

**DRAFT**

A regularly scheduled meeting of the Carson City Regional Planning Commission was held on Wednesday, May 27, 1998 in the Community Center Sierra Room, 851 E. William St., Carson City, Nevada, beginning at 3:30 p.m.

**PRESENT:** Chairperson Verne Horton, Vice Chairperson Deborah Uhart, and Commissioners Allan Christianson, William Mally, Archie Pozzi, Alan Rogers, and Richard Wipfli

**STAFF PRESENT:** Community Development Director Walter Sullivan, Deputy District Attorney Melanie Bruketta, Senior Planner Juan Guzman, Senior Engineer John Givlin, and Recording Secretary Katherine McLaughlin (P.C. 5/27/98 1-0001.5)

**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 AND DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE -** Chairperson Horton called the meeting to order at 3:38 p.m. Roll call was taken and a quorum was present. Chairperson Horton led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**B. COMMISSION ACTION - APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR MARCH 25, 1998 -** Commissioner Wipfli moved to approve the Minutes as read. Commissioner Mally seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.

**C. PUBLIC COMMENT (1-0020.5) -** None.

**D. MODIFICATIONS TO THE AGENDA (1-0028.5) -** None.

**E. DISCLOSURES (1-0030.5) -** None.

**F. CONSENT AGENDA (1-0036.5)**

**F-1. S-96/97-1 - DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON A REQUEST FROM COLLEGE PARKWAY ASSOCIATES**

**F-2. V-97/98-12 - DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON A VARIANCE APPLICATION FROM PATRICK AND PAMELA MARBLE -** Chairperson Horton explained that the applicants for Item F-2 had requested a continuance. Approval of that item would constitute acceptance of the continuance. Commissioner Wipfli moved to approve Items F-1 and F-2 as read. Commissioner Uhart seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.

**G. PUBLIC HEARING (1-0053.5)**

**G-1. U-97/98-42 DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON A SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FROM LORETTA FRANCO (1-0072.5) -** Senior Planner Juan Guzman, Loretta Franco - The building is to be used as a garage and for storage. Its size required obtaining a special use permit. The proposed location of the structure and the ability of the mature landscaping on the property to partially obscure the view of the proposed building were explained. The building will have electricity but not water. Ms. Franco felt the structure would improve the visual presentation of the property. Public comments were solicited but none given. (1-0116.5) Commissioner Uhart moved to approve U-97/98-42 based on seven findings and subject to five conditions of approval contained in the staff report. Commissioner Christianson seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.

**G-2. V-97/98-11 DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON A VARIANCE REQUEST FROM DAVID G. COCHRAN (1-0124.5) -** Senior Planner Guzman, David Cochran - The variance is to accomodate a

building for storing gardening equipment. Staff had received several calls regarding the item, most of which related to whether the building will be connected to a septic system that could impact water sources below the site. There will not be any toilet facilities in the building. At some future time the applicant intends to build a garage adjacent to the proposed building. The garage will be considered by the Commission at that time. The proposed location is felt to be the only place for the building due to the terrain. Mr. Guzman's comments included the requirements for granting a variance. The adjacent neighbor supported the variance. The site had been graded previously. The applicant provided photographs of the property and used the parcel map to explain the location. Public comments were solicited but none given. (1-0219.5) Commissioner Mally moved to approve V-97/98-11 based on five findings and subject to six conditions of approval contained in the staff report with the understanding that any acknowledgements to the Commission or Board by the applicant shall be considered as further stipulations or conditions of approval on this application. Commissioner Wipfli seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0. (The photographs were given to the Clerk.)

**G-3. S-97/98-4 DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON A REQUEST FROM SLV DEVELOPMENT (PROPERTY OWNER: SARIO LIVESTOCK COMPANY) FOR A TENTATIVE INDUSTRIAL SUBDIVISION MAP - (1-0237.5)** - Senior Planner Guzman, Applicant's Representative Glen Martel - Mr. Martel indicated this is the applicant's third subdivision in the area and that the owner is working with the neighboring property owner, Mr. Shaheen, to keep the appearance of the corridor similar. He wished to use Mr. Shaheen's CC&Rs to keep the same architectural styles, setbacks, and landscaping. There are no concerns about the conditions. Clarification with Public Works prior to the meeting indicated that the traffic study is to address impact issues which may be created if and when Challenger Way connects to College Parkway. His developer is not being required to construct this roadway. He then provided a map of the site and pointed out the FEMA floodway. During the past couple of years the adjacent property owners have been coordinating the re-mapping of the FEMA floodway. Its location was illustrated. FEMA approval is anticipated shortly. Clarification indicated that the CC&Rs had been recorded. Public comments were solicited but none given. Commissioner Uhart emphasized the need to have the same aesthetic look as Mr. Shaheen has been utilizing. (1-0279.5) Commissioner Mally moved to approve a motion to recommend that the Board of Supervisors approve S-97/98-4, a tentative industrial subdivision application from Sario Livestock Development Company based on three findings and subject to 13 conditions of approval as 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 Wipfli seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.

