A regularly scheduled meeting of the Carson City Regional Planning Commission was held on Wednesday, August 28, 1996, at the Community Center Sierra Room, 851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada, beginning at 3 p.m.

PRESENT: Chairperson Alan Rogers, Vice Chairperson Vern Horton, and Commissioners Allan Christianson, William Mally, Archie Pozzi, Deborah Uhart, and Richard Wipfli

STAFF PRESENT: Community Development Director Walter Sullivan, Public Works Director Jay Aldean, Public Health Officer Daren Winkelman, Deputy District Attorney Mark Forsberg, Principal Planner Rob Joiner, Senior Planner Juan Guzman, Associate Planner Tara Hullinger, and Recording Secretary Katherine McLaughlin (R.P.C. 8/28/96 Tape 1-0001.5)

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

A. ROLL CALL, DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM, AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE - Chairperson Rogers convened the meeting at 3 p.m. Roll call was taken. A quorum was present although Commissioners Mally, Uhart, and Wipfli had not yet arrived. Chairperson Rogers lead the Pledge of Allegiance.

B. COMMISSION ACTION - APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR THE SPECIAL MEETINGS OF APRIL 10, MAY 6, AND JUNE 20, 1996 (1-0012.5) - (Commissioner Mally arrived at 3:02 p.m. during Chairperson Rogers' reading of the title. A quorum was present as indicated.) Commissioner Horton moved to recommend approval of the April 10, May 6, and June 20 Minutes as presented. Commissioner Christianson seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0-0-2.

C. PUBLIC COMMENT (1-0025.5) - None.

D. AGENDA MODIFICATIONS (1-0034.5) - None. (Commissioner Wipfli arrived at 3:05 p.m. during Chairperson Rogers' reading of this title. A quorum was present as indicated.)

E. CONSENT AGENDA (1-0036.5)

E-1. U-92/93-2 - DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON A REVIEW OF A PREVIOUSLY APPROVED SPECIAL USE PERMIT FROM ART PONTIUS

E-2. AB-96/97-2 - DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON AN ABANDONMENT REQUEST FROM HANS HANKE - Loreen Hautekeet requested Item E-2 be pulled for discussion. Clarification indicated that anyone wishing to make comments during an agendized item should hold the remarks until the item is being considered. Commissioner Horton moved to approve Item E-1, U-92/93-2, as presented on the Consent Agenda. Commissioner Christianson seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0.

E-2. AB-96/97-2 - DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON AN ABANDONMENT REQUEST FROM HANS HANKE (1-0070.5) - Senior Planner Juan Guzman and Loreen Hautekeet - Mr. Guzman's introduction explained the Statutes requiring payment for the abandonment unless the original property had been dedicated to the City at no cost. The applicant has provided documentation to the City indicating the property had been dedicated, therefore, there will not be a charge for the property. Clarification indicated the last sentence of Condition 1 could be removed. Ms. Hautekeet explained the reasons a title search could not be performed. Only the map, which Mr. Guzman had previously explained, could be filed. She requested Condition 1 be removed in its entirety. Public testimony was solicited but none given. Mr. Guzman requested the first sentence of Condition 1 be retained. Ms. Hautekeet agreed to the amended Condition 1. Commissioner Christianson moved to approve the motion to recommend that the Board of Supervisors approve AB-96/97-2 from the Hautekeet Family Trust, an abandonment of a portion of the right-of-way for Curry Street, consisting of approximately eight feet in width by 183.52 feet in length as well as an abandonment of a portion of the right-of-way for Sophia Street consisting of approximately eight feet in width by 86.57 feet in length, adjacent to APN 1-184-01 and 03, based on two findings and subject to four conditions of approval contained in the staff report and with the understanding that any acknowledgements to the Commission by the applicant may be considered as further stipulations or conditions of approval on this application with Condition No. 1 being changed to read: Prior to the Board of Supervisors review and action on said abandonment, the applicant shall be responsible for the submittal of all necessary legal documentation and title search material, if required by the Community Development Department, in order to fully complete the abandonment process. Commissioner Horton seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0. Community Development Director Sullivan indicated the Board of Supervisors will consider this item on September 19.

F. PUBLIC HEARINGS

F-1. U-96/97-9 - DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON A SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FROM RICHARD SCOTT (1-0170.5) - Associate Planner Tara Hullinger, Public Works Director Jay Aldean, Richard Scott, Greta Pepper, Nora Chipman, Terry Kuha, Helen Marsden, Mr. Sullivan, Property Owner Shirley Wilson - Discussion between Ms. Hullinger and the Commission indicated the six foot sight-obscuring fence would be required on all the property lines except Airport Road. The Airport Authority will consider the proposal. Staff did not think that the Authority would have a problem with the proposed height. Ms. Hullinger indicated a desire to have a "decorative fence" and had left the fence requirement rather vague for that reason. Mr. Aldean explained the concerns with the northern entrance to the parcel. NDOT will have some requirements. The Graves Lane extension may reduce the Airport Road traffic volume. This may reduce the access concerns, however, staff felt that it could be configured differently. Chairperson Rogers felt that any adjustment would negatively impact the landscaping. Ms. Hullinger noted the condition requiring another Planning Commission review if there is a significant design change. Chairperson Rogers then explained his desire to have covered parking. Ms. Hullinger indicated that this condition could be added to the Special Use Permit although the present Code does not require it.

(1-0312.5) Mr. Scott indicated that he is substantially in agreement with the staff report. He had met with staff on the access point from Airport Road. He felt that if the access was moved to the middle, the amount of asphalt could be reduced. This will increase the landscaping by 4500 square feet and necessitate a redesign of the project to place the parking lot in the middle and the buildings on the sides. He hoped that this would not require a return to the Commission. He noted that staff had worked hard to help him develop an acceptable plan for the property. He then explained a drainage problem created by having the street three feet higher than the property. Curb and gutters will require a lot of fill and impede water draining from the site. Therefore, he requested a waiver of the requirement for curb, gutters, and sidewalks and that the water continue to drain as it presently does rather than constructing an island for drainage into the street. He was willing to accept all of the other staff conditions. He had agreed with staff's conditions concerning the sight-obscuring fencing, wood, any pattern desired or incorporate in the landscaping a trellis or chainlink with slat fence. He was willing to install whatever type the landscape the architect and staff develop. Discussion indicated there would be parking for 32 or 34 cars on a "back to back" basis. Mr. Scott indicated he was willing to work out the geometry of the parking lot on the north side with staff or move the parking to the middle and increase the landscaping by 4500 square feet. The difference in traffic movements were noted.

(1-0398.5) Ms. Pepper opposed the project based on traffic, safety, noise and density. Ms. Chipman opposed the project as the drainage would run into her backyard. She also felt that the candidates for office opposed additional growth as it does not pay its own way. The area is becoming more and more compacted. The East side of Airport does not have any multi-family housing units at this time. Approval of this project will open the door for additional units. She urged the Commission to maintain the Master Plan and change the zoning. Traffic problems encountered at the site now were noted to illustrate her concerns. A two-story, 32 car development is not appropriate for this site. The area is mainly single family one-story residences. The proposal is spot zoning. Chairperson Rogers indicated that the zoning would allow this use. The request before the Commission is for a Special Use Permit. Ms. Kuha indicated that the staff wanted the driveway as indicated even though Mr. Scott had submitted different plans. The property currently has six foot fences on the back and south sides. She felt that if the level of the property is raised, the drainage would go into Airport Road and not follow the natural path. The proposal to put four four-plexes on the property would upgrade the area and provide additional privacy for the residents in mobile homes behind the property than that of a shopping center, bar, or other commercial uses. Traffic volumes would be less. The driveway should remain as proposed as it would allow more time for other drivers to see that an individual is turning into the property. (Commissioner Uhart arrived during her comments--3:38 p.m. A quorum was present as previously indicated.) Ms. Marsden opposed the building of a high density dwelling due to the traffic, the dangerous corner, and the change in the character of the neighborhood. She presented a letter of opposition to Mr. Sullivan. Mr. Sullivan read Gary Heinz' letter opposing the project into the record. He opposed the project based on it being a two-story dwelling, the loss of his view and privacy, and impact to his property values. He was aware that the property is zoned commercial which he felt should be maintained. He pointed out the dangers encountered with the current traffic pattern which makes the location poor for multi-housing. Mr. Sullivan gave the letter to the Clerk.

Ms. Wilson noted that the property is zoned to allow a motel which would increase the traffic volume. The project is better for the community as it would provide a needed family dwelling.

Additional public comments were solicited but none given.

Discussion between the Commission and staff explored the commercial uses allowed on the site, the height restriction of 45 feet, the setback requirements which the project exceeds, (1-0630.5) the present drainage and Code requirements for mitigation of additional runoff. (1-0628.5) Mr. Aldean indicated that the driveway could be relocated without greatly impacting the plan. (1-0640.5) Mr. Aldean indicated opposition to waiving the curb, gutter, and sidewalk requirements. Ms. Hullinger also opposed any modification to the condition requiring reconsideration by the Commission if the project is redesigned. If the driveway is relocated, the project would be brought back to the Commission as it is a redesign. The design which the Commission is discussing is the design staff supports. The parking on the north and south sides of the project will provide additional buffer zones and reduce the amount of paving in the center area. Chairperson Rogers explained that the project would be taller than any of the surrounding buildings. He felt that it is a deviation from the current residential uses. Commercial development is further south. The density is rather high when compared with the surrounding lots. Discussion explored the other types of commercial uses which are allowed in this district and reasons staff supported the project.

