

CARSON CITY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of the September 24, 1997, Meeting
Page 1

A regularly scheduled meeting of the Carson City Regional Planning Commission was held on Wednesday, September 24, 1997, at the Community Center Sierra Room, 851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada, beginning at 3:30 p.m.

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

STAFF PRESENT: Community Development Director Walter Sullivan, Health
Director Daren Winkelman, Deputy Public Works Director
Tim Homann, Deputy District Attorney Melanie Bruketta,
Senior Planner Juan Guzman and Tara Hullinger, and Recording Secretary Katherine McLaughlin (R.P.C. 9/24/97
Tape 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, DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE -
Chairperson Horton convened the session at 3:30 p.m. Roll call was taken. A quorum was present although Commissioner Rogers was absent. Chairperson Horton lead the Pledge of Allegiance. (1-0058.5) Mr. Sullivan explained that Commissioner Rogers' absence was due to an emergency meeting in Las Vegas.

B. COMMISSION ACTION - APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR MAY 28 AND AUGUST 27, 1997, REGULAR SESSIONS AND SPECIAL JULY 29, 1997 WORKSHOP SESSION (1-0012.5) - Commissioner Wipfli moved to approve the Minutes as read. Commissioner Christianson seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0.

C. PUBLIC COMMENTS (1-0020.5) - Nevada Department of Motor Vehicles and Public Safety Representative Sue Newberry invited the Commission and public to attend the "Walkable Communities" workshop scheduled for Monday, September 29, at 9 a.m. at the Evergreen Center. The purpose of the seminar was explained. Additional public comments were solicited but none given.

D. MODIFICATIONS TO THE AGENDA (1-0048.5) - Mr. Sullivan indicated Item G-5, U-97/98-6, Discussion and possible action on a special use permit application from Richard Scott, had been withdrawn. Mr. Guzman requested Item G-7 from the National Forest Service be heard as soon after 4 p.m. as possible.

E. DISCLOSURES (1-0067.5) - None.

F. CONSENT AGENDA (1-0070.5)

F-1. AB-97/98-1 - DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON A REQUEST FROM ROY AND MAGDALENA FARROW

F-2. U-96/97-14a - DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION AMENDING A PREVIOUSLY APPROVED SPECIAL USE PERMIT FROM BRECHLER AND BELL CONSULTING ENGINEERS

F-3. Z-97/98-2 - DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON A CHANGE OF LAND USE REQUEST FROM DWIGHT MILLARD

F-4. V-97/98-3 - DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON A REQUEST FROM CAPITAL ENGINEERING - None of the items were pulled for discussion. Commissioner Wipfli moved to approve the Consent Agenda consisting of Items F-1, F-2, F-3, and F-4. Commissioner Mally seconded the motion. Chairperson Horton noted that Items F-3 and F-4 would be continued by the action. Motion carried 6-0.

(1-0896.5) Mr. Guzman explained a request for reconsideration of one of the Consent Items. Due to the need to provide appropriate notice, this could not be accomplished at this time as the applicant and/or other interested

parties may no longer be present. Mr. Guzman indicated he would work with the individual in an attempt to resolve the issues. Ms. Fuentes agreed to this process and indicated she had previously attempted to work with the company to no avail.

G. PUBLIC HEARING

G-1. V-97/98-4 - DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON A VARIANCE REQUEST FROM DENNIS SMALL (1-0090.5) - Associate Planner Tara Hullinger - Applicant Dennis Small introduced the Electrical Company's Representative Tom Weatherby. Public comments were solicited but none made. Commissioner Christianson moved to recommend to the Board of Supervisors approval of AB-97/98-1, a request from Roy and Madalena Farrow. Following clarification of the item, Commissioner Christianson withdrew the motion and moved to approve V-97/98-4, a variance request from Smatay, Inc., to construct a free-standing sign totaling 240 square feet, not to exceed 30 feet in overall height, and to allow total signage from the property of 327 square feet, on property zoned General Commercial, located at 3879 Highway 50 East, APN 8-305-01, based on five findings and subject to five 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 Mally seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0.

