

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the May 31, 2006 Meeting

Page 1

A regular meeting of the Carson City Planning Commission was scheduled for 3:30 p.m. on Wednesday, May 31, 2006 in the Community Center Sierra Room, 851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada.

PRESENT: Chairperson John Peery
Vice Chairperson Mark Kimbrough
Connie Bisbee
Steve Reynolds
William Vance

STAFF: Walter Sullivan, Planning and Community Development Director
Lee Plemel, Principal Planner
Jennifer Pruitt, Senior Planner
Heidi Eskew-Herrmann, Associate Planner
Tom Grundy, Engineering Division Civil Design Supervisor
Michael Suglia, Senior Deputy District Attorney
Kathleen King, Recording Secretary

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

A. CALL TO ORDER, DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM, AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE (3:30:08) - Chairperson Peery called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. Roll was called; a quorum was present. Commissioners Mullet and Semmens were absent. Chairperson Peery led the pledge of allegiance.

B. COMMISSION ACTION ON APPROVAL OF MINUTES - April 26, 2006 (3:31:12) - Commissioner Bisbee moved to approve the minutes. Vice Chairperson Kimbrough seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

C. PUBLIC COMMENT (3:31:38) - David Smith, of 1050 Holly Way, referred to comments made at the April 26, 2006 commission meeting. He advised of having met with City representatives, and that "we continue to disagree over the matter." He requested an item to be agendized for a Planning Commission meeting. In response to a question, Mr. Smith advised of a grading permit issued for a project which should have required a special use permit. He advised that elevation of the property adjacent to his property has been raised approximately ten feet. He expressed the understanding the property owner intends to develop the property, and concern over issues of privacy and storm water runoff. In response to a question, he described the location of the subject property "between Arrowhead Drive, Old Hot Springs Road, and the subdivision off of Mark Way and Holly Way." Vice Chairperson Kimbrough requested Mr. Smith to develop a thorough report with photographs, "and make it so we can understand both sides." Mr. Smith advised of having spoken with Mr. Sullivan on two occasions, and expressed the opinion the commission is very fortunate to have him. Mr. Sullivan requested Mr. Smith to submit his position statement by the first week in June, and discussion took place with regard to the appropriate meeting date.

Chairperson Peery called for additional public comment; however, none was forthcoming.

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the May 31, 2006 Meeting

Page 2

D. MODIFICATIONS TO THE AGENDA (3:36:20) - Chairperson Peery advised of being on call, and that he may need to recess the meeting.

E. DISCLOSURES (3:36:53) - None.

F. CONSENT AGENDA (3:37:03) - None.

G. PUBLIC HEARING

G-1. ZCA-06-081 ACTION TO CONSIDER APPROVAL OF A ZONING CODE AMENDMENT AMENDING CARSON CITY MUNICIPAL CODE (“CCMC”) TITLE 18 ZONING, SECTION 18.04.020(6), BY ALLOWING DEVELOPMENT ON SPLIT-ZONED PARCELS WITH APPROVAL OF A SPECIAL USE PERMIT (3:37:57) - Chairperson Peery introduced this item, and Mr. Sullivan reviewed the staff report. Chairperson Peery called for public comment and, when none was forthcoming, entertained a motion. **Commissioner Reynolds moved to recommend to the Board of Supervisors approval of ZCA-06-081, an ordinance amending Carson City Municipal Code, Title 18, Zoning, Chapter 18.04, Use Districts, Section 18.04.020, Determination of Districts, to allow development on split-zoned parcels with approval of a special use permit. Commissioner Vance seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.**

G-2. SUP-06-068 ACTION TO CONSIDER A SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FROM R.O. ANDERSON ENGINEERING, INC. (PROPERTY OWNER: CARSON CITY CHRISTIAN FELLOWSHIP) TO ALLOW AN 18,036-SQUARE-FOOT CHURCH AND 16,850 SQUARE FEET OF CLASSROOMS, ON PROPERTY ZONED SINGLE FAMILY ONE ACRE (SF1A), LOCATED AT 1635 CLEARVIEW DRIVE, APN 010-191-14 (3:41:04) - Chairperson Peery introduced this item, and Ms. Eskew-Herrmann reviewed the staff report. She noted the written comments in opposition submitted by Michael and Theresa Thomas, distributed to the commissioners and staff prior to the start of the meeting. She further noted the conditions of approval included in the staff report. She advised that the applicant had met the findings, and noted staff’s recommendation of approval.

Vice Chairperson Kimbrough referred to condition of approval 28, and inquired as to the definition of “event.” Ms. Eskew-Herrmann provided background information on the condition of approval. She expressed the belief that events would be scheduled “after hours, in the evenings, or on the weekends.” Vice Chairperson Kimbrough expressed concern over use of the word “event.” Mr. Sullivan advised of residents along South Edmonds Drive who were concerned over late night activities at the church. Staff used the term “special event” in consideration of those types of activities. The purpose of the condition of approval was to acknowledge the property is adjacent to a residential zone. Vice Chairperson Kimbrough reiterated concern over further clarification of the type of activity which would constitute an “event.” Mr. Sullivan acknowledged that any event would be required to conclude by 11:00 p.m. Vice Chairperson Kimbrough expressed appreciation for the bicycle parking to be included as part of Phase I. In response to a question regarding condition of approval 33, Ms. Eskew-Herrmann advised that the special use permit is specified for the church and its associated uses. Any further division of the parcel or future residential development would be subject to a separate process. In response to a question, Mr. Sullivan expressed the belief there are other churches with the same requirement to conclude special events by 11:00 p.m.

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the May 31, 2006 Meeting

Page 3

(3:50:42) Carson City Christian Fellowship Senior Pastor Pat Propster acknowledged his agreement with the staff report. With regard to special events, he didn't foresee the congregation "doing too many things in the late evening." He anticipates once or twice a year events, such as praying in the New Year, which may last beyond 11:00 p.m. "The rest of the time it's just going to be the normal activities of a church fellowship ... very low impact." In response to a question, Pastor Propster advised that the largest vehicle anticipated to be parked on the property would be "a sixteen-passenger van or two." Chairperson Peery called for public comment.

(3:53:32) Sue Maiden advised that her property is located on the corner of Clearview and Northview, and expressed concern over potential increases in traffic. She inquired as to when the last traffic study was conducted on Clearview and Edmonds, Valley View, Koontz Lane, and who will control the speeding. She expressed concern over the lack of traffic patrol in the area, and joggers, motorcycles, bicyclists, and equestrians which use the area. Chairperson Peery deferred some of Ms. Maiden's questions to City staff. Ms. Maiden requested a traffic count between 6:00 a.m. and 9:30 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. to 6:30 p.m. Chairperson Peery expressed the opinion that the City Engineering Division would deem the traffic load, added to that which already exists in association with the subject project, as relatively insignificant. He requested Ms. Maiden to provide contact information in order for City staff to respond to her questions. Mr. Sullivan provided Ms. Maiden a copy of supplementary information regarding traffic counts, from R.O. Anderson Engineering, which was included in the agenda materials. He advised that concerns over road improvements would be deferred to the Streets Department. Enforcement of traffic laws is the responsibility of the Sheriff's Office. Mr. Grundy reviewed the report provided by R.O. Anderson Engineering. He acknowledged the accuracy of Chairperson Peery's earlier statement that the project will have a relatively insignificant impact on traffic flows.

