commitment that it will be a temporary placement. Redevelopment to the south and west will occur. The site will remain in State ownership. The building will be buffered by landscaping. Additional public comments were solicited but none were given. Public comments were closed.

Commissioner Wipfli moved to deny U-01/02-30, a special use permit request from Lorne J. Malkiewich, State of Nevada Legislative Council Bureau, to allow a warehouse on Assessor's Parcel Number 004-065-01, property zoned Public, located at 201 Sixth Street, based on the feeling that it is incompatible in that district and that area and is a nonconforming structure as a warehouse. Discussion indicated a desire to take a break to develop the required findings.

RECESS: A recess was declared at 6:30 p.m. The entire Commission was present when Chairperson Christianson reconvened the meeting at 6:35 p.m., constituting a quorum.

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the May 29, 2002, Meeting

Page 9

Commissioner Wipfli moved to disapprove U-01/02-30, a Special Use Permit request from Lorne J. Malkiewich, the applicant, the State of Nevada Legislative Counsel Bureau, the owner, to allow a warehouse on Assessor's Parcel Number 004-065-01, property zoned Public, located at 201 East Sixth Street, based on the findings of Item 1 - it will not be consistent with the Master Plan Element, as the proposed is not consistent with the character of the area or compatible with the primary use of the site; Item 2 - It will be detrimental to the use, peaceful enjoyment, economic value or the development of surrounding properties or the general neighborhood and will cause objectionable noise, vibrations, fumes, odors, dust, glare or physical activity; Item 3 does not fit; and Item 4 - It could result in material or prejudice to other property owners in the vicinity. Commissioners Mally and Farley seconded the motion. Commissioner Pedlar indicated he would vote against the motion, The applicant has indicated on the record a willingness to address the concerns and issues. He appreciated the other Commissioners' viewpoint, however, he felt that they were being "shortsighted" in this case. He agreed that the use is not what he would want the ultimate use to be. Mr. Malkiewich has made it very clear that it is not his wish for the ultimate use. The Commission should be realists. This is State land. The State has been a good neighbor and has demonstrated that by the method in which they maintain their properties in the downtown area. He believed that the State should be given the benefit of the doubt. Therefore, he would vote against the motion. Chairperson Christianson indicated that he would also be voting no on the motion as he felt that it is a good use of the property. Enough had been done in the plans to mitigate the steel building problems which people have with steel buildings and their appearance. He indicated that he would also take Mr. Malkiewich at his word that the ultimate use of the site will be different from that proposed. This is why he would vote no. Commissioner Peery felt that it is an inconsistent use which does not fit well in the area. He did not believe that the State was a bad neighbor as they had been working with the City, had done some nice work in the past, and had made improvements to the building. It is difficult, however, to support a warehouse in that particular area. Commissioner Farley disagreed with Commissioner Pedlar. She felt that the Commissioners were realists. We must answer to the public regarding the decisions which are made. She preferred to be on the citizens' side. This decision is based on all the meetings she has set on for years and all the nights and the hard labor that everyone has put in on the redevelopment of Carson City. It has been a beautiful job. The State has done a great job and helped out a lot. This use will be the opening of a can of worms and everyone will be wanting warehouses. It has nothing to do with the way the building looks. It is setting a precedence. Commissioner Mally indicated that, although he would vote for the motion, he was not sure that the State is always a good neighbor. Commissioner Sedway felt that they were realists and from the realistic aspect usable buildings do not go away. When lobbying the Legislature, you need all the tools possible. He would support the motion only if it has a sunset clause that the building is removed in seven years. The term temporary had been used many times. The sunset clause will provide additional incentive and ammunition to the individuals lobbying the Legislature. Otherwise, the building will be there a very long time. Commissioner Wipfli indicated he would not include a sunset clause in the motion. Commissioner Mally supported leaving the sunset clause out. The motion was voted and carried on a 5-2 vote with Commissioners Pedlar and Chairperson Christianson voting against the motion. Mr. Sullivan described the appeal process.

G-7. U-01/02-34 - DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON A SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR JIM JONES (2-0025) - Senior Planner Skip Canfield, James Jones - Mr. Jones had read the report and concurred with it. Public comments were solicited but none were given. Commissioner Mally moved to approve U-01/02-34, a Special Use Permit request from James K. Jones to allow a detached garage/workshop structure consisting of 864 square feet, which exceeds 50 percent of the square footage of the primary structure, on property zoned Single Family 6,000, located at 6 Rose Circle, APN 002-031-15, based on seven findings and

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the May 29, 2002, Meeting

Page 10

subject to eight conditions of approval contained in the staff report and with the understanding that any acknowledgements to the Commission/Board by the applicant may be considered as further stipulations or conditions of approval on this application. Commissioner Peery seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.

