A workshop of the Carson City Planning Commission was held on Monday, December 18, 2000, at the Carson City Community Center, 851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada, beginning at 6 p.m.

PRESENT: Chairperson Allan Christianson and Commissioners Gayle Farley, William Mally,

Roger Sedway, and Richard Wipfli

STAFF PRESENT: City Engineer Larry Werner, Senior Planner Skip Canfield, Senior Planner Juan

Guzman, Assistant Planner Jennifer Pruitt, and Recording Secretary Katherine

McLaughlin (P.C. 12/18/00 (Tape 1-0001)

NOTE: Unless otherwise indicated, each item was introduced by the Chairperson. Staff then presented/clarified the staff report/supporting documentation. A tape recording of these proceedings is on file in the Clerk-Recorder's office. This tape is available for review and inspection during normal business hours.

A. ROLL CALL, DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE - Chairperson Christianson convened the meeting at 6:05 p.m. A quorum was present although Vice Chairperson Rogers and Commissioner Farley had not yet arrived. Commissioner Larkin was absent. Commissioner Farley arrived at 6:30 p.m. Chairperson Rogers arrived at 6:35 p.m. Chairperson Christianson led the Pledge of Allegiance.

- B. PUBLIC COMMENTS (1-0032) None.
- C. WORKSHOP TOPICS (1-0042) Staff discussed with the Commission and City Consultant Carol Dotson of Lumos and Associates the following items and the proposed method of illustrating the changes and the original code when considered for final action.
- C-1. CCMC SECTION 18.02; C-2. CCMC SECTION 18.03; C-3. CCMC SECTION 18.04; C-4. CCMC SECTION 18.05; C-5. CCMC SECTION 18.07; C-6. CCMC SECTION 18.10; AND C-7. CCMC SECTION 18.11. Vice Chairperson Rogers and Commissioner Farley arrived during the Commission and staff's discussion with Albert LeBalch regarding the master plan and the hillside guidelines. Discussion indicated that a change had not been made to these guidelines.
 - C-10. CCMC SECTION 18.31 (1-0464) No changes were made to it.
 - C-13. CCMC SECTION 18.94 (1-0489) No changes were made to it.
- **C-8. CCMC SECTION 18.24 (1-0489)** Following Ms. Dotson's introduction, Gene Lepire espoused his reasons for believing that the term "campground" needed to be revised. He suggested the term be "RV park" or "RV resort" due to the amenities they have that campgrounds do not have. Grandfathered units should not be impacted by the revised Code. The City has no control over the State's programs including installation of a campground within the community if it decides to make one.

Chairperson Christianson suggested that staff consider separating the two facilities—campgrounds and RV parks. Mr. Lepire questioned the City's control over the vehicle licenses and the ability to park such vehicles for long periods of time. Discussion ensued between Mr. Lepire and Chairperson Christianson regarding this issue and the belief that families live in the RV parks/campgrounds and have an impact on the City and School District. Mr. Lepire advised that he pays room taxes on anyone living in the park. He also found the proposal to increase the square footage per unit to be too high. He believed that twelve feet between units should be more than adequate.

Discussion between Ms. Dotson and Don Langson indicated that the Growth Management Ordinance mandates that he obtain allotments for his RV park. Chairperson Christianson explained that it should not be difficult for him to obtain the allotments as the number of allotments taken for the last 15 years has not been close to the number that were available. Mr. Langson asked that the fee for the water and sewer connections also be considered. Ms. Dotson indicated that Mr. Martel had allegedly informed the Commission at the last meeting that the typical household usage is not typical for RVs. Mr. Langson also indicated that mobile homes are not allowed in RV parks. He alleged that it is not economical for him to build a mobile home park. Clarification by Ms. Dotson indicated that the Growth Management allotments will consider the seasonal usage. Mr. Langson felt that transient parks should have different standards than permanent parks. He wanted a transient park. He agreed to work with Ms Dotson and staff on the ordinance.

Mr. Lepire also agreed to work with them. He alleged that he had signed up two years ago to be on such a committee. Its first meeting was allegedly cancelled. He has not been notified of another meeting since that time. He explained his belief that an RV uses only 35 gallons of water per day. He alleged that the highest usage he was aware of was purported to be 65 gallons. He did not believe that the park should be under Growth Management. Mr. Canfield was not sure how many meetings had been held on the RV park ordinance. Mr. Lepire alleged that neither he nor Mr. Langson had been notified of this meeting or any other RV park meeting.

