

CARSON CITY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION  
Minutes of the January 27, 1999, Meeting  
Page 1

A regularly scheduled meeting of the Carson City Regional Planning Commission was held on Wednesday, January 27, 1999, at the Community Center Sierra Room, 851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada, beginning at 3:30 p.m.

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

STAFF PRESENT: Community Development Director Walter Sullivan, Principal  
Planner Rob Joiner, Development Engineering Manager Jay  
Ahrens, Deputy District Attorney Melanie Bruketta, Senior Planners  
Juan Guzman and Tara Hullinger, Senior Engineer John Givlin, and Recording Secretary Katherine McLaughlin  
(R.P.C. 1/27/99 Tape 1-0001)

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

**A. ROLL CALL, DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM, AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE** - Vice Chairperson Christianson convened the meeting at 3:35 p.m. Roll call was taken. Chairperson Horton and Commissioner Mally were absent. A quorum was present. Vice Chairperson Christianson lead the Pledge of Allegiance.

**B. COMMISSION ACTION** - None.

**C. PUBLIC COMMENTS (1-0021)** - None.

**D. MODIFICATIONS TO THE AGENDA** - None.

**E. DISCLOSURES (1-0031)** - None.

**F. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**F-1. V-98/99-6 - DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON A VARIANCE REQUEST FROM CLARK RUSSELL (1-0032)** - Principal Planner Rob Joiner, Best Western Sign's Representative Ivan Zam - Mr. Zam briefly described the need for the variance. He had read the staff report and agreed with it. Public comments were solicited but none given. Commissioner Rogers moved to approve V-98/99-3, a request from Clark Russell, Pinion Plaza Resort, to construct one ground-mounted monument sign totaling 62 square feet with an overall height of 10 feet 3 inches on property zoned General Commercial, located at 2171 Highway 50 East, APN 8-152-15, based on five findings and subject to five conditions of approval contained in the staff report. Commissioner Uhart seconded the motion. Following a request for an amendment to the motion, Commissioner Rogers amended his motion to correct the Variance Number to be V-98/99-6, the APN to be 8-152-19, and the overall height to be 12 feet 9 inches. Commissioner Uhart concurred. The motion was voted and carried 5-0.

**F-2. V-98/99-8 - DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON A VARIANCE REQUEST FROM LEO A. AND ANNETTE MANKINS (1-0133)** - Principal Planner Joiner, Leo Mankins, Senior Engineer John Givlin, Gerald Adamson, Laurel Stadler, Tom Foster, and Annette Mankins - The application is identical to the one made two years earlier. The building had not been constructed due to health problems. Mr. Mankins had read the report and agreed with the staff's findings. Discussion between the Commission and Mr. Mankins indicated that the garage would be located five feet from the west and north property lines. It also described the length of his RV and boat--70 feet, the site, the setback requirements, and reasons for requesting the variance. Mr. Givlin explained the drainage from the adjacent property(ies), the drainage problems on Mr. Mankins' property, the

current lack of a drainage easement across his property, the condition requiring a five foot drainage easement along the west and north property lines, the "V" ditch and berm which will be in this five foot easement, and staff's concerns about the 12 foot "cut bank". Mr. Mankins indicated that he had dug the hillside some time ago in an attempt to start his project. Reasons he had not been able to proceed with his building plans were noted. A copy of Building and Safety Department's requirement mandating that "walls or portions of walls designed to retain the dirt be completed within 30 days of the date the variance is granted" was discussed. Mr. Mankins felt this was an unreasonable requirement due to his inability to control the weather and its impact on his construction plans. The purpose of the condition was discussed. Mr. Mankins displayed his previously approved, engineered building plans. Mr. Givlin felt that there should be a retaining wall as well as the block structure and questioned the building's height at the westerly edge. He reviewed the plans with Mr. Mankins.

Mr. Sullivan pointed out that the retaining wall issue is not before the Commission. The application is related to the variance. Mr. Mankins should review the condition with the Building Official. Likewise, the 30 day requirement should also be discussed with the Building Official.