Chairperson Peery called for additional public comment and, when none was forthcoming, entertained a motion. **Vice Chairperson Kimbrough moved to approve SUP-06-068, a special use permit application from Keith Ruben of R.O. Anderson Engineering, Inc., to allow phased construction of a church, classrooms, and a school facility, on property zoned single-family one-acre, SF1A, located at 1635 Clearview Drive, APN 010-191-14, based on seven findings and subject to the recommended conditions of approval contained in the staff report. Commissioner Bisbee seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.**

G-3. SUP-06-070 ACTION TO CONSIDER A SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FROM PEAK CONSULTING ENGINEERS, LLC (PROPERTY OWNER: LIBERTY HOMES, LLC) TO ALLOW TWO, FOUR-UNIT TOWNHOUSES, ON PROPERTY ZONED GENERAL COMMERCIAL (GC), LOCATED AT 4000 LEPIRE DRIVE, APN 010-351-03 (4:00:39) - Chairperson Peery introduced this item, and Ms. Eskew-Herrmann reviewed the staff report. She noted the property owner had hosted a neighborhood meeting to discuss the project, and invited adjacent property owners in the Sundance Ridge Phase I subdivision. She advised that findings had been met, and noted staff's recommended approval. She narrated pertinent photographs, and noted the renderings provided by the applicant which were displayed in the meeting room. In response to a question, Mr. Sullivan advised that grading the property was allowed based on the understanding the application is subject to commission approval.

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the May 31, 2006 Meeting

Page 4

(4:04:30) Keith Shaffer, of Peak Consulting Engineers representing Christian Funk, acknowledged his agreement with the staff report. Mr. Shaffer explained the reason for having proceeded with grading of the property. He advised of plans to raise the grade significantly to “get drainage out.” Drainage will come forward to the existing street and storm water facilities. The improvements to Lepire Drive, associated with Sundance Ridge Phase II, will take drainage to the existing facilities and mitigate drainage problems on the south end of Lepire Drive. In response to a question, Mr. Shaffer advised that the grade elevation will be raised two or three feet against the existing retaining walls, “whatever is necessary to make the lot higher in the back than it is in the front.” In response to a further question, he advised that infiltration basins will be included as part of the project. The developer will work closely with Engineering Division staff to ensure hydrology and drainage comply with City Code. Mr. Shaffer advised of having conducted a conceptual drainage study.

(4:08:57) Christian Funk provided background information on the project. In response to a question, he pointed out the location of a proposed fence. In response to a further question, he advised there are 20 feet in the back yards. Chairperson Peery opened this item to public comment.

(4:12:40) Richard Lund advised of having recently purchased a house on Sundance Court which “overlooks this project.” He expressed the opinion “this type of project would be a big improvement over what exists ...” He expressed support for the project.

Chairperson Peery called for additional public comment and, when none was forthcoming, entertained a motion. **Commissioner Bisbee moved to approve SUP-06-070, a special use permit application to allow the construction of an eight-unit townhouse complex, consisting of two four-plexes, on property zoned general commercial, located at 4000 Lepire Drive, APN 010-351-03, based on seven findings and subject to the conditions of approval contained in the staff report. Commissioner Vance seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.**

G-4. SUP-06-058 ACTION TO CONSIDER A SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FROM DAVID HAMLIN (PROPERTY OWNER: ROBERT E. AND JOYCE M. HAMLIN, ET AL.) TO ALLOW A GUEST DWELLING IN ADDITION TO THE MAIN RESIDENCE, ON PROPERTY ZONED SINGLE FAMILY ONE ACRE (SF1A), LOCATED AT 4322 VOLTAIRE STREET, APN 009-253-05 (4:14:42) - Chairperson Peery introduced this item. Mr. Sullivan reviewed the staff report, and noted three letters in support of the application distributed to the commissioners and staff prior to the start of the meeting. He recommended approval based on the findings contained in the staff report and the 13 conditions.

(4:16:28) Dave Hamlin acknowledged having reviewed the staff report and his agreement. Chairperson Peery opened this item to public comment and, when none was forthcoming, entertained a motion. **Commissioner Vance moved to approve SUP-06-058, a special use permit application from David Hamlin and owners Robert E. and Joyce M. Hamlin to allow an accessory building of 4,350 square feet, which exceeds 75 percent of the size of the primary structure and five percent of the parcel size, on property zoned single family one acre, located at 4322 Voltaire Street, APN 009-253-05, based on seven findings and subject to conditions of approval contained in the staff report. Commissioner Reynolds seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.**

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the May 31, 2006 Meeting

Page 5

G-5a. MPA-05-116 ACTION TO CONSIDER ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION 2006-PC-4 RECOMMENDING APPROVAL OF AN AMENDMENT TO A PREVIOUSLY DENIED MASTER PLAN AMENDMENT APPLICATION FROM WESTERN ENGINEERING (PROPERTY OWNER: BALDWIN, JANET TRUST 11/05/91) TO CHANGE THE MASTER PLAN LAND USE DESIGNATION OF APPROXIMATELY 1.23 ACRES OF THE SOUTHERN PORTION OF THE 2.09-ACRE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 1851 MERCURY WAY, APN 008-161-18, FROM MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL / MOBILE HOME TO COMMERCIAL; and G-5b. ZMA-05-117 ACTION TO CONSIDER AN AMENDMENT TO A PREVIOUSLY DENIED ZONING MAP AMENDMENT APPLICATION FROM WESTERN ENGINEERING (PROPERTY OWNER: BALDWIN, JANET TRUST 11/05/91) TO CHANGE THE ZONING OF APPROXIMATELY 1.23 ACRES OF THE SOUTHERN PORTION OF THE 2.09-ACRE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 1851 MERCURY WAY, APN 008-161-18, FROM MOBILE HOME 12,000 (MH12) TO GENERAL COMMERCIAL (GC), AND TO CHANGE APPROXIMATELY 0.85 ACRES OF THE NORTHERN PORTION OF THE PROPERTY FROM MOBILE HOME 12,000 (MH12) TO MOBILE HOME 6,000 (MH6) (4:18:30) - Chairperson Peery introduced these items. Mr. Plemel clarified the original application was submitted prior to adoption of the master plan and requested a change from medium density residential to commercial. The comprehensive master plan has since been adopted, designating that commercial portion of Highway 50 as mixed-use commercial. Mr. Plemel reviewed corresponding revisions to the recommended action. He reviewed the staff reports and oriented the commissioners to the subject property using pertinent slides. He reviewed the May 31, 2006 letter, from Greystone Development, LLC, which was distributed to the commissioners and staff prior to the introduction of this item. He noted, for the record, that conditions of approval cannot be placed on zoning map and master plan amendments. He advised that residential-only access onto Neptune Court and the commercial access only going back to Mercury Way and Highway 50 has been approved by the City Engineer. He noted staff's recommended approval of the amended application, as submitted.