**G-4. U-97/98-46 - DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON A SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FROM CARSON CITY PARKS AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT (1-0365.5)** - Senior Planner Guzman, Parks and Recreation Director Steve Kastens, Wes Granstrom, John Vettel, Darlene Duckworth, Tom Hughes, Rosemary Sanders, Gaeton Pecoraro, Melisse Morrison, Charles Chinnock, Guy Farmer, Karen Hamer, Troy Leaper, Diane Dickerson, Tim Holdersworth, Carl Walter, Community Development Director Walter Sullivan - The special use permit was for the purpose of allowing the park improvements to proceed. One had been conceptually approved as part of the Long Ranch PUD in Kings Canyon. The permit had been agendized due to staff's concern about the use of a porta-potty facility. Parks and Recreation is of the opinion that a full restroom facility at this park is not beneficial, however, they also want to be able to have a facility so that the children will not have to return home. Therefore, the proposed porta-potty. The facility is to be in an enclosure with walls on three sides and a roof. The design is similar to the pavilion that is part of the park improvement plan. The elevations were included with the staff report. Staff had received a large number of calls on the proposal with the majority indicating their desire to not have any kind of restroom facility at the park if it is to be a porta-potty. Mr. Guzman explained for Commissioner Uhart that the property had not yet been dedicated. When the improvements are installed, the developer will dedicate the property and it will become a City park maintained by the City. In response to Commissioner Mally's question, Mr. Guzman explained that it is his understanding that there are parks with porta-potties as well as other types of facilities and requested Mr. Kastens respond to the question. Commissioner Christianson explained his personal experience with the park in Carriage Crest Square including its lack of maintenance and restrooms. The use of restrooms in private homes is an alternative. Mr. Guzman asked that Mr. Kastens respond to his question concerning whether the park could be used for soccer or other youth activities although he, personally, did not feel that the park was of an adequate size to meet the needs for such organized activities.

(1-0471.5) Mr. Kastens reviewed the history of the park including the Park and Recreation Department and Commission involvement with the review process. This review had concluded that there were enough homes/people in the subdivision to require park amenities. They then worked with the developer to estimate the type of people who would live in the subdivision from which the park plan was developed. Due to the problems encountered at Sonoma Park and Park Terrace, the surge in AYSO soccer and other recreational youth sports activities, and the size of proposed park's turf area, it was felt that some kind of a restroom facility should be provided. The turf area is approximately equal to that required for a Little League baseball field. This is not adequate to accommodate the 12 and older group and may not meet the needs of the 9 and older group but could handle the 5 and 6 year olds. Attempts to meet the youth recreational demand were noted. He then explained the Park Terrace vandalism, graffiti and other problems with illegal activities which had occurred in its full blown restroom facility. When this restroom had been vandalized beyond repair, it was removed. The park users are now using the private homes in the park's vicinity. Based on this experience, an alternative was developed which is to construct three sided shelters with a roof into which portable toilets can be slid. This is proposed for the Long Ranch park. The facility is to be located in an area where the service company can easily service it. Servicing includes pumping and sanitizing the units. Washoe County is using this approach. The shelters are made aesthetically pleasing. Sani-huts are used during the winter time at Mills Park, Riverview Park and Centennial Park. These facilities have not been vandalized nor experienced the graffiti or illicit activities found with the full blown facilities. He felt that the proposal was a prudent response to the demand but agreed that if the Commission decides the against his recommendation to not put them in. He requested the record reflect his feeling that restroom facilities are necessary at the proposed park so that when future residents/users need the facilities he could respond by explaining his attempt to provide public facilities. Alternatives will be solicited at that time and were solicited now. He indicated that he is considering installing Sani-huts at Sonoma Park and Park Terrace due to the neighborhood feedback. The conceptual plans for the proposed park on Mark Way includes a portable restroom facility. He stressed his intent to continue bringing forward plans with portable restrooms until either the District Attorney tells him not to or an ordinance prohibiting them is adopted.

