

MINUTES
Regular Meeting
Carson City Planning Commission
Wednesday, April 27, 2016 • 5:00 PM
Community Center Sierra Room, 851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada

Commission Members

Chair – Paul Esswein
Commissioner – Victor Castro
Commissioner – Elyse Monroy
Commissioner – Daniel Salerno

Vice Chair – Mark Sattler
Commissioner – Monica Green
Commissioner – Walt Owens

Staff

Lee Plemel, Community Development Director
Hope Sullivan, Planning Manager
Danny Rotter, Engineering Manager
Susan Dorr Pansky, Special Projects Planner
Dan Yu, Deputy District Attorney
Tamar Warren, Deputy Clerk

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

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

A. ROLL CALL, DETERMINATION OF QUORUM, AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

(5:02:54) – Chairperson Esswein called the meeting to order at 5:02 p.m. Roll was called and a quorum was present. Commissioner Owens led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Attendee Name	Status	Arrived
Chairperson Paul Esswein	Present	
Vice Chairperson Mark Sattler	Present	5:15 p.m.
Commissioner Victor Castro	Absent	
Commissioner Monica Green	Present	5:15 p.m.
Commissioner Elyse Monroy	Present	
Commissioner Walt Owens	Present	
Commissioner Daniel Salerno	Present	

B. PUBLIC COMMENTS

(5:04:28) – John Bullis introduced himself as a resident on Chaparral Drive and expressed his “surprise and concern and disappointment” in the City and its Engineers for considering a planned unit development (PUD) on the property west of Mountain Street. Mr. Bullis believed that “it’s not consistent with the area to consider such high density and small size lots” and was concerned about traffic and flooding of the open field. He also suggested that the Commission not approve the PUD.

(5:06:03) – Tommy Hughes introduced himself as a Carson City resident since 1975 and referred to a Nevada Appeal article where a developer's representative was quoted saying "if we build it, the City will provide Water". Mr. Hughes noted his agreement with Mr. Bullis and objected to a HUD-Financed development, adding that the water and sewer fees should revert to the initial \$5,000 rate. Chairperson Esswein invited the public to attend the May 25, 2016 Planning Commission meeting in which the water issues will be discussed as part of growth management. Mr. Plemel clarified that public comment could not be discussed any further, since the development in question is not agendized for discussion in this meeting, per the Open Meeting Law.

(5:12:43) – Brian Ferenz introduced himself as a Carson City resident for 14 years. Mr. Ferenz praised many of the recent developments in the City; however, he objected to the Vintage property development because he believed that unlike other areas where open space, trails, and communities have been woven together, this development did not convey a similar balance.

(5:16:26) – LeAnn Saarem introduced herself as a Carson City native and also objected to "the preliminary plans that are being proposed".

(5:17:56) – Jan Sullivan introduced herself as a Carson City resident since 1952. Ms. Sullivan objected to the Vintage development as well because of flooding, traffic, and high density concerns.

C. POSSIBLE ACTION ON APPROVAL OF MINUTES – March 30, 2016.

(5:19:54) – MOTION: I move to approve the minutes [of the March 30, 2016 meeting] as written.

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

D. MODIFICATIONS OF AGENDA

(5:20:35) – Mr. Plemel recommended addressing items F-3A and F-3B, and items F-4A and F-4B together as they were related.

E. DISCLOSURES

(5:21:20) – There were no disclosures.

F. PUBLIC HEARING MATTERS

F-1 SUP-16-018 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FROM THE CARSON CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT (PROPERTY OWNER: CARSON CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT, FREMONT SCHOOL) FOR A SPECIAL USE PERMIT TO ALLOW A SINGLE-FACED LED CHANGEABLE MESSAGE CENTER DISPLAY SIGN ON PROPERTY ZONED PUBLIC (P), LOCATED AT 1511 FIREBOX RD., APN 010-041-30.

(5:21:30) – Chairperson Esswein introduced the item. Ms. Sullivan introduced Mark Johnson, Project Manager, and Mark Korinek, Carson City School District Director of Operations. She also presented the Staff Report and the accompanying photographs, incorporated into the record, and recommended approval, subject to conditions. She added that because the sign location is in the Public District, the Commission's approval is required.