G-8. U-01/02-32 - DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON A SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FROM GEORGE D. WENDELL (2-0069) - Senior Planner Skip Canfield, Rev. George Wendell, Community Development Director Walter Sullivan, Senior Engineer Rob Fellows - Chairperson Christianson's question whether the Church had acquired the corner property was referred to Rev. Wendell. Chairperson Christianson felt that it would make a great drop-off location. Rev. Wendell indicated that he had read the report but did not agree with it due to his objection to the engineering report/requirements. The reasons for needing to improve the Hot Springs frontage with curbs, gutter, and sidewalk was questioned as it is cost prohibitive, unwarranted at this time due to the distance to similar improvements along Hot Springs, and the lack of an impact on that street. He was willing to include them when they construct their sanctuary on the corner lot. If the congregation continues to grow as it has during the last three years, the sanctuary may be built in three to five years. Mr. Sullivan felt that it may be possible to defer this requirement by using a development agreement. His concern with a deferral was related to the legality of the requirement if it is related to the Hot Springs building. If it is related to the corner building, he could not support the requirement at this time. He agreed that there are sidewalk improvements at the adjacent building on Northgate. The City policy is to require improvements in unimproved areas when a change of use occurs. There are a number of children in the area who will use the sidewalk. As his office is located adjacent to the site, he is aware of the number of children who travel through the area and explained his safety concerns for them. All new development along Hot Springs Road has been required to provide these amenities. The areas where sidewalks are presently located along Hot Springs Road were limned. Rev. Wendell explained that he would like to support Mr. Sullivan's suggestion, however, it is speculation on his part as to the time when the sanctuary will be constructed. He described the area used by the Church for classrooms and a sanctuary and the location of sidewalks along the west side of Hot Springs Road. Mr. Sullivan explained that the request for the sidewalks is based on the fact that the property has access from both Hot Springs Road and Northgate Lane. Engineering should decide when the improvements should be added. Mr. Fellows indicated the intent is to have the improvements at the site where the church is now located. He also understood Rev. Wendell's point and pointed out that the City has filled in some areas that connect to other developed sites. He agreed that the area could be handled in a development agreement if it happens within the specified time frame. Rev. Wendell agreed to stipulate that a development agreement will be done and that the construction will occur when the sanctuary is constructed on the corner lot. Mr. Fellows explained that the improvements, if installed now, will be like an island and could not be ADA accessible. Commissioner Pedlar suggested that the motion include the trigger and not remain vague as to when the improvements are to be accomplished. Rev. Wendell explained that he would be required to furnish landscaping, parking, curb, gutter, and design plans, etc., for the sanctuary which is to be constructed at 300 Hot Springs Road. The proposal at this time is to combine 200 and 300 Hot Springs Road and for the church to be identified as 300 Hot Springs Road. The total complex will meet City requirements. Mr. Sullivan explained the permit process which would allow the permit for the childcare facility to be issued without mandating the street improvements based on the stipulation given by Rev. Wendell. Chairperson Christianson explained the area that will have sidewalks, curbs, and gutters installed when the sanctuary is constructed. Rev. Wendell agreed. Commissioner Pedlar suggested that both of the parcel numbers be included in the motion. Rev. Wendell indicated that the hours for the childcare facility are to be from 6:30 a.m. to 6:30 p.m. This will allow the children to be dropped off according to the parents' work hours.

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the May 29, 2002, Meeting

Page 11

Comments indicated that this will enhance the operation. Rev. Wendell felt that the facility will be the only one in the vicinity and that a large number of the parents will work in the immediate area. Public comments were solicited but none were given. Commissioner Pedlar moved to approve U-01/02-32, a Special Use Permit request from George Wendell/Victory Christian Center to allow a childcare facility as an accessory use to a business within the main building or within an accessory building for a maximum of 40 children in a General Commercial zoning district located at 300 Hot Springs Road, APN 002-062-11, based on seven findings and ten conditions of approval contained in the staff report with the exception that the curb, gutter, and sidewalk will not be required until such time as development commences on the adjacent parcel number APN 002-062-14, discussion verified the parcel number, at which time curb, gutter and sidewalk improvements will be required on both APN 002-062-14 and APN 002-062-11 and with an amendment to Condition 7 to allow hours of operation from 6:30 a.m. to 6:30 p.m., and with the understanding that any acknowledgements to the Commission by the applicant may be considered as further stipulations or conditions of approval on this application. Following a request for an amendment, Commissioner Pedlar amended the motion to include it will meet all City Code requirements. Commissioner Farley seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.

