

# **CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION**

## **Minutes of the December 7, 2005 Meeting**

### **Page 1**

A meeting of the Carson City Planning Commission was scheduled for 5:30 p.m. on Wednesday, December 7, 2005 in the Community Center Sierra Room, 851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada.

**PRESENT:** Chairperson John Peery  
Vice Chairperson Mark Kimbrough  
Connie Bisbee  
Craig Mullet  
Steve Reynolds  
Roy Semmens  
William Vance

**STAFF:** Andrew Burnham, Public Works Department Director  
Walter Sullivan, Planning and Community Development Director  
Lee Plemel, Principal Planner  
Juan Guzman, Open Space Manager  
Joe McCarthy, Economic Development / Redevelopment Manager  
Ben Herman, Consultant  
Kathleen King, Recording Secretary

**NOTE:** A recording of these proceedings is available, in the Clerk-Recorder's Office, for review during regular business hours.

**A. CALL TO ORDER, DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM, AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE** (5:32:09) - Chairperson Peery called the meeting to order at 5:32 p.m. Roll was called; a quorum was present. Commissioner Semmens led the pledge of allegiance.

**B. PUBLIC COMMENT** - None.

**C. PUBLIC HEARING:**

**C-1. PRESENTATION, DISCUSSION, AND PUBLIC COMMENT ON THE DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE MASTER PLAN DEVELOPED THROUGH THE ENVISION CARSON CITY MASTER PLAN UPDATE PROCESS** - (5:33:00) Chairperson Peery provided an overview of the purpose and format of the meeting. He introduced Mr. Plemel, who reviewed the staff report and provided an overview of the agenda materials. Mr. Plemel discussed the public process in which the comprehensive master plan had been developed.

Ben Herman, of Clarion Associates, narrated a PowerPoint presentation, which included discussion of the relationship of the comprehensive master plan to other plans and a chapter-by-chapter review of the preliminary draft document. Chairperson Peery suggested providing commissioner comments and input on a chapter-by-chapter basis.

Mr. Herman responded to questions regarding regulatory language associated with eminent domain. He advised that staff had requested development of criteria rather than just language, and to more closely relate the criteria to the master plan and not just zoning. He suggested the criteria could be developed into a checklist format. Commissioner Mullet expressed appreciation for the information provided, and agreed

## **CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION**

### **Minutes of the December 7, 2005 Meeting**

#### **Page 2**

it should be further developed. Chairperson Peery agreed that eminent domain is an important issue, and read a portion of paragraph 4 of the Planning and Property Rights Section into the record. Commissioner Semmens expressed the opinion that a multitude of zoning changes will take place as freeway construction is completed.

With regard to Chapter 3, Chairperson Peery inquired as to how the statement “establishing a balance of land uses within the community promotes vitality and long-term economic stability” will equate with employment. Mr. Herman advised that consideration had been given to the amount of land necessary to support the type of employment projected. Consideration was also given to the “qualitative side of it” to ensure areas of employment, retail, and housing. There are challenges in Carson City because there’s quite a bit of land for some categories and not for others. Mixed-use development and infill therefore become more important considerations. Choosing to not grow out results in “growing in and up.” Mr. Herman advised that, from a numeric standpoint, information indicates the master plan can easily accommodate the forecasts and appears to have the right balance. The qualitative side will become known over time whether the City can achieve mixed-use development and some of the other proposed patterns. With regard to the equitable distribution of recreational opportunity, Chairperson Peery suggested that equestrian uses weren’t addressed as fully as other opportunities. He expressed the opinion there are a great deal of equestrian interests and utilization in Carson City, and that the plan should be very clear with regard to the same.