(5:24:23) – Vice Chairperson Sattler was informed that the conditions of approval were consistent with the City's requirements for electronic signs. Ms. Sullivan noted that the default settings at this school for the illuminated sign were 6:30 a.m. until 10:00 p.m.

(5:29:18) – Chairperson Esswein invited Mark Johnson, applicant representative, to the podium. Mr. Johnson confirmed that he had read the Staff Report and was in agreement with the conditions of approval outlined by Staff. Commissioner Owens believed that having the sign lit until 10:00 p.m. was too late and Mr. Johnson noted that it was meant for the parents driving by the school to see the community and school activities. Commissioner Green believed that the LED lights are too bright to have on late at night and Mr. Johnson explained that the sign was "dimmable"; however, he was not aware of the actual dimming time. Commissioner Monroy pointed out the dimming information in the conditions of approval. Mr. Plemel provided additional clarification on the brightness levels. Discussion ensued regarding LED signs present at other schools in the district.

There were no public comments.

(5:32:45) – MOTION: I move to approve SUP-16-018, a Special Use Permit to allow a single-faced LED changeable message center display sign at 1511 Firebox Rd., APN 010-041-30 on property zoned Public (P), based on the findings and subject to the conditions of approval contained in the Staff Report.

RESULT:	APPROVED (5-1-0)
MOVER:	Sattler
SECONDER:	Salerno
AYES:	Esswein, Sattler, Green, Monroy, Salerno
NAYS:	Owens
ABSTENTIONS:	None
ABSENT:	Castro

F-2 SUP-16-019 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FROM THE CARSON CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT (PROPERTY OWNER: CARSON CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT, MARK TWAIN SCHOOL) FOR A SPECIAL USE PERMIT TO ALLOW A SINGLE-FACED LED CHANGEABLE MESSAGE CENTER DISPLAY SIGN ON PROPERTY ZONED PUBLIC (P), LOCATED AT 2111 CARRIAGE CREST DR., APN 002-101-46.

(5:33:38) – Chairperson Esswein introduced the item. Ms. Sullivan presented the Staff Report and the accompanying photographs, incorporated into the record, and recommended approval, subject to the conditions of approval outlined in the Staff Report.

(5:35:46) – Mr. Johnson stated that, on behalf of the applicant, he would accept the Staff's conditions of approval, incorporated into the record. Commissioner Owens believed that the sign should be lit until 9:00 p.m. and Mr. Johnson noted that 10:00 p.m. was the currently-approved time for the schools to turn off their signs.

There were no public comments.

(5:37:18) – I move to approve SUP-16-019, a Special Use Permit to allow a single-faced LED changeable message center display sign on property zoned Public (P), located at 2111 Carriage Crest Dr., APN 002-101-46, based on the findings and subject to the conditions of approval contained in the Staff Report.

RESULT:	APPROVED (5-1-0)
MOVER:	Sattler
SECONDER:	Salerno
AYES:	Esswein, Sattler, Green, Monroy, Salerno
NAYS:	Owens
ABSTENTIONS:	None
ABSENT:	Castro

F-3A VAR-16-022 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: TO CONSIDER REQUEST FROM BELLA LAGO, LLC (PROPERTY OWNER: BELLA LAGO, LLC) FOR A VARIANCE TO ALLOW THE REDUCTION OF REQUIRED OPEN SPACE PER UNIT FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT IN A NON-RESIDENTIAL ZONING DISTRICT ON PROPERTY ZONED GENERAL COMMERCIAL (GC), LOCATED AT 1600 AIRPORT RD., APN 008-312-04.

F-3B SUP-16-021 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FROM BELLA LAGO, LLC (PROPERTY OWNER: BELLA LAGO, LLC) FOR A SPECIAL USE PERMIT TO ALLOW THE ADDITION OF 64 MULTI-FAMILY APARTMENTS WITHIN THE EXISTING 175-UNIT BELLA LAGO APARTMENT COMPLEX ON PROPERTY ZONED GENERAL COMMERCIAL (GC), LOCATED AT 1600 AIRPORT RD., APN 008-312-04.

