

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the October 25, 2000, Meeting
Page 1

A regularly scheduled meeting of the Carson City Planning Commission was held on Wednesday, October 25, 2000, 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 Alan Rogers, and Commissioners William Mally, Roger Sedway, and Richard Wipfli

STAFF PRESENT: Community Development Director Walter Sullivan, Deputy Library Director Traci Haakinson, Deputy District Attorney Neil Rombardo, Senior Planner Skip Canfield, Recording Secretary Katherine McLaughlin, Associate Engineer Paul Lohman, Assistant Planner Jennifer Pruitt (P.C. 10/25/00 Tape 1-0001)

NOTE: Unless otherwise indicated, each item was introduced by the Chairperson. Staff then presented/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 3:34 p.m. Roll call was taken. A quorum was present although Commissioner Mally had not yet arrived and Commissioners Larkin and Farley were absent. Chairperson Christianson lead the Pledge of Allegiance. Commissioner Mally arrived following the Pledge--3:36 p.m.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - 9/27/00 PLANNING COMMISSION AND 9/27/00 GROWTH MANAGEMENT COMMISSION (1-0020) - Commissioner Wipfli moved to approve. Commissioner Rogers seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

C. PUBLIC COMMENTS (1-0026) (1-0058) - Community Development Director Walter Sullivan introduced and welcomed Associate Engineer Paul Lohman. He also reminded the Commissioners to speak into their microphones.

D. AGENDA MODIFICATIONS (1-0033) - Community Development Director Sullivan indicated that Item G-3 had been withdrawn by the applicant and that the applicant for Item G-6 had requested an one year continuance.

E. DISCLOSURES (1-0049) - Commissioner Sedway disclosed that Mark Palmer does work for the Hospital, however, did not feel that this business relationship would influence Commissioner Sedway's objectivity or ability to consider the application.

F. CONSENT AGENDA (1-0077)
F-1. U-99/00-33 - DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON A SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FROM DWIGHT MILLARD
F-2. V-00/01-3 - DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON A REQUEST FROM SHARON ADAMS
F-3. U-00/01-13 - DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON A SPECIAL USE PERMIT FROM FRED WOODSIDE
F-4. D-00/01-3 - DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON A REQUEST FROM LANDMARK HOMES -
Items F-1, F-2, and F-3 were for continuances. Commissioner Rogers moved that the Commission approve the Consent Agenda Items F-1 through F-4 as presented by staff. Commissioner Mally seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

G. PUBLIC HEARING (1-0120)
G-1. U-00/01-16 DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON A SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION

FROM JEAN ROBERTS, JUBILEE MINISTRY - Assistant Planner Jennifer Pruitt, Executive Director of the Jubilee Ministry Eugene Combs - Mr. Combs indicated he had read the staff report and agreed with it. He briefly described the program including the transportation services which will be provided by the City or the Salvation Army. The service is for drop-ins. Ms. Pruitt indicated that this transportation plan did not pose a problem for the commercial site. Public comments were solicited but none given. Commissioner Rogers moved to approve U-00/01-16, a special use permit from Jean Roberts, Jubilee Ministry, property owner: Winnie West, Inc., to allow an adult day care facility in a Retail Commercial zoning district located at 258 West Winnie Lane, APN 001-031-03, based on seven findings and subject to seven conditions of approval in the staff report. Commissioner Sedway seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0. Due to the lack of opposition, the appeal process was not described.

G-2. U-00/01-17 - DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON A SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FROM SIERRA WEST, INC. (1-0235) - Assistant Planner Pruitt, Applicant's Representative Mark Palmer - Mr. Palmer indicated the owner was present to respond to questions. He had read the staff report and agreed with it. New site plans and "photographs" of a Reno development were distributed to the Commission and Clerk. (Copies are in the file.) Mr. Palmer clarified the height of the building as being 22 feet. The height to the eaves is 16 feet. The roof slope is at a 3 to 12 pitch. Signage will be provided on the west, south, and east sides of the building. The Oak Street sign will be a monument which will help the public find the entrance. The color scheme was displayed. The plan is to use earth tones which Mr. Palmer indicated were sand tan, light stone, and adobe beige. The darker sandstone is to be used on the roof. There will be berming and a significant amount of landscaping provided. Discussion noted the monument sign at G. S. Richards Boulevard and College Parkway which had required a special use permit as an example which the Commission felt should be followed for the monument sign. The features which will soften the appearance of the metal building were described. Clarification indicated only the sign facing 395 would be lit. The Oak Street sign is for identification and will not be lit. Property to the south and west is owned by NDOT. The freeway elevation at that location was unknown. Public comments were solicited but none given. Commissioner Rogers moved to approve U-00/01-17, a special use permit from Sierra West, Inc., property owner: First Choice Management Corp., to allow an RV storage facility on a split-zoned parcel of 17,280 square feet which is zoned General Commercial/Single Family One Acre, located 4950 Oak Street, APN 009-191-05, based on seven findings and subject to 13 conditions of approval in the staff report and with the understanding that any other acknowledgements to the Commission/Board by the applicant may be considered as further stipulations or conditions on this application with a modification to Condition No. 13 to say that signage will be limited to the Oak Street and western portion of the subject parcel to reduce potential impacts and will be approved by staff. Commissioner Sedway seconded the motion. Discussion indicated that the elevation height was not part of the conditions. Mr. Palmer had mentioned it for clarification purposes. Commissioner Rogers indicated that this was the reason he had not included it in his motion but had included the statement regarding acknowledgements. The motion to approve the application as indicated was voted and carried 5-0. Ms. Pruitt briefly described the appeal process.

