

DRAFT MINUTES
Regular Meeting
Carson City Planning Commission
Wednesday, September 30, 2015 ● 5:00 PM
Community Center Sierra Room, 851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada

Commission Members

Chair – Paul Esswein	Vice Chair – Mark Sattler
Commissioner – Victor Castro	Commissioner – Monica Green
Commissioner – Elyse Monroy	Commissioner – Walt Owens
Commissioner – Daniel Salerno	

Staff

Lee Plemel, Community Development Director
 Susan Dorr Pansky, Planning Manager
 Danny Rotter, Engineering Manager
 Joseph Ward, Deputy District Attorney
 Tamar Warren, Deputy Clerk/ Recording Secretary

NOTE: A recording of these proceedings, the board’s agenda materials, and any written comments or documentation provided to the recording secretary during the meeting are public record. These materials are on file in the Clerk-Recorder’s Office, and are available for review during regular business hours.

An audio recording of this meeting is available on www.Carson.org/minutes.

A. ROLL CALL, DETERMINATION OF QUORUM, AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE (5:07:19) – Chairperson Esswein called the meeting to order at 5:10 p.m. Roll was called and quorum was present. Commissioner Sattler led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Attendee Name	Status	Arrived
Chairperson Paul Esswein	Present	
Vice Chairperson Mark Sattler	Present	
Commissioner Victor Castro	Present	
Commissioner Monica Green	Present	
Commissioner Elyse Monroy	Present	
Commissioner Walt Owens	Present	
Commissioner Daniel Salerno	Present	

B. PUBLIC COMMENTS (5:08:18) – None.

C. POSSIBLE ACTION ON APPROVAL OF MINUTES – AUGUST 26, 2015.

(5:09:01) – MOTION: I move to approve the minutes of the August 26, 2015 meeting as written.

RESULT:	APPROVED (7-0-0)
MOVER:	Sattler
SECONDER:	Owens
AYES:	Esswein, Sattler, Castro, Green, Monroy, Owens, Salerno
NAYS:	None
ABSTENTIONS:	None
ABSENT:	None

D. MODIFICATIONS OF AGENDA

(5:09:21) – None.

E. DISCLOSURES

(5:10:35) – Commissioner Sattler explained that Agenda item F6 related to Silver Oak development and that he was a member of the Eagle Valley golf community; although he did not see any conflicts. Mr. Ward stated that he did not see any conflict since there was no pecuniary relationship. Chairperson Esswein explained that he had an association with one of the applicants for the Jackson Village project; however, he did not believe there was an association between that and his position on the Planning Commission. Mr. Ward agreed that as long as he acted as a “reasonable member of this body”, there would be no conflict.

F. PUBLIC HEARING MATTERS

F-1 RESOLUTIONS 2015-PC-R-1 – ACTION TO ADOPT RESOLUTION 2015-PC-R-1 COMMENDING GEORGE WENDELL FOR EIGHT YEARS OF SERVICE ON THE PLANNING COMMISSION.

(5:12:03) – Chairperson Esswein introduced the item and read the resolution, which is incorporated into the record.

(5:14:01) – MOTION: I move to adopt the resolution [to commend former Planning Commission Member and Chair, George Wendell].

RESULT:	APPROVED (7-0-0)
MOVER:	Sattler
SECONDER:	Salerno
AYES:	Esswein, Sattler, Castro, Green, Monroy, Owens, Salerno
NAYS:	None
ABSTENTIONS:	None
ABSENT:	None

(5:14:28) – Chairperson Esswein thanked Mr. Wendell for his service. Mr. Wendell thanked the Commission, Staff, and the Board of Supervisors.

F-2 SUP-15-085 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: TO CONDUCT A FIVE-YEAR REVIEW OF A PREVIOUSLY APPROVED SPECIAL USE PERMIT, GRANTED TO GEORGE WENDELL (PROPERTY OWNER: GEORGE WENDELL) FOR A METAL STORAGE CONTAINER ON PROPERTY ZONED RETAIL COMMERCIAL (RC), LOCATED AT 2462 NORTHGATE LN., APN 002-061-32.

(5:15:14) – Chairperson Esswein introduced the item.

(5:15:39) – Ms. Pansky presented the agenda materials and related photographs, which are incorporated into the record. She also corrected the record by noting that the property owner was Victory Christian Church.

(5:16:36) – Mr. Wendell, applicant, confirmed that he had read the Staff Report and agreed with all the conditions of approval.

There were no public comments.