(1-0621.5) Commissioner Christianson suggested the fourth side, where the doors are, have a similar face as the remaining sides. Mr. Kastens agreed that the aesthetics may be the major objection. He questioned whether a small child could open the decorated wall/door as well as the door to the Sani-huts. This proposal had not been considered. Reasons for placing the doors toward the park were provided including the ease in accessing the units for servicing or replacing. Regular sanitizing and pumping schedules are provided. The Sani-huts will be used on a seasonal basis and as a standard for other parks. The facility will house a single unit. Elaboration on the service plan indicated the provider will have a regular route, which may be once a week or more often during the peak seasons, however, Mr. Kastens was unsure of the actual coverage. The service will be similar to that used for the dumpsters which are emptied on a regular weekly basis. Mills Park and the sports complexes are exceptions to this routine. They are serviced twice a week unless demand requires additional service. Mr. Kastens indicated the sewer and water connections for a permanent facility would be in the \$5 to \$6,000 range which is in addition to the monthly use fees. It may cost \$50 to \$60,000 for a permanent facility. He then indicated that the options are the Sani-huts or no restrooms at all. Commissioner Wipfli briefly explained his problems with the concept. He also felt that the estimate for the permanent structure was out-of-line. The standard should be raised rather than lowered to a bucket if the facility is vandalized. He supported Commissioner Uhart's request for a cost analysis. Comments indicated that the sewer and water connection fees could not be waived. Commissioner Mally agreed with Commissioner Wipfli, explained his opposition to the proposal, and expressed his belief that the City could afford to put in a restroom.

Mr. Guzman then explained a concern expressed by a parent, Rosemary Sanders, that if there is no water, the children could not wash their hands and would spread germs. She supported having no facility rather than that proposed. He supported Commissioner Mally's comments about having a park with appropriate facilities. Mr. Kastens responded by indicating that there are porta-potty facilities with handi-wipe dispensers.

(1-0809.5) Public testimony was solicited. Chairperson Horton indicated that a time limit would be imposed to allow all to speak. Citizens Granstrom, Vettel, Duckworth, Hughes, Sanders, Pecoraro, Morrison, Chinnock, Farmer, Hamer, (1-1102.5) Leaper, Dickerson, Holdersworth, and Walter opposed the special use permit for the Sani-huts. Reasons given were the desire that it be a neighborhood park; commitments made during the purchase

of the residences; objections to undesirable visitors from elsewhere, odor, noise, graffiti, vandalism, it unsightliness, obstruction of their views, resulting loss of property values, and lack of water for hygiene; the use of their "neighborhood park/green belt" as a "City park", lack of off street parking, lack of landscaping to this point, the lack of a bridge at the creek, and the feeling that the area was not adequate for any organized recreational activities. Mr. Granstrom indicated that he had 14 letters from other neighbors opposing the plan which he gave to the Commission. (Neither a copy nor the originals were given to the Clerk.) Mr. Granstrom also requested the record reflect that not all of the neighbors had been given proper notice of the meeting. Ms. Sanders questioned the final plan for the park and requested a copy of it. (1-1155.5) Chairperson Horton polled the audience to determine support for the testimony as given. A majority of those present raised their hands. Commissioner Rogers suggested these individuals sign a "log" which would indicate opposition. (1-1186.5) Additional public comment was solicited but none given. Public comment was then closed.

(1-1187.5) Commissioner Rogers felt that staff's intent was admirable, however, given the small size, neighborhood parks should be for the surrounding neighborhood. During construction at Sonoma Park last year there had been a porta-potty facility much to the chagrin of the neighbors. For the reasons stated by the residents, he did not believe it was a good idea to have a porta-potty. A neighborhood park should be planned by the residents in the area and reflect an extension of the front or back yards of the surrounding neighbors. He commended Mr. Hughes on the humanitarian nature of his comments regarding allowing children to use his restroom facilities. He also noted his personal experience as a youth coach with such friendly neighbors.