(5:38:27) – Chairperson Esswein introduced the items and clarified that the two items will be heard jointly; however, they will be voted on separately.

(5:39:10) – Ms. Sullivan presented the agenda materials and accompanying photographs, incorporated into the record, and introduced applicant representative Mike Railey of Rubicon Design Group, LLC.

(5:45:56) – Vice Chairperson Sattler inquired about the open space landscaping requirement timeline and Ms. Sullivan noted that landscaping may be damaged during construction; therefore it may take place after the completion of the project. She also clarified that the proposed parking had met the accepted parking requirements. Ms. Sullivan explained to Commissioner Salerno that the current open space requirements are quantitative and that the qualitative portion would be addressed at a later date.

(5:50:56) – Mr. Railey indicated that Ben Farahi, the owner of Bella Lago, LLC, was also present in the audience. He also explained that the landscaping would be upgraded regardless of the project approval. Mr. Railey noted his agreement with the conditions of approval in the Staff Report; however, he reminded the Commission that the building code items referenced in those conditions applied only to the new buildings. Vice Chairperson Sattler

inquired about the tenants' input on the new buildings and was informed that many tenants were inquiring about two and three-bedroom units. Mr. Railey assured Commissioner Salerno that the new building would complement the existing ones. In response to a question by Chairperson Esswein, Ms. Sullivan confirmed that the density is consistent with the City's multi-family housing requirements.

There were no public comments.

(5:57:05) – I move to approve VAR-16-022, a Variance request to allow the reduction of required open space per unit for residential development in a non-residential zoning district, so as to allow a total amount of open space of approximately 40,792 square feet where 59,750 square feet [are] required, on property zoned General Commercial (GC), located at 1600 Airport Rd., APN 008-312-04, based on the findings and subject to the recommended conditions of approval contained in the Staff Report.

RESULT:	APPROVED (4-2-0)
MOVER:	Salerno
SECONDER:	Sattler
AYES:	Sattler, Green, Monroy, Salerno
NAYS:	Esswein, Owens
ABSTENTIONS:	None
ABSENT:	Castro

(5:59:27) – I move to approve SUP-16-021, a request for a Special Use Permit to allow the addition of 64 multi-family apartments within the existing 175-unit Bella Lago Apartment complex on property zoned General Commercial (GC), located at 1600 Airport Rd., APN 008-312-04, based on the findings and subject to the conditions of approval contained in the Staff Report.

RESULT:	APPROVED (5-1-0)
MOVER:	Salerno
SECONDER:	Sattler
AYES:	Esswein, Sattler, Green, Monroy, Salerno
NAYS:	Owens
ABSTENTIONS:	None
ABSENT:	Castro

F-4A VAR-16-024 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FROM CAPSTONE COMMUNITIES (PROPERTY OWNER: ANDERSEN FAMILY ASSOCIATES) FOR A VARIANCE TO REDUCE THE REQUIRED DRIVEWAY APPROACH, MINIMUM PARCEL SIZE AND DIMENSIONS, AND MINIMUM REAR YARD SETBACK FOR SINGLE-FAMILY ATTACHED RESIDENTIAL LOTS IN THE MULTI-FAMILY APARTMENT (MFA) ZONING DISTRICT, ON PROPERTY LOCATED ON LITTLE LN, APN 004-021-13.

F-4B TSM-16-023 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: TO MAKE A RECOMMENDATION TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS REGARDING A TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP APPLICATION FROM CAPSTONE COMMUNITIES (PROPERTY OWNER: ANDERSEN FAMILY ASSOCIATES) TO

CREATE 147 SINGLE-FAMILY ATTACHED RESIDENTIAL LOTS ON 10.31 ACRES ON PROPERTY ZONED MULTI-FAMILY APARTMENT (MFA), LOCATED ON LITTLE LN, APN 004-021-13.

(6:00:40) – Chairperson Esswein introduced both items and noted that the applicant had withdrawn the request for the variance or the rear yard setback (a component of agenda item F-4A).

