

**MINUTES**  
**Regular Meeting**  
**Carson City Planning Commission**  
**Wednesday, March 28, 2018 ● 5:00 PM**  
**Community Center Sierra Room**  
**851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada**

**Commission Members**

<b>Chair – Mark Sattler</b>	<b>Vice Chair – Charles Borders, Jr.</b>
<b>Commissioner – Paul Esswein</b>	<b>Commissioner – Elyse Monroy</b>
<b>Commissioner – Daniel Salerno</b>	<b>Commissioner – Candace Stowell</b>
<b>Commissioner – Hope Tingle</b>	

**Staff**

Lee Plemel, Community Development Director  
Hope Sullivan, Planning Manager  
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](http://www.Carson.org/minutes).

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

(5:01:40) – Chairperson Sattler called the meeting to order. Roll was called. A quorum was present. Vice Chairperson Borders led the Pledge of Allegiance.

<b>Attendee Name</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Arrived/Left</b>
Chairperson Mark Sattler	Present	
Vice Chairperson Charles Borders, Jr.	Present	
Commissioner Paul Esswein	Present	
Commissioner Elyse Monroy	Absent	
Commissioner Daniel Salerno	Present	
Commissioner Candace Stowell	Present	
Commissioner Hope Tingle	Present	

**B. PUBLIC COMMENT**

(5:02:28) – Chairperson Sattler entertained public comments; however, none were forthcoming.

**C. POSSIBLE ACTION ON APPROVAL OF MINUTES – February 28, 2018**

(5:03:00) – **MOTION: I move to approve the February 28, 2018 meeting minutes.**

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>APPROVED (6-0-0)</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Borders
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Salerno
<b>AYES:</b>	Sattler, Borders, Esswein, Salerno, Stowell, Tingle
<b>NAYS:</b>	None
<b>ABSTENTIONS:</b>	None
<b>ABSENT:</b>	Monroy

**D. MODIFICATION OF AGENDA**

(5:03:16) – Mr. Plemel explained that there were no modifications to the agenda; however, he highlighted the consent agenda portion, noting that should the Commissioners wish to discuss one of the items, it will be pulled from the consent agenda. He also stated that not much had changed in terms of ordinances for billboards; hence, the consent agenda.

**E. Consent Agenda Items**

(5:03:54) – Chairperson Sattler entertained a motion.

**(5:03:57) – MOTION: I move to approve the consent agenda.**

(5:04:30) – Commissioner Borders requested adding the age of the billboards and whether they comply with current rules in the future. Mr. Plemel clarified that all billboards were brought up to current standards; however, he offered to include that information for future approvals. There were no additional comments and Chairperson Sattler called for the vote.

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>APPROVED (6-0-0)</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Tingle
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Salerno
<b>AYES:</b>	Sattler, Borders, Esswein, Salerno, Stowell, Tingle
<b>NAYS:</b>	None
<b>ABSTENTIONS:</b>	None
<b>ABSENT:</b>	Monroy

**E.1 SUP-18-018 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION – TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR A BILLBOARD ON PROPERTY ZONED RETAIL COMMERCIAL (RC), LOCATED AT 3590 NORTH CARSON STREET, APN 007-462-03.**

**E.2 SUP-18-022 – FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR A BILLBOARD ON PROPERTY ZONED GENERAL INDUSTRIAL (GI), LOCATED AT 5740 HIGHWAY 50 EAST, APN 008-391-07.**

**E.3 SUP-18-023 – FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR A BILLBOARD ON PROPERTY ZONED GENERAL COMMERCIAL (GC), LOCATED AT 4769 SOUTH CARSON STREET, APN 009-287-02.**

**E.4 SUP-18-024 – FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR A BILLBOARD ON PROPERTY ZONED GENERAL COMMERCIAL (GC), LOCATED AT 1991 EAST WILLIAM STREET, APN 008-152-22.**

**E.5 SUP-18-025 – FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR A BILLBOARD ON PROPERTY ZONED GENERAL INDUSTRIAL (GI), LOCATED AT 6369 HIGHWAY 50 EAST, APN 008-522-11.**

**E.6 SUP-18-026 – FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR A BILLBOARD ON PROPERTY ZONED GENERAL COMMERCIAL (GC), LOCATED AT 497 WEST BENNETT AVENUE, APN 009-301-05.**

**E.7 SUP-18-028 – FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR A BILLBOARD ON PROPERTY ZONED GENERAL COMMERCIAL (GC), LOCATED AT 4900 SOUTH CARSON STREET, APN 009-284-01.**

**E.8 SUP-18-029 – FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR A BILLBOARD ON PROPERTY ZONED GENERAL COMMERCIAL (GC), LOCATED AT 5100 SOUTH CARSON STREET, APN 009-301-06.**

**END OF CONSENT AGENDA**

**OTHER ITEMS:**

**F. ITEM(S) PULLED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA WILL BE HEARD AT THIS TIME.**

No items were pulled from the consent agenda.

**G. PUBLIC HEARING MATTERS**

**G.1 SUP-18-031 – FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A SPECIAL USE PERMIT TO ALLOW A FENCE TO EXCEED THE HEIGHT LIMITATION ON PROPERTY ZONED SINGLE FAMILY ONE ACRE (SF1A), LOCATED AT 4031 CENTER DRIVE, APN 009-142-11.**

(5:05:46) – Chairperson Sattler introduced the item. Ms. Sullivan presented the Staff Report, incorporated into the record, and responded to clarifying questions from the commissioners.