G-2. U-97/98-13 - DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON A SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FROM ROBERT BELKNAP (1-0190.5) - Associate Planner Tara Hullinger, Community Development Director Walter Sullivan, Applicant Robert Belknap - Discussion indicated the desire to obtain a signed document indicating the additional building would not be rented. The variances and special use permits are checked for compliance by either the Compliance Officer or an intern. Commissioner Wipfli recommended Condition 9 be modified to indicated "guest unit" rather than "rental unit". Mr. Belknap had read the staff report and concurred with it. Public testimony was solicited but none given. Commissioner Mally moved to approve U-97/98-13, a special use permit request to allow expansion of a legal non-conforming building and to allow a detached accessory structure in excess of 50 percent of the square footage of the primary structure in a Single Family One Acre zoning district located at 4831 South Edmonds Drive, APN 10-202-09, based on seven findings and subject to nine 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-3. U-96/97-44 - DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON A SIX MONTH REVIEW OF A SPECIAL USE PERMIT FROM CHRIS OSHEROFF (1-0305.5) - Associate Planner Hullinger, Applicant Jennifer Osheroff - Ms. Osheroff indicated she had a copy of the revised scheduled. The building is approximately half finished. She felt that it would meet all of the Code requirements and be completed within the timeframe requested. Public testimony was solicited but none given. Commissioner Mally moved that the Planning Commission grant the six month extension and that no additional reviews will be required with the understanding that the completion date will be December 31, 1997. Commissioner Pozzi seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0.

G-4. U-97/98-10 - DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON A SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FROM MICHAEL AND RACHELLE GEROW (1-0365.5) - Community Development Director Sullivan, Applicant Michael Gerow - Discussion between Mr. Sullivan and Commissioner Mally explained the access route to the building. Mr. Gerow indicated that they had read the staff report and concurred with it. The driveway would be extended from the residence. There should be adequate space to comply with the sideyard setback requirement. Public testimony was solicited but none given. Commissioner Christianson moved to approve U-97/98-10, a special use permit from Michael and Rachelle Gerow 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/Board by the applicant may be considered as further stipulations or conditions of approval on this application. Commissioner Wipfli seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0.

G-5. U-97/98-6 - Withdrawn. No action was taken or required.

G-6. U-97/98-12 - DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON A SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FROM KAMIE AND MIKE MCBRIDE (1-0458.5) - Associate Planner Hullinger, Applicant Mike McBride, Lisa Ramsey - Ms. Hullinger expressed her concern about the limited street frontage and the lack of landscaping. Comments indicated the landscaping is to be completed by April 1998. Discussion ensued on the building code requirements for handicapped access. Ms. Hullinger felt that this requirement would be mandated if there were more than six children from outside of the home. Commissioner Uhart suggested a one year review. Ms. Hullinger indicated that she had not included this as a condition as any item could be returned for review if a compliant is received. Mr. McBride indicated he had read the staff report and concurred with it. The landscaping is approximately 50 percent completed. The contractor should have it completed within two weeks as the lawn can be installed during that timeframe. He was certain that the April 1998 deadline would be complied with. The parents are currently arriving at 7:30, 8, and 9 a.m. He realized that this may not always be the case. They had all been instructed to not park in front of the neighbors' homes. He felt certain that the three spaces in front of his home and two spots in the driveway were adequate. His contact with his neighbors was explained. Commissioner Wipfli encouraged Mr. McBride to continue working with his neighbors. Mr. McBride explained the site for the children's play area, the reason a lot larger than SF6,000 had been selected, and that his wife would remain at home regardless of their ability to have the day care center. Commissioner Christianson explained his opposition to having a day care facility in a residential neighborhood, however, as there would only be five additional children and "he had done his homework", he would support the proposal. Mr. McBride explained that he had not been able to contact all of the neighbors as they had not acquired or commenced construction of their homes. These individuals do not become property owners until they take physical custody of the home. He felt certain that Stanton Park had been notified, however, this notice may not have been passed on. He had walked and talked to the neighbors who are residing in the area.