(6:02:08) – Ms. Sullivan presented the agenda materials with accompanying photographs. She also introduced Manhard Consulting Planning Manager and applicant representative Chris Baker. Ms. Sullivan noted that Staff recommended approval of the Variance because of its previous zoning of multi-family apartment units, which now would be single-family attached homes. She also explained that for rent apartments would not have required any approvals. Ms. Sullivan reviewed the conditions of approval and timelines, including those modified by the City Engineer. Vice Chairperson Sattler was informed that non-residential zones included parameters for single-family attached homes. Commissioner Green inquired about the Fire Department's turning radii and was informed that the Project engineer was in discussions with the Fire Marshall. Discussion ensued about lot sizes for apartments versus those for a single family unit.

(6:14:29) – Mr. Baker introduced himself and Mike Branson of Capstone Communities, and presented the property information which is incorporated into the record. He reiterated Ms. Sullivan's comments that the application was being reviewed only because it is a “for sale” versus “for rent” development. Mr. Baker also explained that each individual residence would have a two-car garage which will not be seen from the street side. Member Salerno wished to understand the discrepancy between the floor plans and the elevation drawings. He also objected to not having a private space per residence. Mr. Branson identified himself and explained that the second floor balconies have been planned. Mr. Baker noted that the residences would not have a yard or a private space. Commissioner Monroy inquired about the existence of standards for minimum parcel size and dimensions for single family attached residences and was informed that there were none; therefore, they needed a planned unit development (PUD) or a variance. Vice Chairperson Sattler was informed that a homeowners’ association would maintain what is installed by the developer.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

(6:49:19) – David Potts introduced himself as an area resident and inquired about school redistricting. He was also concerned about potential traffic. Chairperson Esswein noted that the Commission would not be involved in school redistricting issues. Suzanne Fox introduced herself as not an area resident but as an owner of rental properties. Ms. Fox was in favor of developing “eyesores”; however, she was concerned that residents would use their garages for storage and park on the streets. She also inquired about traffic control and speed limits in the area. Monika Franks stated that she represented her mother who had sent an opposition letter about the development, and was unhappy that the developers had not reached out to area residents. Charlie Muller, a Cedar Street resident, believed a two-story structure would ruin the neighbors’ views and would take away the privacy in his backyard. Mike Snyder noted that he had purchased his home 12 years ago and objected to the development. He believed a fire truck could not get through the development as well. Terry Zimmerman, another Cedar Street resident was concerned that the condominiums would eventually turn into rentals and residents would park in the streets in order to store their items in the garages. John Drown inquired about traffic from Parkland to Little Lane and presented a photograph, incorporated into the record, of another development where cars were parked in front of garages. He also expressed concern over the lack of private space. Susan Palmer indicated that she was raised on Cedar Street and was concerned about the development causing a drop in area home values and the lack of privacy. Rick Lee, a Cedar Street resident also objected to the development and

echoed the sentiments of the previous speakers. Keith Work introduced himself as a Carson City resident not residing in the area, and stated his opposition citing the lack of publicly accessible parking spaces. He also inquired about the term “alley” used by the developer representative.

(7:13:12) – Chairperson Esswein invited the applicant and his representative to address the concerns brought forward by the public. Mr. Baker addressed the traffic issues and specifically the extension of Parkland Avenue, noting that it would not take place until the 74th unit is built. He also believed that Little Lane would be the main point of entry based on the traffic study. Mr. Baker clarified that the properties must be owner-occupied for the first twelve month of ownership, reducing the rental property concerns. He explained that the developer will meet the City’s parking requirements. In response to the comments regarding obstructed views, Mr. Baker stated that they would do “anything to the best of our ability and within reason with some screening”, adding that they were not proposing structures with “extreme heights” but could offer solutions that involve landscaping. Mr. Baker explained that the term “alley load” referred to a public street with a “rear loaded garage” in planning terminology. He also clarified that they had accepted a condition from the Carson City Fire Department to widen the fire truck returns.