Vice Chairperson Kimbrough inquired as to methods by which the plan will encourage mixed-use development projects. Mr. Herman explained that one way is to specifically designate land uses. Mixed-use is a new land use category in the process of being created, and will include residential and commercial. The master plan is full of intent language regarding the objective for those areas. One immediate step is to add a zoning district for mixed use development. Mr. Herman explained an incentive for developers is to provide clear and easy language for what is desired and, similarly, to make inconsistent development a challenge. Mr. Plemel advised that the detail of those incentives to be written into a zoning ordinance would be an implementation strategy of the master plan and not specifically included in the master plan language. In response to a further question, Mr. Herman advised that evaluation criteria will be included for mixed use development. He explained the incentives will be more procedural than financial, but that many of them will manifest as financial benefits. Commissioner Mullet agreed that quality design and development tools should be outlined in the ordinance.

Mr. Herman commented that chapter 3 is “basically everything you ever wanted to know about land use.” In reference to development of the Lyon County border, Chairperson Peery advised that some of the language will be changed. In response to a question, Mr. Herman referred to paragraph 1.2b and discussed the City’s redevelopment areas. Mr. McCarthy advised there are redevelopment plans in place for the downtown and South Carson corridor redevelopment areas. The plans include strategies to use incentives and invite investments in both plan areas. Any plan developed for a third redevelopment district would be submitted for review and approval by this commission and the Redevelopment Authority / Board of Supervisors. In response to a comment, Mr. Herman advised that additional language describing the redevelopment districts could be easily added to the draft.

For the benefit of the public, Chairperson Peery inquired as to the purpose for mixed use zoning as opposed to the existing special use permit process. Mr. Herman explained the importance of clear direction and “making it easy to do things well.” Special use permit review indicates a great deal of scrutiny as opposed

**CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**Minutes of the December 7, 2005 Meeting**  
**Page 3**

to a more straightforward process. Mr. Herman advised that communities which have encouraged and been successful with mixed use development have created a district that enables it and is very clear with regard to what is desired.

Commissioner Reynolds inquired as to the correlation between land use categories and the actual zoning of property within a land use category. Mr. Plemel explained that the master plan map is distinctly separate from zoning maps. The master plan is a policy document. Zoning maps and associated codes are regulatory ordinances. The master plan map will not change zoning. There is a correlation between the master plan and zoning in that, if and when zoning is changed in the future, it must be consistent with the master plan. In most cases, existing zoning is consistent with land use categories. A master plan document is more broad and general, as a policy document, than the specific zoning. Land use categories include a range of zoning districts that fall within the land use category. As part of the master planning process, attempts have been made to more evenly distribute the land use categories. There are also policies throughout the document which address compatibility. Mr. Plemel acknowledged that the land use designations do not equate to zoning.

In response to a question regarding energy conservation, Mr. Herman clarified the intent of the language was not to limit it to single-family homes. Commissioner Vance suggested revising the language to indicate that energy conservation would apply to new residential and commercial development. Commissioner Mullet commented that, in some cases, commercial and industrial development may benefit more than residential development. In response to a question regarding accessory dwellings, Mr. Plemel advised that the current Carson City Municipal Code ("CCMC") allows accessory and secondary dwellings unlimited in size, but not as rentals. He advised that not allowing these structures to be rented is fairly difficult to regulate. The proposed language suggests accessory buildings as an option to provide housing where land prices are increasing and affordability is decreasing; to modify the regulatory aspect of the CCMC to allow accessory dwelling units to be rented rather than limited to only non-paying guests. The suggestion to limit the size of accessory structures is a way to address the compatibility issue that they are truly accessory to the main dwelling unit. Mr. Plemel advised that the language provides a general policy solution for alternative housing types, but that there would need to be quite a bit of discussion in the details of appropriate zoning, size, etc. for the ordinance. Commissioner Vance suggested proceeding cautiously and considering the suggestion "very, very carefully."