(1-0642.5) Public testimony was solicited. Ms. Ramsey explained her original opposition to the application due to a previous experience. She had written the letter. She had indicated to Mr. McBride that she would withdraw this letter, however, had forgotten to do so. She indicated an intent to bring any parking violations, etc., to staff/Commission's attention. She requested the one year review be required. Chairperson Horton indicated that if a problem/violation occurs, she should notify staff who will, in turn, notify the Commission. Ms. Ramsey apologized for failing to contact Ms. Hullinger. Additional public comments were solicited but none given.

Commissioner Mally moved to approve U-97/98-12, a special use permit request from Kamie and Mike McBride to allow a day care facility, accessory to a primary residential use, for a maximum of six children in a Single Family 6,000 zoning district located at 1633 Spruce Way, APN 2-613-05, based on seven findings and subject to eleven 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-7. M-97/98-8 - DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON THE HUMBOLDT-TOIYABE NATIONAL FORESTS PLANNING UPDATE PROCESS FOR THE NORTHERN SIERRA AMENDMENT (1-0701.5) - Senior Planner Juan Guzman, Northern Sierra Amendment Public Affairs Officer Bill Van Bruggen - Commissioner Wipfli stepped from the room during Mr. Guzman's introduction--4:15 p.m.-- and returned during Mr. Van Bruggen's explanation of the process, area, and amendment--4:18 p.m. (A quorum was present the entire time.) Maps delineating the difference between the 1970 and 1986 areas were displayed. Concerns and comments expressed at previous meetings were briefly described. Commissioner Uhart encouraged him to have additional Carson City public hearings particularly after the final amendment is drafted. Chairperson Horton thanked him for the presentation and for granting the Commission an opportunity to provide input. Mr. Guzman suggested staff advertise a public hearing on the final amendment and facilitate the meeting for the Forest Service. Chairperson Horton also suggested copies of the draft be made public. Mr. Van Bruggen explained the original process used for developing plans/amendments and the change in public attitude this time around. He supported Mr. Guzman's suggestion. No formal action was taken or required.

BREAK: A fifteen minute recess was declared at 4:25 p.m. A quorum was present when the meeting was reconvened at 4:40 p.m. although Commissioner Rogers was absent as indicated.

G-8. U-97/98-11 - DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON A SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FROM LISA STOKES (1-0928.5) - Senior Planner Guzman, Applicant Lisa Stokes, Bill Vance, Gene Lepire, Mike Millard - Ms. Stokes indicated she had read the staff report and concurred with it. Public testimony was solicited. Mr. Vance opposed the request based on the lack of support from the neighborhood, the use of a special use permit to obtain the ability to have the facility in the residential area, the commercialization of his neighborhood which he felt would occur if the special use permit is allowed, the intrusion it would create on the residential area, the possibility that it may reduce the residents' property values, and requested a poll be taken of the audience to determine opposition to the special use permit process. He then questioned Mr. Guzman about the location of the other elder care unit, its special use permit, and the number of individuals who would be allowed to live at the facility. Additional public comments were solicited. Mr. Lepire expressed his belief, as a contractor and a neighbor, that his property values would be decreased due to the facility. He indicated that his company was in the process of developing another facility within the community and that two more are on the drawing board. They will meet the growing community needs for this type of operation. He threatened to convert his residence into a similar facility if approval is granted to the applicant. Commissioner Christianson questioned him in depth on the property values. Mr. Lepire expressed his feeling that the building should be demolished and the lot subdivided. It is continuously be flooded. Additional public comment was requested but none given. Public comment was closed.

Commissioner Uhart explained her personal involvement with the residence, her experience in real estate and investigation of the property value issue. Her research did not support Mr. Lepire's contention that the proposal would create a negative impact on the surrounding residential values. The change in the community's demographics was creating a need for this type of facility. The majority of residents who would be living in the facility had been members of the community or had family members in the community for many years. They should be allowed to continue residing in a residential neighborhood rather than being warehoused in a large inhospitable facility. Her family impact on the neighborhood when she was young was described and felt to have been more of an intrusion than the proposal. She also felt that it was a moral issue which she would have to set aside when evaluating the proposal. A special use permit would not open a flood gate for other commercial operations. It means that an appointed body would evaluate all of the criteria and make a reasonable decision based upon the criteria and with the understanding of the responsibility created by the arrived at decision. She indicated her support for the project.