(1-0738.5) Commissioner Mally moved to approve U-96/97-9, a special use permit request from Richard Scott to allow a multi-family development for four four-plexes in a Retail Commercial zoning district located at 3109 and 3179 Airport Road, APNs 8-181-25 and 8-191-18, based on seven findings and subject to 12 conditions of approval contained in the staff report and with the understanding that any acknowledgements to the Commission or Board by the applicant may be considered as further stipulations or conditions of approval on this application. Commissioner Horton seconded the motion. Chairperson Rogers suggested an amendment to the motion to modify Condition 7 to require a perimeter fence of sight obscuring material and that a Condition 13 be added to include that all parking shall be covered. Commissioner Mally opposed the covered parking requirement. Mr. Sullivan explained that any added conditions should relate to the public health, safety and welfare. He requested that the covered parking be sustained in some fashion to the welfare of the project given the neighborhood, otherwise, the condition may be considered as arbitrary and capricious as it is not required by the ordinance. Chairperson Rogers explained his concern as being due to the density of the 16 residences which makes it look like a parking lot rather than a residential area. Covered parking would provide a residential view. The open parking lot would provide the appearance of a commercial development. His personal investigation of other four-plexes supported this impression. Discussion indicated that a two-story motel with 25 to 30 units could be located on the site without covered parking. Commissioner Mally then amended his motion to modify Condition 7 to require a perimeter fence of sight obscuring material. Commissioner Horton continued his second. The motion was voted and carried 5-2 with Commissioner Pozzi and Chairperson Rogers voting Naye. Clarification indicated that Commissioner Uhart is in attendance and had voted for the project. Chairperson Rogers indicated his problems with the motion were related to the lack of covered parking and the density. Commissioner Pozzi indicated his vote was against the motion.

F-2. U-96/97-12 - DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON A SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FROM JOHN AND CYNTHIA GUEVIN (1-0805.5) - Ms. Hullinger, John Guevin, Cynthia Guevin, Heidi McCullen, Chuck Crisman, Mary Stresen-Reuter, Cher Falk, Darryl Clark - Mr. Guevin indicated that he had read the staff report and agreed with it except for the traffic. He felt that as some families have more than one child, the number of vehicles loading/unloading at one time would be reduced. The use is "not proposed as a long-term use". The proposal would only be viable if eight children are allowed. The other childcare provider would not have to park a car at the site. If additional parking is required, the area on the north side of the house could be converted. He also had two letters from neighbors who were unable to attend supporting the project. He had attempted to contact his neighbors. He felt that the majority of the opposition was based on concerns about the property value. Staff has indicated that there is no supporting documentation to indicate the property values would be decreased. Limited playtime outside would help reduce the noise volume. Commissioner Christianson explained his visit to the site. The backyard needed to be improved. There is no grass. He did not feel that the applicants were ready to start. The garage on the north side of the house had been converted which had removed the ability to park personal cars inside. Ms. Guevin indicated that her car would not fit in the garage. Commissioner Christianson also felt that the house was not air conditioned and questioned whether the noise could be reduced. He also indicated his objection to having a business adjacent to his residence. He was certain that it would impact the ability to sell the home as well as its market value. Mr. Guevin indicated that the house is "prepped" for air conditioning. He had not been able to afford it due to the medical bills incurred for his daughter. The landscaping had been halted for the same reason. He had agreed to staff's condition that it be completed within three months. The garage had been converted in order to separate the residential area from the daycare and pre-school areas. The garage could be converted back when the use is abandoned. Staff indicated that six month reviews could be required if desired. Chairperson Rogers also noted that there are several with annual reviews. Mr. Guevin further explained the ability to convert the garage back and reasons he had originally converted it. The traffic count is either three or four/four or five cars. Commissioner Uhart suggested the side of the garage be gravelled for additional parking. The traffic is staggered from 7:30 to 8 and 4:30 to 5:20. Ms. Guevin indicated that consideration had been given to staggering the playtimes due to the different ages of the children. Commissioner Uhart encouraged her to stagger the playtimes, park the Suburban on the side of the garage, and limit the number of cars within the short period of time to five cars. She explained her knowledge of the impact on property sales to support the recommendations. Ms. Guevin indicated that she could not promise that there would only be five cars as her clientele may change. Ms. McCullen indicated that there are only two single children. The rest are two to a family. Clarification indicated the parking which had been discussed is not permanent but in and out. The conditions prohibit parking in the driveway. Parking is required on the street. The third parking stall was for the employee. If she is not parking a car at the site, the parking would not be required.

Mr. Crisman explained his opposition to having a business in a residential neighborhood. The CC&Rs prohibit commercial activity in the subdivision. His poll of the area had resulted in a petition opposing the request. He gave the petition to the Clerk. His contacts with realtors indicated that the facility would impact the market value. He felt that the applicants could find another method to provide the necessary income. He opposed the request due to the noise, extra traffic, and the encroachment of commercial establishments on a residential district. Commissioner Christianson pointed out that the Commission could not enforce the CC&Rs. He also indicated that another child care facility had been opened within 550 feet of this establishment. He encouraged him to seek legal recourse as the precedence had already been set. Mr. Crisman indicated that the residents within 300 feet of that facility had not been notified and were not aware of the facility. (1-1197.5) Ms. Stresen-Reuter noted that she had written about the problem. She felt that the applicant had made a commitment to have the children outside for only two half-hour periods a day and not alternating all day long. This is not the norm for a family. The 12 children had created an incredible amount of noise over the summer. She felt that she was entitled to the peaceful and quiet enjoyment of her property. She had contacted a realtor who indicated that it would be difficult to sell a house adjacent to the facility. She did not oppose having six children as a day care as it is more of a normal family setting. She submitted a letter from Vicki Nowling to Ms. Hullinger supporting her position. Ms. Falk explained her objection to the noise and violation of the CC&Rs. She was concerned about the traffic and property values. She felt that the other childcare provider could not be prohibited from driving to work. This would increase the parking problems.

Ms. Hullinger briefly noted the letters which had been received. Bruce Burns indicated he did not object to the request. Carolyn Rawles-Heiser supported the facility. Vicki Nowling opposed the facility.

Additional public comments were solicited. (1-1988.5) Mr. Clark opposed the request. He felt that larger lots had been acquired for peace and quiet. The noise had been "pretty loud" during the summer. He noted traffic and parking concerns. He questioned whether the house was large enough for 12 children. He also suggested that the applicants check into Easter Seals as they have good quality, affordable child care.

Additional public comments were solicited but none given. Public testimony was closed.

Discussion ensued between the Commission and Ms. Hullinger on the number of children requested. She stated that the Health Department indicates 15 children could be allowed in the home. Staff felt that with the conditions the impacts could be mitigated. Ms. Hullinger suggested a review period if so desired. Commissioner Christianson indicated that he would have voted against the original application had he known that it would have established a precedence for this area. He opposed the application based on his belief that the parking could not be policed, that the site is not big enough for this number of children, and that the noise cannot be prohibited. This will be a problem for the neighbors. He requested this statement be in the record and forwarded to the Supervisors. Chairperson Rogers voiced his concern with the yard and the number of children. He felt they are not compatible at this time. He suggested having a six month review and limiting the number of children to eight. When the applicant has completed the yard repairs and can more adequately care for 12 children, the Commission could review the request and consider increasing the number.

(1-1392.5) Commissioner Wipfli moved to approve U-96/97-12, a special use permit request from Cynthia Guevin to allow a child care facility for a maximum of 12 children, accessory to a residential use, in a Single Family 6,000 zoning district based on seven findings and subject to 13 conditions of approval contained in the staff report and with the understanding that any acknowledgements to the Commission/Board by the applicant may be considered as further stipulations or conditions of approval on this application; Condition 13 is to require a six month review and that the facility will be limited to eight children during that time. Following a request for a correction to the motion, Commissioner Wipfli amended the motion to be for eight children during the six month review period as recommended by the Chairperson. Commissioner Mally seconded the motion. Ms. Hullinger explained staff's recommendation that the number of vehicles on the site be restricted or restricting the time periods for drop off/pick up. These are not conditions. If the Commission wished to have them included, they should be as stipulations or as additional conditions. Commissioner Wipfli indicated he did not have a problem with it as the six month review would control it. Chairperson Rogers indicated that Condition 7 controls the parking locations for drop off and pick up. Discussion indicated Ms. Hullinger was attempting to control the number of vehicles on or visiting the site at one time. Chairperson Rogers indicated that the applicants had stipulated that the drop offs average 30 minutes a part. Mr. Guevin indicated "that is fine". Chairperson Rogers then asked Mr. Guevin if he was willing to stipulate that on a normal basis no more than two cars will be at the site at any given time during any 15 minute period. Mr. Guevin agreed and indicated that this is what is occurring now. The parents are dropping off the children at different times starting at 7; some are there between 8:30 and 9. Everyone has different work schedules. He was willing to stipulate that to the parents also. Chairperson Rogers also pointed out that at the time of the six month review this item could be reviewed to determine if you have been in compliance. Mr. Guevin indicated he had no problem with it. Ms. Hullinger then indicated that the other issue was the staggered play times. Commissioner Wipfli felt that the applicant would monitor the play period. If necessary, this could be handled during the six month review. Chairperson Rogers indicated that Condition 9 had been modify to allow only eight children and Condition 13 would require a six month review. The motion was then voted and carried 5-2 with Commissioners Pozzi and Christianson voting Naye. Mr. Sullivan briefly explained the appeal process. Commissioner Christianson noted that the appellants may wish to contact the candidates running for the Board of Supervisors positions.