Mr. Herman advised that chapter 4 was a very condensed version of the parks and recreation master plan, approved by the Parks and Recreation Commission at their December 6, 2005 meeting, which will be presented to this commission in the near future. In response to a question, Mr. Plemel advised that the pedestrian master plan, referenced in the draft document, will be part of the unified trails plan. He explained that the pedestrian and bicycle plans are generally transportation plan elements and trails are generally parks and recreation plan elements. Both will be part of the unified trails plan to be presented to this commission at a future meeting. Commissioner Mullet discussed the importance of connectivity for trails and other parks and recreation facilities. Mr. Guzman agreed, and advised that the unified trails master plan will bring together all sources of funding and effort into one common document. Commissioner Mullet expressed the hope the unified trails plan will be very detailed to serve as a reference for future development. Mr. Guzman explained that certain funding sources can only be used to fund certain projects. He expressed the hope that the unified trails plan will provide a "big picture that we can all follow." Mr. Plemel noted chapter 7 of the draft plan, and advised that the process associated with the unified trails plan will take place in January and February 2006. He expressed the belief that connectivity

## **CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION**

### **Minutes of the December 7, 2005 Meeting**

#### **Page 4**

between parks and recreation facilities is a high priority of the unified trails plan. Mr. Herman advised of the suggestion to make the unified trails master plan map a part of the comprehensive master plan, by reference, in order to avoid frequent amendments to the master plan.

With regard to chapter 7, Commissioner Mullet discussed the possibility of connecting the V&T Railway and Mills Park. He expressed the opinion that not doing so would be shortsighted. In response to a question, he advised there was no language in the draft document to preclude this from happening. Commissioner Reynolds discussed concerns over the lack of north / south arterials, and provided examples such as Stewart Street, Saliman Road, and Ormsby Boulevard. He suggested additional language to ensure maintenance of thoroughfares in conjunction with future development. Mr. Burnham advised that the transportation system, included in the draft master plan, is pretty much the same as the existing with a few minor changes. The freeway will do a lot to change the existing capacity imbalance. Based on all the new land uses, a capacity analysis is in the process of being conducted. Mr. Burnham anticipates that the capacity analysis won't indicate the need for new roadways as much as the need for significant improvements to existing roadways. He reviewed plans for improvement projects, including North Stewart Street, connection of South Stewart Street to Curry Street, additional improvements to Roop Street, and a new collector roadway planned for the Lompa property if it is developed. Commissioner Reynolds suggested including a guiding principle to maintain or continue connectivity for vehicular traffic. Mr. Herman agreed to consider adding the suggested language. Vice Chairperson Kimbrough suggested including language describing the Safe Routes to School program. In reference to Commissioner Reynolds' comments, Commissioner Mullet discussed a partnership opportunity with State government to extend Roop Street to Highway 395 near the Department of Motor Vehicles. (6:47:13) Commissioner Vance noted that the land use map indicates the proposed extension of Stewart Street.

Commissioner Bisbee inquired as to whether the plan will sufficiently coincide with the state demographer's growth projections. Mr. Plemel advised that flexibility had been incorporated, and that the demographer projected preliminary estimates for 2005 at 57,000. Projections for the next twenty years are in the 65,000 to 67,000 range. The current, adopted master plan includes a land use capacity analysis which provides for up to 75,000 people. The land use capacity analysis in the draft master plan provides for 75,000 to 80,000 population depending upon densities. If demographer projections hold and the City continues at a fairly steady growth rate, the draft master plan provides for plenty of land to accommodate growth over the next twenty years.

(6:47:45) With regard to chapter 8, Mr. Plemel advised that the Schulz Ranch and Brown Street specific plan areas had been adopted and that the policies would be incorporated into the plan. The Vicee Canyon specific plan area is currently in the review process. Mr. Plemel advised that the Lompa Ranch specific plan area is identified in the existing land use plan. The policies generally indicate the type of development desired, and provide future direction for the same. Mr. Plemel noted that the Eastern Portal specific plan area is similar.

Commissioner Vance commended staff and the consultant on the Action Plan in Chapter 9. With regard to Goal 2.3a, he inquired as to a mechanism for retaining "prime retail space" from some other type of development. Mr. Herman explained that Goal 2.3a is a recommendation to develop an inventory of potential retail space. The economic consultant has indicated there is more land, in some categories, which will be absorbed by the market over the next twenty years. The master plan addresses the question more for employment than for retail. There are areas designated on the map for mixed-use development. Mr.

