

**CARSON CITY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION, BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT AND
MASTER PLAN TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Minutes of the Special April 25, 1996 Meeting

Page 1

A special meeting of the Carson City Regional Planning Commission, Bureau of Land Management, and Master Plan Technical Advisory Committee was held on Thursday, April 25, 1996 in the Community Center Sierra Room, 851 East William Street, Carson City, NV at 6:00 p.m.

PRESENT: Chairperson Alan Rogers
Vice Chairperson Verne Horton
Alan Christianson
William Mally
Maxine Nietz

STAFF: John Berkich, City Manager
Jay Aldean, Public Works Director
Rob Joiner, Principal Planner
Fran Smith, Recording Secretary
(PCS 4/25/96 1-0000.5)

NOTE - Unless otherwise indicated each item was introduced by Chairperson Rogers. Individuals speaking are identified following the heading of each item. 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 PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE - Chairperson Rogers called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m. A roll call was taken and a quorum was present although Commissioners Pozzi and Uhart were absent. Those present affirmed their pledge of allegiance.

PUBLIC COMMENT - None.

AGENDA ITEMS

C. MASTER PLAN UPDATE

C-1 DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE DRAFT MASTER PLAN LAND USE ELEMENT TEXT INCLUDING VACANT LAND STUDY, ZONING FRICTION AREAS, GOALS AND POLICIES, IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES, POPULATION ESTIMATES, SPECIFIC PLAN AREA STATEMENTS, AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES AND C-2 REVIEW OF THE MASTER PLAN DRAFT LAND USE MAP - (1-0027.5) Randy Walter and Karen Melby of SEA - George Szabo, Architect and Planning Consultant for Private Property Owners - Jim Bawden, Developer and President of the Builders Association of Western Nevada - Mark Amodei, Representing the Merchant Family - Curt Brown - Jay Meierdierck, Chairperson of the Carson City Parks and Recreation Commission - Mr. Joiner reported that the updated document contained changes which Ms. Melby and Mr. Walter had incorporated. He noted that Mark Rotter of Capital Engineering had also made some comments on the document. He said Ms. Melby and Mr. Walter would be pointing out examples of how, administratively or otherwise, the document could be administered to handle clarifications or new information on a case by case basis. He added that the Builders Association was also present and would be handing out their comments.

(1-0089.5) **III-42 - Urban Area** - Mr. Joiner said this related to the level of development and that this section clarified how amendments would be made. He also noted the sentence referring to what would be required and suggested eliminating the sentence because on a case by case they would be dealing those parameters. He felt there is no need to try to guess what they might be. He also mentioned there is a detailed service outlined in the document.

(1-0117.5) **III-47-1 and III-48-2-3 - Level of Service** - Mr. Joiner noted these talk about the appropriate level of service for fire, water, sewer, etc. and that the property represents a logical and concentric extension of the urban service boundary and is or can be compatible with the surrounding existing and proposed land uses. He commented this compares to when a zone change request comes before the Planning Commission who look at the

**CARSON CITY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION, BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT AND
MASTER PLAN TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Minutes of the Special April 25, 1996 Meeting

Page 2

compatibility with surrounding property owners and land uses. He felt it may be looked at as being potentially subjective. He said staff was proposing that "and is or can be compatible with the surrounding and existing proposed land uses" be left as it is. He also mentioned Number 3 which talked about services and felt it, too, is acceptable.

(1-0149.5) Mr. Walter said he planned to walk the Commission through three different scenarios. He had a map and said it had been discussed as to how detailed is the map intended to be and how much flexibility is there and how much interpretation there will be. He said from their standpoint it is felt this is something that can be done administratively through staff and done at the time a project is submitted.

(1-0167.5) Mr. Walter proceeded to visually point out the area being considered. He talked about open space, residential, agricultural residential, rural residential, and suburban residential. He noted that the topographical map demonstrated that a portion of the map should be changed to reflect what in reality is more detailed topographic information as to how the property could actually be developed. He reported they had modified it to reflect the detailed information so that the suburban residential was brought in to the area. He felt the Commission could get a feel for what he was talking about in terms of where the changes were made and why. He solicited comments from the Commission as to whether it is something that is appropriate for an individual project.