F-3. M-96/97-2 - DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON A SHOW CAUSE HEARING FOR CONSIDERATION OF REVOCATION OF U-82-11 (1-1498.5) - Mr. Sullivan, NDOT Supervisory Right-of-Way Agent Mary Luster - Ms. Luster requested the application for an extension of the period be withdrawn. She acknowledged that this action would make the permit null and void. Public testimony was solicited but none given. Commissioner Mally moved that the Planning Commission move to revoke special use permit U-82-11. Commissioner Pozzi seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.

F-4. U-96/97-14 - DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON A SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FROM BRECHLER AND BELL CONSULTING AND PAIUTE PIPELINE (1-1556.5) - Mr. Guzman, Paiute Pipeline Major Projects Manager and a Southwest Gas Employee Jack Klackner, Parks and Recreation Commission Chairperson Jay Meierdierck, William Goni, Jeff Love, Parks and Recreation Commissioner George Chapman, Paiute Pipeline Representative Richard Breedlove, Deputy District Attorney Mark Forsberg - Mr. Klackner indicated he had read the staff report and agreed to it. The cultural resource study on the archeological concerns has been submitted to BLM, the Forest Service, Nevada State Historic Preservation Officer and Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. When their reviews are completed, the report will be submitted to the Environmental Advisory Council on Historic Properties in Denver, Colorado. He was willing to have the City's Historic Architectural Review Committee also review it. He then explained that Paiute Pipeline is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Southwest Gas. Paiute Pipeline does not own the gas carried in the line. It provides the line and other services. Ownership of the gas was explained. The proposal would supply additional gas to Lake Tahoe and surrounding areas. There is a line currently going into Tahoe now which was constructed in 1965. The size and route of the current line and the terminus of the proposed line were explained. Requirements mandating restoration/revegetation of the landscaping were noted. These requirements included revegetation of the 1965 scar. Discussion reiterated the route.

(1-1821.5) Public comments were solicited. Chairperson Meierdierck noted that the proposal would impact a new area in Centennial Park. He pointed out the BLM joint use agreement which provides for City oversight of BLM lands and the Eagle Valley trail which uses a portion of the current pipeline route. He requested the Commission refer the proposal to the Parks and Recreation Commission. This would allow his Commission to analyze the trail improvements which will be installed as part of the project. Chairperson Rogers indicated that Mr. Klackner had nodded indicating that he had agreed to this review. Chairperson Rogers directed staff to forward the report to the Commission.

Mr. Goni expressed his disappoint in staff for having made its recommendation without contacting any of the property owners. He had not seen the report. He owns several parcels in the impacted area. The project will cut through the backyards of his subdivision for a 16 inch pipeline. There is an eight inch pipeline already cutting through a portion of the subdivision. One pipeline should be adequate. He encouraged the applicant to use BLM property instead of cutting through the subdivision. He supported having the Parks and Recreation Commission review the project as it could provide a bike and horse trail from Centennial Park to the west side of the City. If the line stays as designated, the trail will be closed by the property owners. The proposal would scar the hillside. Mr. Guzman explained that the addenda in the Board's packet show that the property owners were aware of the application for the extra pipeline. Mr. Goni indicated this is correct, however, the property owners were not aware of staff's recommendation. Mr. Guzman explained staff's recommendation as having been based on the fact that there already is an easement across the property and that the proposal would add to that use. Mr. Goni indicated that the easement is for the exclusive use of the power company. Clarification by Mr. Goni explained the easement through his subdivision. He felt that the pipeline would negatively impact the value of the lots. Mr. Goni also explained that the applicant would need an additional ten to fifteen feet of property for the easement beyond that currently used by Sierra Pacific. Mr. Guzman explained that he had sent notifications to 48 property owners. Only one letter was received on the issue. Therefore, it was assumed that the property owners were in agreement with the applicant.

(1-2030.5) Mr. Love explained that he had only received his notice on Monday. He had signed the addendum but had not been contacted further regarding the proposal. He questioned whether Carson City has a setback requirement from the easement. He requested the response be provided in writing so that he would not have an issue at some future date when he develops the site. He then explained that the manual shut-off valves for the line are located along Highways 50 and 395. He expressed his concern if an emergency arose mandating closure of the line and the time it would take to get someone to these valves. The 16 inch pipeline is proposed to cross earthquake faults and traverse under a powerline. The thirty minutes required to close the valves could pose a hazard to anyone along that line. He urged the Commission/applicant to route the line over BLM property and not on private property. He also felt that the property owners should have been notified of staff's recommendation.

(1-2111.5) Mr. Chapman expressed his concern about using the right-of-way as a trail. The City's trail plan includes recommended trail standards. He requested an opportunity to review the proposal. He was also concerned about the aesthetics of the trail and requested a review of this portion of the plan. He suggested that the property owners may have concerns about the dust and construction procedures. Conditions should be placed on the project to mitigate these concerns also. Mr. Chapman was not sure where the trail is planned in the subdivision area. He then explained his reasons for wishing to have the Commission/its Trail Committee review the plan.

Additional public comments were solicited but none made.

Mr. Klackner then explained the construction and maintenance standards mandated for the pipeline in addition to the testing program. There are no setback requirements mandated by the U. S. Department of Transportation other than the prohibition against a permanent structure. Paving can be constructed over the pipeline. He then explained that the Northridge earthquake had only ruptured one line which had been constructed in 1932. This line had purportedly been slated for replacement. The line was abandoned and the new line only one street over was placed in service. The test after the earthquake had indicated that that line had not suffered any damage. Modern pipelines are constructed to accommodate ground movement. Nevada ground movement is projected to be less than that required in designing the pipeline. He acknowledged the location for the shut-off valves as previously indicated. It is a standard operating practice to have gas lines and powerlines in the same easement. More regulatory pressure is being applied to increase this multi-use of common rights-of-ways rather than to distribute or acquire new easements. His biggest problem is with individuals who have not notified the company before they dig. Alternative locations have been discussed with BLM. Some portions of the other easement are located in developed areas and some portions are developed to the fullest capacity. He was willing to reconsider the other easement if all the other agencies are willing to grant approval. Future development surrounding the powerline easement was discussed. He then expressed a desire to meet with the Parks and Recreation Commission and design the bike trail as the City and Commission would like. Commissioner Uhart supported Mr. Goni's proposal that the pipeline utilize BLM property as much as possible. This would provide a trail which is open for public access. Mr. Klackner refused to stipulate that he would go outside the private easements. He agreed to stipulate to meeting with BLM on it. If they are willing to grant the easement, he would do so provided the necessary clearances can be obtained from the other agencies. This would require natural and cultural resource studies. He agreed that this would be his first avenue if there are no major road blocks.

(1-2492.5) Mr. Breedlove then explained the subdivision powerline easement and the need to enlargen it on a temporary basis by 25 feet for construction. This 25 feet would be along the northern boundary of the current easement. This will require the property owner's agreement as well as recontouring and revegetation of the property when completed. (During this discussion Commissioner Mally stepped from the room--5:25 p.m. A quorum was still present.)

Clarification indicated that the easement is an exclusive one for Sierra Pacific only. The applicant is going to ask Sierra Pacific to allow it to use the same easement. Mr. Guzman noted that the easement crosses the center portion of several long narrow parcels. This was the easement which had been discussed when Mr. Goni's subdivision was considered. It was used to establish the building envelope limit. The only exception was Mr. Love's lot. His entire lot is on top of the easement. Commissioner Pozzi expressed his concern for the property owners. Mr. Guzman explained the form which the property owners had signed indicating they knew about the request for a Special Use Permit. He explained that 48 individual notices had been mailed informing them of the application and inviting them to come and testify or to contact the Department. Commissioner Pozzi felt that Mr. Goni's testimony indicated that he had not received this notice. Mr. Guzman explained the addenda which the property owners had signed. Commissioner Pozzi elaborated on his concern for the small property owners. Discussion indicated that the easement would not encroach into the hillside ordinance areas. The City does not have easement setback requirements. The easement, itself, would prohibit construction. The hillside ordinance would further prohibit any construction as the easement is above that line. Mr. Love's property does not "fit this description" as his entire lot is north of the easement. If the line is moved onto BLM property, Mr. Love's lot would be south of the easement. Mr. Love would not be able to construct on his lot if the line remains where it was originally proposed. Discussion ensued concerning whether there is another lot which would be impacted--Lot 32. Clarification indicated that Mr. Love's lot is number 31. (Commissioner Mally returned during this discussion--5:30 p.m. A quorum was present as previously indicated.) It was felt that there were three lots which may be impacted by the easement. If the easement is moved to BLM land, none of the parcels will be impacted. It would, however, create a new scar. Discussion ensued between Mr. Forsberg and Chairperson Rogers on how to condition the approval to require the applicant to use BLM property and not cut through the subdivision. Mr. Forsberg felt that the Commission should deny the application. He also pointed out that the easement was known to the property owners and is a recorded easement. He suggested that the issue related to the type of and use of the easement not be considered in the deliberations. The Commission's options were to deny the application, grant a continuance so that the applicant could investigation BLM's stand, or accept the stipulation that he would attempt to work with BLM to move the easement. Mr. Forsberg felt that the Commission could not approve a route which had not been presented. Chairperson Rogers noted that the stipulation was not a guarantee that the existing route would be modified. Mr. Forsberg also indicated a potential agenda problem with the new route. Mr. Klackner indicated that he had stipulated that he would move the pipeline onto BLM property if possible. He refused to request a continuance to make this determination.