## **CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION**

### **Minutes of the December 7, 2005 Meeting**

#### **Page 5**

Herman suggested the recommendation may need more discussion in terms of the City's policy on land designated for retail use. Commissioner Vance suggested the perception that there is a lack of retail property in Carson City. Mr. Plemel advised that Goal 2.3a will define more clearly where to retain restricted commercial uses versus encouraging mixed-use commercial. Identifying those areas would help the commission make decisions. Mr. McCarthy advised that staff struggles with trying to determine how much retail can be absorbed over a period of time. Demographic factors include sufficient "rooftops or bodies" to attract retail to Carson City. Without the population density, certain retail will not come to Carson City. Mr. McCarthy agreed that more retail is needed along South Carson Street, but a residential component is also needed to make the investment worthwhile. He advised that staff is working to determine the amount of retail the City can absorb based on population projections. In response to a question, he advised that holding retail land is an excellent idea, in theory, because it provides the community an opportunity to demonstrate to local and out-of-town investors the "broad brush of a plan for where this kind of use would be best served." He noted the importance of flexibility for determining the best use at the time.

Vice Chairperson Kimbrough expressed concern over language specifically indicating signs along the freeway bypass. Mr. Herman advised the language should be clarified in that it was intended to indicate signs on property adjacent to the freeway. Vice Chairperson Kimbrough clarified his concern over billboards. Mr. Plemel advised that the sign ordinance would apply to both billboards and commercial signage. Sign controls could include regulation of size, height, etc.

In response to a question regarding Goal 3.3b, Mr. Plemel advised that the language relates to current Uniform Building Code standards. In reference to Goal 3.3d, Commissioner Vance inquired as to whether development in the 100-year flood plain could be prohibited. Mr. Guzman acknowledged that it could be, but the City would first be required to purchase the property. Mr. Herman advised there are communities which have restricted development in the 100-year flood plain; however, Carson City's regulations currently allow it. Flood way development is prohibited, but flood plain development can occur after meeting certain conditions. In response to a question, Mr. Plemel explained that density can be regulated. Commissioner Vance suggested, as a planning issue, to consider "migrating toward prohibiting development within the 100-year flood plain." Mr. Plemel explained there is more flood plain in Carson City than just the Carson River, including primary flood plains which come from the west and the north across the City. "It's a bigger issue than just a few properties in terms of prohibiting [development]. We actually have a lot of commercial development in flood plains. And commercial development ... is generally accepted as more reasonable development." In response to a question, Mr. Guzman explained that other communities restrict development in the flood way. More restrictive regulations can also be adopted to severely regulate flood zone development. "The bottom line is this: if you are going to prevent development in the flood zone, you might as well write a check because sooner or later you're going to lose in the courts. ... If somebody owns the property, they have the right to develop that property either by clustering or by moving or by complying or by engineering standards that allow that property to be developed." Mr. Guzman agreed it's a very complicated issue, and advised that Carson City is "even worse" because of the valley topography. He advised that the flood zone maps show most of the City within a flood zone of some type or another. Even worse, severe flooding only occurs once every 15 to 20 years. Because of this, the City has historically been comfortable with taking chances. Most of the City was built with a very poor drainage system because of the desert climate. History has taught us to be more cautious in considering environmental hazards. Mr. Guzman reiterated that to severely restrict flood zone development usually translates to a major legal battle and eventually "writing a check."

## **CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION**

### **Minutes of the December 7, 2005 Meeting**

#### **Page 6**

With regard to Appendix A, Vice Chairperson Kimbrough suggested the Carson River Master Plan element appeared to be a “little outdated.” He discussed important issues associated with the River as the V&T Railway is developed. In response to a question regarding the language of Goal 8.2b of the Action Plan, Mr. Plemel offered to meet with Rex Massey, the housing plan expert. Mr. Herman advised the consultants would attempt to standardize the approach to expanding affordable housing options. Chairperson Peery provided direction with regard to public comment, and opened this item.