(1-0199.5) His next comments were on the level of service. He said they had taken the urban level of service information in the draft plan and arbitrarily picked a site to try and analyze how that site would meet the criteria for level of service standards. He added in this particular case they were not talking about an amendment to the service areas, but rather how a particular piece of property would be looked at from the standpoint of service levels within an existing area. He visually pointed out the site on the map and commented on the roads, major and minor, and that the intent would be that they would be paved and have curb, gutter, sidewalk, and storm sewers as required within an urban area. He noted that development on the piece of property would have to meet the basic requirements. He said in terms of water and sewer they would be adjacent or crossing through the property itself. He commented that with fire and emergency services there would be a five minute response time. He noted from SEA's standpoint and staff's perspective it probably meets the intent. He also said from the Sheriff's standpoint they were assuming there are no particular problems with response time. He noted that the elementary school closest to the site needs to be basically within walking distance. He mentioned the middle school and said it needs to be within two miles or less. Regarding the senior high school, he said it should be three miles or less and the neighborhood parks should be within one half of a mile and that community parks should be within a mile. He said suburban is somewhat different in what can and cannot be done from a level of service standpoint. They had again arbitrarily chosen a site which he visually noted on the map. He commented in terms of roads there are options in the suburban areas which are not available in the urban areas. He said in terms of development of roads, major and minor arterials and local and collector streets, they can be done more urban such as curb, gutter, sidewalks, and storm drains particularly in those areas that are adjacent to developments that have those types of improvements where they can be more rural - paved or open ditch - depending on where the piece of property is and what development is around it and how it fits and how compatible it is. He noted in terms of water and sewer this particular site is well within the ability to provide these services and should not be a problem from the standpoint of fire and emergency services. He said in the suburban area they are projecting a ten minute or less response time. He visually pointed out a fire station and that it should provide a five minute response time. He commented that the Sheriff's Department would be able to provide any specific information about the area and what the problems might be. Regarding the elementary school, he noted it would be within the distance parameters and that the same situation should occur with the middle and high schools. He said in this particular case the closest neighborhood park will be over a mile away and noted it is fairly clear that in this area there should probably be another neighborhood park and that the Parks and Recreation Director could provide more specific direction on this. He felt that staff would probably agree with these assumptions and that intent of this presentation had been to provide guidelines on how a particular site fits within those guidelines.

(1-0320.5) Chairperson Rogers felt that this information is tied together to what the Commission has been trying to accomplish with regard to service boundaries. He said it gives them a platform from which they can begin discussions. He also noted it would help City departments to define a level foundation and it is an excellent check list for the Commission in evaluating projects. He also felt it would help the Board of Supervisors because it gives

**CARSON CITY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION, BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT AND
MASTER PLAN TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Minutes of the Special April 25, 1996 Meeting

Page 3

the Commission the opportunity to mitigate some issues that sometimes go unnoticed before they go to the Board.

(1-0356.5) Mr. Bawden asked what would happen if some of the illustrations he had used fall outside of tolerances and how are they mitigated. Mr. Walter felt on a project by project process there will always be a discretionary review. He noted what they had tried to do was establish a baseline of what would be acceptable. He said a review could be done in a number of ways and cited examples that it could be what is being proposed, how is it approached from a land use standpoint, how the fire department can be helped to improve their response time, etc. He also noted if there is a need for school and park sites the Parks Department needs to identify areas that meet the criteria. Mr. Bawden expressed a concern that there could be several interpretations. He explained that changes in staff, the Commission, and changes in the Board of Supervisors could affect these interpretations asked what direction should be taken. Mr. Walter said they were trying to be consistent and to create a level field for use when reviewing projects on a case by case basis.

(1-0471.5) Chairperson Rogers said it is his opinion that is what the Commission is trying to do and that there have never been these guidelines. He felt it also provides flexibility which will be a key element for judging each project on its merit. Mr. Walter felt one of the things that would be important long term is that through the process and through staff they have identified areas which need certain types of services and that the intent is that this would become a framework for a CIP program and for a funding program that says resources need to be allocated to these areas for these purposes. Chairperson Rogers felt that sometimes the focus is on maps and not on what the Master Plan is trying to accomplish. Mr. Joiner noted that some of the minor clarifications, because of more detailed information, would not be something staff feels would merit a formal presentation to the Commission.

(1-0573.5) **III-51 - Review Policies** - Mr. Joiner then stated he would like to discuss some specific planning areas. He mentioned taking large undeveloped areas, prior to development, and give the property owners and future developers guidelines. This had to do with what should be preserved and accentuated and where there might be flexibility in the land use designation for clustering and conserving environmentally critical areas. He reviewed several areas noted in this section that would be impacted by environmental uses, compatibility of uses, achieving diverse development patterns, and insuring that public services are adequate to serve the developed areas. Commissioner Nietz asked about the items referring to densities which had been added to this section and Mr. Joiner explained the formula which had been used to arrive at the criteria.