(1-2845.5) Commissioner Mally moved to approve U-96/97-14, a special use permit for the installation and operation of a 16 inch natural gas transmission line, based on seven findings and subject to eight conditions of approval, one condition had already been added and Commissioner Mally indicated he would add another, as contained in the staff report with the understanding that any acknowledgements to the Commission/Board by the applicant may be considered as further stipulations or conditions of approval on this application; Condition 8, why are there six conditions. Chairperson Rogers indicated there were seven conditions. Commissioner Mally then amended his motion to reflect eight conditions with seven being in the staff report, Condition 8 will require the application to be reviewed by the Historic Architectural and/or Archaeological Review Committee and Parks and Recreation Commission. Commissioner Horton seconded the motion. The motion was voted by roll call with the following result: Christianson - No; Pozzi - No; Mally - Yes; Wipfli - Yes; Uhart - Yes; Horton - Yes; and Chairperson Rogers - No. Motion carried 4-3.

Mr. Sullivan explained the appeal process. Chairperson Rogers explained his opposition is the routing of the pipeline. He would like to have had the route go around the private property. Commissioner Christianson indicated he would have preferred this route and have had the stipulation on this be part of the motion.

F-5. U-96/97-8 - DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON A SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FROM GRAHAM AND NADINE HARTUNG (1-2918.5) - Mr. Guzman, West Williams Construction Representative Richard Aitkenhead - Discussion noted the structure had not been painted in earth tones as indicated in the application and the colors of the other buildings on the site. Mr. Aitkenhead indicated he was the builder and not the owner. He had not read the staff report but had listened to the comments. He was in agreement with them although he felt that building's colors were those typically found on any other farm house/building. He did not feel that this is a major issue with the property owners. He then explained the building's construction. The building is now on hold pending the Commission's action. A building inspection will be conducted if the Commission approves the special use permit. He purportedly has a building permit. He also indicated that the small building is a pump house. Reasons for the color of the building were explained. Public testimony was solicited but none given. Commissioner Mally moved to approve U-96/97-8, a special use permit for the construction of an accessory structure exceeding 50 percent of the size of the primary structure based on seven findings and subject to six conditions of approval contained in the staff report and with the understanding that any acknowledgements to the Commission or Board by the applicant may be considered as further stipulations or conditions of approval on this application. Commissioner Horton seconded the motion. Following discussion on Condition 6, Commissioner Mally removed the repainting requirement. He indicated that the portion requiring the structure to be in earth tones is to remain. Commissioner Horton continued his second. Following additional discussion on Condition 6, Commissioner Mally amended his motion to have Condition 6 end at "those of the primary residence." and elimination of the remaining portion of the Condition. Commissioner Horton continued his second. Motion was voted and carried 7-0.

F-6. S-96/97-1 - DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON A SUBDIVISION MAP REQUEST FROM COLLEGE PARKWAY ASSOCIATES (1-3230.5) - Mr. Guzman, Mr. Aldean, Applicant's Planning Consultant Robert Loveberg, Mr. Sullivan, Parks and Recreation Commissioner and its Bike Trail Committee Chairperson George Chapman, Henry Butler - Discussion ensued between the Commission and staff on the accesses, future City upgrades to Roop Street, the proposed left turn access on Roop Street, the need for a bike path on Roop Street, and the right turn access on Hot Springs.

(1-3485.5) Mr. Loveberg indicated they generally concurred with staff's recommendations and Public Works memo except for three conditions--Conditions 11 and 12 in the Planning staff report and Condition 6 of the Public Works memo of August 22. He was willing to agree to the portion of Condition 11 indicating that they would explore redesign of the sidewalk, however, they felt that it was not a good idea. He was willing to accept the Commission's direction on this requirement, however, requested its elimination. There are questions concerning the type and amount of right-of-way and improvements required for the bike lane. He was willing to go with staff to the Regional Transportation Commission and Board of Supervisors to determine what will be needed for the bike lane. He requested this condition be modified to allow them to work it out with staff, RTC, and the Board of Supervisors. He requested Condition 6 of the Public Works memo be modified to not require the recommended improvements. He was willing to work with staff on the right-of-way improvements and easements to make the project workable. He then briefly outlined the project indicating that the access from Hot Springs had always been proposed to be a right-in and right-out driveway. This would eliminate the need to make improvements to Hot Springs Road for a left turn pocket/lane. He agreed to construct an island on Hot Springs which would prohibit left turning movements. His engineers had analyzed the Roop Street driveway. He felt that there is adequate space to provide the necessary turn lane and agreed to do so. (2-0009.5) The emergency access from College Parkway was explained. He then reviewed the project by using an architect's rendering and the condition changes which he had indicated. In response to Commissioner Uhart's question, he explained that his island would be on the property and would prevent left turning movements. This would eliminate the need to place a median strip in Hot Springs. He indicated he would not just paint a line. Commissioner Wipfli explained his preference to have the sidewalk set back from the street due to pedestrian safety concerns. Mr. Loveberg stipulated that he would be happy to look at that to determine what it would do to the landscaping. He wanted to keep the berms if at all possible. The design for the sound wall had not been completed. He felt it could be of decorative block, some of which would be "of" ground level and some would be a six foot wall. His explanation indicated a portion would start at the driveway and taper up to a six foot wall in those areas where the units are closer to the street to provide a private entrance feature. There would be one at the north end of the project near the Roop Street Driveway. It would be both decorative and a sound wall. Its final construction feature has not been determined although he indicated it could be either a block wall, a wooden wall, or both. The proposal would be to vary the wall with bermed areas and landscaping. The locations and variances were described. The detention basin is small, separate, and shallow. It will be surrounded by landscaping to meet both the landscaping and retention needs. There may be rocks in the basin with landscaping surrounding it. Chairperson Rogers suggested that the bike trail be analyzed by the Parks and Recreation Commission Bike Trail Committee. Mr. Loveberg indicated this had been his intent in addition to having staff review it along with the right-of-way issue to determine the total requirement. He agreed to modifying the condition to allow review and approval by Public Works and Community Development. Mr. Sullivan indicated that he would like to take the plan to the Parks and Recreation Commission. If there is a conflict after staff's reviews, the issue could be brought back to the Planning Commission. Public Works is part of staff. Mr. Loveberg explained the desire to work with staff and continue the application process without a delay in the review by the Board of Supervisors. Chairperson Rogers explained his desire to have the berm and sidewalk. He suggested that Condition 11 be modified to allow staff and the applicant to work it out. Mr. Loveberg felt that this was the intent of Condition 11. Chairperson Rogers recommended a modification to Condition 11 so that it would read: A sidewalk plan will be developed to the approval of Community Development Department and the applicant. Mr. Loveberg agreed to this modification and added "exploring all means does not necessarily force them to do something". Chairperson Rogers indicated that he did not have a problem with the project's having uncovered parking as it is "hidden". Mr. Aldean indicated that he did not have a problem with the amended language nor with the third amendment which indicated that a "a method would be approved by the Public Works Department to prevent left turns in the driveway". He did not wish to install a median in the center of Hot Springs if there is a reasonable driveway control method. Chairperson Rogers then indicated his feeling that the project was still fairly dense in spite of it being less than allowed. He appreciated the landscaping efforts. Commissioner Wipfli also felt that the density was "huge". It is a well thought out project. The long sidewalk expansion is such an important feature for the health and safety of the people and the residents walking there that he would support elimination of one or two apartments, if necessary. This would create a wonderful bermed sidewalk. Chairperson Rogers supported his comments by noting that the development would create a lot of pedestrian traffic who would use the sidewalk and bicycle path. Therefore, he felt that, for the residents of the development, it was encumbrant upon the applicant to provide as much of it as possible. There are no real walking paths or areas through the development. The only path is on the outside and it should be developed with the best possible features, aesthetics, safety, etc., in mind. Mr. Loveberg indicated that the right-of-way impacts would determine the sidewalk issue. He felt he could work all of these issues out with Community Development and still provide a quality project.

Clarification between Mr. Guzman and Mr. Loveberg indicated that Mr. Loveberg had stipulated to working with staff on designing an emergency exit which is agreeable to both parties; that Condition 12 was in reference to Roop Street and College Parkway and not Roop Street and Hot Springs; and that staff would encourage Mr. Loveberg to set the sidewalk in as had been done on two similar developments. Mr. Loveberg also indicated that at the conceptual review there had been discussions concerning the emergency access. It was his intent to allow the residents to use this exit while accommodating the emergency apparatus. He indicated a willingness to work with the City to make it happen.