(5:17:25) – MOTION: I move to approve SUP-15-085 a Special Use Permit request from George Wendell (property owner: Victory Christian Center) for a five-year review of a previously-approved metal storage container in the Retail Commercial (RC) zoning district, located at 2462 Northgate Ln., APN 002-061-32, based on the findings and subject to the conditions of approvals contained in the Staff Report.

RESULT:	APPROVED (7-0-0)
MOVER:	Sattler
SECONDER:	Salerno
AYES:	Esswein, Sattler, Castro Green, Monroy, Owens, Salerno
NAYS:	None
ABSTENTIONS:	None
ABSENT:	None

F-3 TPUD-15-069 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FROM PROJECT ONE (PROPERTY OWNER: JACKSON FAM LIV TRUST 5/25/00) FOR A TENTATIVE PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT OF 41 SINGLE FAMILY DETACHED RESIDENTIAL LOTS, INCLUDING A SPECIAL USE PERMIT TO ALLOW A RESIDENTIAL USE ON PROPERTY ZONED GENERAL COMMERCIAL (GC) AND VARIANCES TO ALLOW REDUCTION IN MINIMUM LOT SIZE, REDUCTION OF REQUIRED PARKING, REDUCTION OF REQUIRED OPEN SPACE AND REDUCTION OF REQUIRED PERIPHERY SETBACK, ON PROPERTY LOCATED AT 250 EAGLE STATION LANE, APN 009-123-38 and 39.

(5:18:30) – Chairperson Esswein introduced the item.

(5:19:12) – Ms. Pansky presented the Staff Report and accompanying photographs, all of which are incorporated into the record.

(5:26:49) – Commissioner Castro inquired about “common area open space”, and received confirmation that in this case, 49 percent would be considered open space if backyards are counted as well.

(5:27:34) – Chris Baker, applicant representative, presented the applicant’s proposal and called the project “unique”, adding that the residences would fill the first-time buyer and downsizer needs. Mr. Baker showed a video representation of the project and confirmed that the square footages of the residences included the garages. He also noted that the parking estimate is at 79 spaces; however, the City requirement is 103 spaces as they will have “more stalls than we need”. Mr. Baker noted that they had read the Staff Report and agreed with the Staff’s recommendations and conditions of approval. Member Salerno inquired about tree sizes and was told they would be 2.5 inch trees and the front yards would be landscaped and maintained by the homeowners’ association. Ms. Pansky clarified the difference between affordable and lower-priced housing, adding that the former referred to government-subsidized housing. Commissioner Sattler inquired about motor home parking and Mr. Baker clarified that the homeowner’s association may not allow such vehicles. Commissioner Castro called the project “smart development”.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

(5:47:07) – Edith McCartney identified herself as an area resident and commented on the small lot sizes and the additional traffic. Richard Ray, another area resident, was concerned about drainage and received information about a drainage easement and a retention basin. Paula Ray, area resident, noted that she loved the plan but was concerned about the “one way in and one way out” traffic. She suggested having two ways to access the homes. Mr. Baker addressed the density issue by pointing out that currently 72 units are allowed on the site, yet they were proposing 41 instead. He also acknowledged the traffic concern and stated that the community would not be gated; however, they only had one “legal point access” granted to them at this point. Vice Chairperson Sattler received confirmation that the in and out points had two lanes each and were divided by a median. Commissioner Monroy noted that her parking concerns were addressed at this point. Chairperson Esswein suggested two motions, one to address the Special Use Permit and another to address variances. Commissioner Salerno spoke in favor of the project and the architecture, calling it “a nice place to live”. Chairperson Esswein noted that the density should not be an issue since the originally-proposed 72 unit apartments required a much smaller lot size.

(6:02:27) – MOTION: I move to recommend approval of TPUD-15-069, a Tentative Planned Unit Development consisting of 41 single family detached residential lots, to the Board of Supervisors, including approval of the Special Use Permit to allow a residential use on property zoned General Commercial (GC) and Variances to allow reduction in the minimum lot size, reduction of required parking, reduction of required open space, and reduction of required [periphery] setback, on property located at 250 Eagle Station Lane, APNs 009-123-38 and 39, based on the findings and subject to the recommended conditions of approval.

RESULT:	APPROVED (7-0-0)
MOVER:	Sattler
SECONDER:	Salerno
AYES:	Esswein, Sattler, Castro Green, Monroy, Owens, Salerno
NAYS:	None
ABSTENTIONS:	None
ABSENT:	None

(6:03:55) – Ms. Pansky noted that this item would be heard by the Board of Supervisors during their October 15, 2015 meeting.