(1-0689.5) Mr. Szabo noted the people he was representing with regard to the land use plan. He referred to SPA-CR.2 and said it was their understanding it is related to slope analysis and areas that can be developed relative to the gradient. He commented that this section might be a little too restrictive with respect to the densities and suggested alternative wording that would allow some flexibility. He then referred to CPA-CR.4 relating to Mexican Ditch. He felt is it not the most environmentally pleasant area and suggested easing the language somewhat with regard to its location and the idea of preservation. He also noted that research had been done on its historic significance and it had been found it was not. Mr. Joiner said staff had modified the language so that it did not reflect the historic aspect.

(1-0907.5) SPA-LR.3 - This section had to do with drainageways on the Lompa Ranch. Mr. Szabo suggested adding language to the effect that those corridors should continue under the US395 bypass and should be provided for in either the on grade or the above grade engineering design solutions. He reported he had talked to NDOT several months ago and they had said they would take care of the drainage concern when they do the design. Mr. Aldean said the NDOT policy is that they will take care of the drainage corridors. However, they will not be doing anything to improve the aesthetic value of the drainage features. He said if the City wanted to do the Koontz Lane project, where a detention facility and a park would be built, NDOT will not build the park portion of anything but will build the hard improvements. He mentioned that legally they have no choice because the requirement is that for any Federal aided secondary highway that is built must include the drainage.

(1-0989.5) SPA-LR.9 - Mr. Szabo said from a transportation standpoint the Master Plan for the City shows Robinson Street going through to Airport and the development of the Lompa area. He felt it should have an additional east-west connection there and suggested the addition of language in this regard.

**CARSON CITY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION, BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT AND
MASTER PLAN TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Minutes of the Special April 25, 1996 Meeting

Page 4

(1-1059.5) **III-61** - Mr. Szabo commented on the densities on slopes and suggested eliminating the sentence with regard to suburban residential densities and clustering higher densities in areas with slopes of less than ten percent. Commissioner Nietz had a question as to the area he was discussing and he confirmed it is the northern and northeastern edges. Commissioner Nietz suggested to staff that they include acreage in this section.

Commissioner Christianson left at 7:15 p.m. A quorum was present as previously noted.

(1-1185.5) Mark Amodei said he was representing the Merchant Family Trust. He said there is no problem with keeping Mexican Ditch as a conduit for surface water rights and transporting them. He noted that the concern is that the conceptual designs which had been discussed have provided for other linear corridors, either along the river or along the hill to provide access to Prison Hill. He said his concern with the language is that his clients do not want to do the river front, the toe of the hills - staying out of the steep slope areas - and then have to come back and create a 200 wide lineal park for the Mexican Ditch. He continued by stating his appearance was in a contingency context and nothing that was said should be interpreted to say that the Merchants have backed away from the present ALC process. He added that the process is ongoing and is in the appraisal phase and this should be complete within the next thirty days. Chairperson Rogers felt there are two things to be considered, one of which has already been done, and open space as a whole. He added he is looking forward to seeing what the design will be and that the purpose was to provide an opportunity of working with staff on the project and then review it when it comes before the Commission. Commissioner Nietz echoed Chairperson Rogers' feeling and said she was pleased that the lineal trail and park requirements had been worked out with Parks and Recreation. She then asked staff about parceling the area in terms of densities. She noted the point of the SPA was to look at it as one area. Mr. Amodei said a non-delineation by parcel would clearly be of benefit to Silver Saddle. He added if it is left the way it is someone could say there is a footprint with no environmental constraints and they could say they could possibly get 1,500 units on it.

(1-1377.5) Mr. Aldean referred to Mexican Ditch and said it is really undersized for use as an ultimate drainage channel and to convey storm waters through the properties it crosses. He added, on the other hand, there are developments which are now using it as a primary discharge point which eventually ends up in the river. He said he has a concern that it is not delineated as either a channel corridor or some sort of a conveyance that will drain quite a bit of land area. He then said, because the code allows them to do drainage requirements on sub-divisions, they can still maintain it as open without having it designated as such in the land use plan. He felt the Commission should be aware that they will probably be looking more and more at making this a major facility. He noted that as property along the facility develops the conveyance capacity of the ditch will have to be increased so as to not flood those properties. Chairperson Rogers felt if it is left flexible then it could be used as a drainage corridor and felt more open space would result. Mr. Aldean said they would assume if there is no corridor designated then where the ditch enters the property that is to be developed and where it leaves the property would be considered sacred points. He noted that however the water is conveyed through the property is immaterial provided the conveyance and structures are there to do that. He said it is true it was an irrigation but now will be a conveyance area for storm water and felt it is important that this distinction be made.