In response to a question, Mr. Grundy described the function of a break-away gate. In response to a question, Mr. Plemel explained there are certain requirements where commercial development abuts residential property such as building setbacks and screening of parking areas. There are no specific requirements for a screen fence between the commercial and residential development. In response to a further question, Mr. Plemel reviewed property ownership in the area using a displayed parcel map. In response to a question, Mr. Sullivan pointed out the Lencioni property. He reiterated the requested requirements outlined in the Greystone Development LLC letter. In response to a further question, Mr. Plemel pointed out a 20-foot access easement, provided historic information on the issues associated with residential and commercial access, and explained resolution of those issues. In response to a question, Mr. Grundy advised that the 20-foot easement is suitable to serve the commercial development. In response to a further question, he advised that traffic to the north is mitigated by prohibiting commercial traffic from accessing Neptune Court. He advised that the access is required to be comprised of an all-weather surface. Chairperson Peery recessed the meeting at 4:40 p.m. and reconvened at 4:45 p.m.

(4:46:00) Dennis Smith, of Western Engineering representing Janet Baldwin, acknowledged having reviewed the staff reports and his agreement with the same. He provided an overview of the previous application, and revisions to the subject application. He advised that the "real issue is to limit access in the two directions and to protect the residential from the commercial." He explained that residential development on the property "would impact Neptune Court greatly." He pointed out a residential unit and two mobile homes on the property. He advised these residences will remain in the residential district and

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the May 31, 2006 Meeting

Page 6

be accessed from Neptune Court. The remainder of the property, comprised of 1.2 acres, is proposed for commercial development. Mr. Smith advised the location is more suitable for accessory commercial development than retail commercial development. There won't be a lot of traffic, and he agreed the 20-foot access easement is suitable. Mr. Smith advised that the property owner has discussed with the owner of Benson's Feed the possibility of increasing the access to 30 feet for the commercial. He referred to the letter from Greystone Development, and advised that the concerns listed therein will be considered in association with any development plan. He agreed to consider separating commercial and residential traffic, "especially along Mercury Way." He advised that a crash gate will be installed to limit access; there will be no traffic between the two uses. Buffering, access, and fencing can be addressed as part of the development plan. Mr. Smith expressed the opinion that the proposed development "fits in really well with the intent of a mixed-use zoning district." He acknowledged a stipulation to the concerns outlined in the Greystone Development letter. In response to a question, Mr. Smith advised that once the buffering and fencing is installed, access will be cut off.

(4:51:15) In response to a question, Janet Baldwin advised that children access the area via the Lencionis' private driveway. She expressed complete agreement to "trying to block that off down there." She advised of never having intended to provide commercial access from Neptune Court. She provided background information on the compromise associated with the revised application.

Chairperson Peery called for public comment and, when none was forthcoming, entertained additional comments, questions, or a motion. Mr. Plemel advised that a two-thirds majority of the commission was required to forward a recommendation of approval to the Board of Supervisors for master plan amendment. Commissioner Bisbee complimented staff, Ms. Baldwin, and adjacent property owners for working together to arrive at a compromise. Chairperson Peery agreed. **Commissioner Reynolds moved to recommend to the Board of Supervisors approval of MPA-05-116, a master plan amendment to change the land use designation of approximately 1.23 acres of the southerly portion of APN 008-161-18, from medium density residential to mixed-use commercial, based on the findings contained in the staff report. Vice Chairperson Kimbrough seconded the motion.** Mr. Suglia suggested including adoption of the resolution as part of the motion. **Commissioner Reynolds amended his motion to indicate adoption of resolution 2006-PC-4, recommending approval of an amendment to a previously denied master plan amendment application from Western Engineering, property owner Baldwin, Janet Trust 11/05/91, to change the master plan land use designation of approximately 1.23 acres of the southern portion of the 2.09-acre property, located at 1851 Mercury Way, APN 008-161-18, from medium density residential mobile home to mixed-use commercial. Vice Chairperson Kimbrough continued his second. Motion carried 5-0.**

Commissioner Reynolds moved to amend the previously decided zoning map amendment application from Western Engineering to change the zoning of approximately 1.23 acres of the southern portion of the 2.09-acre property located at 1851 Mercury Way, APN 008-161-18, from mobile home 12,000 to mobile home 6,000, and to change approximately 0.85 acres of the northern portion of the property from mobile home 12,000 to mobile home 6,000, based on the findings contained in the staff report. Commissioner Vance seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the May 31, 2006 Meeting

Page 7

G-6. ZMA-06-069 ACTION TO CONSIDER A ZONING MAP APPLICATION FROM SILVERSTATE CONSULTING (PROPERTY OWNER: STRENG, MARTIN K AND MICHELLE R; CARDINAL, DAVID AND RHONDA) TO CHANGE THE ZONING FROM SINGLE FAMILY ONE ACRE (SF1A) TO SINGLE FAMILY 12,000 (SF12), ON PROPERTY LOCATED AT 360 EAST OVERLAND STREET AND 329 EAST ROVENTINI WAY, APNs 009-173-04 AND -01 (4:58:22) - Chairperson Peery introduced this item. Mr. Plemel oriented the commissioners to the subject property using displayed slides, and reviewed the staff report. He noted staff's recommendation to deny the application, based on the discussion outlined in the staff report and given the surrounding zoning. He read into the record language contained in the staff report that the application "should only be considered concurrently with or subsequent to any potential rezoning of other properties surrounding the subject parcels in conformance with the Land Use Map to provide for zoning consistency and neighborhood compatibility."

Commissioner Vance agreed with staff's recommendation, and expressed disbelief that much of the vacant land in the area would be developed "as just one-acre lots." Mr. Plemel agreed the master plan identifies the long-range likelihood that the transition will take place. As part of the master plan update process and the policies considered, transition should be well thought out and compatibility maintained. Consideration should be given to existing neighborhoods in Carson City as transitions occur. In response to a question, Mr. Plemel referred to a map included in the agenda materials which highlights parcels in the area that are less than one acre. He explained that the one-acre parcels pre-date zoning in Carson City, and were created by the federal government. Mr. Sullivan provided historic information, and advised that the less-than-one-acre parcels were created prior to the 1973 parcel map law, with the exception of the development on Silver Sage Drive south of Koontz Lane.