Commissioner Wipfli also expressed his desire to have his parents, as well as everyone else's parents, reside in a residential area. He wished that the applicant had done her homework and had tried to work with the neighbors. He felt that a 30 or 60 day continuation may allow this to occur. If movement does not occur, however, it would be a waste of time. He supported Commissioner Uhart's comments concerning the use of a special use permit as it would not force the area to change. This is a real worry for the neighbors. He was unsure of how he would vote. He encouraged the applicant to request a continuation.

Chairperson Horton explained that at the American Planning Association's San Diego seminar an attorney had made a presentation on the property value issue. This individual had cited 25 studies that indicated property values would not be decreased by such projects. The only impact on property values was created by the number of individuals within the facility and its maintenance and upkeep. The attorney had also pointed out that more damage could be created by large families. He suggested that the Commission obtain documented information illustrating the negative impact which would be created. Opinions regarding this issue should be disregarded.

(1-1411.5) Mr. Sullivan then read the CCMC 18.02.063 indicating the criteria used to evaluate special use permits. He explained the zoning, surrounding uses, the term group care facility, and the requirement that the care provider reside on the premises. Only six elder care individuals could reside in the home. Commissioner Uhart pointed out that this individual must be ambulatory. Mr. Sullivan apologized to the public and Commission for staff's failure to provide written documentation concerning the property value issue. The research on the property values surrounding the group care facility in the New Empire area had been conducted, however, was not in written form. Staff recommended approval with nine conditions, which he read into the record. Condition eight mandated a six month review with noticing to all of the residents within 300 feet.

Mr. Guzman then explained his research on the two elder care facilities. One facility is closed. During its operation, the surrounding properties had increased in value. The same was true of the one remaining operation. He had not taken into consideration any inflation values. Commissioner Christianson also pointed out that these facilities were not in the same area as the proposed site. Commissioner Uhart agreed that the values were not the same when the locations are compared, however, Mr. Guzman's information does show that the values have not dropped.

Commissioner Pozzi suggested the applicant be advised about the procedure for requesting a continuance. This will allow her an opportunity to gather additional information. Commissioner Wipfli supported his recommendation and expressed his concern about the amount of opposition. He also pointed out that if six homes could be constructed on the site, she may find that her proposal is less of an incentive to the opposing residents. This would also provide an opportunity for her to work with the neighborhood and learn about the proposal.

(1-1696.5) Mr. Lepire objected to his inability to comment as public comment had been closed. Chairperson Horton relinquished and allowed him to speak. Mr. Lepire felt that 11 children were more acceptable than a commercial operation. His seven children were not producing an income of \$2 or \$3,000 a piece. This made it a commercial operation. There is an adequate amount of commercially zoned property in the City to provide an appropriate location for the proposed use without requesting a special use permit.

(1-1731.5) Ms. Stokes explained her purpose had been to save an historical home. She had not been aware of the neighborhood opposition. She expressed a desire to meet with the neighbors. Chairperson Horton explained that she would have to request a continuance until either the next meeting or some subsequent meeting. He also noted the appeal process.

(1-1752.5) Mr. Millard indicated a desire to move forward with the project and not request a continuance. He agreed that it would have been easier to demolish the building and start over. The attempt was to preserve an historical structure. He agreed that a rundown facility would create a negative impact on the neighborhood. Ms. Stokes would reside at the facility and would not wish to live in such an environment. The facility would not be detrimental to the property values. Efforts were being made to mitigate the flooding problems noted by Public Works. There will be curb, gutter, and sidewalks installed. He requested a decision from the Commission. Chairperson Horton then reiterated his comments about the appeal process. Mr. Sullivan further delineated that process including the timelines.

