

CARSON CITY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the March 31, 1999, Meeting
Page 1

A regularly scheduled meeting of the Carson City Regional Planning Commission was held on Wednesday, March 31, 1999, at the Community Center Sierra Room, 851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada, beginning at 3:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Chairperson Verne Horton, Vice Chairperson Allan Christianson and Commissioners William Mally, Alan Rogers, Roger Sedway, Deborah Uhart, and Richard Wipfli

STAFF PRESENT: Community Development Director Walter Sullivan, Principal Planner Rob Joiner, Deputy District Attorney Melanie Bruketta, Senior Planner Tara Hullinger, Senior Engineer John Givlin, and Recording Secretary Katherine McLaughlin (P.C. 3/31/99 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 Horton convened the meeting at 3:35 p.m. Roll call was taken. A quorum was present although Commissioner Mally had not yet arrived. Chairperson Horton lead the Pledge of Allegiance.

B. COMMISSION ACTION - APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR 7/29/98 AND 2/24/99 REGULAR SESSIONS AND 1/7/99 SPECIAL MEETING (1-0015) - Commissioner Wipfli moved to approve the Minutes as read. Commissioner Uhart seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0.

C. PUBLIC COMMENTS (1-0024) - None.

D, MODIFICATIONS TO THE AGENDA (1-0032) - None.

E, DISCLOSURES (1-0038) - Commissioner Uhart explained that she had discussed the sign location with Roger Williams and that he is her CPA. She did not feel that the discussion or her professional relationship would influence her decision. (Commissioner Mally arrived during her comments--3:38 p.m. The entire Commission was present at that point, constituting a quorum.) Commissioner Sedway indicated that he would recuse himself from Item G-4 as he would be making the presentation for the Hospital.

F. CONSENT AGENDA (1-0074)

F-1. U-98/99-42 - DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON A SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FROM PETER BOND - The applicant had requested a continuance until May 13. Commissioner Uhart moved to approve the Consent Agenda as presented. Commissioner Christianson seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.

G. PUBLIC HEARINGS (1-0066)

G-1. U-79-25 - DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON A REVIEW OF A PREVIOUSLY APPROVED SPECIAL USE PERMIT FROM T. E. BERTAGNOLLI AND ASSOCIATES (1-0075) - Senior Planner Tara Hullinger, Applicant's Representative Nickols, Community Development Director Walter Sullivan - Mr. Nickols declined to make a statement at this point. Public testimony was solicited but none given. Discussion between Commissioner Christianson and Ms. Hullinger explained the reasons for the annual reviews and the need for Mr. Bertagnolli to catalog, photograph, and prepare a report for the State to complete the requirements regarding the historical retaining wall. Ms. Hullinger suggested that the Commission condition the motion to require the documentation within a specified time and that the Conditions be revised when the annual review is

considered next year. Discussion between Commissioner Mally and Mr. Sullivan indicated that staff would continue to monitor the site for compliance of the revegetation and grading requirements, etc. Mr. Sullivan suggested that the item be placed on the Consent Agenda in the future rather than to require discussion under the Public Hearing heading if no concerns are noted or the Commission could require biennial reports. Commissioner Christianson supported a biennial Consent Agenda review. Commissioner Christianson moved that the Bertagnolli and Associates Special Use Permit move to a two year review with one condition that the photographing and archiving of the wall be done within one month. Commissioner Mally seconded the motion. Mr. Sullivan indicated that associated conditions would have to be revised with the applicant, specifically, Condition 5. Commissioner Christianson amended his motion to allow the Planning Department to make those changes which will be relative to the every other year review. Discussion indicated that the monument sign, which is also required, could not be addressed until the railroad alignment is determined. Commissioner Mally concurred with the amendment. The motion was voted and carried 7-0.