G-9. U-90/91-18 - DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON A SHOW CAUSE HEARING FOR REVOCATION OF A PREVIOUSLY APPROVED SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FROM RONALD AND BEVERLY GUTZMAN (2-0438) - Community Development Director Walter Sullivan, Health Director Daren Winkelman, Environmental Health Specialist Dustin Boothe, Senior Engineer Rob Fellows, Chief Deputy District Attorney Mark Forsberg, Gutzmans' Attorney Chris MacKenzie, Carrie Henson - The facility is now in compliance with all requirements. Mr. Sullivan agreed that the Commission could request a second review to determine that compliance is maintained. Some of the carpet had been replaced. The tripping hazards have been eliminated. Mr. Boothe's inspection of the site was described. The fence will pose a splinter risk to the children but this is an inherent problem with wood fencing. The carpet has been repaired. The well is in the process of being abandoned. The facility is connected to City water. The status of the mold had not been checked. Commissioner Peery described his personal inspection of the site and his concern regarding screws in the fence which were sticking out and could pose a safety hazard to the children. Mr. Forsberg asked that the discussion relate to previous concerns with the facility. The due process requirements mandate that any new items or concerns should be part of a future hearing. Commissioner Peery explained that he had raised the screw issue due to the original concerns about the fencing. Commissioner Pedlar pointed out that the Development Engineering report indicated that the well abandonment process will take time. The facility is now connected to the City system. Mr. Fellows indicated that the water and sewer connections meet City standards.

Mr. MacKenzie summarized the previous discussions and indicated that all of the problems had been addressed. Additional work will be completed in the future.

Chairperson Christianson pointed out that Mr. MacKenzie had not been at the original hearing and explained the letter of concern regarding his relationship with Bob Crowell. Mr. Crowell has not been his personal attorney for 12 years. There is no conflict of interest for him.

Commissioner Mally suggested that the screws in the fence be shortened. Mr. MacKenzie indicated that Mr. Gutzman will address the concern.

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the May 29, 2002, Meeting

Page 12

Public comments were solicited. Ms. Henson indicated that Mr. Gutzman had made improvements. Some new carpet and siding in the little children's play area have been installed. The new siding only covers three to four feet in height. She asked that the record indicate that the City had been the one involved in trying to revoke the Special Use Permit and not her. She had asked for a special use permit for a childcare facility on the adjacent lot. She felt that the improvements were only half done and that she would be sued for the cost of those improvements. She questioned Chairperson Christianson regarding where he had heard that she is to be sued. He indicated that the possibility of litigation related to the terms of the lease was in the information contained in the Commission's packet. Ms. Henson felt that the Commission is responsible for determining the location of childcare facilities. She had looked for another location for some time without success. A residential zone is the only area which will allow the facility to operate. She did not want to remove the special use permit from the Gutzmans.

Additional public comments were solicited but none were given. Chairperson Christianson closed public comments. Commissioner Wipfli moved that the Planning Commission close the review of the Special Use Permit U-90/91-18 for Ron and Beverly Gutzman located at 2109 South Roop Street for a childcare facility as the facility is in full compliance with all conditions of approval for the subject Special Use Permit. Commissioner Mally seconded the motion. Following a request for an amendment, Commissioner Wipfli amended his motion to require a review in six to 12 months to ensure that compliance continues. Commissioner Mally concurred. Following a request for a specific time frame, Commissioner Wipfli amended the motion to require a review in 12 months unless a complaint is filed. Commissioner Mally concurred. The motion was voted and carried 6-1 with Commissioner Farley voting Naye.