Commissioner Uhart moved to approve U-97/98-11, a special use permit request from Lisa Stokes to allow a group care facility for the elderly up to a maximum of six residents on property located at 1600 Kings Canyon Road, APN 9-012-06, 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 or Board by the applicant may be considered as further stipulations or conditions of approval on this application. Commissioner Mally seconded the motion. Motion was voted by roll call with the following result: Uhart - Aye; Wipfli - No; Pozzi - No; Mally - Aye; Christianson - No; and Chairperson Horton - Aye. Motion failed on a 3-3 vote with Commissioner Rogers absent.

Following Mr. Sullivan's request for statements reflecting reasons for each Commissioner's vote, Commissioner Mally stated he had voted for it as he has a 94 year old father in the Dayton Park View Assisted Living Care facility with approximately 60 other people. They get relatively good care but they don't get personal care. Six people in a home, he felt, would be better care and that more personal attention will be given to them. Commissioner Horton indicated he had supported it as, in his personal opinion and based on the information presented this evening, he had not been convinced that the project as presented will necessarily: 1. Be detrimental to the community, specifically, detrimental to the use and enjoyment of the surrounding properties; 2. Was not necessarily convinced that it would have a negative impact on the property values, he had not seen any substantiation of that, in fact, his personal investigation into the issue has shown the contrary to be the case; and 3. Did not find that the item is contradictory to the basic general master plan and the well-being of the citizens of the community. Commissioner Uhart indicated she had voted yes based on the following reasons: The fact that she could not find any substantiation that there would be a loss of property value and that she was saying this not only as a Commission member but as a realtor who specializes in this type of properties in these neighborhoods. She

had also said yes because she believed that a family of six persons can be constituted individuals outside the traditional family configuration and she thought that this particular property and its particular setting blends itself to that kind of set-up. There is a range of commercial uses. This falls on the farthest low end of the impact of the commercial range which exists. The value which could be created in the neighborhood with the proposed use actually augments the quality of life for the neighborhood. There are too few older people walking around in the afternoons and evenings in the neighborhoods which we have regardless of the property values of that neighborhood. She did not think that a special use permit sets a precedent for commercial uses in a residential neighborhood. In fact she felt the ordinance indicates that each special use permit must be considered on its own merits. Any other comments which she would make would be of a personal nature. Commissioner Christianson indicated that, based on his own business, he was very much aware of the "thundering herd of boomers that are quickly approaching us, he was just ahead of that by a few years," and the recent activity in Carson City and surrounding areas in approving care facilities is because people want to invest in that area and their ability to see that "thundering herd" coming. We will all need some place to stay some day. He also has the same situation as Commissioner Mally has with putting someone into a home where you are not quite sure whether they are getting the right care or not. Although the idea of this type of a home and the care that they would receive has certainly a lot of value to it rather than being put in a big warehousing facility, he just had to register his opposition because he felt that a commercial enterprise in the middle of a residential area, especially with everyone that he had heard here tonight opposed to it, would not work. That is why he voted no. Commissioner Pozzi indicated he did not have a comment. He did what he felt was the right thing to do. He had to admit that when you serve in the Legislature that if you get dumped, you get dumped. Commissioner Wipfli indicated that this had been his hardest vote so far. He had attempted to convince the applicant that they were way out in front of the issue but this did not work. In his mind, if you have this much opposition, you have not done your homework. There are people who have not been communicated to. There was no contact with the neighbors. Ms. Stokes indicated that she had had no contact with the neighbors. That is totally unheard of, trying to do something like this without contacting the neighbors. If she did move in in this environment, it will create a horrible environment. You have the neighbors who haven't been talked to. They will go ahead and start on the project. To him, he had to vote against it because of those reasons. As far as, does he want to see the seniors in amongst the neighborhood, yes, he did. He was probably one of the folks who votes a lot for day care as long as it is very limited in size. He did not think that 21 people in six houses would be more disruptive than this project would be. He could not think of Commissioner Uhart and her entire family being any more disruptive than this house would be, specifically when the Uharts had included a pony or several ponies. But Ms. Stokes was way out in front of the process and did not do her homework. He hoped that there was still time for them to go back and do it and he hoped that they would do so.

Mr. Sullivan then explained his reasons for requesting this information.