G-3. U-00/01-18 - DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON A SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FROM CARRIE L. HENSON (1-0479) - Withdrawn.

G-4. U-00/01-15 - DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON A SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FROM TRACI HAAKINSON, CARSON CITY LIBRARY (1-0485) - Senior Planner Skip Canfield, Applicant Traci Haakinson, Community Development Director Sullivan, Francis Brooks, Deputy District Attorney Neil Rombardo - Staff felt that the building would eliminate some of the clutter at the Library. Commission comments pointed out that the metal building would be approximately the same size as a two car garage and lacked any amenities which would soften the appearance. The Commission had recently denied a similar request from a property owner in the vicinity. If the City is granted permission for this type of building, it should be allowed throughout the community when the land use is similar. Mr. Canfield felt that Condition 6 gave staff latitude to require softening of the building. He also indicated that no trees are to be removed. Commission comments indicated that Condition 6 did not require compliance with the upgrades. The Commission indicated its awareness of the financial implications created by this requirement but felt that the City should be held to the same conditions mandated private industry. It was also felt that the building would become a permanent fixture.

Ms. Haakinson had read the staff report and agreed with it. She described the funding, staff's review of the

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the October 25, 2000, Meeting
Page 3

location and ultimate recommendation on the type of building based on that funding. She expressed a willingness to have a better looking building within the Library's funding ability. Mr. Sullivan explained in more depth the CIP funding program. It may be possible for the Library to return to the CIP Committee to seek additional funds. Commissioner Wipfli cited, as an example, a request from Mark Palmer regarding a similar type of building and the upgrades that he had done to soften the impact. Commissioner Wipfli objected to allowing the standard to be different for the City than that required of private industry based solely on the ownership and finances. He also felt that the mass of the building was inappropriate for the location. His opposition was not due to the fact that it is a metal building. Mr. Sullivan suggested that Condition 6 be revised to include: "and certain architectural features will be complied with to the satisfaction of the City staff". He asked that Commissioners Wipfli and Rogers work with staff, including the Library, to develop the features. Commissioner Wipfli agreed based on his feeling that an approval would establish a dangerous precedence.

(1-0725) Ms. Brooks urged the Commission to support the Library based on her experience as a teacher and school librarian. The compromise suggested should be pursued to prevent the establishment of a precedence and approving a City project with different standards than that required of private industry. She urged the community to support the Library. Additional public comments were solicited but none given.

commissioner Rogers moved to approve U-00/01-15, a special use permit request from Traci M. Haakinson, Carson City Library, for the construction of an 18 by 20 storage building, a maximum of ten feet eleven inches tall in a Public district located at 900 North Roop Street, APN 002-172-07 based on seven findings and subject to six conditions of approval contained in the staff report with a modification to Condition No. 6 to read "The storage building shall be a maximum of ten feet eleven inches tall and shall be painted or constructed of a material that has the color and includes architectural designs that is the same or similar to the existing Library building and subject to the approval of the Community Development." Clarification indicated that the committee would be established by the Department. Commissioner Sedway seconded the motion. Commissioner Wipfli expressed his feeling that the motion was too open ended. Similar approvals are not granted to private industry. He was unsure what improvements would be made. He suggested that the project be continued and that the details be worked out and brought back. Commissioner Rogers supported his comments and expressed his feeling that the financial ability of the City should not be a consideration. He agreed that the motion required staff to review the design. It did not require the changes. The motion was then voted and failed on a 2-3 vote with Commissioners Mally, Wipfli, and Rogers voting naye.