F-4 SUP-15-079 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FROM PAM MCINTOSH (PROPERTY OWNER: KAREN L. HAUPT) FOR A SPECIAL USE PERMIT TO ALLOW THE CUMULATIVE SQUARE FOOTAGE OF ACCESSORY STRUCTURES ON THE PROPERTY TO EXCEED 75 PERCENT OF THE SIZE OF THE MAIN RESIDENCE ON PROPERTY ZONED SINGLE FAMILY 1 ACRE (SF1A), LOCATED AT 4589 SILVER SAGE DRIVE, APN 009-176-05.

(6:04:19) – Chairperson Esswein introduced the item.

(6:05:06) – Ms. Pansky presented the Staff Report and accompanying photographs, incorporated into the record. She also stated that a letter of objection with a petition, and two other letters of objection had been received as late information and are now incorporated into the record. Commissioner Munroy received clarification on City code

regarding accessory structures that exceed 75 percent of the residential structure. Vice chairperson Sattler confirmed that a similar request had been approved several months ago. Commissioner Salerno stated that he was “uncomfortable” with the metal structure and preferred a stick-built one. Chairperson Esswein noted that the issue being addressed is the appropriateness of the “excess building area”, adding that there were no design guidelines for residential structures in this zoning district. Commissioner Monroy inquired about the structure’s consistency with Master Plan elements. Ms. Pansky noted that additional visual improvements to the structure may be mitigated as a condition of approval.

(6:15:44) – Pam McIntosh, applicant, explained that she had read and agreed with the Staff Report and the conditions of approval. She also introduced her son, Jason McIntosh, who lived on the property and would build and utilize the structure. In response to a question by Commissioner Salerno, Mr. McIntosh noted that the steel structure was affordable and a stick-built one was not, adding that he had already started building a six-foot fence, approved by code enforcement, and was “doing the best I can to stick with the guidelines of Carson City”. Commissioner Sattler was informed that the back of the structure would face the home and not the street. Mr. McIntosh also noted that he planned to landscape and add trees “at a later date”.

PUBLIC COMMENT

(6:19:49) – Susan Singer Whitewolf introduced herself as the adjacent property owner and cited sections of the Carson City Master Plan, noting that the proposed structure did not promote quality of design and neighborhood compatibility, as it gave the neighborhood an industrial look. Commissioner Monroy also expressed concern over “this type of building changing the characteristic of the whole neighborhood”, and noted the size to be excessive; however, she was amenable to having it screened from view. Commissioner Salerno explained that he would approve a smaller structure such as an 891 square foot one. Discussion ensued regarding acceptable sizes, paint color, and type of structure. Chairperson Esswein suggested adding landscaping to screen the structure from Willow Street and adjacent properties, and **recommended** no outside storage of unregistered and/or inoperable vehicles, as additional conditions for approval. Mr. Plemel cautioned against “rewriting the municipal code” regarding vehicles. Mr. Ward clarified that the Commission may “impose any conditions you want to on a motion” and did not see obstacles to the above-mentioned conditions. Commissioner Monroy was opposed to a structure as large as 118 percent of the main residence. Commissioner Castro suggested hearing from the applicants what an acceptable size would be.

(6:48:05) – Mr. McIntosh explained that he did have plans to paint the building and stated that he was flexible but could not make the building shorter. Commissioner Castro objected to the size of the structure. Commissioner Sattler was informed that the neighboring structure was 3,000 square feet.

(6:54:09) – MOTION: I move to approve SUP-15-079, a Special Use Permit request allowing the cumulative square footage of accessory structures on the property to exceed 75 percent of the size of the main residence on property zoned Single Family 1 Acre (SF1A), located at 4589 Silver Sage Drive, APN 009-176-05, based on the findings and subject to the recommended conditions of approval contained in the Staff Report, adding that the structure would be landscaped and once the structure was built, that no other vehicles would be allowed on the property that were not registered or not running. An additional condition, painting the structure a neutral color, was also added.