Mr. Givlin explained the building plans. A wall will not be extended from the building along the westerly side. The building wall varies between approximately seven feet in height to zero along the northern property line. Mr. Joiner pointed out that if the wall is over six feet in height and contained within the setback, the Commission should also approve it. This would have to be agendaized for another meeting. Mr. Mankins indicated that the wall is in line with the building and five feet from the property line. Commissioner Rogers pointed out that the wall/building's wall were an original concern. The application is identical to the request which had been heard originally. Mr. Joiner supported Mr. Sullivan's comments by indicating that Mr. Mankins should discuss the timeframe and wall requirements with the Building Official. These issues are separate from the variance. Commissioner Rogers suggested that the Commission modify these conditions. Mr. Sullivan reiterated Mr. Joiner's and his original comments. The issue is between Mr. Mankins and the Building Official. The building issues are outside the Commission's purview and not related to the variance. Commissioner Uhart opposed the 30 day condition. Mr. Mankins suggested the 30 day period be extended to one year.

Mr. Adamson opposed the request due to his concern that any drainage would impact his property and the condition of the property. Photographs illustrating his concerns were given to the Commission. (These photographs were later given to the Clerk and are contained in the packet.) The parcel map in the packet was used to locate his parcel. The drainage ditch currently takes the runoff to a detention pond on the south side of Avery.

Ms. Stadler opposed the request as it violates the CC&Rs and would have a negative impact on the aesthetic and property values. There should be adequate space on the one acre lot to park the vehicles in a garage without a variance. Vice Chairperson Christianson explained the Commission's inability to enforce the CC&Rs.

Additional public comments were solicited. Mr. Foster opposed it as it would impact his ability to build and sell spec homes in the vicinity. Additional public comments were solicited but none given.

Ms. Mankins indicated the dirt pile Mr. Adamson had opposed would be removed when the project is completed. The drainage in her area should not impact his property. Mr. Foster had constructed her home and at that time had supported the residence's location and development plans. The garage would not appear to be as tall as the house as Mr. Foster's error had made the house four to five feet taller than it should have been. If the building had been completed as planned, this discussion would not have been required.

Mr. Mankins pointed out that the drainage ditch which Mr. Adamson felt should be there is not on the parcel map plans as illustrated on his plot plan, which he displayed. The culvert and ditch run under Avery. His garage would stop the sheet flow from BLM's property and force it into the ditch. This is the purpose of the culvert. It will contain the water by channeling it to the detention pond. Mr. Givlin indicated that he had reviewed the plan. Mr. Mankins explained the difficulties he had encountered after the house had been constructed which make 57 percent of his lot unusable. Backing from Avery Road onto the property is unsafe due to the hills on both sides of his property. His plan will allow him to do all of the backing on his property. He, too, felt that if he had not encountered health problems, the building would have been constructed before this time.

Mr. Givlin explained that only the water from the adjacent property would be perpetuated to the detention pond. Although Mr. Mankins should be able to develop his lot as he desired, the City still needed a drainage easement across his property. The proposed five foot easement along the west and north boundaries had, therefore, been proposed. Discussion between Mr. Givlin and Commissioner Rogers indicated there would be five feet between the wall and the property line. Mr. Givlin agreed that a ten foot easement would be desired with a well defined corridor for perpetuating the water flow. This is not how the parcel map had been presented originally nor as it had finally been recorded. The water now flows to the west and across BLM property to the culvert. Commissioner Rogers felt that this had been the original concern as expressed by the Commission, however, the Board of Supervisors had overridden the Commission.

Commissioner Wipfli explained his original opposition to the request due to his feeling that it was a self-imposed hardship. He felt that everyone should work within their lot and that the Commission should not approve something which is overwhelming or outrageous and imperils the other neighbors. He would vote against the request.

Commissioner Rogers requested the record indicate that the Commission added Condition 6 which is that within 30 days following the granting of the variance, that the building plans must be provided to the Building Department for the retaining wall. This would allow the Department time to reconsider the time in which the building is to be completed. Condition 7 is that the use of the subject accessory structure shall be for personal, non-business purposes only. Clarification by Commissioner Rogers added his Condition 6 to the staff's Condition 6 by adding "within 30 days". This would not impose a hardship as Mr. Mankins already has the building plans. Further clarification indicated that these conditions are to be added to the record and staff's conditions.