G-10. U-01/02-27 - DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON A SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FROM CARRIE HENSON (1-0724) - Associate Planner Jennifer Pruitt, Senior Planner Skip Canfield, Chief Deputy District Attorney Mark Forsberg, Community Development Director Walter Sullivan, Senior Engineer Rob Fellows, Applicant Carrie Henson, James Michelson, Ryan Phillips - Staff's recommendation of denial was based on the Code prohibiting childcare facilities within 500 feet of each other in residential zoning districts. As indicated in the Health Department report, the facility adjacent to the proposed location is now in compliance with the conditions of its Special Use Permit. One letter of opposition had been received by staff. A petition supporting the applicant contained 25 signatures from her neighbors. The Commission should not make an exception to the City Code without first amending the Code. To do so would be arbitrary and capricious. The restriction applies only to the residential zoning district. Commissioner Peery explained his belief that a variance should be used to grant the Special Use Permit based on the distance between the two buildings. Mr. Canfield explained that a variance could not be granted based on the prohibition against a self-imposed hardship, which he felt Ms. Henson's site had. Discussion limned the three-month process required to revise the Code. The Code must be developed for the entire City and not for one specific area. Roop Street is classified as a collector street. It is not considered an arterial although it functions as an arterial. At this time the Code does not provide any criteria for an exception. To do so at this time may be arbitrary. The Commission can put its concerns on the record and Ms. Henson can appeal the denial. The Board of Supervisors (Board) will then consider the policy and code issues. Commissioner Pedlar suggested that the Board consider the street's designation as he felt that it functioned as an arterial. Mr. Sullivan agreed that the term collector should not be used in a residential area. Commissioners Peery and Mally iterated their belief that the Commission/Board should grant a variance. Commissioner Wipfli explained his unsuccessful attempt to rewrite the findings to grant the application. He felt that using this process would create a nightmare

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the May 29, 2002, Meeting

Page 13

for others. The street has changed. Commercial uses are there. He suggested that the zoning be changed to commercial which will allow the use or that the Board be asked to eliminate the 500-foot prohibition. He also pointed out that if the property was on the opposite side of the street and the street is designated as an arterial, the special use permit could be granted. Commissioner Farley referenced Pat Hughey's memo explaining that the 500-foot prohibition had been enacted in 1993 and that two churches located in a residential area had been granted special use permits for childcare facilities before its implementation. This example indicates that two childcare facilities in a residential area can operate successfully without any problems. Commissioner Pedlar supported Commissioner Wipfli's recommendation that the zoning district's designation of residential and that the street designation as a collector be reconsidered. The Commission must uphold the ordinances even if it is not the popular thing to do.

Public comments were solicited. Ms. Henson gave a purported NDOT letter regarding the traffic volume to the Commission. (A copy was not given to the Clerk or staff.) The traffic study had purportedly been conducted on Roop Street one year ago. She urged the Commission to look at each individual childcare facility and not be so restrictive. Reasons for selecting a residential area for a childcare facility were limned. Roop Street was felt to be unique. Allowing two facilities to be adjacent to each other on Roop would not impact either's ability to operate. There had only been one letter of opposition out of the 42 that had been submitted. The area lacks residential character due to the traffic. The traffic has the largest impact on the area. Children playing should not be considered detrimental to the residential use. The facility will operate during normal business hours and not impose a hardship on the residents. Commission comments pointed out that 500-foot prohibition is preventing approval of the special use permit. The findings she was referencing had been met. The two churches on Proctor Street had been grandfathered as they had been approved before the 500-foot prohibition was implemented. Ms. Henson could not understand the reasons for the 500-foot prohibition in a residential area. Chairperson Christianson explained that in a lot of residential areas of the City it does not make good sense to have two childcare facilities within 500 feet of each other. Ms. Henson agreed. Roop Street is classified as an arterial in her area. Commissioner Farley explained that the Commission's recommendation and concerns should be considered by the Board who could change the ordinances/Codes. Comments indicated the belief that the issue will be appealed regardless of what the Commission does. Ms. Henson reiterated the uniqueness of Roop Street to illustrate her belief that the area is not residential in nature. Chairperson Christianson explained that this is an issue the Commission cannot consider. The Code ties the Commission's hands. They must deny the application based on it. Ms. Henson questioned whether she would be granted a variance if she is evicted as it will then become a hardship for her to operate. Chairperson Christianson explained that this is an issue the Commission could not consider as it is a personal, financial hardship. He also indicated that the Commission was not trying to put her out of business as a lot of people seem to feel. He urged her to appeal the item to the Board. The Board is the ultimate authority. Mr. Canfield explained that the staff and Commission would review the Code if the Board directs it. It will take more than a month to complete the process. Commissioner Pedlar disclosed his experience in the childcare field and limned the reasons the Board must provide direction to staff and the Commission before action can be taken changing the Code. He urged her to begin discussion of the issues with the Board as soon as possible. Chairperson Christianson explained his effort to find a location for Ms. Henson. Ms. Henson reiterated her desire to have the special use permit process for childcare facilities look at each individual application particularly when it is to be located in a residential area. Her reasons for deciding to use her home, which is located adjacent to the Gutzmans, as the childcare facility were limned. Chairperson Christianson again explained that Ms. Henson must appeal the denial to the Board and that it will not cost her an additional fee