RESULT:	Failed (3-4-0)
MOVER:	Sattler
SECONDER:	Owens
AYES:	Esswein, Sattler, Owens
NAYS:	Castro, Green, Monroy, Salerno
ABSTENTIONS:	None
ABSENT:	None

(6:58:01) – Discussion ensued regarding the size of the current structures on the lot, and Mr. McIntosh explained that he needed a structure; therefore, he would accept the approval of a smaller structure. He also stated that he could **remove** the two small structures after building the larger one; however, he could not do it before completion as he stored his tools there. Upon the request of Commissioner Castro, Ms. Whitewolf noted that she objected to the size but would appreciate the appropriate landscaping and painting. She also was uncertain that the property owner would be amenable to the removal of the smaller structures as Mr. McIntosh was a tenant.

(7:06:50) – MOTION: I move to approve SUP-15-079, a Special Use Permit request allowing the cumulative square footage of accessory structures on the property to exceed 75 percent of the size of the main residence on property zoned Single Family 1 Acre (SF1A), located at 4589 Silver Sage Drive, APN 009-176-05, based on the findings and subject to the recommended conditions of approval contained in the Staff Report, and on the condition that the main structure not exceed 1,200 square feet and the other two accessory structures come down, and also that the cars that are not registered be placed inside the building, and landscaping be done to shield the building.

RESULT:	Approved (6-1-0)
MOVER:	Monroy
SECONDER:	Sattler
AYES:	Esswein, Sattler, Castro, Green, Monroy, Salerno
NAYS:	Owens
ABSTENTIONS:	None
ABSENT:	None

(7:08:45) – Mr. Plemel noted that the Commission’s decision was final on special use permits; however, any party could appeal this decision within 10 days by contacting the Planning Division.

(7:09:30) – Chairperson Esswein recessed the meeting for 10 minutes.

(7:22:48) – Chairperson Esswein reconvened the meeting. A quorum was still present

F-5 SUP-15-080 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FROM JOSE HERNANDEZ (PROPERTY OWNER: JOSE AND ELIZABETH HERNANDEZ) FOR A SPECIAL USE PERMIT TO ALLOW THE CONSTRUCTION OF A CHURCH ON PROPERTY ZONED SINGLE FAMILY 1 ACRE (SF1A), LOCATED AT 420 CLEAR CREEK AVE., APN 009-239-01.

(7:22:53) – Chairperson Esswein introduced the agenda items.

(7:23:23) – Ms. Pansky presented the Staff Report and the accompanying photographs which are incorporated into the record. She also notified the Commission of late material, incorporated into the record, that would modify condition 13 for approval and the removal of curb and gutter requirements as they were no longer required by City engineering. Mr. Plemel noted for the record that a signature page of the petition was missing from the agenda packet and would be added to the record. Ms. Pansky also clarified that any additional usage except Sunday school, such as a school or a childcare facility, would require a modification to the Special Use Permit.

(7:31:50) – Robert Lauder, applicant representative and owner of RL Engineering, introduced himself and acknowledged reading the Staff Report and his agreement to the conditions outlined, including those presented as late material. Mr. Lauder agreed that the building design could be “fine-tuned” from an architectural standpoint, gave a description of “metal buildings”, and was amenable to revise the design in order to provide better landscaping. He also clarified that his clients would not need a commercial grade kitchen or have a school (except Sunday school), and noted that the parking would be minimally lit to avoid “light pollution”. Commissioner Castro was informed by applicant Jose Hernandez that the location would bring churchgoers from Carson City, Minden, and Gardnerville, adding that he and his wife bought the property with the intention of building a church.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

(7:41:15) – Guinevere Hobdy, area resident, introduced herself and noted that the increased traffic would create accidents and problems with horses owned by residents. She was also concerned about five area churches having services at the same time causing, traffic and speeders.

(7:44:30) – Kristi Geiser, another area resident, noted that she had been informed by a realtor that the property values would be devalued by building a church in the neighborhood.

(7:46:50) – Joyce Gale Ramos believed that having a church would be equal to having a bar or a casino in the neighborhood. She also noted the over saturation of churches in the area.

(7:49:43) – Robert Fulghum also addressed the issue of five churches in the area and explained that they had moved to the area because it was rural. He wished to see strict requirements and objected to having a commercial-style building in the neighborhood. Mr. Fulghum added that the persons opposed to this church comprised over 50 percent of noticed neighbors.

(7:56:03) – Jean Gunter, adjacent property owner and a signatory to the opposition letter included in the packet, was also concerned with the traffic, light pollution, and the abandonment of Hemlock Street.

(7:57:52) – Richard Geiser was concerned about the noise on Sundays.