Following discussion on whether the motion had in fact approved the special use permit report, discussion returned to the item. Mr. Nickols had unfortunately left the room. Procedures were discussed during which time Mr. Nickols returned. It was felt that no-one else had left the room or had been interested in the item as no-one had spoken when public testimony was solicited. Commissioner Christianson explained the need to approve the special use permit report and thanked him for returning. Commissioner Christianson then moved that they approve the Special Use Permit with the clarification that it will go a two year review and that within one month the historical portion will be completed by Bertagnolli and Associates. Commissioner Mally seconded the motion. Following a request for an amendment, Commissioner Christianson amended his motion to include that staff will make the changes to the conditions which move it to a two year review from a one year review. Commissioner Mally concurred. Following discussion on the need to rescind the original motion, Commissioner Christianson withdrew this motion and moved to approve the review of the Special Use Permit and rescind the first motion. Commissioner Mally seconded the motion. Following additional discussion on the motion which is required to modify the conditions, the motion to approve the special use permit report and rescind the original motion was voted and carried 7-0.

Commissioner Christianson then moved to approve the review of the special use permit with the items being changed to biennial review and that the Planning Department make the changes in the conditions to reflect that and having the historical portion updated by May 1. Commissioner Mally seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0. Chairperson Horton again thanked Mr. Nickols for returning.

G-2. V-98/99-10 - DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON A VARIANCE REQUEST FROM ROGER WILLIAMS (1-0345) - Senior Planner Hullinger, Applicant's Representative George Szabo - Clarification by Mr. Szabo indicated the signs had been revised to be 39 and 46 square feet for a combined total of 84.7 square feet. Computer enhanced photographs of the proposed sign were given to the Commission. (A copy was not given to the Clerk or staff.) With the size revisions to Condition 6, Mr. Szabo indicated concurrence with the remaining conditions. He then explained the sign location and the reasons for needing large signs. The signs will be ground lighted. Mr. Szabo felt that the building style and signage could be used as an example for other buildings, specifically, a second one he was designing. Commission comments commended him on the building style and character. Discussion ensued on the Code requirements, measurement procedures, the proposal to use stucco and the building's colors in the sign, and the amount of signage allowed in commercial districts. Public comments were solicited but none given. Commissioner Rogers moved to approve V-98/99-10, a variance request from Roger Williams, Freeman and Williams, LLP, to allow two free-standing monument signs and to exceed the maximum amount of sign area allowed for an office building use on property zoned Retail Commercial-Planned Unit Development for an office building use based on five findings and subject to eight conditions of approval contained in the staff report and with the understanding that any acknowledgements to the Commission or Board by the applicant will be considered as further stipulations or conditions and with the modification to Condition 6 to allow up to 39.1 square feet on Sign "A" and 45.6 square feet on Sign "B" as indicated on the handout given to the Commission which is to be part of the packet. Commissioner Wipfli seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.

Principal Planner Rob Joiner thanked the Commission for its consideration. This process had been envisioned when the Code revisions had been developed. The revisions had been undertaken due to community concerns.

The discussion regarding the materials, colors, architecture considerations are the issues which should be considered.

(NOTE FOR THE RECORD: Mr. Szabo picked up his pictures and magnifying glass at the conclusion of the following item.)