Commissioner Reynolds agreed with the points outlined in the staff report, particularly that "just because something appeared to be or is spot zoned ... doesn't mean we should spot zone now." He commented on the "interesting chicken and egg situation" in that the future will most likely bring tighter density on the parcels. He inquired as to how many more parcels at one time should still be considered as not spot zoning. At Chairperson Peery's request, Mr. Plemel explained the differences between land use designation and zoning. He advised that the master plan is a long-range land use guide for future development. The zoning map provides specific entitlements and rights to certain types of development at certain densities on a property. The zoning map presently is not always consistent with the land use map. Mr. Plemel advised that the application represents an attempt to bring the parcels into conformance with the master plan. Existing zoning, in this instance, is a lower density than identified by the master plan. Mr. Plemel explained the process for amending a zoning map designation. Rezoning of property is proposed by application of a property owner. The City has not actively rezoned property with some exceptions identified in the recently adopted master plan. Mr. Plemel advised that a broad summary of "spot zoning is about treating somebody differently than the surrounding property owners and not having a logical transition of land uses." Higher density which occurs on properties adjacent to the subject property, from the Clearview Drive side or from the west, would be in a transition area between existing or remaining one-acre areas and higher density development. Chairperson Peery agreed with Commissioner Vance in that if this was really an issue, there would be quite a few people indicating opposition. In response to a question, Mr. Plemel was uncertain as to whether the property was designated as medium density prior to 1996.

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the May 31, 2006 Meeting

Page 8

(5:16:39) Julio Sandoval, of Silver State Consultants representing Mr. and Mrs. Martin Streng and Mr. and Mrs. Dave Cardinal, advised the subject parcels are “less than one acre in a one-acre zone.” He oriented the commissioners to the subject property using a displayed map. He defined a boundary south of East Roventini down to Snyder, between California and Silver Sage and advised there are twenty parcels in the area. Of those twenty parcels, eight are one acre or larger, and eight are less than three-quarters of an acre. Mr. Sandoval stated “no one wants to introduce the big, ugly gorilla that is spot zoning.” He described the area as a peninsula rather than an island in relationship to the master plan. He acknowledged having read the staff report and advised he did not agree with it. With respect to the zoning, he described the parcels as “an island closest to shore.” With regard to development of a transition zone, he expressed the opinion the parcels would “be the first in line to be considered the transition zone” as the northernmost and westernmost parcels that abut to the “higher designated land uses.” He expressed disbelief that the land designated as mixed-use residential in the new master plan would be developed as single-family, one-acre lots. He pointed out the Strengs’ and Cardinals’ parcels on a displayed map and advised they had owned these properties for 18 and 19 years, respectively. He further advised that the medium density residential designation has been in place for at least a decade. He reviewed changes which have taken place over the years, including development of Ross Gold Park, the Sunchase subdivision, and the freeway. He advised there were more than half of the adjacent property owners who could not have joined in on the application. He explained the application represents “two potentially additional parcels of approximately 19,600 feet.” He advised of having spoken to many of the adjacent property owners, and “not everybody wanted to take that on, but there were a lot of them that said, ‘Let me know how it turns out. I won’t oppose it.’” He expressed the opinion that the proposed zoning change will not “jeopardize the existing neighbors.” “To be first is not always the most popular, but in this instance, we’re talking a very small area of the first area that will be the transition zone.” Mr. Sandoval expressed the opinion that “easily with the setbacks and what can go on a 19,000-square-foot parcel, it will be compatible with those that have built ... basically splitting their lot.” “In a sense, it’s not why now but maybe why not now?”

In response to a question, Mr. Sandoval pointed out, on an aerial photograph, the properties of neighbors to whom he spoke. He advised that none of the neighbors objected outright. There was some concern with the SF12 designation until it was explained “well, there’s not an SF19.” In response to a further question, he advised most of the responses indicated “we don’t want to be involved but we’re in favor.” Commissioner Vance expressed an interest in having heard from the people that can’t do a lot split. In response to an earlier comment, he advised “it’s not the least bit unusual to get letters of support.”

(5:30:12) Martin Streng advised of having spoken with many of the neighbors, and that he has a “good rapport with all the neighbors.” He further advised of having met with no opposition, but explained the reason pursuing the application may not have been advantageous to the neighbor across the street. He advised of having “seen a big change” over the past eighteen years. He oriented the commissioners to his property using a displayed aerial photograph. He expressed the opinion that the zoning map amendment would be “advantageous to the neighbors, possibly clean up some vacant lots that have become eyesores. The City is in dire need of a couple of good building lots.” Chairperson Peery called for public comment.

(5:32:10) David Cardinal advised of having owned his property for 19 years. He was told “ten years after he built ... after he improved the water line that this would happen.” He advised that the sewer line has been installed. He further advised of no desire to build two small homes. He advised of having supported the Landmark Homes development “which improved the area.” He reviewed adjacent development, including the credit union, Wal-Mart, JC Penney. He advised of having “started this process”

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the May 31, 2006 Meeting

Page 9

approximately eight to ten years ago “but it wasn’t just for our two parcels, it was a complete zone change ... That was almost impossible.” He expressed support for horses and horse keeping in the area. He expressed the desire to build a larger home. He commented that the neighborhood is “great.” He expressed concern over the possibility of property to the north being rezoned for commercial development. He discussed development on adjacent property, and expressed support for the application.

(5:36:13) Keith Shaffer, a friend of Marty Streng, advised of having reviewed the staff report and expressed understanding for staff’s recommendation. He requested the commissioners to consider the possibility of marrying the concept of spot zoning with implementation of the master plan. He noted the commission had approved a master plan “that says sometime in the future we can anticipate that this is what the landscape is going to look like.” He inquired as to how implementation will take place “if you don’t allow the owners” to rezone. He suggested the commission could accomplish rezoning, that an independent entity could “get the whole area together ... to try to change it.” He referred to page 3 of the staff report, “Master Plan Policy Consistency” and read a portion of the same into the record. He read paragraph 9.4(b) of the master plan into the record, and noted that the master plan land use map “has the density on it that is being requested for zoning.” He read a portion of the Discussion paragraph, from page 2 of the staff report, into the record. He requested the commissioners’ consideration in light of the Strengs’ and Cardinals’ situations and the timing associated with implementation of the master plan.