Commissioner Uhart expressed her belief that Mr. Kastens and his staff were truly looking for the best solution to a difficult problem. It is not a private park regardless of the presentation made by Ryder Homes during the sales pitch. It is not a gated community. It is not maintained by a homeowners association. As a real estate professional she knew the implications of this situation and understood why the residents were upset. The Commission is not charged with upholding the developer's representation but rather they are enjoined to make a decision based on the best interest of the community and the health and welfare of the citizens. She agreed that other neighborhoods, which do not have parks, will use the facility. She supported Commissioner Rogers suggestion that neighborhood input be allowed to decide the type of facility created. She emphasized that the park had always been proposed as a community park. Carson City is a considered a neighborhood, therefore, the definition of neighborhood park included the entire community. In a perfect community, full restroom facilities should be provided in every park. In this particular instance, however, the neighborhood did not wish to have it. It may also be possible that at some future date, the neighborhood may oppose allowing the public to use private restrooms.

Commissioner Wipfli felt the scope of the park could be limited at this point, i.e., a simple walking neighborhood park, and that the facilities may not be needed. As the neighborhood grows, the needs will change and the demand will be there for restrooms.

Mr. Guzman reiterated that the property had been offered for dedication, however, until the amenities are constructed, the offer had not been accepted. Commissioner Mally suggested letting the homeowners association have the park area and be responsible for its amenities, upkeep, etc. Commissioner Christianson pointed out the complexity of the situation and reiterated his comments relating to his personal experience in Carriage Crest and with its park. He personally felt that until other parks have porta-potties, this should not be the only exception.

Mr. Guzman indicated the parking issue had been discussed. It was decided to provide only curb parking so that the park would remain as a family/neighborhood park. He also explained the procedure for noticing the neighbors within 300 feet of the park's boundaries. The issue is not whether there would be a park but rather the type of restroom facilities. It is public land and open to all citizens. The limited amount of parking will help maintain it as a neighborhood park.

(1-1410.5) Commissioner Uhart moved to approve U-97/98-46 with the omission of the temporary restroom facilities based on seven findings and subject to five conditions, which may or may not address those particular improvements, 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

DRAFT

application. Commissioner Wipfli seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-2 with Commissioners Mally and Pozzi voting Naye. Chairperson Horton and Mr. Sullivan briefly described the appeal process.

BREAK: Chairperson Horton declared a recess at 5:05 p.m. He reconvened the meeting at 5:18 p.m. A quorum was present although Commissioner Rogers was absent.

**G-5. U-97/98-45 DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FROM SALLY SMALL (1-1451.5)** - Senior Planner Guzman, Sally Small - The permit is for a building to be used basically for hangar storage with an office use on the upper floors. A permit had previously been approved but not put into place. The new applicant is ready to proceed. Staff recommended approval. The Airport Authority is anxious to have the facility constructed. In response to Commissioner Mally's questions, Mr. Guzman indicated that the Airport Authority requires as a condition of the lease that the applicant extend all infrastructure improvements from the Authority's services to the building. All of these amenities are available for the applicant. Ms. Small indicated the project complies with the plans and goals of the Airport Authority. It will improve the airport's value, meet the pilots' needs, and bring in additional revenue. The Airport Authority's color scheme and conditions were explained. The building will be earth tone--light stone or ash gray with a blue trim--and consistent with the surrounding buildings. Commissioner Mally moved to approve U-97/98-45, a special use permit from Sally Small to construct approximately 54 aircraft storage hangars within property zoned Public based on seven findings and subject to six 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 on this application. Commissioners Uhart and Wipfli seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0-0-1.