(7:59:15) – Mr. Hernandez explained that they were currently renting church space in a building on Winnie Lane and had not received complaints from any of the residents in the apartment complex nearby. He also noted that he wished to serve the community but did not have the funds to buy property and build a church elsewhere. Mr. Hernandez indicated that he had discussed the concerns of the pastor of the neighboring church and was certain they had reached an agreement. Mr. Lauder clarified that the 800 vehicles per day was not accurate and that the engineering report had mentioned 80 vehicles per weekday and 320 vehicles on Sundays. Vice Chairperson Sattler was informed that the applicant had not met with neighbors prior to applying for a Special Use Permit. Mr. Lauder was in favor of having a neighborhood liaison to assist in the architectural design. Commissioner

Salerno clarified that churches were allowed in residential areas; however, he commented on the large number of churches in the area. He also suggested making the design and landscaping acceptable. Mr. Lauder noted that unless Staff was satisfied with the design, the church would not be built. He also brought to the Commission's attention the many churches clustered in one area on the west side of the City, calling it a precedent. Chairperson Esswein suggested redirecting the entry and exit points to the church away from Silver Sage Drive and onto Clear Creek Avenue and Mr. Lauder believed that may not be possible due to City regulations. Vice Chairperson Sattler and Commissioner Monroy wished to see the architectural changes and believed the neighbors would as well. Mr. Lauder was amenable to continue the item in a future meeting once the design was revised and the applicant had communicated with the neighbors.

(8:16:15) – Sandra Danforth, a Clear Creek Avenue resident, expressed concern over the size of the signage as well. She also offered her home as a venue for the community meeting. Mr. Geiser reiterated his concern for the traffic in the neighborhood. Mr. Hernandez noted that he and his wife had given up their careers to serve the community and were eager to meet with them. Mr. Plemel offered to work with the applicant regarding an indefinite continuance, adding that they would re-notice the neighbors when a specific date was chosen.

(8:19:32) – MOTION: I move to continue this item indefinitely until Staff returns with a recommendation.

RESULT:	APPROVED (7-0-0)
MOVER:	Sattler
SECONDER:	Castro
AYES:	Esswein, Sattler, Castro, Green, Monroy, Owens, Salerno
NAYS:	None
ABSTENTIONS:	None
ABSENT:	None

F-6 SUP-15-077 For Possible Action: To consider a request from Jeff Frame (property owners: Mark Turner and Sean Richards) for a Special Use Permit to allow multi-family apartments in a Retail Commercial (RC) zoning district on property zoned Retail Commercial-Planned Unit Development (RC-P), located on GS Richards Blvd., APNs 007-461-22 and -23.

(8:20:58) – Chairperson Esswein introduced the item.

(8:21:41) – Ms. Pansky presented the Staff Report, which is incorporated into the record. She also noted that late information had been distributed to the Commission regarding a change in the conditions of approval. Commissioner Castro was informed that traffic would be through College Parkway and not Silver Oak Drive.

(8:34:56) – Jeff Frame, applicant representative and owner of Frame Architecture, Inc., introduced himself and noted that he had read the Staff Report and agreed to the conditions of approval, including the amended ones. Commissioner Salerno inquired about an elevator and was informed that elevators were not required for a three-story building, and that cost was an issue.

PUBLIC COMMENT

(8:38:00) – Steve Hartman introduced himself and disagreed with Staff regarding the zoning districts, adding that there were specific limitations regarding density and design elements to the Planned Unit Development (PUD).

He also objected to the issuance of a Special Use Permit and expressed concern about traffic. Mr. Hartman gave background on the zoning in the area and anticipated a negative impact.

(8:45:19) – Richard Wipfli, an area resident, introduced himself and agreed with Mr. Hartman’s comments. He also considered the project density “absurd” and expressed concern about parking and snow removal. Brenda Wipfli introduced herself as the wife of Mr. Wipfli and explained how they had used their Special Use Permit. She was also concerned about the speeding cars and traffic on Ivy Baldwin Circle.

(8:52:56) – Rob Bauter introduced himself as an area resident and expressed concern about the 181 parking spaces, noting the lack of guest parking. Pam Bauter introduced herself as Mr. Bauter’s wife and commented that as a high-end apartment complex, the development did not include enclosed garages or elevators.

(8:56:56) – Jim Cavilia introduced himself as representing Julius and Joanne Ballardini, owners of multiple properties in the area. Mr. Cavilia noted that this change was significant; therefore, it would require a modification of the PUD and receive more input from the neighbors. He also expressed concern about the project density.