Chairperson Peery called for additional public comment and, when none was forthcoming, requested individual input of the commissioners. In response to a question, Mr. Plemel advised that horse keeping requires one-acre zoning or larger. In response to a further question, he explained that the zoning designation allows horse keeping. The size of the parcel regulates the number of various types of animals allowed. In response to a further question, Mr. Plemel advised that the staff report is based objectively on the code regulations, policies of the master plan, and findings. Mr. Sullivan advised that two parcels would “end up with a spot zone.” Proper planning practices discourage against spot zoning. Mr. Sullivan further advised that a zoning map amendment can be requested by the property owner, this commission, or the Board of Supervisors. Avoiding “islands of zoning and incompatibility ... with adjacent neighbors” is the goal of planning and zoning.

Commissioner Bisbee expressed understanding for discouraging spot zoning, but inquired as to “why not now.” Mr. Sullivan acknowledged “the first application bears all the arrows.” He suggested that staff may have supported the application if more than two parcels had been included. He further suggested the commission could direct staff to consider additional parcels for potential rezoning. Chairperson Peery compared the situation to the previously presented “B portion” of the race track property, and suggested that more parcels should have been included with the subject application. He expressed the opinion the subject application represents an island and not a peninsula. “It could be made a peninsula if, in fact, there were enough properties to couple with this to do so.” Commissioner Reynolds commended staff on the staff report, and expressed support for amending the zoning map. He advised he would be more concerned if single-family, one-acre residences already existed. He expressed the opinion the vacant lots will not be developed as single-family, one-acre residences. He expressed agreement that individual ownership in such an area doesn’t result in “that big outpouring” of support. He expressed the opinion that the outpouring associated with the Race Track and Schulz Ranch proposal “was the fact that there were 512 homes dropping into the middle of this area. That’s a pretty big change.” He advised he would support the application. Vice Chairperson Kimbrough advised of having been convinced with “good arguments that explained some reasoning ...” He noted that the subject parcels are surrounded and have the “potential to

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the May 31, 2006 Meeting

Page 10

have this change without an impact on the neighborhood.” He advised he would support the application. Commissioner Bisbee expressed support for the concept, but the opinion it should “have come in as a bigger group.” Commissioner Vance advised he would support rezoning because there will most likely never be “another house built on a one-acre parcel down there on any of the vacant lots.” He expressed the opinion that this was anticipated in the master plan. He acknowledged it was not an easy decision, but expressed the opinion “it’s time to get this ball rolling.” Chairperson Peery entertained a motion. **Commissioner Reynolds moved to recommend to the Board of Supervisors approval of ZMA-05-117, a zoning map amendment to change the zoning of property located at 329 East Roventini and 360 East Overland, APNs 009-173-01 and -04, from single-family, one acre to single-family 12,000, based on findings for approval in the staff report and discussion at this meeting. Vice Chairperson Kimbrough seconded the motion. Motion carried 4-1.**

G-7. MPA-06-059 A MASTER PLAN AMENDMENT APPLICATION FROM WEISE TRUST (PROPERTY OWNER: WEISE TRUST) TO CHANGE THE MASTER PLAN LAND USE DESIGNATION OF APPROXIMATELY 144 ACRES, LOCATED EAST OF LAKEVIEW ROAD AND COMBS CANYON ROAD AT THE TERMINUS OF BUCKSKIN ROAD, APNs 007-091-71, -73, AND -77, FROM RURAL RESIDENTIAL (FIVE ACRES PER DWELLING UNIT) TO LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (0.3 TO FIVE ACRES PER DWELLING UNIT) AND CONSERVATION RESERVE (20 ACRES PER DWELLING UNIT). (THE CURRENT ZONING OF THE PROPERTY IS SINGLE-FAMILY ONE ACRE); and G-8. MPA-06-060 A MASTER PLAN AMENDMENT APPLICATION FROM DAN JENKINS (PROPERTY OWNER: JENKINS, DANIEL AND LORI, ET AL.) TO CHANGE THE MASTER PLAN LAND USE DESIGNATION OF APPROXIMATELY 60 ACRES LOCATED EAST OF LAKEVIEW ROAD AND COMBS CANYON ROAD, EAST OF THE TERMINUS OF BUCKSKIN ROAD, APN 007-091-74, FROM RURAL RESIDENTIAL (FIVE ACRES PER DWELLING UNIT) TO LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (0.3 TO FIVE ACRES PER DWELLING UNIT) AND CONSERVATION RESERVE (20 ACRES PER DWELLING UNIT). (THE CURRENT ZONING OF THE PROPERTY IS SINGLE-FAMILY ONE ACRE) (5:55:29) - Chairperson Peery introduced these items. Mr. Sullivan reviewed the staff reports, and narrated pertinent slides. He advised of having received a phone call from a Lakeview resident, and noted the gentleman was in the audience. Mr. Plemel noted the letter of objection included in the agenda materials, as part of item G-8. In response to a question, Mr. Plemel explained the method by which the land use map was generated. In response to a further question, he noted that the applications were associated with the master plan and not zoning. Commissioner Reynolds referred to the letter of objection and read a portion of the same into the record. Mr. Sullivan acknowledged the request was for a master plan amendment and not rezoning, and provided background information with regard to the same. He responded to questions regarding the conservation reserve designation.

(6:09:00) Grant Weise advised that his property has been held in trust for approximately twenty years, and that he was recently appointed as the trust administrator. He advised that the notification had mistakenly been sent to the previous trust administrator, and that he only “found out about it just prior to approval” of the land use map. He further advised that his family developed Lakeview Estates and that the subject property was a piece of the original development which was set aside with special instructions for the trustees. He requested that the current one-acre zoning remain. He provided historic information on his family’s acquisition of the property. He requested the commission’s consideration of the requested amendment. He acknowledged his agreement with the staff report.

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the May 31, 2006 Meeting

Page 11

Chairperson Peery opened this item to public comment. (6:12:15) Bruce Kittess, 4401 Levi Gulch, expressed confusion over the relationship between the master plan and zoning. He referred to the 1996 land use map, reviewed figures associated with suburban residential, open space, and rural residential designations, and discussed zoning entitlement. He noted that Lakeview Estates has CC&Rs. He stated, "You can't go back to what it was because there is no more suburban residential; there is no more open space reserve because you've deleted those. The RR, which was 3-10 acres per dwelling unit, is now 5-20." Mr. Kittess expressed understanding for the applicant's position that the master plan has been changed in "the opposite direction" and for the concern the applicant's property may be down zoned. He noted that property on Combs Canyon Road had been changed from suburban residential, 1-3 acres per unit, to low density. "You took 1500 acres with this and 300 percent increase. That's what you did when you deleted suburban residential and made it all low density." Mr. Kittess suggested considering the number of acres of low density residential proposed may be "more acres than the suburban residential you had before. You've made it bigger." He reviewed the provisions of the Lakeview Estates CC&Rs with regard to further subdivision of land.

(6:19:45) Jacqueline Wyatt advised that neither she nor her neighbors had received notification of this hearing. She requested a listing of those people who were notified, and the commissioners to look into the issue of adequate public notification.