(1-0471.5) Public testimony was solicited. Mr. Chapman commended the Commission on its willingness to include the bike trail in its requirements. He urged the Commission to include an easement for a bicycle path on Roop for future needs. He then cautioned the Commission to include density and distance in its deliberations concerning the sound wall. Trees and shrubs are ineffective sound mitigators. They provide good aesthetics but should be mixed with a berm to be effective barriers. If the project truly provides more landscaping and open space than required, he was certain that additional community open space could be provided along the roadway by setting the walkway and bike lane along the street. Chairperson Rogers then explained his concerns about the standard sidewalk widths and their difficulty to roller blade on. He urged Mr. Chapman to consider widening the sidewalk standards. Mr. Chapman felt that this is a change which may occur in the future. He supported the recommended modification. He felt that staff and the applicant could provide a solution which meets both the developer's and community's needs. He agreed that the sidewalk and bicycle path would be used by the project's residents. He then explained his reasons for not combining the sidewalk and bicycle path due to safety concerns.

Additional public comments were solicited. Mr. Butler supported the project as one of the proponents and principals involved. He indicated that the project needed to balance the bicycle needs, the sidewalk needs, and the residential isolation needs. He supported discussing these issues with Public Works to determine the best plan for the project. He suggested a sidewalk on the other side of Roop with the residential pedestrian traffic being handled on the rear of the project. He agreed that putting the pedestrians against the street could be dangerous. He stipulated that he would work with Mr. Loveberg and staff to develop the best project possible as Mr. Loveberg had previously stipulated.

(2-0616.5) Additional public testimony was requested but none given.

Commissioner Mally moved that the Regional Planning Commission approve S-96/97-1, a motion to recommend that the Board of Supervisors approve a tentative subdivision application from College Park Associates based on three findings and subject to 12 conditions of approval contained within the staff report and with the understanding that any acknowledgements to the Commission or Board by the applicant may be considered as further conditions or stipulations of approval on this application, retaining Condition 11, and changing Condition 12 to Roop Street, Hot Springs Road, and College Parkway, and allowing the applicant to work with the Public Works, Parks and Recreation, and RTC, and the wording of the Public Works Condition as submitted "driveway, a concrete center median strip shall be installed on Hot Springs Road to prevent left turns into the driveway and a left turn pocket sized to accommodate peak left turn movements for the project projected for both driveways shall be provided on Roop Street, this will be worked out with the Public Works Department". Commissioner Christianson seconded the motion. Following discussion of Condition 11, Commissioner Mally amended his motion to restate Condition 11 to: that the applicant and Community Development Department will seek a solution that is agreeable by the City and the applicant. Commissioner Christianson continued his second. Clarification by Commissioner Mally indicated his original Condition 12 had been modified to remove the median requirement to allow the applicant and staff to work out a solution which is agreeable by the City and the applicant. Discussion indicated this Condition is actually Public Works' Condition 6. Chairperson Rogers indicated that the last sentence of this Condition is: Dedication of additional right-of-way may be required along Roop Street and Hot Springs Road frontages of this property and shall be determined by Public Works Department and RTC prior to application for the Final Map. Mr. Aldean stipulated that the median requirement could be deleted as long as the language requiring the applicant to work out the solution with the staff is maintained. Commissioner Mally agreed that this is his motion. Commissioner Christianson continued his second. Motion carried 7-0. Mr. Sullivan indicated the Board of Supervisors will consider this item on September 19 if all the issues are resolved.

F-7. V-96/97-5 - DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON A VARIANCE REQUEST FROM JOHN NICOSIA (2-0708.5) - Mr. Joiner, John Nicosia - Mr. Nicosia indicated he had read the staff report and agreed to it. Public testimony was solicited but none given. Commissioner Christianson moved to approve V-96/97-5, a variance request from Wyman Gordan Precision Founders, John Nicosia, to vary ten feet from the required 30 foot rear yard setback requirements on property zoned Air Industrial Park, located at 2727 Lockheed Way, APNs 8-405-32 and 8-405-33 based on five findings and subject to five conditions of approval contained in the staff report with the understanding that any acknowledgements made to the Board/Commission by the applicant may be considered as further stipulations or conditions of approval on this application. Commissioner Uhart seconded the motion. Discussion noted the application had been for ten feet although the site plans indicate nine feet. Mr. Joiner felt that if the motion said not to exceed ten feet, it would be acceptable. Commissioner Christianson amended his motion to not exceed ten feet. Commissioner Uhart continued her second. Motion carried 7-0.

F-8. U-96/97-11 - DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON A SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FROM RON KIPP (1-0779.5) - Mr. Guzman, Ron Kipp - Mr. Kipp indicated he had read the staff report and its conditions of approval. The hours of operation are from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. Wednesday through Monday. He exhibited two copies of the original photographs of the site as the copied versions were not very clear. Public testimony was solicited but none given. Commissioner Christianson moved to approve U-96/97-11, a special use permit for a temporary tract sales office in a model home complex based on seven findings and subject to six conditions of approval contained in the staff report and with the understanding that any acknowledgements to the Commission/Board by the applicant may be considered as further stipulations or conditions of approval on this application. Commissioner Mally seconded the motion. Clarification indicated there would be off-street parking. Commissioner Christianson amended his motion to correct an error in Condition 6 to indicate that it is off-street parking. Commissioner Mally continued his second. Discussion indicated the hours could remain as listed in the staff report even though they are not as long as it indicates. The motion as amended was voted and carried 7-0.

F-9. U-94/95-9 - DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON A STATUS REPORT OF A PREVIOUSLY APPROVED SPECIAL USE PERMIT FROM DON HOWELL (2-0845.5) - Mr. Joiner - The applicant was not present. Public testimony was solicited but none given. Commissioner Christianson moved that the Regional Planning Commission move to approve an annual review of U-94/95-9 permitting a subdivision sales office on property zoned Single Family 12,000 located at 2505 Roxbury Way, APN 7-382-02 based on seven findings and subject to eight conditions of approval contained in the staff report and with the understanding that any acknowledgements to the Commission/Board by the applicant may be considered as further stipulations or conditions of approval on this application. Commissioner Horton seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0.

F-10. U-96/97-13 - DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON A SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FROM PARKS AND RECREATION DIRECTOR STEVE KASTENS (2-0885.5) - Mr. Joiner, Parks and Recreation Director Steve Kastens - Commissioner Mally stepped from the room during Mr. Joiner's introduction--6:55 p.m. (A quorum was still present.) Discussion explained the frame for the banners. Mr. Kastens had read the staff report and agreed to it. Public testimony was solicited but none given. Commissioner Uhart moved to approve U-96/97-13, a special use permit request from Steve Kastens for an addition to the existing freestanding sign in the form of a framework to accommodate banners measuring four feet two inches by 14 feet one inch in a Public zoning district located at 501 East William Street, APN 2-181-01 based on five findings and subject to five conditions of approval contained in the staff report and with the understanding that any acknowledgements to the Commission or Board by the applicant may be considered as further stipulations or conditions of approval on this application. Commissioner Christianson seconded the motion. Following a request for a correction, Commission Uhart amended the motion to indicate 851 East William Street. Commissioner Christianson continued his second. Motion carried 6-0-0-1.

F-11. A-96/97-2 - DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON A REQUEST FROM CARSON CITY TO AMEND CARSON CITY MUNICIPAL CODE SECTION 18.03.106 (2-0965.5) - Mr. Sullivan requested the item be continued to the next regularly scheduled Commission meeting to allow staff time to work on some issues which the public had just presented. Staff also recommended revising the current ordinance rather than drafting a new section for individuals under age 55 requiring assisted care services. Public testimony was solicited. Planning Consultant Graham Ross agreed to discuss his issues with staff during the 30 day continuation. Additional comments were solicited but none given. No formal action was taken on this item.

BREAK: A dinner recess was declared at 7:05 p.m. When Chairperson Rogers reconvened the meeting at 7:50 p.m., a quorum was present although Commissioners Pozzi and Mally were absent. Staff present included Community Development Director Walter Sullivan, Public Works Director Jay Aldean, Utilities Director Dorothy Timian-Palmer, Deputy Utilities Director Jay Ahrens, Health Officer Daren Winkelman, Water Utilities Superintendent Tom Hoffert, Deputy District Attorney Mark Forsberg, Water Utilities Assistant Superintendent Curtis Horton, Senior Planner Sandra Danforth, and Recording Secretary Katherine McLaughlin.

G. PUBLIC HEARINGS (1-1018.5)

G-1. U-95/96-15 - DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON A REVIEW OF A PREVIOUSLY APPROVED SPECIAL USE PERMIT FROM DAVID LONG - Senior Planner Sandra Danforth, Action Lazer Tag President Jaydene Yurtinus, David Long - During Mrs. Danforth's introduction, Commissioner Mally arrived--7:52 p.m. (A quorum was present as previously indicated.) Discussion between Mrs. Danforth and the Commission questioned who "she" is in the Sheriff's report.