G-3. U-96/97-5 - DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON A REVIEW OF A SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FROM BRIAN SMITH (1-0652) - Principal Planner Rob Joiner, Nugget General Manager Brian Smith - During Mr. Joiner's introduction Commissioner Mally stepped from the room--4:18 p.m. He returned during Mr. Smith's comments--4:22 p.m. (A quorum was present the entire time.) Mr. Smith indicated that a remediation report had been submitted to staff, however, Mr. Joiner had not yet received the document. Mr. Smith explained the projected cost and reasons for contacting the former property owner, Shell Oil, regarding participating in this effort. A response had not been received. State requirements were noted. Current remediation procedures were described. The report includes additional procedures. This process may take as long as two years to complete. Until a response is received, Mr. Smith suggested no change be made in the parking lot. Mr. Smith hoped to have a response within 30 days. Mr. Joiner explained the reasons the item was brought to the Commission at this time. Mr. Smith explained his understanding that the issue was to be considered in October. He also indicated that he would give Mr. Joiner a copy of the report later today. Discussion explained the remediation program and reasons for its cost which is constantly growing larger. Mr. Smith expressed the desire to be able to complete the remediation process, plant landscaping, and move on. If the project is too expensive, they may be forced to close the site. Litigation may then be pursued. Public testimony was solicited but none given. Commissioner Wipfli moved to approve Special Use Permit U-96/97-5, a request from Brian Smith, Carson City Nugget, to allow off-street parking within 300 feet of the building site located at 617 North Carson Street, APN 4-263-01, based on seven findings and subject to seven conditions of approval contained in the staff report with the understanding that any acknowledgements to the Commission or Board by the applicant can be considered as further stipulations or conditions of approval on this application. Commissioner Mally seconded the motion. Following a request for a correction to the motion, Commissioner Wipfli amended his motion to be to approve the review and the not the permit. Commissioner Mally concurred. Following a request for an amendment to establish a 60 day timeline, Mr. Smith indicated that they would attempt to meet this date, however, had no control over how long it will take Shell or its successor to respond. The permit is to be reviewed in September or October. Commissioner Wipfli amended his motion to require a six month review. Commissioner Mally concurred. Motion carried 7-0.

G-4. U-98/99-46 - DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON A SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FROM MARK PALMER (1-0929) - Principal Planner Joiner, Applicant's Architect Mark Palmer and Hospital Project Manager Roger Sedway - Commissioner Sedway stepped from the dais. (Under Item E he had indicated that he would recuse himself from this item.) Discussion between the Commission and Mr. Joiner indicated the parking lot would be open to the public. The Hospital felt that additional parking was required in view of the amount of overflow parking occurring in the neighborhood. It is not required by the Code. Mr. Palmer explained the project including the modified plan to use low lighting bollards, which are 42 inches high. A copy of the plan was given to the Commission. (None to the Clerk.) Slants will be installed in the chainlink fence along the residential area. Climbing vines will also be planted. Discussion ensued on Condition 8 indicating a six foot setback. Mr. Palmer indicated a desire to put the landscaping between the sidewalk and curb with the sidewalk abutting the parking area. He felt that there was ten feet between the parking area and curb. He suggested the Condition be amended to allow this plan. There will be a "six foot" curb to stop the cars from crossing the sidewalk. He agreed that the bumpers may hang over a portion of the sidewalk. He felt that there would still be 4-1/2 feet for a walking area. Commissioner Mally felt that this could be creating a liability concern. Mr. Palmer indicated that this is a common practice when additional sidewalk can be provided. Discussion between the Commission and Mr. Sedway explained the security plans for the site. Lights will remain on at night. Employees working the night shift(s) will be encouraged to park closer to the Hospital or request security escorts. There have not been any problems with the parking lot on Mountain. Public testimony was solicited but none given. Mr. Joiner indicated for the record that staff had checked the Code and determined that there are Code requirements for landscaping, headlights and lighting. If there had been residences directly across from the Fleischmann side of the parking lot, additional screening requirements would have been mandated. The

Hospital owns that parcel and uses it for parking. Therefore, flexibility could be provided in these requirements. He hoped to use low growing plants for landscaping and expressed a desire to work with applicant on the plan. Commissioner Wipfli moved to approve U-98/99-46, a special use permit request from Carson-Tahoe Hospital to allow a parking lot on property zoned Public, located on the north side of Fleischmann Way approximately 275 feet west of North Division Street and 140 feet east of Lane Circle on APN 1-141-67 based on seven findings and seven conditions of approval contained in the staff report with the understanding that any acknowledgements to the Commission or Board by the applicant may be considered as further stipulations or conditions of approval and clarified that Condition 8 in the packet was to be omitted. Commissioner Mally seconded the motion. Following discussion of the direction distances, Commissioner Wipfli amended his motion to indicate that Lane Circle is 140 feet to the east. Commissioner Mally concurred. The motion was voted and carried 6-0-0-1 with Commissioner Sedway abstaining.