**G-6. M-97/98-14 DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE PLANNING COMMISSION INITIATION OF A CHANGE OF LAND USE FOR PROPERTIES LOCATED WEST OF COCHISE STREET, SOUTH OF KOONTZ LANE, AND NORTH OF ROLAND STREET, THAT CONTAIN DUAL ZONING DISTRICTS (1-1550.5)** - Senior Planner Guzman, Community Development Director Sullivan, Senior Engineer John Givlin - The properties in question were shown on maps included with the staff report. The application was initiated at the Commission's request. The property owners had been contacted. Details of their input were provided. Public testimony was solicited but none given. Commissioner Wipfli questioned the feelings of the surrounding neighbors. The area under discussion had been considered for a zone change/special use permit at the last meeting. Without neighborhood input, he was concerned that neighbors may not like the proposed zoning. Mr. Sullivan explained the change in land use process. The Commission had asked staff to bring back all the split zoned parcels in this area. This is the beginning of the process. He asked the Commission which parcels they wanted included in the zoning change and the zoning designation which should be considered. Staff will then initiate the noticing process. A hearing will be conducted and public comments will be accepted. Commissioner Uhart noted the item had been agendaized at Commissioner Rogers' request. She suggested a stronger notice be sent to the property owners so that a response is provided. Discussion between the Commission and staff explained the status of the Commission's previous decision and the probably that it will be appealed to the Board. Discussion also entailed the split zoning on parcels listed in the request, the zoning on a parcel in the middle of that area, reasons for that zoning, the notification process, the use of the property owners' input in the process, the need to improve Curry Street south of Koontz, and zoning options. Commissioners Uhart and Wipfli expressed their concerns about reopening the issue based on the residents' feelings as expressed during the last meeting. Chairperson Horton suggested and then tabled the discussion until after Commissioner Rogers returned. No formal action was taken at this time.

(1-2635.5) Chairperson Horton brought this item back up by noting that it had been tabled earlier pending the return of Commissioner Rogers. Commissioner Rogers expressed his concern about taking action at this date as the final decision on the special use permit/change of zoning considered at the last meeting had not been concluded. He was not sure that the Commission concurred that all of the split properties should be made Commercial. There should be dialogue with the public at a future meeting after noticing has occurred. He asked that the process be allowed to continue so that the Commission could handle large tracts rather than doing it on a piecemeal basis. Chairperson Horton explained that the Commission had been asked to initiate the change of land use discussion and that the property owners would be individually contacted to determine their desires regarding

the zoning designation(s). Their comments and staff's professional opinions would be considered at a public hearing. Staff was asking the Commission to request that staff initiate the process. Commissioner Uhart then briefly explained her original comments and her reasons for changing her mind. She then indicated her support for having staff initiate the process. Mr. Sullivan then responded to Commissioner Wipfli's question by explaining the process which will allow the property owners to participate in the zoning designations. Commissioner Wipfli indicated support for this process rather than having staff designate the zoning district and forcing the property owners to react. Commissioner Rogers indicated that this had been his original intent and explained his desire to consider the entire area rather than individual lots and piecemealing. Chairperson Horton pointed out that split zoning creates a problem which should be solved. Commissioner Rogers then moved that the Commission direct staff to continue the process for notifying and getting comments from the property owners and surrounding residents to initiate an action to consider a master plan and zone change in the area designated on G-6. Commissioner Wipfli seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.

**G-7. A-97/98-10 - DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A REQUEST FROM IVAN LEPIRE TO AMEND CARSON CITY MUNICIPAL CODE SECTION 18.03.470 (1-1892.5) -** Community Development Director Sullivan, Valley Chevrolet Sales Manager Don Jack, Albert Le Balch - Justification for granting the proposed code amendment was provided. Direction was solicited regarding who, the staff or Commission, and what type of control should be placed over such uses. The use would be allowed on a parcel that is contiguous and adjacent with a considerable amount of touching property. The applicant, Ivan Lepire, was not present. Public testimony was solicited. Mr. Jack supported the code modification and explained his reasons for making the request. Mr. Le Balch advocated requiring a special use permit to provide a control mechanism over the expansions. Additional public comments were solicited but none given. Commissioner Wipfli moved to recommend to the Board of Supervisors approval of the revised Title 18, Section 18.03.470, Primary Uses, the following: Primary use means the use for which a lot, structure or building or the major portion thereof is designed; All primary uses require a permanent building on the parcel or the parcel that is located contiguous and adjacent to the parcel where the single business utilizes the multiple parcels other than public facilities with uses within the agriculture or conservation reserve with special use permit requirements. Commissioner Pozzi seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0-0-1.