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the May 29, 2002, Meeting
Page 14

to appeal. Ms. Henson acknowledged the Commission's understanding and sympathy for her situation.

(2-1352) Mr. Michelson questioned the reasons the Code could not be circumvented through the use of a development agreement similar to the action taken previously this afternoon. He felt that the Commission should support the public who like the location. A "deal" should be made establishing a set time for relocation of the facility or elimination of the 500-foot prohibition. If no problems arise and the prohibition is removed, the facility should be allowed to stay at the proposed site. He also felt that the other facility would be gone in that period of time which would eliminate the Code concern. The 500-foot prohibition was based on the desire to avoid having several adjacent residences used as a childcare facility and functions as a method of limiting the number of children allowed at one facility. He did not believe that Ms. Henson and the Gutzmans would form a partnership. This would allow the Commission to act favorably on a publicly supported item. Commissioner Peery reiterated his recommendation that a variance be granted by either the Commission or Board. He agreed that the Special Use Permit process could not be approved. Mr. Sullivan explained for Mr. Michelson that development agreements address infrastructure items such as curbs, sidewalks, and gutters. The Code allows the use of development agreements or immediate installation of these items. The special use application has only one way of processing, which they are following. Mr. Michelson felt that this is a clear indication that the Commission would soon "be out of a job". Mr. Sullivan explained that the Commission has the final say on variances and special use permits unless they are appealed. Their appeals go to the Board. Only five percent of the variances and special use permits have been appealed. Mr. Michelson reiterated his belief that the Commission should grant an exception as it had earlier. (Commissioner Sedway stepped from the room during this discussion at 8:02 p.m. and returned at 8:04 p.m. A quorum was present the entire time.) Mr. Forsberg reiterated that the Commission could do so for curbs, gutters, and sidewalks under a different Code provision. The Code does not allow special use permits to use the same process. Mr. Michelson felt that common sense indicated that the application should be granted.

Discussion between Commissioner Mally and Ms. Pruitt indicated that the Gutzmans had been out of business for a brief period which was less than the 12 months required for abandonment of the permit. Another operator had been brought in and ran the facility prior to expiration of the 12-month period. Discussion pointed out that the technicality is that the permit was issued to the property owners and not the operator. The current code now issues the permit to the operator.

Additional public comments were solicited. Mr. Phillips pointed out his belief that the Gutzmans had sold their special use permit for \$24,000 and then took it back when that operator closed the facility. Mr. Sullivan explained that the special use permit for the Gutzmans could not be discussed.

Additional public comments were solicited but none were given. Chairperson Christianson closed public comments. Commissioner Wipfli urged Ms. Henson to talk to Mr. Sullivan and to take the application to the Board. The Commission is sympathetic with her request. The street is changing. Commissioner Wipfli then moved to deny U-01/02-27, a Special Use Permit request for Carrie Henson to allow a childcare facility for 30 children on a parcel zoned Single Family 6,000 located at 2117 South Roop Street, APN 009-093-03, based on the inability to make six of the seven findings required and contained in the staff report and with the understanding that any acknowledgements to the Commission/Board by the applicant may be considered as further stipulations or conditions of approval on this application. Commissioner Pedlar seconded the motion and concurred with Commissioner Wipfli's comments. Without the ordinance, he would be in favor of