BREAK: A ten minute recess was declared at 4:50 p.m. The entire Commission was present when Chairperson Horton reconvened the meeting at 5:05 p.m, constituting a quorum (including Commissioner Sedway).

G-5. U-98/99-45 - DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON A SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FROM GEORGE WENDELL (1-1245) - Senior Planner Sandra Danforth, George Wendell - Discussion between staff and the Commission noted the "courtesy" approval notice provided by Hytek. Hytek was added to Condition 7. Four required spaces are being provided by Hytek and 40 required spaces are provided by the City. Clarification indicated that the City's client parking spaces could be used by any City employee working over the weekend or in the evenings. The car pool spaces had also been designated. Snow plowing will be discussed with the applicant. Mr. Wendell concurred with the staff report. He also indicated he did not have a problem with the requirement to locate additional parking elsewhere if the City or Hytek ever removes its approval. Public testimony was solicited but none given. Commissioner Uhart moved to approve U-98/99-45, a special use permit request from Thomas Johnson, George D. Wendell, Pastor of the Victory Christian Center, to allow off-site parking within 300 feet on property located at 300 Hot Springs Road, 2555 Northgate Lane, APN 2-062-11, based on seven findings and subject to nine conditions of approval with an additional condition stating that if the City or Hytek at any point rescinds their agreement to allow the Church to use their parking, the Church will seek other remedy 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. Commissioners Wipfli and Rogers seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.

G-6a. MPA-98/99-2 - DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON A MASTER PLAN AMENDMENT REQUEST FROM SILVER STATE CONSULTANTS; G-6b. S-98/99-2 - DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON A REQUEST FROM SILVER STATE CONSULTANTS; AND G-6c. Z-98/99-3 - DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON A REQUEST FROM SILVER STATE CONSULTANTS (1-1394) - Senior Planner Danforth, Applicant's Representative Julio Sandoval, Community Development Director Walter Sullivan, Fran McLain, Ron Kipp - Mr. Sandoval indicated the owners had read the staff report and agreed with it. He thanked staff for its assistance and highlighted the project. The project will abut one acre residential parcels with single family 12,000 square foot lots and provide a transition from SF6000. The drainage plan and street lighting were described. Mrs. Danforth explained the ordinance restricting master plan and land use changes to two times a year. Mr. Sullivan explained the reasons the Commission was hearing the Master Plan in March rather than February. The Applicant had complied with the mandatory timeframes.

Public testimony was solicited. Ms. McLain questioned what had happened to the 30 foot setback requirement between SF7,000 square foot lots and one acre lots. She urged the Commission to return to the established Statutes and not allow one acre lots to abut 12,000 square foot lots. The 7,000 square foot lots are not adequate for a 30 foot buffer unless a two story home is constructed. The proposal will impact the view. She requested the Commission deny the application. Additional public comments were solicited. Mr. Kipp felt that the project would provide a good transition from Landmark Homes' 6,000 square foot lots, however, they had been required to provide the one acre buffer between the already developed one acre and their 6,000 square foot lots. Additional public comments were solicited but none given.

Discussion between the Commission and staff clarified that the project would have 12,000 square foot lots and that

the 30 foot buffer had been required for the subdivision north of Koontz 20 or 30 years ago due to the potential conflict between livestock on the one acre lots and the 6,000 square foot residences. This 30 foot setback had been required on the 6,000 square foot lots. Commissioner Mally then moved to approve a motion to recommend that the Board of Supervisors approve MPA-98/99-2, a Master Plan Amendment request from Danny and Karen Rasner, Silver State Consultants, applicant, requesting a change of the Land Use Master Plan designation from the existing Suburban Residential into the proposed Low Density Residential for an area totaling approximately 2.23 acres, based on four findings contained in the staff report. Commissioner Wipfli seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.

Commissioner Mally moved to approve Z-98/99-3, a motion to prepare an ordinance for first reading to change the land use designation for approximately 2.23 acres of land from the existing Single Family One Acre into the proposed Single Family 12,000 square feet and recommend to the Board of Supervisors adoption of said ordinance based on one finding contained in the staff report. Commissioner Wipfli seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.