In response to a question, Mr. Sullivan advised that 30 property owners within 313 feet of the property which is the subject of item G-7 were notified. The requirement is within 300 feet; however, the Planning and Community Development Division ensures that 30 unique property owners are notified. With regard to item G-8, Mr. Sullivan advised that 30 property owners were noticed within 1,000 feet of the subject area. Ms. Wyatt reiterated her request for a list of the property owners notified, and Mr. Sullivan agreed to provide it. In response to a question, Ms. Wyatt advised that her property adjoins the subject property. She further advised that the subject property is very steep with "tremendous boulders." She expressed concern over flooding issues and infringing on wildlife habitat.

(6:28:09) Frank DiMartino, a co-owner of the Jenkins property, advised that he had not been informed of the proposed master plan change. He provided background information on acquisition of the property, and advised of no intention to "put 60 houses" on the property.

(6:29:05) Dan Jenkins provided background information on purchase of the property, and advised of never having been notified of the proposed change. He further advised of plans for development, and that a conceptual plan is in the process of being developed. "The constraints up there are such that there's a limited amount of units that are going to be up there." Mr. Jenkins expressed the opinion that the development will be "pretty restricted."

(6:30:27) Fred Welden, of 3688 Lakeview Road, provided written comments to the commissioners and staff and reviewed the same.

(6:35:13) Randy Schlaffer, of 3683 Lakeview Road representing his family, advised of having received notice of this hearing approximately ten days ago. He further advised of having contacted the Planning and Community Development Division and of having left a detailed telephone message for Mr. Sullivan. He further advised he was representing Don and Julie Bray, of 4281 Weise Road, who did not receive notification. In response to a question, Chairperson Peery advised the subject item is a request for a master

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the May 31, 2006 Meeting

Page 12

plan change. Mr. Schlaffer advised of having canvassed his neighborhood, and expressed confusion over Mr. Jenkins' statement that "he has a plan submitted." He expressed concern over lack of notification to affected residents. He advised his is "the only property on Buckskin;" that he has the "only access." He expressed confusion over the number of potential lots, slope, whether a plan has been submitted, traffic, ingress / egress, and fire protection. He reviewed documents he had researched.

(6:42:30) Eagle Valley Children's Home Executive Director Pamela Smith expressed concern over the conservation reserve designation on the eastern border of the subject parcel, as it travels parallel with the railroad tracks and, therefore, above and across the western portion of Eagle Valley Children's Home property. She expressed additional concern over a secondary access which "might impinge on our property and present a new problem ... on the eastern side." She expressed additional concern over a strip of land, on the northern portion of the parcel, which may be used for low density residential development. She advised that the area is "immediately above and tributary to Eagle Valley Creek;" that the Eagle Valley Children's Home has water rights and water use there. She expressed concern over water quality and quantity which may be impacted by runoff or usage. She expressed no opposition to the master plan amendment, but wanted to place the concerns on the record in the event of future development.

(6:44:35) Jim Patridge, of 3675 Lakeview Road, advised his property is directly adjacent to the Weise property. He further advised of having attended this meeting because the newspaper reported the item as a zoning change. He expressed a strong belief in private property rights, and that the property owners have the right to develop their land. He expressed understanding that the suburban residential designation was eliminated, and suggested it "puts you ... in an either / or situation." He expressed no opposition to one acre or larger home sites. He expressed opposition to home sites of 1/3 acre which brings in other issues of traffic, fire prevention, runoff, etc. He expressed concern over granting the master plan change with the potential for 1/3 acre lots, that the owners would be tempted to submit planned unit developments "to make the land more valuable for them." He suggested holding master plan changes until such time as a development proposal could be reviewed and "tie that to whether a zoning change is needed or not."

(6:47:32) Al Fiegehen, of 4200 Weise Road, advised of not having received a notice of this hearing, but of having heard about it through friends. He further advised of having spoken to other Lakeview residents who did not receive notification. He expressed the opinion that everyone should be noticed in an area with the density of Lakeview Estates. He expressed the further opinion that the room would have been filled. He expressed the belief that allowing 1/3 acre lots will ensure development of 1/3 acre lots.

Chairperson Peery closed public comment and expressed appreciation for the comments presented. He entertained additional comments, questions or a motion from the commissioners. He requested staff to reiterate the purpose of these items. Mr. Sullivan explained the request to change the master plan designation to low density residential which has a range of land use districts of 1/3-acre to five acres. The property is zoned one acre, inclusive of the low density residential category. Mr. Sullivan emphasized that zoning will not be changed. This item considers changing the master plan designation to low density residential and conservation reserve. Conservation reserve is at a much lower density than low density residential. The very steep areas would be zoned conservation reserve to limit development. Low density residential would be designated in the "flatter" areas. Mr. Sullivan emphasized the subject item does not represent a subdivision request. At Chairperson Peery's request, Mr. Sullivan advised the current zoning is single-family, one-acre over the entire property. Chairperson Peery advised that zoning could affect the residents by going to as little as 1/3 acre. Mr. Sullivan explained that anything more or less than one acre

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the May 31, 2006 Meeting

Page 13

would require a zoning change, which would also require the noticing process. He reiterated staff's process for noticing at least 30 unique property owners. He acknowledged that the notification list could be made available to the public. He explained the requirement to follow the statutory notification process. Vice Chairperson Kimbrough commented that the City's proposal for the master plan designated the land use at five-acre zoning. He expressed the opinion this may have caused some confusion, and that "it had to be changed to bring it back to the one-acre lots." He expressed the further opinion that it would be ludicrous for a developer to propose 1/3 acre lots in the area. He noted the Weise family's strong commitment to their land, and advised that this item attempts to protect the value of the land.

Chairperson Peery entertained a motion. **Commissioner Bisbee moved to adopt resolution 2006-PC-5, recommending approval of MPA-06-059 to the Board of Supervisors, a master plan amendment request to change the master plan land use designation of approximately 144 acres located east of the Lakeview Estates subdivision, APNs 007-091-71, -73, and -77, from rural residential to low density residential and conservation reserve, as presented with this application, based on the discussion and findings contained in the staff report and further substantiated by the public hearing record. Commissioner Reynolds seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.**

Commissioner Vance moved to adopt Resolution 2006-PC-6, recommending approval of MPA-06-060 to the Board of Supervisors, a master plan amendment request to change the master plan land use designation of approximately 60 acres located east of Lakeview Estates subdivision, APN 007-091-74, from rural residential to low density residential and conservation reserve, as presented with this application, based on the discussion and findings contained in the staff report and further substantiated by the public hearing record. Commissioner Bisbee seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

(7:00:04) Mr. Sullivan advised that these items would be presented to the Board of Supervisors at their second meeting in June.