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the May 29, 2002, Meeting

Page 15

supporting this Special Use Permit. Commissioner Farley explained her dilemma as she had been a single mother who relied upon childcare. She did not like the motion but was bound to it by the Code. She indicated her willingness to help her in any way possible, which included finding another location. Commissioner Mally suggested that she talk with Mr. Sullivan and to appeal the decision to the Board to see what could be done. Commissioner Peery explained that his advice is to seek a variance from the Board. Commissioner Sedway felt that she was swimming up a stream. Three months had already been spent on the effort. He acknowledged the emotions involved. He did not feel that there is a win in it for her. There is a lawsuit written all over the request. The Gutzmans have an existing Special Use Permit and do not wish to give it up. He also expressed his opinion that the Board would not overturn the motion. The cost of an appeal is not the concern as the lawsuit cost will be horrendous. Although he sympathized with her, his advice is to find another location as he believed it is the only way that it will happen. Chairperson Christianson explained that when the 500-foot prohibition was implemented, it was done for many reasons. He believed that Ms. Henson had an excellent operation but the ordinance will not allow the issuance of the Special Use Permit. He must uphold the Code and reiterated that his comments regarding a lawsuit had been based on information in the staff report. He had been accused of having an attorney who was involved in the issue, which is not the case. He had tried to be fair. He also felt that by the time both she and the Gutzmans appeal it, she would be better off to go elsewhere. He could not predict how the Board will rule. They could change the district to commercial which would allow the two childcare facilities to operate side-by-side. The motion to deny the application was voted and carried 6-1 with Commissioner Peery voting Naye. Mr. Sullivan described the appeal process.

H. INTERNAL COMMUNICATIONS AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS - NON-ACTION ITEMS

H-1. STAFF BRIEFING ON THE STATUS OF COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS TO

THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS AND CORRESPONDENCE TO THE COMMISSION (2-1701) -

The Board had approved the tentative map and change of land use for Heritage Park/Saliman Estates, the Legislative Counsel Bureau's change of land use, and Randy Harris' zone change. The Harris zone change had been approved on a 3-2 vote that was based on the master plan and overturned the Commission's denial. The Board's decision was felt to have been due to the feeling that it was legally bound by the master plan. Discussion explained that the master plan is the zoning map in Washoe County. The Statutes do not require the master plan and zoning map to be the same nor its implementation at the same time. The Commission had found no significant changes in the immediate area to justify the change. Mr. Forsberg explained his attendance at the Board meeting and feeling that the Board had not had a map to consider the areas where the changes had occurred which the Commission had at its meeting. The Board had indicated that it was a reasonable change based on the list showing 100 or so changes which had already occurred in the neighborhood. The Board also felt that it was a reasonable transition in a neighborhood that was changing due to other forces. The Commission's use of the map had indicated that those changes were scattered around the area including across Highway 395. Mr. Sullivan explained that a project does not have to be submitted with a zone change. Commissioner Sedway felt that the project should be required for a zone change. Mr. Canfield noted the concern involved with this requirement as the Commission cannot condition the zone change based on the project. The applicant could sell the property and the new owner could build something else which is allowed under the zoning. Mr. Forsberg pointed out a discussion indicating that the applicants would have a good project based on their reputation should not be used to approve a zone change. This position is not legally supportable. (Commissioner Farley stepped from the room-8:21 p.m. A quorum was still present.)

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the May 29, 2002, Meeting

Page 16

Mr. Canfield pointed out examples of conditional zone changes which included the Millennium project and Saliman Estates. Discussion also pointed out that the Commission often approves projects which never happen, i.e., Williams' strip mall and a casino on south Highway 395. (Commissioner Farley returned at 8:23 p.m. A quorum was present.)

H-2.FUTURE COMMISSION ITEMS AND DATES (2-1884) - Commissioners Sedway and Wipfli indicated they would not be at the June 26th meeting. It was felt that the agenda for that meeting may be moderate in length. Mr. Sullivan also noted that Commissioners Sedway and Mally's terms were expiring. Commissioner Mally had served on the Commission for 13 years. He did not plan to reapply. The Board will consider applications at its June 6th meeting. Commissioner Sedway indicated that he would be out-of-town on that date.

Chairperson Christianson announced as a public service that a pancake breakfast would be served at the First Baptist Church at Mountain and Bath Street on Saturday morning at 7 a.m. in an effort to raise funds for a child at Sanford Medical Center. He complimented Nevada Appeal Correspondent Amanda Hammond on the article she had run on the child and the breakfast.

I. ADJOURNMENT (1-2005) - Chairperson Christianson passed the gavel to Vice Chairperson Wipfli. Commissioner Christianson moved to adjourn. Commissioner Mally seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0. Vice Chairperson Wipfli adjourned the meeting at 8:27 p.m.

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the May 29, 2002, Meeting
Page 17

The Minutes of the May 29, 2002, Carson City Planning Commission meeting

ARE SO APPROVED ON July 31, 2002.

/S/
Allan Christianson, Chairperson