During Ms. Yurtinus opening comments explaining the partnership, Commissioner Pozzi arrived--7:55 p.m. (The entire Commission was present constituting a quorum.) Ms. Yurtinus indicated she did not have a copy of the Sheriff's Report. The hours of operation had been modified when school opened. The restaurant is not open for breakfast. The hours are now 2:30 p.m. to 9 or 11 p.m. The security cameras need to have three or four monitors. The cameras are in place in the restrooms and are monitored from a location which can be readily seen. The restrooms are still being renovated and the cameras will have to be modified. Her concerns and the problems involved with having security cameras in the mall restrooms were explained. She questioned the reasons for needing security cameras in the restrooms as the schools, Boys and Girls Club, and skating rink are not required to have them. Access to the mall restroom is controlled by requiring the user to obtain the key. If the Commission requires it, they will continue to work with the mall owner on this issue. He has requested formal written notification from the Commission on this requirement. The front parking lot can be monitored from the counter. There is no entrance from the rear parking lot. It is "looked over regularly" to be sure that things are okay. The children are to fill out a form indicating their parents, emergency telephone numbers, and other notification procedures. This information is entered into the computer and is accessible when needed at the front counter. She emphasized that the stipulation was for a formal checkin and checkout program. They had decided to do it by computer. The metal detectors have not been placed on the premises as of this date. They should be installed soon. She did not understand the third item in the Sheriff's report. She was aware of the other two items. Commissioner Christianson noted that there were a lot of things which have not been done. Ms. Yurtinus felt that the operation had been started by two individuals who had worked very hard at getting every done. She indicated that the lazer tag game was still not installed. The movie theater area is 90 percent finished. It should be finished shortly. She explained that she is the president and her feeling that it was a great opportunity to provide a needed service to the community and families. Commissioner Christianson expressed the feeling that the original plan had been well thought out and that many of the stipulations had been made by the applicant. The Commission had been promised many things and he expected to see them done soon. If these items are not done soon, then it is show cause time. Ms. Yurtinus indicated that the Commission had been promised the items and that they would be done soon. Commissioner Christianson indicated that if they were done in the same fashion as the backflow, the Commission did not know what to expect. Chairperson Rogers explained his understanding of the security cameras in the restrooms which were to monitor the wash basin area and hallways. He did not feel that the privacy issues had been involved in the discussions. Her written comments indicate that she wanted the Commission to rescind this requirement. Ms. Yurtinus indicated that the statements had been made without thought. She agreed that the cameras could be angled/focused to monitor the wash basins. She felt that if a problem occurs in the restroom, the individual(s) would use the handicapped stall to handle it. She questioned the benefit of the system under such conditions. She explained her reasons for feeling that the cameras should not be used in the restrooms. Chairperson Rogers explained the Commission's concerns had been related to the propensity for a fight to occur in the restroom. The legal concerns would have been indicated by staff if there had been a concern. This is not an issue for the Commission. The Commission's issue is that it was a requirement and the Sheriff has not indicated otherwise. Failure to comply with the condition would be considered grounds for a show cause hearing. Ms. Yurtinus indicated that with these statements, she would have the cameras installed. Chairperson Rogers indicated that the Commission was still concerned about this issue as the cameras are not installed. Ms. Yurtinus indicated that the cameras were in the restrooms but not in the public mall restrooms. They were installed "yesterday". Staff had not had an opportunity to verify this statement.

(2-1385.5) Ms. Danforth explained her contact with Ms. Yurtinus between 11-11:30 this morning had indicated that the cameras had not been installed. Ms. Yurtinus explained that she had not been to the facility due to commitments at another business. Mr. Long had informed her after she had seen Mrs. Danforth that the cameras had been installed.

Mr. Sullivan then indicated for the record that when the original application had been submitted Undersheriff Dehl had expressed a desire to have cameras in the "satellite restroom". The applicant had indicated that they would monitor those restrooms as children use them. If there is a case of decency, privacy, and things of this nature, one way to cut to the quick would be to say that they will utilize their own restrooms. This would eliminate the need to worry about the mall restrooms which other patrons businesses use. The limitation for use of the facility would then be based on the restroom facilities on site. Chairperson Rogers indicated that this suggestion is close to his own. He felt that the camera requirement should be for the applicant's restroom and that the mall restroom could be restricted to use by a key. This would allow for monitoring the mall restroom. Ms. Yurtinus indicated that the camera(s) is/are installed in the facility's restroom. She also expressed her feeling that the issue related to the Water Department was "history" It has been taken care of. Everything that they had asked for and to which they had stipulated had been handled. The back flow valve which they had requested had been put in. Chairperson Roger explained for the record that the Utilities Department had submitted a report indicating that on August 19th all of their requirements were met. Ms. Yurtinus reiterated her request that discussion no revolve around previous history and take up valuable Commission time. These issues have been taken care of.

(2-1445.5) Public testimony was solicited but none given.

Chairperson Rogers then expressed his concern about the lack of knowledge which would verify that the cameras are installed and working. This provides the necessary grounds to consider a show cause hearing. This would provide the applicants with 30 days to provide a completed report. A motion could also be made to accept the applicant's word and approve the review. Mr. Sullivan then asked if the computer system and the logging in of the children is operating. There have been reports that the system is not working.

(2-1468.5) Mr. Long explained the sign-in program which had been used. He acknowledged that some kids do not sign-in. They had been constantly reminding the kids to sign-in. The computer is plugged in at the front door. Anyone who walks up to the counter can see the cameras, the computer, and the monitors. The program technically came with the computer when it was purchased. So it is installed. It is operational, is plugged in, and is working fine. He indicated that they are currently logging people in with the computer. This was installed and "moved" today. This was done so that it would be ready for this meeting. The plan was to have the individuals sign-in on the sheets and staff will log it into the computer when there is sufficient time to do the imput. This was the reason they had done the "hurried thing of making certain that the cameras were all in place so that they would not have to deal with some more fall out". The computer was to be up and operational. Anyone going to the facility can see it. The check-in counter has two huge glass pane windows. Anyone monitoring the computer and can see the entire parking. This is an ideal location for check-in/check-out. He felt that there had been "so few people come in that it was silly to worry about it until now". Clarification indicated that the system was a mail order program which is AT&T and IBM compatible. It started with 999 files and can be expandable to handle all the patrons which the facility would have for three to six months. There should be plenty of time to expand the program. The computer is at the front door and is more than is needed right now. The sign-up sheets are still there. Commissioner Christianson indicated his concern with accepting Mr. Long at his word based on previous experience. Mr. Long indicated that the computer could be seen from the parking lot. He then indicated that "he felt bad about the entire water fiasco" although Commissioner Christianson "may have a biased way of looking at it".

Commissioner Wipfli then expressed his feeling that, based upon the previous meeting and the staff's report, there is just reason for a show cause hearing. The review period should have provided time for the applicants to put their best foot forward and attempt to comply and make the project look great. The project appears to be a great project based solely on its merits. He could not believe the need to go through the matter and the amount of City time spent on the project. There were many promises "that it will be done soon" or "that it will be done". He was appalled. Ms. Danforth explained that in order to determine what has/has not been done another visit to the site would be required. She had attempted to visit the site this morning without success. She suggested the visit be conducted with other Departments. She was aware that the facility does not have a temporary "C of O" which would allow the facility to be open. The "C of O" has not been renewed as of the meeting time according to the Building Department Director. Chairperson Rogers expressed his hope that the issues would have been resolved by this meeting. As they have not and based upon past performance, the lack of verification, and his personal knowledge, he recommended having a show cause hearing in 30 days. If staff determines that everything is done during the interim, the Commission could deal with it at that hearing.

(2-1602.5) Commissioner Mally moved that the Item U-95/96-15, Action Lazer Tag Fun Center, be setup for a 30 day Show Cause Hearing. Commissioner Uhart seconded the motion. Discussion ensued on the Certificate of Occupancy, which had expired, and the business' ability to continue to operate. Mr. Aldean explained staff's review of the ordinances related to failure to have a certificate of occupancy. Citations can only be issued on the basis of a Building Code violation and not under other City Codes. Public Works is working with the Utilities Department, the Fire Department, and Community Development to determine how the enforcement will occur. Under this process a written notice must be sent to the applicants requesting they obtain a certificate of occupancy. This process is lengthy but required for the future if court action is pursued. This process will allow the applicant(s) to continue to operate during the 30 day interim before the show cause hearing occurs. Commissioner Mally indicated it had been his intent to allow the facility to operate until the show cause hearing. Discussion explained that a temporary certificate of occupancy had been issued which had allowed the facility to open. This certificate had expired. Mr. Aldean indicated that the certificate had been granted based on promises which were later not kept. Chairperson Rogers indicated that if all of the conditions/stipulations are in compliance when the show cause hearing is held, staff may issue a permanent "C of O". Mr. Sullivan explained that the motion is to set a show cause hearing and read Title 18.02.087 which stipulates various grounds for a show cause hearing. Commissioner Mally amended his motion to include: 1. Failure or refusal of the applicant to comply with any of the terms or conditions of a variance or special use permit; 2. Any misrepresentation made in the application for a variance or special use permit; 3. Any act or failure to act by the applicant or its agents or employees directly related to the variance or special use permit which would be a violation of federal or state law or a violation of the Carson City Municipal Code; 4. Any act or failure to act by the applicant or its agents or employees directly relating to the variance or special use permit which creates or tends to create a public nuisance or is detrimental to the public health, safety and welfare; and 5. A failure to return a signed copy of the notice of decision ten days from receipt of said notice. Following discussion on the relevant finding, Commissioner Mally amended the motion to include the finding of: Failure or refusal of the applicant to comply with any of the terms of the special use permit. Commissioner Uhart continued her second. Chairperson Rogers requested an amendment to the motion to include a condition requiring the restroom within the facility to be monitored by the security camera and that the restroom outside of the facility not be monitored by a security camera but that its access be controlled and maintained by the applicant. This will provide clear direction on what is expected to be accomplished by the cameras by the next meeting. Commissioner Mally agreed to amend his motion to include Chairperson Rogers request. Mr. Sullivan indicated that staff would be able to provide clear direction on the security cameras at the next meeting. Commissioner Uhart continued her second. The motion as amended was voted and carried 7-0.