Commissioner Rogers then moved to deny V-98/99-8, a variance request from Leo and Annette Mankins on property located at 2340 Avery Road, APN 8-892-01, to vary 25 feet from the required 30 foot rear yard setback and ten feet from the required 15 foot side yard setback on property zoned Single Family One Acre based on two findings which are that the hardship is a self-imposed hardship and that the granting of the variance would impact drainage and other considerations which will be damaging to the adjacent property owners. Clarification indicated the motion was for denial. Commissioner Wipfli seconded the motion. Commissioner Sedway indicated that if this had been the first time the request had been heard by the Commission that he would have supported a denial. He felt that the hardship is self-imposed as an acre lot should provide adequate space on which to turn a motor home and boat. At this stage, however, the only reason the request was in front of the Commission is due to health problems. The Board of Supervisors had already over-ruled the Commission once. There is a condition out there which is not a good condition which the Building Department has identified as a 12 foot high, earth bermed cut wall and that, if there had not been medical problems, the structure would have already been constructed. Therefore, he would have to vote against the motion. Commissioner Uhart expressed support from Commissioner Sedway's comments. Even though she had felt at one time that the Commission had not had adequate grounds for approval, the Board of Supervisors had acted upon it and the Commission is at this point merely continuing on a predetermined course despite the Commission's original denial. She, too, would vote against the motion. The motion to deny the variance was voted and failed on a 2-3 vote with Commissioners Sedway and Uhart and Vice Chairperson Christianson voting Naye.

Commissioner Uhart moved to approve V-98/99-8, a variance request from Leo and Annette Mankins on property located at 2340 Avery Road, APN 8-892-01, to vary 25 feet from the required 30 foot rear yard setback and ten feet from the required 15 foot side yard setback on property zoned Single Family One Acre based on five findings and subject to seven conditions of approval as amended by Commissioner Rogers 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 Sedway seconded the motion. Clarification indicated that there were to be only seven conditions as the Building Department time restriction had been modified and added to Condition 6. The motion to approve the variance as modified was voted and carried 3-2 with Commissioners Wipfli and Rogers voting Naye.

**F-3. V-98/99-9 - DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON A VARIANCE REQUEST FROM CAROL DOTSON (1-1035) - Senior Planner Tara Hullinger, Carol Dotson - The abandonment has occurred.**

The lot is now .97 of an acre which is similar to other lots in the subdivision. Ms. Dotson had reviewed the staff report and concurred with the conditions including the condition related to the septic system. Public comments were solicited but none given. Commissioner Uhart moved to approve V-98/99-9, a variance request from Dan Masden to vary from the minimum one acre lot size, .97 acre, in a Single Family One Acre zoning district located at 158 Manzanita Terrace Drive, APN 8-042-03, based on five findings and subject to seven conditions of approval contained in the staff report. Commissioner Rogers seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

**F-4. S-98/99-1 - DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON A VARIANCE REQUEST FROM AL SILVA (1-1188)** - Senior Planner Hullinger, Al Silva - The property to the east is not part of the park and is zoned Agricultural. The topography will make it difficult to develop that area, therefore, a conflict in zoning should not occur. Mr. Silva described his acquisition of the parcel and development plans. He had read the report and agreed with the conditions. Public comments were solicited but none given. Commissioner Wipfli explained his knowledge of the lot and supported the variance. Commissioner Wipfli moved to approve V-98/99-7, a variance request from Alfred Silva, property owner Alfred and Sherie Silva, to vary seven feet from the minimum twenty feet rear yard setback in a Single Family 12,000 zoning district located at 1229 Buzzy's Ranch Road, APN 10-612-04, based on five findings and subject to six conditions of approval contained in the staff report and with the understanding that any acknowledgements to the Commission/Board by the applicant may be considered as further stipulations or conditions of approval on this application. Commissioner Uhart seconded the motion. Following a request, Commissioner Wipfli corrected the lot size to be 21,000. Commissioner Uhart concurred. Motion carried 5-0.