(7:22:01) – Commissioner Monroy inquired about parking enforcement by the City and Mr. Plemel clarified that the photographs provided by Mr. Drown were of private and not public streets. He also noted that the parking enforcement on public streets would be conducted by the City. Vice Chairperson Sattler suggested redesigning the perimeter homes in such a way to avoid having the balconies look into neighbors’ yards. Commissioner Salerno reiterated his concern about the private yard requirements and Mr. Plemel indicated that the open space requirements would be met by having common areas. Commissioner Green suggested tabling the item to provide the developer time to meet with concerned neighbors and Mr. Plemel offered to research the code and timelines prior to offering an answer. Member Salerno wished to see a redesign of the project to incorporate a private space for each unit, in addition to finding out where the unit numbers would be placed. Commissioner Monroy stated that she was more comfortable with this project which she believed would be less congested than “300 apartments”. Commissioner Sattler expressed “heartburn” over the north end of the property, which he believed should not interfere with the privacy of the current residents. Chairperson Esswein was informed that the Cedar Street zoning district allowed two-story structures. Mr. Plemel clarified that action on this item must be taken within 60 days of receiving a completed application; however, it could be extended with the applicant’s consent, adding that this application was received 45 days ago. Mr. Baker requested a recess to consult with his client regarding a continuance, adding that an easement has been requested for the sewer.

(7:39:56) – Chairperson Esswein recessed the meeting.

(7:47:34) – Chairperson Esswein reconvened the meeting. A quorum was still present.

(7:47:45) – Mr. Baker explained that they would be “more than happy to meet with the residents” and would consent to the continuance, as long as the item was placed on the Commission’s May agenda. He also noted that they would address “the interface on the north boundary” by doing their best. In response to Commissioner Salerno’s inquiry, Mr. Baker stated that the home addresses would be displayed on the front and the rear of the homes. He also noted that this type of housing has been successful in many locations and believed that the common spaces encouraged neighbor interaction. Commissioner Monroy requested “updated current information” in the next meeting and Mr. Baker agreed to return with updated site plans and elevations. Chairperson Esswein entertained a motion.

(7:56:45) – At the applicant’s request, I move to continue VAR-16-024 and TSM-16-023 to the Wednesday, May 25, 2016 Planning Commission meeting, as a continuation of the public hearing.

RESULT:	APPROVED (5-1-0)
MOVER:	Green
SECONDER:	Sattler
AYES:	Esswein, Sattler, Green, Monroy, Owens
NAYS:	Salerno
ABSTENTIONS:	None
ABSENT:	Castro

(7:58:00) – Mr. Baker thanked everyone for their input and suggested interested members of the public provide him with contact information for a neighborhood meeting.

G. STAFF REPORTS (NON-ACTION ITEMS)

G-1 DIRECTOR'S REPORT TO THE COMMISSION.

(7:59:30) – Mr. Plemel noted that the Silver Oak PUD amendment was approved by the Board of Supervisors. He also stated that Carson City Transportation Manager Patrick Pittenger would continue to work with the neighbors and address their traffic issues.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

(7:58:43) – Mr. Plemel announced that the May meeting agenda will contain Growth Management, several Special Use Permits for medical marijuana establishments, and the continuance of agenda items F-4A and F-4B which will be agendized as the first two items for discussion. Mr. Rotter stated that he would present “a water update”.

COMMISSIONER REPORTS/COMMENTS

(8:00:35) –Chairperson Esswein stated that he would not be present at the May meeting which will be chaired by Vice Chairperson Sattler.

H. PUBLIC COMMENT

(8:02:30) – LeAnn Saarem stated that a single-story option is more convenient for elderly tenants; however, Ms. Saarem did not specify to which agenda item she was referring. Sean Gallagher stated “I came here very upset, but to your credit, I would really like to thank all of you”, adding that he was happy to see some scrutiny of the projects. Mr. Gallagher also voiced his concern regarding miscommunication and “terrible public relations” regarding the upcoming Vintage project and urged the Commission to continue being critical of the project.

I. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: FOR ADJOURNMENT

(8:07:32) – MOTION: Vice Chairperson Sattler moved to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Green. The meeting was adjourned at 8:08 p.m.

The Minutes of the April 27, 2016 Carson City Planning Commission meeting are so approved this 29th day of June, 2016.

PAUL ESSWEIN, Chair