Mr. Sullivan then indicated that a letter would be mailed to the applicant outlining the show cause process. The next meeting will be on September 25. The letter will outline the Commission's concerns and items which should be rectified in that time period. He urged Ms. Yurtinus to meet with staff to obtain a full understanding of the conditions of approval and encouraged her to work toward full compliance of those conditions. Ms. Yurtinus indicated that the facility will be closed for one week to do this. She questioned whether the facility was closed at this time. Mr. Sullivan indicated he could not give her legal advice and urged her to obtain a "C of O" before reopening. Chairperson Rogers requested she contact staff after the meeting. Ms. Yurtinus responded by expressing her feeling that she had had one year from the date of the original hearing to complete the conditions of approval. Mr. Sullivan indicated that this is not the issue at this time. If the facility had not been opened, the special use permit could have been extended for one additional year. Chairperson Rogers reiterated his request that she meet with staff.

G-2. A-96/97-3 - DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON A REQUEST FROM JOHN UHART TO AMEND CCMC SECTION 18.06.129; G-3. Z-96/97-2 - DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON A CHANGE OF LAND USE REQUEST FROM JOHN UHART; AND, G-4. U-96/97-10 - DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON A SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FROM JOHN UHART (1-1815.5) - Mr. Joiner, Mr. Forsberg, Applicant's Representative John Uhart, Jay Balentine, Randy Kearns, Land Use and Planning Consultant Graham Ross, Joyce Hoffer, Virginia Orcutt, Vaughn Smith, Rob Scanland, Vicki Dunmore, Don Dunmore - Commissioner Uhart explained her potential conflict of interest and left the dais and room--8:30 p.m. (A quorum was still present.) Mr. Joiner then explained the staff report. Discussion between the staff and Commission explained the area which would be rezoned, a potential resolution of intent, the current zoning, the Master Plan designation as a high density residential district, methods to control development on Parcels D and E, and legal concerns involved with the use of the resolution of intent. Discussion indicated that the Commission could approve the project conditioned upon a resolution of intent which would have to be developed prior to the Board of Supervisors' consideration of the application. Clarification indicated that the resolution of intent would not be for Parcels D and E.

(2-2339.5) Messrs. Uhart and Balentine indicated they had read the staff report and agreed to it. At this time the intent is to acquire only the back 4.2 acres of land--Parcel F. They explained their concern about future projects on Parcels D and E. They opposed two story apartments. The purchase agreement includes an escape clause stating that the purchase is terminated if a project of over one story is proposed. This statement is not binding on the Planning Commission. Procedures to maintain this restriction were noted. A site specific traffic study has not been performed. Mr. Uhart indicated that he did not have the authority to speak for the property owner and could not approve a resolution of intent on the front two parcels. Mr. Balentine indicated he had considered purchasing the entire tract which included Parcels D and E. He indicated that this area could be used as a single story medical office with the same architectural design as the nursing home. This would be a daytime use. He then indicated his agreement to Chairperson Rogers' request for a continuance. He gave the Commission and Clerk pictures of a facility similar to the one proposed for Parcel F.

(2-2511.5) Public comments were solicited. Mr. Kearns gave the Commission some photographs of the site as it appears today. (These were given to the Clerk after the meeting.) The purpose of the photographs was to illustrate the country lifestyle of the area. He expressed a willingness to work with the property owner to develop an agreeable project. He indicated that a nursing home or extended care facility could be an acceptable project, however, the present project is not at this time acceptable. He felt that the developer should be required to acquire the entire parcel and dedicate Parcels D and E to the City for a park which would provide a buffer zone. The proposal to put a commercial use against SF6,000 did not provide for a blending of uses and conflicts with the Master Plan. He requested a 30 day extension to allow the homeowners time to analyze the impacts and to work with the developer. Chairperson Rogers explained that this extension could not automatically be granted due to time constraints mandated by the Statutes. An extension could be granted if the applicant requests one.

(2-2639.5) Additional public comment was solicited. Mr. Ross urged the applicant to consider a 30 day continuation and emphasized the country lifestyle of the area and the neighbors' concern about the potential impacts on the aesthetics. He responded to Commissioner Christianson's question by indicating that the design of a single-story medical office could be acceptable particularly if similar to the convalescent facility design or a campus setting. He agreed that this issue could not be resolved this evening.

(1-2683.5) Additional public comments were solicited. Ms. Hoffer thanked the Commission for considering the neighborhood concerns. She felt that the nursing home facility was not the problem although there is a need for some concessions, specifically, the studies which were requested by the staff report. She urged the Commission to require a traffic study and suggested the access be made from Hot Springs. (Commissioner Wipfli stepped from the room at 9:12 p.m. A quorum was still present.) She supported making Parcels D and E into a park. She questioned the feasibility of putting the nursing home adjacent to multi-family apartments, a veterinary clinic with noisy dogs, a freeway on the north and east with its traffic noises, etc. She questioned the type of patients which would be accepted at the facility. She supported maintaining the SF6,000 zoning. Discussion indicated that the dogs could be heard at night and during the early morning hours. She felt that her lot was not included on the Master Plan and is not protected like the area adjacent to the Bypass. Commission comments indicated the dogs are held overnight in inside kennels and are awaiting surgery. They are not boarded.

(2-2830.5) Ms. Orcutt urged the Commission to maintain the area as open space. She opposed the facility based on the traffic, noise, and negative impact the freeway would have on it. She also opposed high-rise apartments due to the traffic. (Commissioner Wipfli returned at 9:12 p.m. A quorum was present although Commissioner Uhart was absent and abstaining as indicated at the beginning of this Item.)

(2-2363.5) Additional public comments were solicited. Chairperson Rogers requested comments be as brief as possible and not repeat previous comments. Vaughn Smith questioned the access for the parcel and noted that without the access the parcel would be landlocked. He supported single-story development on Parcels D and E. He urged the Commission to maintain the SF6,000 uses. He explained his personal knowledge of the problems created by resolutions of intent and urged the Commission to reject this proposal. If the nursing home is located adjacent to the Bypass, noise abatement procedures should be required. He questioned the type of patients who would use the facility and whether the area is appropriate for such a use. He applauded the applicants efforts to bring additional facilities to the area as they are needed. He felt that, if Parcels D and E remain single family residential zoning, the 4.2 acre portion could be zoned to allow the nursing home. The traffic on Emerson had increased since Hot Springs Road was reconfigured. He urged the Commission, if the project is approved, to require access from Hot Springs Road and not Emerson. Chairperson Rogers thanked him for supporting legal staff. He then explained that if the 4.2 acre parcel is approved, it would include the access between Parcels D and E. This would require redrawing of the parcel map. Mr. Aldean explained the resolution of intent control process which is done by placing a note on the parcel map. Clarification indicated that this restriction would be placed against Parcel F. Zoning for Parcels D and E would remain the same.

(2-3056.5) Mr. Scanland commended the Commission and staff for listening to and understanding the neighborhood's concerns. He requested denial due to those concerns--that it remain SF6,000 specifically on the parcels adjacent to Emerson. The remaining parcel should be addressed at some future date but not with the resolution of intent at this time.
(Commissioner Mally stepped from the room at 9:25 p.m. A quorum was still present.)

(2-3088.5) Ms. Dunmore also commended staff and the Commission for looking out for the neighborhood. She questioned the reasons a change of zoning is mandatory. She felt the entire parcel should remain single family with a special use permit to allow a nursing facility in the single family zoning. Mr. Joiner indicated that this would be possible if the Commission amended the Code. Ms. Dunmore felt that this would eliminate the need for Parcels D and E to be discussed. Chairperson Rogers indicated that this would require a different amendment to the Code which could not be addressed this evening and would not address the problem.

(2-3155.5) Mr. Dunmore questioned the difficulty to obtain a change of land use on Parcels D and E if the resolution of intent is approved for Parcel F. Chairperson Rogers felt that it would be "very easy". (Commissioner Mally returned at 9:28 p.m. A quorum was present as previously indicated although Commissioner Uhart had abstained.) He urged the Commission to act on all three parcels at one time.

(2-3192.5) Mr. Meierdierck felt that the change would change the City Code and allow the use throughout the City. He felt that this issue should be considered in the discussion. He also questioned the designation on the present land use map. If it is multi-family, then the main consideration should be that use. Likewise, if it is single family, that should be the main consideration. Chairperson Rogers explained for him that Agenda Item F-11 had been continued to the next meeting. He requested Mr. Meierdierck submit his comments in writing to staff before that meeting. He also explained that the Code modification had not been discussed. He felt that it fit with some of the previous changes. He agreed that a Code amendment would impact the entire City. Mr. Meierdierck then expressed his feeling that nursing homes are commercial establishments by nature and that it should be in a commercial district. Chairperson Rogers explained that neighbors living in the vicinity prefer a nursing home rather than apartments. It can be used as a buffer. Nursing homes are normally not high rises although apartments can be. If the Commission supports the request, it may be that an adjustment to the Master Plan is necessary. The Master Plan indicates the area should be a multi-family buffer between residential and commercial uses.