(7:09:12) Jay Meierdierck expressed concern regarding energy conservation elements which he had addressed in previous meetings and public discussions. He noted these elements were “addressed in the plan finally but very minimally” and provided the references. He expressed the opinion the guidelines and comments need to be “greatly expanded.” He advised that Carson City receives “on the order of 95% of the available solar power.” He noted that energy conservation and energy costs are reported in the news almost daily, and expressed the opinion it would be a mistake to not address the issues more thoroughly. He expressed concern with regard to the Stewart facility. He noted the property is eligible for National Register of Historic Places designation, and suggested designating the property as a special planning area. He further noted the property is adjacent to the Schulz Ranch, and suggested expanding the Schulz Ranch special planning area to include the Stewart facility property.

Mr. Meierdierck expressed the opinion that the draft plan misses identification of the carrying capacity of the City’s natural resources. Water availability is primary, but there are other natural resources which should be considered. Mr. Meierdierck expressed the further opinion the plan should identify the population levels to which the City can develop and the associated implications. He suggested the plan should be based on a readily available inventory of natural resources. Designations of wildlife areas, wetlands, flood plains, etc. should be considered prior to developing a land use plan.

In reference to page 6-6, number 6, Mr. Meierdierck advised that on-street parking is a desirable element for mixed-use activity centers and liveable neighborhoods, but that none was shown in the example. He expressed the opinion that large, commercial centers should have on-site parking. In reference to discussion of the public lands bill, he expressed concern over the perception there is “more control and more protection” when public lands are under local control as opposed to federal control. He expressed the opinion “local control does not give you that; it makes it more vulnerable to disposal.” He referred to the Vicee Canyon special planning area, and provided background information on research he conducted regarding lands adjacent to his current residence. He advised that ownership of the lands was changed after fifteen years “by an administrative act.” He expressed the opinion he had been misled, and concern over “many more of those types of incidents” in considering conversion of large areas to local management.

In reference to Guiding Principle #3, Mr. Meierdierck expressed the opinion the language should be greatly expanded. He reiterated the need to research the inventory prior to developing a land use plan. He suggested the inventory is “readily available” as the basis for the City’s Open Space and other master plan elements. In reference to Goal 3.3b, he expressed the opinion that development in fire prone and flood plain areas should be prohibited. He discussed the importance of open space and vistas to the community, as indicated by the citywide master plan survey results. He suggested the draft plan “promotes a much higher density and encroachment and infringement upon those vistas.” He expressed concern over the 12-foot high freeway sound walls and over encouragement of one to two story development immediately adjacent to property lines.

## **CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION**

### **Minutes of the December 7, 2005 Meeting**

#### **Page 7**

Mr. Meierdierck expressed the opinion that the draft plan attempts to “promote development as fast as we can.” He suggested slowing down a little bit. He clarified there are “many good aspects” to the master plan and “many good design and development restrictions.” He reiterated a concern that energy standards and guidelines were not included in the priority actions, and the opinion they should be. He suggested developing a strategy or action element regarding a new grading ordinance. He noted the current ordinance “promotes and results in the removal or flattening of our natural landmarks and hills.” He provided the example of the recent Northridge Development. [Commissioner Semmens left the meeting at 7:22 p.m. A quorum was still present.]