(1-1505.5) Jim Bawden, representing the Builders Association, had a comment on III-53, SPA-CR.6. He said it appeared to him that with perhaps two developments and two ownerships the first development to go in an SPA has to put in the infrastructure oversized, if required for the other development, and then it would be reimbursed when the other development came on. Mr. Walter said the intent is, if there is an SPA such as the Silver Saddle area where there are multiple ownerships, to do an overall Master Plan so that everyone knows what the sewer, storm drain, water, and roadway requirements are. He noted that the developer is only responsible for building the portion that he is responsible to build and if he has to build something that is oversized such as a larger sewer line that someone will hook up to in the future he is ultimately reimbursed for that. Mr. Bawden said that is not how the process works now which was his concern. Commissioner Nietz commented that the infrastructure should be planned for the entire area, not just that portion which he plans to develop. He felt if the development takes place over a period of years it would not be fair to the first developer in to wait that long to be reimbursed. Mr. Bawden said what happens on oversized items now is they go to Public Works and enter into an agreement where they get reimbursed up front, especially if it is a multi million dollar development. He felt what they are looking for is some changes in the wording before the Master Plan is adopted so that amendments will not be necessary.

**CARSON CITY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION, BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT AND
MASTER PLAN TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Minutes of the Special April 25, 1996 Meeting

Page 5

(1-1629.5) Mr. Bawden then provided staff the the Commission with copies of a packet he had sent to Walter Sullivan, Community Development Director. It detailed all the points in the draft about which the Association had questions or concerns. Chairperson Rogers felt there is a lot in the packet the Commission needs to study and directed staff to work with the Association on their comments. He also suggested that a Commissioner attend the meetings between Mr. Bawden and staff. Mr. Joiner said the meetings could be held between now and May 6.

(1-1745.5) Curt Brown said he owns property that is currently zoned Light Industrial which is proposed to go to Commercial. He explained there are two adjacent parcels under common ownership, one of which is developed. He said he plans to develop the other parcel in a year or so and asked what the process would be. Mr. Joiner said what staff would look at would be if the plans for expansion are consistent with the usage he now has and Mr. Brown said they are. Mr. Joiner had a concern as to whether they would be consistent with the zoning being proposed. He explained that the land use designation will not change the zoning but if it changes in the future the issue would then have to be considered. Mr. Brown said the expansion would be the same usage and asked if he will need a special use permit. Mr. Joiner said there is that possibility in the future if the zoning is also changed after the Master Plan is in place. He noted that just because the land use designation is changed for future planning, it does not necessarily mean the zoning will be changed. Chairperson Rogers said the Commission can look at the property now and make a determination as to whether it should be changed or not. He invited Mr. Brown to stay after the meeting and discuss this with Mr. Joiner and Mr. Brown said he would.

(1-1845.5) Jay Meierdierck, Chairperson of the Parks and Recreation Commission asked if, after the May 6 workshop or shortly thereafter, there will be a revised draft of the document. Chairperson Rogers explained that the document will go through the minor changes being made here and if additional changes are made at the next workshop there would be another draft before the next regular Commission meeting where it will be approved and sent to the Board of Supervisors. He suggested that Mr. Meierdierck put his proposed changes in writing to staff. Mr. Meierdierck referred to the SPA having to do with the Lompa Ranch and a linear park. He felt that the reference to village greens is not a commonly accepted term and may need to be defined. He also had a concern with the reference to neighborhood parks and said the proposal for up to 2,400 units is more than what the park standards call for and this would mean a need for more than one neighborhood park. Chairperson Rogers said his interpretation of that is to try and move those things toward the neighborhood park concept. Mr. Walter said the intent is to create flexibility that will work for both neighborhood parks and developers. At this point Chairperson Rogers declared public testimony closed. No formal action was taken.

D. NON-ACTION ITEMS:

1. **Commissioner Comments** - None.
2. **Staff Comments** - None.

E. ADJOURNMENT - There being no further business Chairperson Rogers entertained a motion to adjourn. Commissioner Mally moved to adjourn. Commissioner Nietz seconded the motion. Motion carried 4-0. Chairperson Rogers adjourned the meeting at 8:01 p.m.

**CARSON CITY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION, BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT AND
MASTER PLAN TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Minutes of the Special April 25, 1996 Meeting

Page 6

The Minutes of the special April 25, 1996 meeting of the Carson City Regional Planning Commission, Bureau of Land Management, and Master Plan Technical Advisory Committee

ARE SO APPROVED _____ July 31 _____, 1996

 /s/ _____
Alan Rogers, Chairperson