Commissioner Mally moved to approve a motion to recommend that the Board of Supervisors approve S-98/99-2, a tentative subdivision application from Danny and Karen Rasner, Silver State Consultants, applicant, to create a seven parcel development on APNs 9-131-02 and 03, as shown on the attached plat map, based on three findings and subject to 13 conditions of approval as contained in the staff report with the understanding that any acknowledgements to the Commission or Board by the applicant or owner may be considered as further stipulations or conditions of approval on this application. Commissioner Wipfli seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.

Commissioner Mally moved to approve a motion to recommend that the Board of Supervisors approve the request for dedication of one roadway known as Rasner Court within the Rasner Place Subdivision with the condition that the applicant meet all City standards and requirements for construction. Commissioner Wipfli seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.

Mrs. Danforth indicated that the Board of Supervisors would consider the applications on April 15. (Commissioner Uhart stepped from the room--5:28 p.m. A quorum was still present.)

G-7. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON THE ANNUAL REVIEW OF A PREVIOUSLY APPROVED SPECIAL USE PERMIT FROM RON KIPP (1-1750) - Senior Planner Juan Guzman, Ron Kipp, Sylvia Peters, Fran McLain, Community Development Director Walter Sullivan - Commissioner Uhart returned following Mr. Guzman's introduction--5:31 p.m. (The entire Commission was present constituting a quorum.) Mr. Kipp agreed that all but one sign had been removed. It will be removed within 30 days--on or before April 30. Public testimony was solicited. Both Ms. Peters and Ms. McLain indicated that the sign no longer advertises Southpointe. Ms. McLain thanked the Commission for requiring the sign's removal. Additional public comments were solicited but none given. Mr. Kipp indicated that he had stipulated that the sign would be removed by April 30. Mr. Sullivan explained that the Code restricts the sign's advertisement to Southpointe and not other subdivisions. Mr. Kipp explained his discussion with Landmark Homes Developer Jim Bawden and reiterated his intent to remove the sign by April 30. If the Commission deemed it necessary, he would paint over it. Chairperson Horton agreed to allow the sign to remain until April 30th and cautioned against doing it again. Commissioner Rogers moved that the Commission find the applicant in compliance with Item U-95/96-27 and 27a with the stipulation that the existing sign will be removed within the timeframe given, which is to the end of April. Commissioner Christianson seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-1 with Commissioner Sedway voting Naye as he did not feel that he was in compliance as its a different sign.

G-8. U-98/99-43 - DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON A SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FROM MICHAEL A. PFEIFER (1-1946) - Senior Planner Guzman, Michael Pfeifer - Discussion between the Commission and staff indicated the garage would be attached to City water and sewer services. Restroom facilities will be included in the structure but not kitchen facilities. It will not be rented. Mr. Guzman agreed that, if the Building Code is complied with, the area could be converted to living quarters. Mr. Pfeifer indicated he had read the staff report and concurred with it. Public testimony was solicited but none given.

Commissioner Christianson moved to approve U-98/99-43, a special use permit request from Michael A. Pfeifer to allow an accessory structure larger than 50 percent of the square footage of the primary structure on property zoned Mobile Home 12,000 located at 2840 Lorraine Street, APN 8-551-04, based on seven findings and subject to six 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 Mally seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.

BREAK: A five minute recess was declared at 5:45 p.m. The entire Commission was present when Chairperson Horton reconvened the meeting at 5:50 p.m., constituting a quorum.

G-9. U-98/99-44 - DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON A SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FROM CHARLES E. BEDROSIAN (1-2092) - Senior Planner Guzman, Community Development Director Sullivan, Charles Bedrosian, Deputy District Attorney Bruketta, Senior Engineer John Givlin - Mr. Guzman's introduction indicated that BLM Geologist Carolyn James had assisted him with the report. Discussion ensued between the Commission and staff on the reasons the City should maintain the bond which Mr. Bedrosian will purchase, the reasons for the bond and its amount, the material which is to be mined, the mine's exemption from the BLM plan to close the Pinenuts, the prohibition against filing for new claims in the Pinenuts, the public response to the notices regarding the application, the access route, projected volume of traffic which would be created by the operation, the type of vehicles which are used to access the site, and the signatures which had been obtained on the application.