(7:22:58) Fred Brown, of 3795 Timberline Drive, inquired as to whether the master plan or the zoning plan “takes precedence.” Chairperson Peery explained that the master plan serves as a guide for City development. Zoning is finite and serves as the method by which development is regulated. In response to a further question, Chairperson Peery explained that when a master plan becomes old, it becomes “out of sync with zoning.” It’s one reason for updating a master plan. Mr. Brown noted that the master plan residential areas, indicated on the map, reference specific numbers of dwelling units per acre as related to “different colors on that drawing.” He suggested this would set a precedent for the zoning plan, and that residential areas should instead be designated as “maximum density,” “medium density,” etc. Mr. Plemel disagreed, and explained that identifying a maximum would actually further the perception of entitlement within a certain range. He clarified earlier statements that the zoning map takes precedence in terms of legal standing in a court. There can be multiple zoning districts within a land use designation, and a developer should not expect to be entitled to a maximum range just because of a master plan designation. The Planning Commission is still required to consider findings of compatibility with surrounding areas. In addition to findings of compatibility required pursuant to ordinance, there are policies in the master plan which protect existing neighborhood characteristics and densities against incompatible transitions. Mr. Plemel advised that the master plan serves for long range and general planning.

Mr. Brown inquired as to the possibility of the City allowing a property owner to increase the value of a parcel of land because of the potential for developing a maximum number of residential dwelling units. Chairperson Peery explained the issue of property owners subdividing which was presented during review of the Schulz Ranch development. He expressed the opinion that the example presented by Mr. Brown would not be City driven but property owner driven, and would also have to be approved. He noted that the draft master plan, as presented, indicated discouragement of “that type of low density redistribution.”

In response to a question, Mr. Herman advised of a separate designation for downtown mixed use development. In response to a further question, he explained that MUE might primarily indicate employment but with a mix of some residential or retail. He suggested a rule of thumb that primary use would indicate approximately three-quarters of the use. Downtown is more of a mix of retail, restaurants, employment, and housing. The “MUR” designation indicates predominantly residential with a mix of other uses. Mr. Herman explained “it’s really a question of emphasis.” Mr. Brown expressed the opinion that extending the V&T Railway to Mills Park would be a “brilliant idea.” He expressed concern over the language indicating the Vicee Canyon specific plan area would be added upon adoption. In response to a question, Mr. Plemel advised that the Vicee Canyon specific plan area would have its own, separate public hearing process. Whatever is adopted will be subsequently added to the master plan. The existing language serves as a place holder. At Chairperson Peery’s request, Mr. Plemel explained the term place holder. Mr. Brown suggested considering eminent domain of airspace for the downtown area.

## **CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION**

### **Minutes of the December 7, 2005 Meeting**

#### **Page 8**

(7:35:38) Bruce Kittess advised of having spent 40 years in the subdivision business in California, and of having left southern California because of “too much traffic, too much density.” He expressed the hope the planners would acknowledge that “from Lakeview to C-Hill on the west side of 395 is a fantastic master planned community. ... It would be nice to see that continue.” He discussed the “homogenization of America”; that every city “has to end up looking ... like every other city.” He expressed the hope the planners would consider what’s different about Carson City. In reference to the issue of affordable housing, he advised that Carson City is more affordable than Minden and South Reno. Dayton is more affordable than Carson City. Mr. Kittess advised that, regardless of the master plan, land prices will continue to increase. Expensive land results in expensive houses; cheap land results in offers for cheap housing. Mr. Kittess expressed the opinion that, as a builder, Carson City is “extremely accommodating” and that professional builders and developers are familiar with the processes. He suggested the City should not adjust its processes to become even more accommodating. He expressed the opinion the freeway will “kill off new, small businesses” in the downtown area.

Mr. Kittess expressed appreciation that the master plan time frame encompasses twenty years. He noted the existing plan had only been around for ten years, and that land use designations in the Lakeview area are proposed to be changed. He expressed the opinion “clustering belongs on level land. It’s very hard to cluster in the hillside.” He anticipates that the concept of clustering will result in more homeowners associations which, in turn, will result in more “vocal groups” in attendance at public meetings. He noted that the City Planning Division is not responsible for enforcing CC&Rs, but expressed the opinion it shouldn’t “make it more difficult.”