**G-8. AB-97/98-12 - DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A REQUEST FROM JOHN C. SERPA (1-2092.5) -** Senior Planner Tara Hullinger, Senior Engineer Givlin, Community Development Director Sullivan, Capital Engineering and the Applicant's Representative Ken Dorr - Mr. Givlin distributed handouts to the Commission delineating the previously approved Deer Run Road abandonments. (A copy was not given to the Clerk.) Ms. Hullinger described the abandonment. Public Works had indicated the remaining right-of-way would be more than adequate to accommodate vehicular and pedestrian access. The area requested for abandonment contains a Public Utility easement and a condition of approval has been recommended requiring the continuation of this easement. Additional conditions of approval, the noticing process and the response, and the staff's recommendation of approval were explained. Not all of the excess roadway had been abandoned. Mr. Givlin provided details describing the abandonment process. Some property owners are not prepared to undertake this burden. Mr. Sullivan further explained the reasons the entire length had not been abandoned. He committed to contacting the three adjacent property owners and determining whether they wish to have the portion abutting their properties abandoned. Mr. Dorr said they had read the staff report and agreed with it. Public testimony was solicited but none given. Commissioner Uhart moved to approve a motion to recommend that the Board of Supervisors approve AB-97/98-12, a request from John Serpa to abandon a 50 foot wide by 110 foot long portion of the public right-of-way located on the east side of Deer Run Road adjacent to Assessor's Parcel Number 8-531-29 based on two findings and subject to four conditions of approval contained in the staff report. Commissioner Christianson seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0-0-1.

**G-9. AB-97/98-10 - DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A REQUEST FROM THE DIVISION OF STATE LANDS (1-2268.5) -** Senior Planner Hullinger, Applicant's Representative George Georgeson - (Commissioner Rogers returned during Ms. Hullinger's introduction--6 p.m. The entire Commission was present constituting a quorum.) The Commission had previously approved three abandonment requests from the State. Several City Departments had requested a conceptual plan for the Third Street abandonment area to insure adequate vehicular and pedestrian circulation and to eliminate the potential construction of buildings within

existing easements. This request had delayed the abandonment consideration originally agendized for the April meeting. The conceptual plan has been circulated for Department review and was found to be acceptable. As the plan is conceptual at this time and as the property is zoned Public, a special use permit shall be required if additional development is proposed. The current proposal is an expansion of an existing parking lot which will allow circulation within that area. Staff contacted adjacent property owners and did not receive any comments. Therefore, staff recommended approval based on two findings and subject to four conditions of approval. A map of the area is in the packet. Discussion with the Commission explained that the Fire Department's concerns had been addressed. Mr. Georgeson explained the request and parking lot improvements. The plan included a 24 foot thoroughfare which more than complies with the Fire Department's requested 20 foot thoroughfare lane. Mr. Georgeson indicated that the large storm drain and utilities in the easement will remain. Public comments were solicited but none given. Commissioner Mally moved to approve a motion to recommend that the Board of Supervisors approve AB-97/98-10, an abandonment request from the State of Nevada to abandon an approximate 66 foot wide by 511 foot long portion of East Third Street located between South Stewart Street and South Anderson Street adjacent to APNs 4-083-01 and 4-083-06 based on two findings and subject to four conditions of approval contained in the staff report 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. Commissioner Wipfli seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.

**G-10. U-97/98-43 - DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A SPECIAL USE PERMIT FROM DONREY OUTDOOR ADVERTISING; AND, G-11. U-97/98-44 - DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A SPECIAL USE PERMIT REQUEST FROM DONREY OUTDOOR ADVERTISING (1-2515.5)** - Principal Planner Rob Joiner, Applicant's Representative Guy Day - The request is for a special use permit to allow the continued use of an existing billboard. The dimensions of board were noted. The board is located in an RC district. No new boards are allowed in this district. The Commission was encouraged to pay particular attention when making the findings for approval. Staff's analysis had included the size of the board which is lower and smaller than the maximum allowed. Development has caused several boards in the area to be removed. All billboard special use permits must be reviewed every five years. The Commission will be seeing more requests in the future. Mr. Joiner emphasized that staff will not be reminding the permittees to renew their permits in the future. The Mayor had asked staff to make an exception to the condition and remind those permittees who have not yet applied. If this fails to motivate the permittees, the Board of Supervisors will consider taking further action. Staff's reasons for recommending approval as well as the condition that staff will not be required to remind the applicant in 2002 that the permit needs to be renewed were noted. Staff comments on U-97/98-44 were the similar with the only difference being that it is a double-faced board. Its dimensions were noted. There were seven findings for approval with seven conditions for it. Mr. Day stated he was at the meeting to respond to any questions the Commission had. There were none. Public testimony was solicited but none given. (1-2563.5) Commissioner Christianson moved to approve U-97/98-43, a special use permit application from Donrey Outdoor Advertising Company, property owner CTV, Inc., to allow a single-faced, off-premise billboard/sign on property zoned Retail Commercial, located at US Highway 395 north at Broadleaf Lane, APN 8-053-30 based on seven findings and subject to seven conditions of approval contained in the staff report. Commissioner Mally seconded the motion. Following a request for an amendment, Commissioner Christianson amended his motion to reflect that the property owner is John Tom Ross/CTV, Inc. Commissioner Mally concurred. Motion carried 7-0.