**F-5. S-98/99-1 - DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON A REQUEST FROM CRYSTAL BAY AVIATION, LLC (1-1369)** - Senior Planner Juan Guzman, Applicant's Attorney Craig Howard, Principal Steve Lantz - Clarification indicated that the Health Department request for additional information should be answered by the applicant or his representative. A will serve letter will be issued after the Board of Supervisors considers and approves the project. Nevada Dept. of Transportation's letter was felt to be unfair, however, the Department has the ability to require improvements when it considers a permit. This process normally occurs after the City has approved the project. Mr. Howard introduced Mr. Lantz and Martin Wood. A will serve letter had been issued. A special use permit had been approved by the Commission in August. They had read the staff report and agreed with the recommendations and Conditions even though several are very broadly written. He then described the project. Mr. Lantz described his reasons for wishing to invest in the airport, the condo concept, the individuals who would use the facility, and unit's proposed size. Public comments were solicited but none given. Mr. Lantz indicated that all of the internal improvements would be constructed within one year including the Airport Authority's required asphalt or concrete in any area not part of the structures. He proposed using concrete throughout. Mr. Guzman explained the reasons for including the Growth Management Ordinance reference. Individuals will not be allowed to reside in the units. The units are considered commercial. Commissioner Rogers moved to recommend that the Board of Supervisors approve S-98/99-1, a lease-hold, common interest community tentative subdivision map from Crystal Bay Aviation, LLC, Steve Lantz, Principal, based on three findings and subject to ten conditions of approval as contained within the staff report. Commissioner Uhart seconded the motion. Following a request for an amendment, Commissioner Rogers amended his motion to include "and with the understanding that any acknowledgements to the Board or Commission by the applicant may be considered as further stipulations or conditions of approval on this application". Commissioner Uhart concurred. Motion was voted and carried 5-0.

**BREAK:** A ten minute recess was taken at 5:15 p.m. A quorum of the Commission was present when the meeting was reconvened at 5:25 p.m. although Commissioner Mally and Chairperson Horton were absent as previously indicated.

**F-6. P-98/99-1 - DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON A REQUEST TO AMEND AND APPROVE A PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT INCLUDING A NEW SITE PLAN AND DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS FOR QUAIL RUN PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT (1-1735)** - Senior Planner Guzman, Applicant's Representative Ron Kipp, Deputy District Attorney Melanie Bruketta, Applicant's Attorney Scott Heaton, Cygnet Attorney Jim Cavilia, Huck Store Fixture Company General Manager Bret

Sheldon, Northern Nevada Manufacturers Association Representative Ray Bacon, Richard Murray, Senior Planner Sandra Danforth - Forty-four of the 46 property owners had signed the application. Considerable discussion ensued among staff, Mr. Kipp, and the Commission on the requirement that the application be signed by all property owners, the reasons two signatures had not been obtained, those individuals' support of the project, potential dates when those signatures may be obtained, and whether the Commission could, by using CCMC 17.04.030(2) consider the request. Mr. Kipp stipulated that, if he did not have the two remaining signatures when the Board of Supervisors considers the request, he would withdraw the application. He requested the Commission not delay the project for 30 days. Mr. Heaton pointed out that the property owners had signed a copy of the CC&Rs. These CC&Rs, specifically, Article 14 Section 12, allow for altering the design or plans if deemed appropriate at a future date. In his legal opinion, this granted the developer the ability to change the plans at a future date without having to obtain the signatures from all of the property owners. Mr. Heaton urged the Commission to consider the application, add a condition as Mr. Kipp had stipulated, and not delay the project as the 30 day delay would cost the developer \$10s of thousands of dollars. Marketing efforts will commence immediately after the Board considers the item. Discussion explained the legal concern and the conflict in the Code and application requirements. Mr. Sullivan felt that if the Commission considers the application, notification should be provided to the Board indicating the reasons for proceeding without the two signatures such as the feeling that honest efforts had been made to obtain the signatures and verbal commitments had been given. The Commission's other options are to defer action until next month or schedule a special meeting. Commissioner Sedway expressed his feeling that the issue had been noticed properly, complied with the spirit of the Code, and would inconvenience the public who had come specifically to discuss/hear this issue. He felt the issue should be heard/considered. Vice Chairperson Christianson supported going forward with the stipulation that it would be withdrawn if the two signatures have not been obtained when the Board consider it. Mr. Sullivan explained that if the application is withdrawn, the applicant would have to resubmit and be reconsidered by the Commission when the applicant again wishes to move forward on the project. Staff would not have brought the item forward if there had not been the written comments confirming an intent to sign the applications. He reiterated the need to include a statement of the reasons for moving forward and making a recommendation in the packet for the Board. Vice Chairperson Christianson directed that the hearing be conducted under these conditions.