(7:41:38) LeAnn Saarem expressed the opinion that the many plans “out right now are quite overwhelming,” and a preference for things to slow down a little bit. She expressed appreciation for an earlier request to add language regarding equestrian use into the master plan. She discussed the unique, small-town aspect of Carson City, and expressed a preference for maintaining a rural feel. She discussed concerns over elements of the lands bill to allow subsequent disposal of certain lands. She agreed with opposition to urban sprawl, but expressed concern that property owners on the outer boundaries of town will look for growth into the future. Chairperson Peery explained the emphasis to not increase density in existing low density areas. The master plan contemplates higher densities in areas where it is more appropriate. Ms. Saarem expressed concern with regard to the future in that once densities have increased in certain areas, outward growth will be required and the City will lose its rural identity. Chairperson Peery advised the commission tries very hard to preserve the unique aspects of the City, especially those uses that the community finds special.

Mr. Herman referred to page 3.4, Goal 1.3, and explained the language discourages future disposal of state and federal lands, identified on the land use map, for private development. Transfer of such lands to City ownership for use as public facilities, parks, trails access, and similar functions is encouraged. He requested the commissioners and the public to consider the language and provide input with regard to its clarity. In response to a comment, Mr. Plemel explained there are a few federal properties identified for disposal into private hands for development. The lands to be transferred into City ownership, consistent with the land use plan for parks and trails, would be identified for specific uses that do not include economic or private development. If the lands are transferred to City ownership for open space, they shall be open space and it would take an additional act of Congress to change the purpose. Vice Chairperson Kimbrough advised that deed restrictions are included with federal lands transfers. He expressed the opinion it will be a great way for the City to manage lands contiguous to the community. Mr. Plemel

# **CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION**

## **Minutes of the December 7, 2005 Meeting**

### **Page 9**

acknowledged further clarification will be included in the lands bill. Commissioner Mullet discussed the importance of communicating community values to future generations.

(7:50:55) Dave Rollings echoed Mr. Brown's comments in support of extending the V&T Railway to Mills Park. He discussed the importance of dark skies friendly lighting in association with the freeway and signage adjacent to the freeway.

In response to a question, Mr. Plemel advised that the Nevada Revised Statutes provide for State government agencies to comply with local zoning ordinances. In response to a further question, he explained that the public land use designation relates to public zoning. Essentially everything which comes under the public designation is subject to a process for the requested use and specifies the public uses.

In reference to earlier comments, Mr. Burnham advised that City staff started the water and sewer master plans ahead of the comprehensive master plan process. The two plans have since been slowed in order to allow the comprehensive master plan process catch up. Capacities in and potential changes to the current master plan were considered, and a maximum population of about 80,000 was established. Infrastructure has been planned around this estimate. The water and sewer plans will comply with the land use plan, and Mr. Burnham suggested including language regarding the process. He advised the City has water rights sufficient for a population of 80,000. In response to a question, he advised that rates are always an issue; infrastructure costs are huge. Carson City's rates are usually at or below those in adjacent counties. Mr. Burnham acknowledged there will be rate increases in the near future. Staff is attempting to reduce the amount of anticipated increases. Infrastructure costs as well as water quality requirements, imposed by State and federal government, drive rates. Mr. Burnham acknowledged there is a sufficient amount of water to satisfy a population of 80,000.

In response to a question, Mr. Plemel advised that the land use designation reflects a conceptual Vicee Canyon plan as represented by the dashed outline on the map. The plan will need to be refined before adoption. Commissioner Mullet discussed the importance of conservation as a major goal in future planning. Chairperson Peery thanked staff, the consultants, and the public for their comments and input. Mr. Plemel thanked the public and the commissioners, and advised that public comment will continue to be received. He requested anyone interested in providing input to direct additional comments to the Planning Division.

**D. ACTION ON ADJOURNMENT (8:00:44)** - Commissioner Bisbee moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:00 p.m. Commissioner Mullet seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0.

The Minutes of the December 7, 2005 Carson City Planning Commission meeting are so approved this 22<sup>nd</sup> day of February, 2006.

---

JOHN PEERY, Chair