Discussion indicated that an affirmative vote was required. Commissioner Rogers then moved to deny the Special Use Permit U-00/01-15 request from Traci Haakinson, Carson City Library, for the construction of an 18 by 20 prefabricated storage building and that the basis for the denial is due to his feeling that it failed to meet the requirements as stated on the visual preference and design guidelines for that particular parcel. Commissioner Mally suggested that Condition 6 be revised to state that the storage building shall be painted and constructed of a material that is the color and of the same or similar material as the existing library. Commissioner Wipfli explained that this left the item open ended and would allow, for example, a concrete building. He reiterated his suggestion that the matter be continued. Ms. Haakinson then requested a continuance to the next meeting and expressed her intent to work with the Department to present a more acceptable project. Discussion ensued on the need to have an affirmative vote and protocol for reconsideration of the original motion. Commissioner Rogers then moved to withdraw both of his motions. Commissioner Wipfli seconded the motion. Following additional discussion on protocol for withdrawing the motion, Commissioner Rogers moved to reconsider the first motion with a motion to withdraw the second motion. Commissioner Wipfli seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

Commissioner Rogers then moved, as requested by the applicant, to continue the item until the Community Development staff brings the application back for consideration by the Commission at a regularly scheduled meeting. Commissioner Wipfli seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0. Chairperson Christianson indicated that the application was continued to the November meeting.

G-5. a-00/01-2 - DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON A REQUEST FROM ALVIN L. ARNESON AND RICH RICHARDSON (1-0915) - Senior Planner Canfield, Community Development Director Sullivan,

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the October 25, 2000, Meeting
Page 4

Rich Richardson, Deputy District Attorney Rombardo - Mr. Canfield's introduction included noting the six letters of opposition which had been received. The Commission expressed a desire to take time to read those letters.

BREAK: A recess was declared at 4:30 p.m. A quorum of the Commission was present when Chairperson Christianson reconvened the meeting at 4:38 although Commissioners Larkin and Farley were absent.

Mr. Canfield then summarized the six letters and the staff report. Discussion explored the reasons 93 individuals had responded to the notices and the information staff had provided to those individuals. Staff felt that these individuals had been confused about the notice due to the lack of an address regarding the specific location. When this question was answered, a majority of the individuals hung-up. Staff is working to correct this noticing problem. Mr. Canfield summarized staff's position of denial as being that there is adequate zoning within the community to allow this use without expanding to another district.

Mr. Richardson explained the location of his business and introduced the property owners Carol and Al Arneson. He had read the staff report and opposed it. Justification for allowing the use within the RC district was based on the residential demand he felt exists for this type of service. His survey, which had been included with the staff notice, was summarized as supporting the zone change. He displayed a map illustrating the RC zone, the GC zone, and the industrial zones, and the survey responses. It purported to indicate that the approval covered the entire RC corridor and that the support was uniform. Potential sales and income tax revenues generated by the service also supported his position. He expounded on his belief that the notice was improper as he intends to handle only rental of residential moving trucks and trailers and opposed the use of the term stored within the notice. He also felt that conditional uses should have been included within the notice. He did not propose to handle commercial moving trucks and felt that there are an adequate number of businesses currently handling this type of service. Although he agreed that there would be trucks and trailers parked on his lot, they should not be considered stored. The Enterprise Rent-A-Car Agency at Tenth and Carson Street was cited to support his feeling that when the vehicles are parked and not rented they are not be considered stored. The confusion which was apparent from the contacts staff had received regarding the notice further supported his position. Purportedly, staff had originally supported the request based upon the surveys which he had received. Staff later changed this position based on the telephone calls and letters of opposition. He claimed that the notice had created the negative response. He then reviewed the staff report indicating locations with which he took exceptions to based his concerns with the notice, the proposed use, and the term stored. He pointed out that U-Haul and United Rentals provides a similar service and, if the term stored is allowed, stores vehicles without screening. He then indicated that he had only found eight of the nine truck and trailer businesses in operation in the community and limned their locations. Six of the eight handle only commercial truck and trailer rentals. Two include residential truck and trailer rentals. If it is a conditional use, the surrounding neighbors would be notified which would eliminate the concern many of the respondents had had with the notice. The unused portion of his lot could be used to hold the rental units without impacting his neighbors. Clarification indicated none of the eight rental businesses were in the RC zone which would be beneficial to the residents of the community. The use of the Gross Vehicle Weight would separate the residential from the commercial rentals. It would also make the rental agencies more accessible than those now in business in other districts.