(1-2323) Mr. Kipp described the current project and the proposed changes. The remaining units were to be stick built. The density would be reduced by 92 units. The open space would be increased to 46 percent. The variances will allow the existing mobile homes to remain and not be disturbed. There will be a zero side lot line setback with a ten foot separation between all units. The CC&Rs will prohibit construction of any sheds, etc., in that ten foot separation. A second main entrance will be constructed on Saliman Road. The Fairview entrance will be retained. The walking pathways, their gates, and the roadway gates were described. The Homeowners Association has supported the project. Their dues will not be increased by the reduced number of units. The CC&Rs will be amended in February to add this clause. The new units will makeup the difference with an increase in their fees. Future fees will maintain the pro rated difference. The proposal will not cause a spot zoned island in the middle of the project which would have happened if the mobile home park zoning had been pursued. Reasons the Association wished to support the project were noted. Storm drain improvements, Saliman Road improvements, efforts undertaken to remove the project from the FEMA flood plain area, phasing plans, projected buildout dates, withdrawal of the linear park improvements proposed in the original plan, plans to assist with running a treated effluent line to Governor's Field, wrought iron or welded steel fencing plans for the area adjacent to the linear park, the fencing proposed for the other areas, his commitment to obtain a special use permit for a sound wall if one becomes necessary for the area adjacent to Cygnet, modifications proposed for the clubhouse exterior lighting and discussions with Parks and Recreation Director Steve Kastens about the lighting at Governor's Field were explained. Mr. Kipp had read the staff report and agreed with all of the Conditions with a modification to Condition 1, 17, 19 and 21. He felt that Condition 1, second sentence, should read final rather than tentative. Later clarification by Ms. Bruketta indicated tentative was correct and that this change should not be made. Conditions 17 and 19 contain a 90 day timeframe which he wished to be reduced to 45 days. He committed to Mr. Sullivan that he would not submit the first set of construction plans, first final map, and the development agreement at the same time. He would be drafting the development agreement. His engineers would prepare the final map and the construction plans. Reasons for wishing to fast track the project were noted. He then explained his oversight of the garage common walls in the existing units. Therefore, he requested a zero setback on the existing garages. Discussion ensued between the Commission and Mr. Kipp on the gated Saliman Street entrance, the Fairview entrance, the gated walkways from the Linear Parkway, the RV storage area, his commitment for

additional buffering between the project and the adjacent LI district, the notification procedures used with buyers and potential clients.

Mr. Heaton distributed to the Commission and Clerk a proposed condition of approval regarding the CC&Rs which would notify buyers of the LI zone. He agreed to include this provision in the CC&Rs as well as the purchase agreement. He also requested that the CC&Rs include a provision which allowed for any Code modifications to the LI district to be included by reference rather than mandating a revision to the CC&Rs each and every time the Code may be modified. Commissioner Uhart explained her reluctance to approve the request without knowing the specific language of the disclosure which would be given to potential buyers. Mr. Heaton agreed and expressed his feeling that the proposed language would address her concern. Vice Chairperson Christianson indicated that his statement was a stipulation. Mr. Kipp agreed. Discussion continued on the street improvements proposed for Saliman, including the potential for a pro rata share of a signal at Fairview, the project's reduced traffic impact, the open space calculations, the application date for Park and Recreation's Residential Construction Tax funds, the entrance and gate from Fairview, the drainage area and the potential to use it as an emergency entrance from Fairview as well as the potential for this entrance to be used by the residents, and the plans to relocate the office parking area for the complex across the street.