(1-2602) Mr. Bedrosian displayed and explained photographs of the site, a topographical map of the area, his reasons for feeling that he would not create a dust problem, the access road's erosion problems, his mining system--neither chemicals nor crushing will be used, his plan to recycle the sluice water, and the assayer's report. Discussion among the Commission, Mr. Guzman and Mr. Bedrosian explained BLM's role in determining the need for security fencing, the present security system, the City's present liability if an accident occurred at the site, the shafts and tunnels now at the mine, Mr. Bedrosian's plans for those shafts, his need and use of explosives, the potential need for a fire suppressant system, and his grading plans. (Commissioner Christianson left the meeting at 6:20 p.m. A quorum was still present.) Mr. Bedrosian then voiced his opposition to having the City require a bond when neither BLM nor the State does. He offered to give the City a promissory note instead of a bond if absolutely necessary.

(1-3001) Public testimony was requested but none given. Mr. Bedrosian responded to Mr. Sullivan's questions by indicating that he had read the staff report and agreed to the conditions, however, in the interest of parity had voiced his concerns about the 150 percent bonding requirement. He also understood that, if a partner came into being or the pickup trips increased in numbers, the Planning Commission would reconsider the permit. He indicated that there is another route which could be used for hauling. Mr. Sullivan explained his reasons for entering this conversation in the record. Mr. Sullivan then explained the reasons for requiring the bonding. He expressed a willingness to work with Mr. Bedrosian on it but felt that it was a necessary condition. Clarification by Ms. Bruketta indicated that the Commission could not amend this condition. (Commissioner Sedway stepped from the room at 6:30 p.m. and returned at 6:32 p.m. A quorum was present the entire time.) Mr. Givlin explained the BLM slope stabilization requirements. Mr. Bedrosian had indicated in his description of the mining operation that these issues will be part of the operational plan. Mr. Givlin then questioned the need for a bond if this is the case. Chairperson Horton indicated that this is the reason Mr. Sullivan needed to discuss the bonding issue and financial risks with Mr. Bedrosian. Mr. Sullivan further delineated these issues and explained the purpose and composition of the team who will review of the project. Overtime a rehabilitation and closure plan will be developed. Part of this plan will establish a cost estimate for the work. Mr. Givlin then pointed out that once the slopes are reconfigured, it will be impossible to revegetate them. This may mean that there will not be a reclamation plan beyond the operation plan even if there is an open pit. Mr. Bedrosian then explained his plan to involve a Boy Scout Troop in the revegetation program. He then described his stabilization/regrading plan.

Commissioner Mally moved to approve U-98/99-44, a special use permit by Charles E. Bedrosian, operator/agent for Melville R. Colgrove, unpatented claim holder, on lands owned by the Bureau of Land Management, zoned Conservation Reserve, located at the southwest quarter of Section 31, T.15N., R.21E, a portion of APN 10-291-03,

based on seven findings and subject to seven 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 Uhart seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0.

G-10. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON THE POSTPONEMENT OF THE WEDNESDAY, APRIL 28, 1999, MEETING TO THURSDAY, MAY 13, 1999 (1-3292) - Commissioner Sedway indicated that he had a conflict with the meeting date, however, would have several items for consideration by the Commission. Discussion then scheduled the meeting to commence at 3 p.m. Mr. Sullivan indicated it would be large agenda. Commissioner Wipfli moved to change the April 28, 1999, Regional Planning Commission meeting to May 13, 1999, and to start the meeting at a time to be determined by staff. Commissioner Mally seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0. Mr. Sullivan expressed an intent to have the meeting commence at 3 p.m. and announced that the meeting would be at the Cooperative Extension's conference room.