Mr. Sullivan acknowledged Mr. Richardson's concerns regarding the notice and requested the item be continued to allow staff to work with him on the notice. The term "stored" was in accordance with Section 18.06.257. Although both he and Deputy District Attorney Rombardo agreed that the notice had been sufficient, he was willing to continue the matter and work with Mr. Richardson on the notice. Discussion between the Commission and Mr. Sullivan indicated that the notice would include the term "storage" and may include "moving" plus the conditional use section of the RC code. Chairperson Christianson asked that staff research the automobile agencies regarding storage. This would provide another noticing which may have a different response. Commissioner Rogers pointed out that Mr. Richardson had specifically stated "residential moving" and questioned whether this designation should be included. He also questioned whether the vehicle size or weight should be included. Mr. Sullivan agreed to consider these issues also. He pointed out that offices could be relocated by using a "U-Haul" truck and questioned whether a difference could be established by using the term "residential". Chairperson Christianson explained that he had seen a UPS driver driving a Ryder rental truck, which was a smaller size. Discussion explained that the revision had been brought forward due to the applicant's submittal of the request even though the entire Chapter is being reviewed.

Mr. Richardson reiterated his request for clarification concerning the storage difference between rental of automobiles and trucks. Mr. Sullivan restated his desire to research this issue.

Mr. Rombardo pointed out that the policy statement for this type of activity requires this type of activity to be screened. This section of the code includes vehicle storage which mandates its inclusion regardless of whether it is automobiles or trucks. He also asked that the record indicate that the District Attorney's office felt that the notice which had been provided was appropriate and that it was not necessary to renotice. Mr. Sullivan stated that, although he felt the notice as provided was clear, the applicant had raised the issue and he wished to provide him his due. His reasons for wishing to renotice the request was based on his desire to be conservative rather than vice versa.

(1-1552) Mr. Richardson then requested a continuance to next month's meeting to work with staff on his issues.

Discussion explained that Mr. Richardson could not apply for a special use permit until the Code is revised as the use is not included under the land use district in which he wishes to have the business, i.e., RC. The proposal impacts all of the RC zones. Reasons staff had not considered changing the land use designation for Mr. Richardson's parcel had been based on the feeling that it may be considered spot zoning. Mr. Richardson had attempted to get the Carringtons, who own the large adjacent parcel, to join his zone change request. This had not been successful. Staff's research on the districts in which Washoe County allows the use was explained. Commission and staff discussion indicated that Commission remarks concerning the concept should be held until the open meeting is conducted specifically in cases where the applicant feels the noticing was improper. Chairperson Christianson also explained for an unidentified individual in the audience who had expressed a desire to speak that public comments could not be taken as public comments had not been requested and may not be requested if a continuance is requested. He was asked to speak with staff later. Mr. Sullivan also indicated that written comments were encouraged and his reasons for preferring written correspondence.

Mr. Richardson asked that the record again reflect his question concerning whether retail vehicles which are not being rented are considered stored and how Enterprise Rent-A-Car can do it without screening, specifically, if it is considered storage under the Code. Does the Code only apply to cars? Pickups? He then requested a continuance until next month. Mr. Sullivan indicated he would research the matter.

Commissioner Rogers moved to continue the item to the next regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting. Commissioner Mally seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

G-6. Z-00/01-2 - DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON A REZONING REQUEST FROM PALMER AND LAUDER ENGINEERS, INC (1-1805) - Community Development Director Sullivan - Discussion explained the reasons for the continuance and its one year period. Commissioner Rogers moved to continue Item G-6 to October 2001. Commissioner Wipfli seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

H. INTERNAL COMMUNICATIONS AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

H-1. STAFF BRIEFING ON THE STATUS OF COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS AND CORRESPONDENCE TO THE COMMISSION (1-1875) - Community Development Director Sullivan explained that the Board had approved the Hospital zone change for the hospitality house and the refund of the fees for the special use permit for the child care facility which was withdrawn. The next regular Commission meeting is scheduled for November 29. He also indicated that there are two open dates in December when the Title 18 revisions could be considered and asked the Commissioners contact him regarding their availability for a meeting on those dates as well as when to hold the December Commission meeting. A copy of the public notice on the four hearings scheduled on the Title 18 revisions was included in the Commission's packet. (A copy is included in the file.) Justification for scheduling the hearings for three hour sessions was provided. A memo regarding the American Planning Association's conference had been included in the Commissioners' packets. A reply from those Commissioners wishing to attend was requested.

H-2. FUTURE COMMISSION ITEMS AND DATES (1-1962) - Mr. Sullivan then explained his reasons for supporting a continuance of Item G-6 as being based on a conference which indicated it was better to error on the conservative side. Commissioner Sedway indicated he would not be able to attend the November 29th

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the October 25, 2000, Meeting
Page 6

meeting. He was unsure of his schedule on November 20 and 27 but would check it.

I. ADJOURNMENT (1-1980) - Commissioner Wipfli moved to adjourn. Commissioner Rogers seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0. Chairperson Christianson adjourned the meeting at 5:30 p.m.

The Minutes of the October 25, 2000, Carson City Planning Commission meeting

2000.

ARE SO APPROVED ON ___December_25___,

_____/s/_____

Allan Christianson, Chairperson