Mr. Langson felt that a RV park is a commercial venture and should not be considered as residential use. Families are an exception in the RV parks. The taxes being paid by the RV owners should be considered in the calculations. He reiterated his desire to not have the ordinance consider transient RV parks. Ms. Dotson felt that the RVs will fall under long-term uses. Mr. Langson then reiterated the statements he had allegedly made at the last meeting regarding having Tourist Commercial (TC) zoning at the gateways and at the freeway offramps. Ms. Dotson explained that the purpose statement was an effort to be futuristic in its broad scope of items that may be considered in the future. Mr. Langson asked that the scope be more specific; i.e., the area included in the gateway. Chairperson Christianson agreed that the term gateway needed to be defined. Mr. Langson explained his plan to have an executive RV park. TC uses should be primary permitted uses in the TC zone. A special use permit should not be required. His experience with this section of the Code was limned. RV parks should be allowed in TC. Non tourist oriented uses should not be allowed. Commission comments again indicated that campgrounds should be separated from RV parks and there should be sections for transient and permanent long-term RV park usage.

Commissioner Sedway expressed his concern about restricting the time an individual may stay in a RV park. Consideration of these issues may slow down progress on the Code. Mr. Canfield suggested that the section be removed and considered later. Chairperson Christianson also believed that additional work needed to be done on these sections.

Mr. Lepire presented photographs to Mr. Canfield illustrating his concerns about RV overnight parking in parking lots. Ordinances in other communities prohibiting such parking were cited. His concerns included the close proximity of RVs and their propane tanks, the lack of liability coverage if an accident/fire should occur, and loss of room taxes. Discussion also explained that dump stations for RVs are available at campgrounds and rest stops. Mr. Lepire charges individuals who are not staying in his park \$8 a dump. Chairperson Christianson reiterated the need to reconsider the RV ordinance and to have separate sections for long and short term RV parks. Mr. Lepire advised that he will be in the community on January 12. He felt that Mr. Langson would be available for that date. Mr. Canfield indicated that staff will contact Messrs. Lepire and Langson and establish a meeting date. Commissioner Farley pointed out that there are other individuals on the committee who should be contacted.

- G-9. CCMC SECTION 18.30 (1-1124) Discussed at the last meeting.
- G-12. CCMC SECTION 18.82 (1-1130) No discussion occurred.
- G-13. CCMC SECTION 18.94 (1-1142) City Engineer Larry Werner described his involvement with Mr. Canfield and Ms. Dotson on the Code revisions. He supported having the Development Standards segregated from the Code. He then highlighted Section 9 of the Development Standards relating to transportation. Discussion explained that traffic studies are required based on the size of the project and its location. The depth of the study varies according to the size and location. The master plan addresses the main arterials. He then reviewed the development process used for the regional storm drainage portion of the Development Standards. Discussion indicated that half streets will no longer be constructed. Development agreements may be used instead. Mr. Werner then referenced Section 13 regarding well construction. Ms. Dotson indicated that State and Federal requirements were added to this section. Mr. Werner then noted the soil engineering report requirements. This is a new requirement. Section 17 was noted. Discussion indicated that a flow chart is being developed delineating this process. Mr. Werner indicated that similar flow charts are being developed for every process in the Engineering Division. The purpose of Section 19 was then noted. Discussion ensued regarding the professional standards required of engineers and the penalty for failing to meet that standard. Bond requirements were noted. Ms. Dotson explained the need to check and double check the testing results and justification for this duplication of effort. She supported the checks and balances provided by this Section. Mr. Werner advised that the standards are the same as those used in other areas.
- G-14. DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS HANDBOOK (1-1425) Ms. Dotson highlighted the contents of the handbook beginning with the Table of Contents which had been expanded. The first chapter explains the purpose of the handbook. Graphs are included to help individuals understand what is expected. Examples of the sections and graphs were provided. Charts which were added to the

handbook were also noted. Discussion noted that the guidelines' section on architectural standards is new. This section could be used by the staff/Commission to deny projects. Mr. Canfield indicated that the concept is to strengthen the ordinances through the use of the words "shall", "must", "will", etc. Commissioner Wipfli pointed out that some of the standards had been discussed by the Commission/a committee previously with direction to staff to include them in the revised ordinance. He felt that not all of the committee's directions had been included and that the committee had not completed its tasks. Ms. Dotson felt that all of the committee's decisions/directions were included in the handbook. Commissioner Wipfli finds some that are not, he should let her know so that they can be added. (During this discussion, Commissioner Mally stepped from the room-7:35 p.m. and returned 7:40 p.m. A quorum was maintained.) Ms. Dotson also pointed out that in the Historical District there are additional guidelines which must be followed. Commissioner Farley supported Commissioner Wipfli's remarks. She also felt that the committee had not completed its tasks. Mr. Canfield indicated a willingness to slow the process and reconsider the items. Commissioner Sedway supported reconvening the committee due to the possibility that the developers may consider the guidelines to be controversial. He suggested that a presentation be given to the Builders Association. Justification for the suggestions were provided. Chairperson Christianson supported his comments. Mr. Canfield felt that it may be possible to address the concerns in one or two workshops.