Chairperson Horton then passed the gavel to Commissioner Pozzi and left the meeting--5:40 p.m. A quorum was still present.

G-9. D-97/98-1 - DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON AN OFFER OF DEDICATION OF PROPERTY TO CARSON CITY (1-2051.5) - Community Development Director Sullivan - Public comments were solicited but none given. Commissioner Mally moved that the Planning Commission recommend that the Board of Supervisors accept dedication of Assessor's Parcel No. 8-541-68 from Stanton Park Development Company to Carson City for a .38 acre parcel of land for open space purposes, located at the northeast portion of the Carson River immediately south of Morgan Mill Road, subject to one condition of approval. Commissioner Christianson seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

H. INTERNAL COMMUNICATIONS AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

H-1. CORRESPONDENCE TO THE COMMISSION (1-2135.5) - Mr. Sullivan indicated there were correspondence items in the Commission's packet.

H-2. STAFF BRIEFING ON THE STATUS OF COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS (1-2147.5) - The ordinances were approved as recommended with the exception of the design guidelines. Reasons the guidelines had not been accepted were noted. Additional workshops will be held on them. A time constraint had not been placed on the guidelines. There is support for the guidelines, however, comments indicated the desire to have objective guidelines rather than the proposal which

had been forwarded to the Board. Discussion explained the purpose of these guidelines, supported the delay, and the Board action. Commissioner Uhart encouraged staff to include something similar to the visional preference survey in the process to be sure that the community provides its input and not just the builders and Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Sullivan expressed a desire to meet with Commissioner Uhart on this topic. He described his intent to increase the notification process in an attempt to obtain more public involvement. Commissioner Uhart also suggested a notification which would emphasize the need for public involvement. Commissioner Christianson thanked the Board of Supervisors for seeing the need to obtain additional public input. He had opposed the original concept due to the lack of public involvement.

H-3. COMMISSION REPORTS (1-2324.5) - Commissioner Christianson questioned the status of the Arizona Pipeline. Mr. Sullivan indicated that Mr. Weddell's situation is being followed and a report will be made to the Airport Authority. If the Authority finds that it is in disarray, a letter will be submitted to the Commission and the issue agendized. Commissioner Christianson indicated that slats had not been installed due to the need to allow drainage. He suggested that the fence be raised or other options pursued. Mr. Sullivan indicated the area is in a flood plain. Mr. Guzman explained the FEMA restrictions on the property. FEMA has agreed to change the designation from a flood way to a flood zone, however, written confirmation has not occurred.

H-4. REPORT FROM OPEN SPACE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBER OR STAFF REPRESENTATIVE (1-2386.5) - Commissioner Uhart indicated the Committee had toured the Merchant Ranch on Monday. Mr. Guzman explained the purpose of the tour and the possibility that the Carson River Advisory Committee would expand its plan. The consultant had been directed to commence the Open Space element of the Master Plan. There is to be a workshop on Monday at 5 p.m. at the City Complex Conference Room. The Commission was invited to attend. If more than four wish to attend, the meeting will be agendized.

H-5. STAFF COMMENTS (1-2442.5) - Mr. Sullivan noted the American Planning Association convention in April and Board funding for training. He urged the Commissioners to attend and, if going, to advise the staff as early as possible.

H-6. FUTURE COMMISSIONS ITEMS (1-2468.5) - The next meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, October 29, at 3:30 p.m. Discussion ensued on the brevity of the meetings. Mr. Sullivan felt that the applications are submitted cyclically and the efforts staff makes to eliminate the conflict which had occurred in the neighborhood as as result of Ms. Stokes' application. He felt that Ms. Stokes had failed to follow up on the suggestions.

I. ADJOURNMENT (1-2526.5) - Commissioner Uhart moved to adjourn the meeting. Commissioners Wipfli and Christianson seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously. Acting Vice Chairperson Pozzi adjourned the meeting at 6 p.m.

The Minutes of the September 24, 1997, Carson City Regional Planning Commission meeting

ARE SO APPROVED ON ____October_29__, 1997.

_____/s/_____
Verne Horton, Chairperson