Mr. Guzman then explained the staff's concerns related to the flood zone and the condition mandating that the FEMA map be revised. This process is rather lengthy but felt necessary due to the flood insurance requirements created by the designation. The applicant will be able to proceed with the project while attempting to revise the map. The RV/boat storage facility has been located adjacent to the LI district. This leaves only one property abutting the LI district. An additional study will be undertaken on the buffering needed for this area. The stipulation that the applicant will take additional mitigation measures if required will be used, if necessary. Staff had also been concerned about having the mobile home area in the middle of the PUD, however, the applicant has been able to mitigate the residents' concerns as indicated by the lack of opposition. The proposal is supported by staff and more than meets the PUD requirements. Concerns expressed about the State/City Departmental letters indicating a need for information prior to approval should be handled by the final map at recording time. If the map is not signed off appropriately, which indicates these Department/Agencies' approval, the Recorder will not record it. The Commission's requirements, however, mandate the inclusion of this information in the packet.

Public comments were then solicited. Mr. Cavilia felt that Cygnet's concerns had been addressed by Mr. Kipp's stipulation that their condition be included. He agreed to Mr. Heaton's change regarding the CC&Rs. He also voiced concern about the proposed reduction in the setback from 20 feet to 15 feet along the LI district. He suggested that the LI firms adjacent to the property be allowed to participate in the discussions. Although the stamping activities have been relocated away from the building, noisy activities still occur in the building. These uses are permitted in the LI district. He hoped that this would not be an issue in the future. Clarification by Commissioner Rogers, Mr. Cavilia, and Mr. Heaton indicated the amendment to the conditions of approval was that "Future ordinance changes which impact this condition shall be incorporated in the CC&Rs without the approval of the City." Vice Chairperson Christianson explained the Commission's original efforts to address the conflict area and expressed the hope that the revisions would correct the situation. Discussion explained that the mobile home park had been approved before any of the present Commissioners had been appointed. The Commission had attempted to address the conflict area when the PUD was submitted.

Additional comments were solicited. Mr. Sheldon explained his personal experience with noise problems due to the conflict between the LI and residential uses. He also expressed concern about the noise impact on the residential area along Fairview due to the heavy traffic volume and the need for a truck route. He also requested that the record indicate Huck's plans to add loading docks to the north side of its building and questioned whether it would be allowed. His firm is sensitive to the noise concerns. Commissioner Wipfli agreed that the Limited Industrial zoning is so important due to its transition from major industrial to lighter uses. He hoped that Mr. Bawden considers the need to protect his residences as the firms are already there. Mr. Sheldon should not be forced to alter his lifestyle. Mr. Sheldon reiterated his desire to have his concerns considered. He also submitted a letter for inclusion in the record. (The letter is included in the packet.)

Additional comments were solicited. Mr. Bacon expressed his feeling that the tone of the meeting was a quantum leap ahead of the last meeting. He suggested that the Commission, if appropriate, include in its recommendation to

the Board of Supervisors that Fairview remain open for truck traffic. It could now be restricted rather easily. Vice Chairperson Christianson indicated that truck traffic for local deliveries should always be allowed. He did not feel that the route should become a major truck route between Highways 395 and 50. The freeway will hopefully address this concern.

Additional comments were solicited. Mr. Murray explained his involvement with the mobile home park and his support for the project due to the feeling that it would improve the area and, hopefully, increase his property value. This will be the only gated senior community in Northern Nevada. He urged the Commission to approve the project. Additional public comments were solicited but none given. Public testimony was then closed.

Mr. Guzman explained a telephone conversation he had had with Ephan McPhee, a resident in the subdivision to the north. Ms. McPhee opposed the project due to the traffic impact on Saliman and the potential increased flood problems her area could have as a result of the development. Staff's efforts to explain the project to her were noted.

Discussion between the Commission and Mr. Heaton indicated that the buyers would have a copy of the proposed condition in the CC&Rs and purchase agreement. Mrs. Danforth suggested that the condition also be recorded on the final map so that title companies would pick it up while preparing the escrow instructions.

Mr. Guzman noted that Mr. Kipp had stated that there will not be an island in Saliman. He will landscape the park setting, that the sidewalk is offset rather than being adjacent to Saliman, and that the space between Saliman and the sidewalk would be landscaped. Mr. Guzman also noted that Condition 1 is to read "final map" and not tentative as suggested by Mr. Kipp. He also requested that the map which Mr. Kipp had used be signed by the Vice Chairperson and that that map be used by the Board of Supervisors. This would, hopefully, provide one map which could clearly be indicated as having been the one used for the Commission and Board in their deliberations/approval. Additional comments were requested but none given.