Glen Martel supported Commissioner Farley's comments. The two members of the Historic Architectural Review Committee and Principal Planner Joiner had attended the Builders' Association meeting two weeks ago. They presented the standards to the Association. The Association had sent them to their members who work on remodels of that nature. Feedback will probably be provided by those individuals. He supported sending them to other developers and have a meeting on the standards. He also pointed out that there are "will, will be, and shalls" contained in the same paragraph. These terms need to be considered. He supported slowing the process and allowing additional input.

Mr. Canfield indicated to Wayne Chimarusti that the standards will be enforceable and handled the same as the Code and ordinances. The process for making amendments has yet to be determined. Additional public comments were solicited.

Mr. LeBalch indicated concerns about the setbacks and building heights for commercial, industrial, and manufacturing zones. He was specifically concerned about the setbacks for these structures when they abut residential zones. He suggested that the 40 to 50 feet setbacks referenced in the master plans be used. The height of buildings adjacent to residential uses is currently restricted to 32 feet. The standards propose increasing the height to 45 feet. An example of this height was used to illustrate the impact such structures will have on residential uses. He then alleged that he had not been invited to any meetings lately. He asked if he could attend the meetings regarding industrial standards.

Commissioner Sedway felt that the standards as written will be very rigid. He questioned whether friction zones had been considered in the development of these standards. He felt that flexibility for friction zones needed to be considered. Ms. Dotson explained that the table had been developed so as to include consideration for additional design features needed to address frictional zones. Item 3 purportedly

indicated that 30 feet is required between residential uses and it. Additional setbacks will be allowed. Mr. LeBalch explained that his residence abuts an industrial area. He questioned the reasons for changing the current standard of 50 feet setbacks and 32-foot height limitation. This change directly impacts his neighborhood.

(1-1808) Ms. Dotson highlighted Division 2, Parking and Loading Standards. She indicated that the Hospital and medical uses continue to be analyzed. She then indicated that ADA standards for handicapped parking will be added to Page 9 of this section. Mr. Canfield advised that a suggestion had been made to add the ADA manual to this section. Ms. Dotson explained other issues which were considered including joint use parking facilities and the sections on loading and unloading zones. Public comments were solicited.

Vern Krahn indicated that he was a member of the committee that had worked on the standards. Issues the committee had considered included the owner's responsibilities versus the City's responsibilities and soil testing. The determination of the number of tests that should be conducted should be established by a landscape professional. Another issue is whether the Parks' standard should be higher than the private property owner's or should they be the same everywhere in the City. These issues will be addressed when the parks and trails' standards are discussed. Other issues were the amount of details that will be required for landscaping and should they be different for the private property owner and the City parks. Justification for raising the bar was provided. The Committee also questioned the minimum standard for a project. Discussion indicated that the current landscaping point system is being abandoned. Carson City is the only entity in the region that uses the point system. An example justifying revising the system was provided. The proposed system will require a percentage of the area to be landscaped. It was felt that this is a significant change in the requirements. Discussion also indicated that an incentive program had been considered. An explanation of the concept was provided. The City will not offer money as an incentive. The proposal is considered a proactive concept. The standards comply with the Statutes which require a landscape architect, a civil engineer, or an architect to do the landscape drawings. The contractor's exemption is the only exception, which he explained. Commissioner Wipfli pointed out the lack of sensitivity toward the area of the City in which the landscaping is to occur, i.e., the historic district or where xeroscape is appropriate. Mr. Krahn indicated that the landscape ordinance had not considered the district specifically. It had considered the overall community. Commissioner Wipfli encouraged staff to consider it when reviewing landscape plans. Mr. Krahn then explained the benefits of having a separate meter for irrigation purposes. It eliminates the sewer charge created by having only one meter. Chairperson Christianson explained his personal knowledge of this concept and the cost to install a second line for irrigation purposes. If it is a recycled water line, the impact would be mitigated. Mr. Krahn indicated that the concept was for potable water. Mr. Martel explained that laying two lines in one ditch provides the ability to recoup the costs through reduced sewer fees. He felt that the sewer charges were averaged and not based on the winter water usage. Chairperson Christianson asked staff to verify this information. Mr. Martel agreed that the installation of an additional line as a retrofit program could be cost prohibitive. Chairperson Christianson asked the reasons why Buffalo Grass was not considered in the landscaping as it is supposed to be drought resistant. Mr. Martel explained his personal experience with it proved that it is "amazing stuff". He then explained the reasons for using an incentive program rather than the current