G-9. SUP-06-051 ACTION TO CONSIDER A SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FROM OXOBY ARCHITECTURE (PROPERTY OWNER: STATE OF NEVADA) TO ALLOW EXPANSION OF THE NEVADA STATE MUSEUM BUILDING, INCLUDING AN ADA ENTRANCE STRUCTURE, GALLERY SPACE, AND CONNECTIVITY BETWEEN TWO BUILDINGS, ON PROPERTY ZONED PUBLIC (P) / DOWNTOWN COMMERCIAL (DC), LOCATED AT 600 NORTH CARSON STREET AND 706 NORTH CARSON STREET, APNs 003-283-05, AND -06 (6:59:22) - Chairperson Peery introduced this item. (7:00:18) Ms. Pruitt reviewed the staff report. She advised that the project was approved by the Historic Resources Commission in April. The project was also reviewed and approved by staff of the State Historic Preservation Office. Ms. Pruitt reviewed dimensions of the proposed addition, and narrated pertinent slides. She advised that the applicant had made the necessary findings, and of staff's recommended approval.

(7:04:39) Robbie Oxoby, of Oxoby Architecture, acknowledged having reviewed the staff report and his agreement with the same. He distributed to the commissioners and staff a smaller version of a displayed drawing. He thanked Ms. Pruitt and Mr. Sullivan for their assistance in developing the application. He expressed concurrence with staff's recommendation for approval and with the conditions of approval. He provided background information on the proposed design. He noted that the addition will provide the Nevada State Museum with a passenger elevator and a legal ADA entrance. The mine exit structure will

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the May 31, 2006 Meeting

Page 14

be eliminated, and a legal ADA exit added. Mr. Oxoby provided an overview of a second project, including site work and bus drop off improvements. He noted the State's willingness to work on historic buildings, and advised of having worked on the Laxalt Building, the old State Library, the Carson City Courthouse, the Capitol Annex, and the exterior of the Nevada State Museum. He expressed the opinion the addition will contribute to the building's attractiveness, and will make access to the Museum's resources easier for Museum staff and the general public.

Vice Chairperson Kimbrough noted the importance of the building to downtown Carson City. He expressed appreciation for the State's investment. Chairperson Peery opened this item to public comment and, when none was forthcoming, entertained a motion. **Vice Chairperson Kimbrough moved to approve SUP-06-051, a special use permit application from Jeff Resler / Oxoby Architecture to allow development and construction of a 3,000-square-foot ADA entrance and gallery structure that will connect the existing Calhoun Building to the south with the FIB building to the north; in addition to removal of the mine exit structure, a new underground exit tunnel will be connected to the proposed entrance structure, on property zoned public / downtown commercial, located at 600 and 706 North Carson Street, APN 003-283-05 and 003-283-06, based on seven findings and subject to the recommended conditions of approval contained in the staff report. Commissioner Vance seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.**

G-10. TSM-06-061 ACTION TO CONSIDER A TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP APPLICATION KNOWN AS ARROWHEAD COMMERCE PARK FROM ARROWHEAD COMMERCE PARK LLC (PROPERTY OWNER: LSP PRODUCTS GROUP, INC.) TO ALLOW AN INDUSTRIAL SUBDIVISION DEVELOPMENT OF 5.39± ACRES INTO 15 LOTS, ON PROPERTY ZONED LIMITED INDUSTRIAL (LI), LOCATED AT 3655 AND 3675 ARROWHEAD DRIVE, APN 008-204-08 (7:13:11) - Chairperson Peery introduced this item. Ms. Pruitt noted, for the record, the correct name of Eagle Valley Commerce Center. She advised of two conditions of approval, specifically number 4 and number 18, which are the same. She reviewed the staff report and narrated pertinent slides. She referred to the findings included in the staff report, and advised of staff's recommendation of approval.

Commissioner Vance suggested adding a condition of approval with regard to lighting. Ms. Pruitt advised that discussions regarding lighting had taken place during the major project and conceptual review processes. She agreed that adding a condition of approval with regard to lighting would be reasonable. In response to a question, she explained the intent of condition of approval #5. In response to a question, Mr. Grundy advised that results of the traffic study indicate traffic will not be an issue with the development, as designed.

(7:23:30) Paul Kinne, of Panattoni Development Company, advised of having reviewed the recommended conditions of approval. He requested clarification of condition of approval #4. Mr. Grundy explained the requirement to bond before construction of improvements. In response to a statement by the applicant, he advised that, given none of the site improvements will be dedicated to the City, the last sentences of condition numbers 4 and 18 could be stricken. Mr. Sullivan suggested deleting condition of approval #18 since it read exactly the same as condition of approval #4. Mr. Kinne provided an overview of the proposed project. He noted the benefit of providing small business owners the opportunity to own their buildings. In response to a question, he provided the square footage of the various buildings. He acknowledged that a building owners association will be designed, and explained the dynamics and mechanism of the same.

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the May 31, 2006 Meeting

Page 15

He further acknowledged that CC&Rs will be recorded for the association. He responded to additional questions regarding methods by which business compatibility is addressed, and the developers' role in the building owners association until one year after the certificate of occupancy is issued or all the units are sold. Mr. Kinne acknowledged his agreement and stipulated to complying with City lighting standards.

Chairperson Peery opened this item to public comment and, when none was forthcoming, entertained additional comments, questions, or a motion. **Commissioner Bisbee moved to approve TSM-06-61, a tentative subdivision map for an industrial subdivision, Eagle Valley Commerce Center, from Lumos and Associates, consisting of 14 industrial lots and common open space on 5.39 acres, located at 3675 Arrowhead Drive, APN 008-204-08, based on twelve findings and subject to the recommended conditions of approval contained in the staff report, to include the lighting requirements, as discussed. Commissioner Reynolds seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.**

(7:33:40) Chairperson Peery recessed the meeting and the Planning Commission to reconvene as the Growth Management Commission. (7:49:20) Chairperson Peery reconvened as the Growth Management Commission.

G-11. GROWTH MANAGEMENT PRESENTATION BY ED JAMES REGARDING REGIONAL WATER (7:49:40) - Carson Water Subconservancy District ("CWSD") General Manager Ed James introduced himself, for the record, and provided background information on the CWSD and its purpose. He narrated a PowerPoint presentation, copies of which were distributed to the commissioners and staff. He responded to questions regarding water appropriation, and the differences between surface and ground water. In response to a further question, he explained the function and location of induction wells. Discussion took place regarding the Lahontan Reservoir. Mr. James responded to additional questions regarding the Southern Nevada Water Authority, recreational aspects of water management, agricultural water rights in Douglas County, and protection of groundwater resources. He commented that Carson City has good quality water, and commended City staff on protecting water resources. In response to a comment regarding federal government requirements, he discussed total maximum daily loads as an example. He advised that many standards placed on the Carson River were "east coast standards" which are not appropriate here. He referred to Indian Creek, as an example, which has a "regulation that has a ... number to achieve that doesn't look at the reality of water for fish." In response to a further question, he advised that projected growth in the Dayton corridor shouldn't affect Carson City directly. It will impact the overall area in consideration of growth. The CWSD is considering the issue on a region-wide basis. Chairperson Peery thanked Mr. James for his presentation.