Commissioner Rogers then moved to approve a motion that the Regional Planning Commission recommends that the Board of Supervisors approve the planned unit development application, P-98/99-1, from Summit Security Housing, in order to develop a 222 parcel Mobile Home 6,000 Planned Unit Development, MH6000-PUD, plus incorporating 52 existing parcels developed as part of the original Quail Run Planned Unit Development, on approximately 37 acres of land presently zoned Mobile Home Park-Planned Unit Development, MHP-PUD, and a change of land use designation to Mobile Home 6,000 Planned Unit Development, MH6000-PUD, located at 1350 Fairview Drive, northwest corner of Saliman Road and Fairview Drive, APNs 9-769-03; 9-752-07, 08, 09, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28; 9-753-01, 02, 03, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31; 9-754-01, 02, 03, 04, 05, 06, 07, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33; 9-756-16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 27; 9-757-01, 02, 03, 04, 05, 06, 07, 08, 09, 10, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26; 9-758-01, 02, 03, 04, 05, 06, 07, 08, and 25 based on 18 findings and subject to 24 conditions of approval as contained within the staff report and with the understanding that all acknowledgements to the Commission/Board by the applicant will be considered as further stipulations or conditions of approval on this application; and, on Condition No. 1, it is agreed that the map discussed is the tentative map; that Condition 24 will read: "All purchasers of property within the Project shall be specifically notified by having the following statement included in the CC&Rs, on purchase agreements, and recorded on the final map: 'The Project is adjacent to real property zoned Limited Industrial. Pursuant to Carson City Municipal Code Section 18.06.290, activities permitted on property zoned Limited Industrial include processing, assembly and manufacture of products. These activities, which are permitted seven (7) days a week and twenty-four (24) hours a day, may cause noise and/or odors. The adjacent Limited Industrial uses existed prior to the residential use of the Project.' Future ordinance changes which impact this condition shall be incorporated into the CC&Rs without additional approval of the City." Following a request for an amendment, Commissioner Rogers amended his motion to include changing Condition 19 from 90 days to 45 days and Condition 21 regarding the sideyard will read "...required setback on existing 52 lots shall be" with a fifth line added stating: "...a zero setback between adjacent garages"; Condition 17 is also changed from 90 days to 45 days. Commissioner Rogers then explained his reluctance to include the Fairview Drive issue. Mr. Guzman indicated that Mr. Bacon's testimony should be included in the record and a copy provided to the Board at the time the Board considers the request. Commissioner Rogers agreed that this item should be considered by the Board and RTC rather than the Planning Commission. Commissioner Uhart seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

**G. INTERNAL COMMUNICATIONS AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS (NON-ACTION ITEMS)  
(2-0070)**

**G-1. STAFF BRIEFING ON STATUS OF COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS AND CORRESPONDENCE TO THE COMMISSION** - The Board approved the Hillside Ordinance revision and the Final Map for the Northpointe Commercial Industrial Subdivision. (2-0130) The Commission will not consider the Genescritti issues. Mr. Sullivan's memo about it was for the Commission's information only. Comments also noted the absence of Chairperson Horton and Commissioner Mally and wished them both a speedy recovery.

**G-2. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS (2-0102)** - Commissioner Uhart requested staff begin the recruitment process for her position. This may provide a new Commissioner with the ability to attend the national conference as well as internal workshops.

**G-3. STAFF COMMENTS (2-0112)** - Staff has received the first semi-final draft of the Open Space Master Plan. Copies were available for the Commission. More work remains to be done before the element is approved/adopted.

**G-4. FUTURE COMMISSION ITEMS AND DATES (2-0120)** - A special meeting had been agendized for February 8 in the Bonanza Room at 6 p.m. Its items relate to zoning Code amendments.

**H. ADJOURNMENT (2-0148)** - Commissioner Wipfli moved to adjourn. Commissioner Uhart seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0. Vice Chairperson Christianson adjourned the meeting at 6:50 p.m.

The Minutes of the January 27, 1999, Carson City Regional Planning Commission

1999.

ARE SO APPROVED ON\_\_February\_24\_\_\_\_\_,

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

Verne Horton, Chairperson