point program. He also agreed with Commissioner Wipfli that the surrounding area's landscaping should be considered when staff approves plans. He suggested that the term "encourage" be used and that the landscaping be compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. The 20% was a figure that they had developed in the committee. The Historic District may be a hard area to obtain 20% for landscaping particularly when a structure is remodeled and parking and ADA requirements are mandated. New development has options which will make it doable. Commissioner Farley pointed out the desire to maintain the "old" trees in the Historic District. Mr. Martel concurred. He felt that they should be able to combine all of the different requirements—onsite parking, ADA, etc.—and waive some to make sure that the project will work. Historical trees should be left alone. Onstreet parking should be allowed as an alternative. Mr. Krahn indicated that Street Operations Manager John Flansberg is working on a program that will address areas where there are cracked/missing sidewalks. Ms. Dotson explained the current technology for retrofitting the sidewalks/streets without damaging the trees. Discussion indicated that technology is also providing better curbs and corners, e.g., Division Street. Commissioner Wipfli explained the setbacks found in the Historic District. There is 14 to 15 feet between the curb and the property line. Landscaping is in this area and is considered under the points program. Mr. Martel indicated that this landscaping can only total 25% of the value needed for the property. He read the section related to this limitation from the handbook. He also explained that NDOT does not grant the credit due to their desire to retain the right-of-way.

Commissioner Sedway suggested that incentives for water conservation be included in the landscaping requirements. Justification for the suggestion was provided. His objection to dual water meters was explained. His concern regarding the connection charge was indicated. He also explained his involvement with a tree on Division. It had taken a lot of Mr. Flansberg and Commissioner Sedway's time to address the issue. He felt that a method of removing the old trees in the Historic District should be included in the guidelines. Mr. Krahn indicated that it may be possible to include something on this issue due to the number of unsafe older trees in the Historic District that had to be removed within the last year. These trees were a public safety concern. The guidelines include statements discouraging replacing Cottonwoods with Cottonwoods. This will reduce the uplifting of sidewalks, bulging of curbs, water main problems, etc. Cottonwoods would be allowed in the riparian and stream areas as they will grow there. He was willing to spend more time on this issue. The large trees are part of the Historical District. The City ordinances currently prohibit the planting of Cottonwoods in the urban area of the City. Commissioner Farley noted that Chinese Elms are "outlawed" in some communities. Mr. Krahn indicated that Reno has prohibitions against some tree species. (Commissioner Wipfli stepped from the room-8:20 p.m.-and returned at 8:22 p.m. A quorum was still present.) Discussion noted the liability issue with the Cottonwoods in the Historic District. Discussion ensued regarding Page 3.13 of the handbook regarding tree maintenance requirements. A maintenance agreement is required delineating the maintenance requirements for developments. Dead trees in these developments are to be replaced. (Chairperson Christianson stepped from the room at 7:23 p.m. and returned at 7:25 p.m. A quorum was present the entire time.) Discussion explained the landscaping requirements mandated for K-Mart's CofO. The loss of the trees reduces the visual aesthetics of the site. K-Mart is out of compliance with its maintenance agreement. Assistant Planner Jennifer Pruitt indicated that she is working with them to get them into compliance. Discussion indicated that the ordinance regarding landscaping maintenance had not changed.

Ms. Pruitt explained that there is a list of more than 200 people who have received the ordinance and the development standards. Anyone who believes their information has changed should contact staff to obtain a new version. Discussion indicated that anyone whose address has changed should also contact the Department. Ms. Pruitt indicated she would check into whether an announcement should be placed in the media.

Chairperson Christianson complimented all of the staff, Commissioners, committee persons, and public who had attended and worked on the ordinance and their attendance at the many meetings and workshops. He also felt that there is lots of work remaining. Commissioner Mally concurred. Chairperson Christianson realized that the process had been slowed down by the need for more information and meetings. Mr. Canfield explained that the City Manager and Board of Supervisors want the ordinance completed as soon as possible. Comments indicated that the last five meetings have clearly illustrated the need to slow the process and be more thorough. Chairperson Christianson suggested that the period between meetings needed to be lengthened. No formal action was taken or required on any of the discussion items.

D. ADJOURNMENT (1-2725) - Commissioner Mally moved to adjourn. Commissioner Christianson seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0. Chairperson Christianson adjourned the meeting at 8:30 p.m.

The Minutes of the Special December 18, 2000, Planning Commission workshop

	ARE SO APPROVED ON	, 2001.
	Allan Christianson, Chairperson	
RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,		
/s/ Katherine McLaughlin, Recording Secretary		