(1-2596.5) Commissioner Christianson moved to approve U-97/98-44, a special use permit application from Donrey Outdoor Advertising Company, property owner: F. C. Plummer, to allow a double-faced, off-premise billboard/sign on property zoned Retail Commercial located at 3590 North Carson Street, APN 7-462-03, based on seven findings and subject to seven conditions of approval contained in the staff report. Commissioner Mally seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.

**RECESS THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION** - (1-2808.5) Chairperson Horton recessed the Regional Planning Commission at 6:18 p.m and immediately convened the Growth Management Commission. For these Minutes please see the Growth Management files.

**RECONVENE THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION** - Chairperson Horton recessed the Growth

DRAFT

Management Commission at 7:20 p.m. and immediately reconvened the Regional Planning Commission. (The entire Commission was present constituting a quorum.)

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

**H-1. CORRESPONDENCE TO THE COMMISSION (2-0518.5)** - A notice from the Army Corps of Engineers regarding the Washoe Tribe's 404 permit was noted. Community Development does not deal with water permits. The letter will be forwarded to the Utility Department.

**H-2. STAFF BRIEFING ON THE STATUS OF THE COMMISSION'S RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS (2-0538.5)** - The Ash Canyon water tank appeal had been reviewed and continued twice. The City is working on an agreement with the residents of Wellington Crescent Subdivision in an effort to create a "license" which will allow the City to use their private roads. If it is acceptable, the appeal will be dropped. The purpose of the "license" was noted. Roger Shaheen's final subdivision map and a street name change had been approved. Mr. Sullivan then described the Community Development budget and its three supplemental requests. Funding had been granted for the clerical upgrade. The other two request were not funded.

**H-3. COMMISSIONER REPORTS (2-0587.5)** - Discussion ensued on the architectural design standards for the downtown area, Mr. Joiner's role as the Hearings Examiner on the Downtown Design standards, and the Historic Architecture Review Commission's role in overseeing the standards for buildings in the Historic District. Commissioner Mally explained his concern with having air conditioning units on the front of buildings and the Commission's efforts to prohibit these units. He questioned how a building had been approved with this type of air conditioning units. Mr. Sullivan indicated the building was reviewed by staff. If the units are roof mounted, they must be screened. If they are side or floor mounted, they do not have to be. A design committee is looking at those issues including whether the units blended with the building's facade, however, at this time the City does not have any standards and can only go so far in controlling the design.

**H-4. OPEN SPACE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBER OR STAFF REPRESENTATIVE REPORT** - None.

**H-5. STAFF COMMENTS (2-0627.5)** - Copies of the revised Open Meeting Law were displayed. The Commission was encouraged to obtain and read the booklet. An example of a change relating to agendas and noticing was provided.

**H-6. FUTURE COMMISSION ITEMS (2-0645.5)** - A date for the special Commission meeting on the Master Plan and related items had not been determined. Chairperson Horton had requested another training session on the NRS for any new or relatively new Commissioners. Copies of a new planning law booklet had been ordered for the Commission. Mr. Sullivan suggested that the training session be scheduled for either August or September after these booklets have been received. The status of the Titles 17 and 18 subcommittee meetings was provided. Discussion reiterated the noticing process used for Commission items. Mr. Sullivan commended Ms. Bruketta and Mr. Givlin for their daily assistance. He also suggested that rules of decorum be followed during the meetings.

**I. ADJOURNMENT (2-0790.5)** - There being no further business, Commissioner Mally moved to adjourn. Commissioner Wipfli seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0. Chairperson Horton adjourned the meeting at 7:40 p.m.

The Minutes of the May 27, 1998 meeting of the Carson City Regional Planning Commission

1998

ARE SO APPROVED\_\_\_\_September\_30\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_/s/\_\_\_\_\_

Verne Horton, Chairperson

**DRAFT**