G-12. GM-06-038 ACTION ON CARSON CITY'S 2006 GROWTH MANAGEMENT PROGRAM TO RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS A GROWTH MANAGEMENT RESOLUTION FOR THE SELECTION OF A GROWTH MANAGEMENT RATE, NUMBER OF RESIDENTIAL BUILDING PERMIT ENTITLEMENTS, AND TO SET THE COMMERCIAL WATER USAGE PER DAY THRESHOLD LIMIT AND OTHER MATTERS RELATED THERETO (8:26:21) - Chairperson Peery introduced this item. Ms. Pruitt referred to the Growth Management Status Report which was included in the agenda materials. She thanked the various City, State and private agency representatives who provide input into preparing the Growth Management Status Report (the "Report"). She noted the Report is a collaborative effort, and reviewed the same. She noted staff's recommended action, and reviewed the supplemental information provided to the commissioners and staff prior to the start of the meeting.

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the May 31, 2006 Meeting

Page 16

Mr. Sullivan commended Ms. Pruitt on coordinating development and production of the Report. He provided an overview of the same, and reviewed the four recommendations outlined therein. In response to a question, he advised of wells which are in the process of being open to production. There are budgetary constraints to consider, however, in addition to issues with equipment and State agency requirements. In response to a question regarding peak water demands, Mr. Grundy advised of a general trend for drilling wells at a faster rate. Some of the wells have not been as productive as had been anticipated. Chairperson Peery discussed factors involved in establishing a growth rate, including outstanding building permits and sufficient water to meet the demands of the highest potential growth rate. Mr. Grundy acknowledged "we're making progress."

In response to a question, Mr. Sullivan referred to Exhibits B and C of the April 24, 2006 letter from Public Works Operations Manager Tom Hoffert. In response to a further question, he discussed the need for additional infrastructure to fully integrate water into the Eagle Valley. He advised Planning staff relies on Public Works Department review for any type of proposed development. Commissioner Vance expressed concern over negative numbers if the allocation "for some reason went to full bore." He suggested seriously considering additional development over the next 18 months. Mr. Sullivan referred to Mr. Hoffert's report, and noted the indication that sufficient water and infrastructure are available to support the 3% growth limit. He acknowledged that the growth limit is set higher than what is actually expected "just in case there's a spike." He advised that, since 1988, there has only been one year which approached anywhere near a build out at 94%. Most other years are in the 50-60% range. The last three years have been below 30%. Mr. Sullivan explained a recent building permit allocation for the Autumn Village I development in response to a further question. Commissioner Reynolds expressed the opinion that area economics keep the growth limit below 3%. He agreed with the likelihood that growth will not exceed 3%, and expressed confidence in the City department representatives' analyses indicating sufficient water and infrastructure. Mr. Sullivan explained the extent to which the City's water tanks are recharged just by prohibiting watering on Mondays. Chairperson Peery opened this item to public comment.

(8:54:40) Builders Association of Western Nevada Governmental Affairs Representative Sheena Beaver read into the record a letter, dated May 31, 2006, the original of which she provided to the recording secretary. She acknowledged the benefit to builders and developers of keeping the growth limit at 3%.

Chairperson Peery called for additional public comment and, when none was forthcoming, entertained additional questions, comments, or a motion. **Commissioner Reynolds moved to recommend approval of the 3% maximum growth rate for 2007, based on option 1, setting the year 2007 building permit number at 715 residential building permits, and the 2008 maximum building permit number at 721 residential permits, and the commercial / industrial threshold limit shall be 7,500 gallons per day of water usage. Vice Chairperson Kimbrough seconded the motion.** At Mr. Sullivan's request, **Commissioner Reynolds included in his motion the resolution number R-2005. Vice Chairperson Kimbrough continued his second. Motion carried 5-0.**

Chairperson Peery adjourned the Growth Management Commission at 8:58 p.m. and reconvened the Planning Commission. Following discussion regarding the previous motion, Chairperson Peery recessed the Planning Commission at 8:59 p.m. and reconvened the Growth Management Commission. **Commissioner Reynolds amended his motion to change the resolution number to 2006-5. Vice Chairperson Kimbrough continued his second. Motion carried 5-0.** Chairperson Peery adjourned the Growth Management Commission at 8:59 p.m. and reconvened the Planning Commission.

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the May 31, 2006 Meeting

Page 17

H. REPORTS

H-1. COMMISSIONER REPORTS / COMMENTS (9:00:29) - In response to a question, Mr. Sullivan explained the purpose of item G-7, agendaized as part of the April 26th commission meeting. He advised that no application had yet been submitted. Vice Chairperson Kimbrough expressed concern over the nature of the presentation. In response to a question, Mr. Suglia advised of his recommendation that the commission exercise caution with regard to extended discussion of any matter under this item of the agenda. In response to a further question, Mr. Sullivan explained that the strip mall development, adjacent to the Wal-Mart store, was not subject to special use permit review. Color schemes, therefore, can be suggested but not mandated. Commissioner Bisbee expressed opposition to the color scheme.

H-2. STAFF REPORTS / COMMENTS

REPORT ON BOARD OF SUPERVISORS' ACTION ON PRIOR PLANNING COMMISSION APPLICATIONS (9:07:47) - Mr. Sullivan reported that the zoning map amendment for the parcel adjacent to the freeway and Highway 50 was unanimously approved by the Board of Supervisors on second reading. An historic tax deferment was unanimously approved. A presentation on the certified local government grants program was made by the Historic Resources Commission, and Historic Preservation Awards were made by the Board of Supervisors. The public right-of-way application for Robert Piccolo was unanimously approved by the Board of Supervisors. The code text amendment was also unanimously approved.

NON-ACTION DISCUSSION BETWEEN THE PLANNING COMMISSION AND PLANNING STAFF REGARDING DRAFT DEVELOPMENT REVIEW CHECKLISTS FOR REVIEW OF DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS WITH REGARD TO COMPLIANCE WITH ADOPTED MASTER PLAN POLICIES (9:09:33) - Mr. Sullivan requested the commissioners to retain, for future reference, the agenda materials pertinent to this item. He requested the commissioners to contact Planning and Community Development staff with questions.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS - None.

I. ACTION ON ADJOURNMENT (9:10:27) - Vice Chairperson Kimbrough moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:10 p.m. Commissioner Reynolds seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0.

The Minutes of the May 31, 2006 Carson City Planning Commission meeting are so approved this 26th day of July, 2006.

JOHN PEERY, Chair