G-11. DISCUSSION AND DIRECTION FROM THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION REGARDING APPLICANTS, AGENTS, AND PROPERTY OWNER SIGNATURES ON REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION APPLICATION FORMS (1-3421) - Community Development Director Sullivan, Deputy District Attorney Bruketta, Senior Planner Guzman - Staff intended to make a recommendation in late May. Commissioner Sedway iterated his concerns with having to continue items due to improper signatures and the inconvenience it caused for the public to be forced to attend several hearings without being heard. The public should be allowed to speak. He supported requiring the property owner to sign the application. Chairperson Horton responded by explaining that unless the correct individual signs the application, there is no application. Ms. Bruketta supported his position. Chairperson Horton felt that the onus should be on the applicant to be the correct individual. (2-0001) Commissioner Uhart suggested that a cover sheet be attached to the application stating the consequences of having the wrong signature on the application. She also supported Sparks' form although she was unsure about allowing an "authorized agent" to sign. A potential problem with such a signature was explained. For this reason she supported having the owner of record sign the application. Clarification by Mr. Sullivan indicated the current handout which goes with each application will be revised to expound on the requirement that the application be the owner of record. He also explained the revised staff processing procedure which will verify the owner of record at the time the application is submitted. An example of the reasons for requiring the property owner to sign the application was cited. Discussion ensued on the Sierra Pacific application. Commissioner Rogers agreed that the process is difficult but felt that worse things could happen. He felt that the Commission's primary function is to minimize the City's exposure from the impact of a change in property values. He wanted the property owner's signature so that he knew that that individual would be aware of the application. He did not feel that the process should be streamlined for an applicant. Staff is very diligent in the performance of its job. He could not think of more than three or four instances where this problem had occurred during his tenure. Staff should not take a lot of heat over this situation as no-one can be 100 percent perfect but 99 percent is close. He commended staff for looking at the situation and attempting to determine what could be done to tighten the process. Chairperson Horton also felt that based on the law of averages, the next occasion would be after all of the Commissioners have been replaced. Mr. Guzman then explained a problem encountered when a corporation or the Hospital owns the property and questioned whether a Department Head or CEO should be allowed to sign. Chairperson Horton felt that the process would assure that the correct person has signed the application and legitimate applications will be agendized. He appreciated the fact that the public would be disappointed in not being able to participate. The process would remove some of the onus from staff. Commissioner Sedway then indicated that he felt staff was already attempting to determine the correct signatures as he had experienced with an application. No formal action was taken or required.

H. INTERNAL COMMUNICATIONS AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS (NON-ACTION)

H-1. STAFF BRIEFING ON THE STATUS OF COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS AND CORRESPONDENCE TO THE COMMISSION (2-0168) - Mr. Sullivan reported on the status of the change of land use for Randall Harris, the Quail Run PUD and its zoning, the reversion to acreage map, and the useful dialogue on the public zoning issue.

H-2. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS (2-0248) (2-0287) - Commissioner Uhart explained the Open Space Advisory Committee's decision to delay the public hearings on open space until the summertime. The

CARSON CITY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the March 31, 1999, Meeting

Page 8

Committee had considered a Clear Creek project which had provided an opportunity for it to analyze the procedures. Chairperson Horton welcomed Commissioner Mally back.

H-3. STAFF COMMENTS (1-0244) - None.

H-4. FUTURE COMMISSION ITEMS AND DATES (2-0265) - Mr. Sullivan explained staff's analysis about the number of appeals which had been considered by the Board of Supervisors and its comparison to other jurisdictions. This report will be provided to the Commission at its next meeting. As a result of this report, the Board felt that the Commission is valuable to them.

I. ADJOURNMENT (2-0295) - There being no other matters for consideration, Commissioner Wipfli moved to adjourn. Commissioner Mally seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0. Chairperson Horton adjourned the meeting at 7:05 p.m.

The Minutes of the March 31, 1999, Carson City Regional Planning Commission meeting

ARE SO APPROVED ON ___March_13____, 1999.

_____/s/_____
Verne Horton, Chairperson