(2-3334.5) Additional public comments were solicited but none given. Public testimony was closed.

(2-3415.5) Mr. Uhart explained potential buffering which could be used between the project and the freeway, the residences, and the businesses to the south. He felt that it would not be beneficial for the project to acquire the right-of-way necessary from Hot Springs Road. He then requested a "stay" in order to discuss the project with Mr. Ross and the property owner. He did not feel that he could make any commitments on the part of that property owner related to his future development of the front two parcels. He then explained that the lighting issue which had been questioned in a letter would be addressed in the final plans. Chairperson Rogers also pointed out that this is part of the normal Public Works standards. Discussion indicated that 30 to 35 SF6000 residences could be developed on the property. Commissioner Wipfli pointed out the amount of traffic which could be generated by this number. He also indicated that the remaining portions could have five to six residences per parcel. The project may be a better option than the potential residential development allowed. He urged the residents to work with the applicant. Mr. Joiner briefly noted the different traffic volumes generated by residential uses, office, nursing homes, multi-family duplexes, etc. Commissioner Wipfli expressed his personal knowledge of the traffic volume created by nursing homes. Chairperson Rogers commended Mr. Uhart on his willingness to work with the neighbors. He also noted that if the two parcel are rezoned multi-family, there could be 30 units on the two small parcels. Commissioner Wipfli noted his opposition to any action granting this zone change for those parcels.

(2-3579.5) Commissioner Horton moved to recommend that the Board of Supervisors approve A-96/97-3 on first reading, an ordinance amendment providing for rest homes, convalescent homes and nursing homes as conditional uses within the Multi-Family Apartment zoning district. Commissioner Mally seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0-1-0 with Commissioner Uhart abstaining.

(3-0002.5) Commissioner Horton moved that on Items U-96/97-10 and Z-96/97-2, that the Commission approve the applicant's request for a continuance until the next scheduled Regional Planning Commission meeting. Commissioner Mally seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0-1-0 with Commissioner Uhart abstaining.

BREAK: A five minute recess was declared at 9:45 p.m. When the meeting reconvened at 9:50 p.m. the entire Commission was present including Commissioner Uhart, constituting a quorum.

G-5. MPE-95/96-3 - DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON A RESOLUTION FORM CARSON CITY TO ADOPT A MASTER PLAN LAND USE SUB-ELEMENT (3-0025.5) - Mr. Joiner, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Forsberg, Parks and Recreation Commission President Jay Meierdierck - Mr. Joiner's introduction corrected several typographical and grammatical errors. Mr. Sullivan explained the change to the Raycraft Ranch Map and corrected the elevation on Page 3. Mr. Joiner pointed out the need for an addendum to this section in view of the recently discovered Indian village. This may require a second designation. Chairperson Rogers explained his request that the repository of historical writings be listed in the document. Mr. Sullivan suggested this list be under cultural resources in general. Chairperson Rogers felt that the definition for cultural resources needed to be defined. Commissioner Horton indicated that the Carson City Public Library has an extensive repository. Chairperson Rogers felt that Page 5 - Cultural Resources should be amended to include this information. He also felt that Page 7, Goal 1 and Policy 1.4 should be amended. Mr. Forsberg suggested that the Commission's purview should be over the land mass and documents are not part of a map or the master plan. Chairperson Rogers explained his position which is based on his belief that this information is a valuable part of the record. Commissioner Horton supported Mr. Forsberg and questioned whether the listing should be under a historical archeological properties preservation document. Mr. Sullivan suggested that page 6, Inventory, be amended to include "...all resources including written material and maps....". Mr. Joiner supported his recommendation. Commissioner Wipfli suggested a goal be established to do some compiling of the documents if funding is available.

(3-0195.5) Public testimony was solicited. Mr. Meierdierck indicated that his comments were as Chairperson to the P&R Commission although his comments had not been endorsed by the Commission. He then recommended coordination of the Master Plan and the Advisory Board. This should include cross references in the Master Plan Sub-Elements. Four of his Commission references to the Historic Element had been cited during his July 31st comments. This has not occurred in the draft. Likewise, the Land Use Element is not included as a reference. The different aspects of historic preservation overlap his Commission, this Commission and HARC areas. These areas of mutual concern should have been coordinated by staff. He then used Policy 2.4 on Page 7 to support his position that this coordination should occur and urged the Commission to send the document to the Parks and Recreation Commission. He acknowledged the failure of one of his Commissioners to attend and participate in the meetings as assigned. Clarification explained his Commission's position on any statements made outside of its meeting without approval. Mr. Meierdierck then explained his personal comments on the document which indicated that the document was not ready for adoption as illustrated by various grammatical and technical errors which he provided. He suggested that the document be edited one more time. He then explained that he had given additional comments to the HARC Chairperson Scott Klette. He had not been able to determine that that Commission had acted upon those comments. Planning Commission comments questioned whether the comments had been considered. Chairperson Rogers indicated that Parks and Recreation Director Kastens was considered part of the technical staff and may have participated. He then recommended continuing action on this Item to allow HARC an opportunity to respond. Mr. Joiner indicated that he had given the Commission a listing of eligible and nationally adopted properties earlier in the meeting. This listing had been adopted by reference. Mr. Sullivan supported Chairperson Rogers' suggestion that the item be returned to HARC. Discussion explained the reasons Mr. Meierdierck had brought his concerns to the Commission rather than through HARC. Coordination between the Parks and Recreation Commission and HARC was emphasized. Mr. Meierdierck indicated his Commission could consider the issue on September 17. Its recommendation would be forwarded to HARC for its October meeting. The Planning Commission would consider the element at its October meeting.

Additional public testimony was requested but none given. No formal action was taken. Staff was directed to coordinate the Parks and Recreation Commission comments to HARC. The Planning Commission will consider the comments as soon as possible after the HARC review. Mr. Joiner then explained that cultural, archeological, and historical resources definitions had been discussed at length at the meetings and with the technical advisory committee members. Some of the apparent inconsistencies are in fact there for valid reasons. Chairperson Rogers indicated that he would submit his written comments for forwarding and requested the other Commissioners do the same.

H. INTERNAL COMMUNICATIONS AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS (NON-ACTION ITEMS)

H-1. CORRESPONDENCE TO THE COMMISSION (1-0438.5) - Discussion ensued concerning the paint on the storage facility on Highway 50 at Dump Hill. Commission comments directed staff to bring this matter back as an agendized item. Mr. Joiner explained the conference notice for October 2 to 5 in Boulder City. Staff planned to attend the National Conference in San Diego April 5 through the 9th.

H-2. STAFF BRIEFING ON STATUS OF COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS (3-0492.5) - Mr. Sullivan reviewed the Board's action on the Thornley removal of a condition, the appeal of staff's interpretation, Ron Kitchen and Polichio's abandonments, Williams' change of land use, the animals and fowl ordinance, Kmart parking lot car sales request, and review of Kmart's special use permit. Any future requests which may impact the Clearview and 395 intersection may have to address traffic concerns. The Board directed staff to pursue Teresa Reid and Helen Tappero's Code amendment. The Commission will consider the issue at a future meeting.

H-3. COMMISSIONER REPORTS (3-0530.5) - None.

H-4. STAFF COMMENTS (3-0532.5) - Discussion ensued on the child care ordinance and information which had been provided a year ago concerning the impact on property values. Commissioner Uhart felt that the assessed value had little to do with the property's marketability. She urged staff to consider sale prices. Chairperson Rogers and Mr. Joiner indicated that the information provided had included this information. The studies had purportedly indicated there is no impact. Other documents had considered the philosophical issues related to such facilities. Commissioner Uhart recommended guidelines be provided due to her belief that the residential area is where a childcare facility should be located. She was concerned about such use on small lots in small homes. A one acre home is an appropriate location. Commissioner Christianson supported her position except from the angle of the property owner who had made an investment in his property and his right to expect the area to stay residential and not commercial. He requested information concerning the sale value. Chairperson Rogers felt that the criteria should include the number of complaints, which he felt during his tenure had been almost none. There had been complaints before approval but not after. He felt that the circumstances were considered which included the fences, yard, etc. Limits are often established which may not agree with the Health Department's recommendation. Mr. Sullivan then noted that the workshop session had not included discussion on the By-Laws. He distributed a copy of the By-Laws and the small brochure on the use permit to the Commission. (A copy of the By-Laws was given to the Clerk but not the brochure.) Mr. Forsberg distributed copies of the Open Meeting Law to the Commission.

H-5. FUTURE COMMISSION ITEMS (3-0642.5) - Discussion indicated a desire to have another training session. Items on the next agenda were discussed including the architectural review of the storage units, the Long Lazer Tag show cause, the two Uhart items, and the ordinance reviews. Commissioner Christianson requested staff check into the operation south of Dynatech and its conditions.

I. ADJOURNMENT (3-0710.5) - There being no other matters for consideration, Commissioner Pozzi moved to adjourn. Commissioner Wipfli seconded the motion. Motion carried 7-0. Chairperson Rogers adjourned the meeting at 10:35 p.m.

The Minutes of the August 28, 1996, Carson City Regional Planning Commission meeting

ARE SO APPROVED ON__November_6____, 1996.

_/s/Vern Horton,_Vice_Chairperson_for__
Alan Rogers, Chairperson