(8:58:20) – Mr. Frame cited two of the high-end apartment complexes in Reno and noted that they did not have elevators. He also stated that 60 garages would be built on site and not all parking spaces were open. Commissioner Owens was informed that the aforementioned apartments had a density of 30 units per acre.

(9:00:36) – Mark Turner introduced himself and noted his appreciation to the meeting so that opinions are expressed; however, he noted that decisions must be made to be supported by viable reasons. He also noted that “conjectures” made regarding property value changes were not validated by their appraisals. Mr. Turner explained that this type of housing “is lacking in Carson City” to cater to young and educated demographics in Carson City who may be living in Reno right now. He also noted that he had not encountered the traffic issues mentioned earlier. Commissioner Salerno inquired about ADA requirements and Mr. Plemel indicated that the building and construction permits would ensure compliance. Ms. Pansky clarified that every building has two ADA-compatible units. Commissioner Green was concerned about the high density aspect of the project in Carson City even though they were acceptable in larger communities. Chairperson Esswein explained that initially the property would house a hotel, which he believed would be denser and house a more transient occupancy. Mr. Turner explained that the economic conditions had improved and that the complex would allow those employed in South Reno to live in Carson City. Chairperson Esswein mentioned that the area was designated as a “village” which encouraged residential housing and discussion ensued regarding the proximity of the apartments to shopping areas and the hospital. Commissioner Munroy explained that she was in search of a similar area to live in; however, she was concerned about the density, which generated additional discussion.

(9:15:39) – Rob McFadden introduced himself and noted that as part of working with Mr. Turner he had surveyed the neighboring businesses and that many were interested in living in the apartments. He also explained that many of the businesses had written letters of support. Further discussion ensued regarding density and parking requirements and Mr. Turner noted that the density of the Parkway Terrace apartments is 24 units per acre. Ms. Wipfli stated that Carson City needed high-end apartments.

(9:23:19) – Matt Thomas introduced himself and explained that he was a recent college graduate who could not live in Carson City because he could not find upscale apartments. Mr. Thomas noted that he had many friends in the same predicament, and to live in a “nice place” they would have to commute from Reno to a job in Carson

City. He also cited examples of apartment complexes in which he had lived that offered one parking space per unit and that they had not had issues with parking, adding that the lack of elevators was not an issue and that this was a place in which he could live. Commissioner Salerno explained that this was a “reasonably nice place to live where we really need in this City” and cited a similar project in San Diego that did not have parking issues.

(9:27:08) – MOTION: I move to approve SUP-15-077, a Special Use Permit request to allow multi-family apartments in a Retail Commercial zoning district on property zoned Retail Commercial – Planned Unit Development, located on GS Richards Blvd., APNs 007-461-22 and -23, based on the findings and subject to the conditions of approval contained in the Staff Report, along with the revised conditions.

RESULT:	APPROVED (5-2-0)
MOVER:	Salerno
SECONDER:	Green
AYES:	Esswein, Sattler, Owens, Salerno
NAYS:	Castro, Green
ABSTENTIONS:	None
ABSENT:	None

(9:28:44) – Mr. Plemel explained that this was the final decision on this Special Use Permit, unless appealed within 10 days to the Planning Divisions, which should be contacted if anyone had questions about filing an appeal.

(9:29:20) – Chairperson Esswein briefly recessed the meeting.

(9:33:03) – The meeting reconvened and a quorum was still present.

G. STAFF REPORTS (NON-ACTION ITEMS)

G-1 DIRECTOR'S REPORT TO THE COMMISSION.

(9:33:19) – Mr. Plemel stated that there were two appeals, the Bethlehem Lutheran School expansion and playground relocation and the medical marijuana sign, with the first item to be heard by the Board of Supervisors this week. The latter item was withdrawn, according to Mr. Plemel and the Planning Commission decision would stand.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

(9:34:03) – Mr. Plemel explained that a five year review on a billboard and another five year review for a metal storage container would be heard in the October meeting. He also noted that Special Use Permits for a guest house, a medical marijuana production facility, a wireless telecommunications tower, and the Adams project would be heard in October.

COMMISSIONER REPORTS/COMMENTS

(9:36:26) – None.

H. PUBLIC COMMENT

(9:37:04) – None.

I. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: FOR ADJOURNMENT

(9:37:10) – MOTION: Vice Chairperson Sattler moved to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Castro. The meeting was adjourned at 9:38 p.m.

The Minutes of the September 30, 2015 Carson City Planning Commission meeting are so approved this 28th day of October, 2015.

PAUL ESSWEIN, Chair