(5:09:44) – Applicants Krista and Lawrence Leach introduced themselves and stated their acceptance of the conditions of approval outlined by Ms. Sullivan and in the Staff Report. Commissioner Salerno cautioned against building a fence that may not withstand Carson City winds and Ms. Leach indicated that they had planned for such wind. There were no public comments. Chairperson Sattler entertained a motion. Commissioner Stowell noted a correction to the suggestion motion.

**(5:11:17) – MOTION: I move to approve SUP-18-031, a Special Use Permit request to allow an increase in the permitted fence height in the street side yard from three feet to six feet, on property zoned Single Family One Acre, located at 4031 Center Drive, APN 009-142-11, based on findings in the conditions of approval contained in the Staff Report.**

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>APPROVED (6-0-0)</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Stowell
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Tingle
<b>AYES:</b>	Sattler, Borders, Esswein, Salerno, Stowell, Tingle
<b>NAYS:</b>	None
<b>ABSTENTIONS:</b>	None
<b>ABSENT:</b>	Monroy

**G.2 SUP-17-217 – FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A SPECIAL USE PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A DETACHED GARAGE THAT RESULTS IN ACCESSORY STRUCTURES THAT EXCEED FIVE PERCENT OF THE LOT AREA AND EXCEEDS 50 PERCENT, BUT NOT MORE THAN 75 PERCENT, OF THE SIZE OF THE PRIMARY STRUCTURE, ON PROPERTY ZONED CONSERVATION RESERVE, LOCATED AT 5371 CORRINNE CT, APN 008-816-21.**

(5:12:19) – Chairperson Sattler introduced the item. Ms. Sullivan presented the Staff Report which is incorporated into the record and responded to clarifying questions.

(5:15:28) – Applicant Robert Hopkins introduced himself and confirmed his agreement with the conditions of approvals outlined in the Staff Report. Mr. Hopkins also clarified for Vice Chair Borders that after meeting with neighbors, the immediately adjacent neighbors would no longer wish to block the project. There were no public comments; therefore, Chairperson Sattler entertained a motion.

**(5:16:59) – MOTION: I move to approve SUP-17-217 a request for a Special Use Permit to allow a 2,600 square foot detached accessory structure and allow the accessory structures on site to exceed five percent of the parcel size, on property zoned Conservation Reserve, located at 5371 Corrinne Ct., APN 008-816-21, based on findings and subject to the conditions of approval contained in the Staff Report.**

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>APPROVED (6-0-0)</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Salerno
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Esswein
<b>AYES:</b>	Sattler, Borders, Esswein, Salerno, Stowell, Tingle
<b>NAYS:</b>	None
<b>ABSTENTIONS:</b>	None
<b>ABSENT:</b>	Monroy

**G.3 SUP-15-079-02 – FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FOR A REVISION TO A SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR AN ACCESSORY STRUCTURE THAT EXCEEDS 75 PERCENT OF THE SIZE OF THE PRIMARY BUILDING, SPECIFICALLY REVISING CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL RELATIVE TO A REQUIREMENT FOR LANDSCAPING TO SCREEN THE STRUCTURE FROM THE STREET AND ADJACENT PROPERTIES, A SIZE LIMITATION OF 1200 SQUARE FEET FOR THE ACCESSORY STRUCTURE, A REQUIREMENT FOR REMOVAL OF TWO SHED STRUCTURES, AND A REQUIREMENT THAT UNREGISTERED AND INOPERABLE VEHICLES NOT BE STORED OUTSIDE THE STRUCTURE. THE PROPERTY IS ZONED SINGLE FAMILY ONE ACRE (SF1A), AND LOCATED AT 4589 SILVER SAGE DRIVE, APN 009-176-05.**

(5:18:05) – Chairperson Sattler introduced the item. Ms. Sullivan presented the agenda materials which are incorporated into the record and responded to clarifying questions.

(5:23:08) – Jason McIntosh introduced himself and indicated that he would accept the recommended conditions of approval as written. Ms. Sullivan noted that the applicant would use landscaping as a screening device; however, additional fencing would be proposed to mitigate the gaps in the fence. Mr. McIntosh confirmed that a six-foot tall fence will be built on the south side of the property, per code, and a three-foot fence around the rest of the front of the property. Additionally, Mr. McIntosh informed the Commission that a gate will be built along with a 20-foot long fence “north to south at the driveway”. Chairperson Sattler received confirmation that the house did not have a garage at this time. Discussion ensued regarding vintage vehicles and Mr. McIntosh stated that four of his vehicles did not fall under that category; therefore, those cars would need to be housed first. Commissioner Stowell wished to see “fencing all the way around” and Mr. McIntosh explained that he planned to complete the fencing by the end of the summer. Vice Chair Borders inquired about a firm completion date for the fencing and Ms. Sullivan noted that the fence should be completed prior to obtaining a certificate of occupancy for the building. Chairperson Sattler entertained public comments.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

(5:29:37) – Debbie Hanner introduced herself and noted that her mother lived “two houses away” and that she lived next door to her mother. Ms. Hanner stated that there currently were 19 cars on the property, all of which would not fit in the proposed shed and that the cars were visible, calling it “an eyesore for the neighborhood”.

(5:30:44) – John McIntosh introduced himself as the applicant’s father and noted that the project was “not objected by all the neighbors” and referenced the supporting letters received from neighbors, and incorporated into the record. He also disagreed that the property was an eyesore. There were no additional comments. Chairperson Sattler entertained a motion.

**(5:33:35) – MOTION: I move to approve SUP-15-079-02, Special Use Permit request to allow the cumulative square footage of accessory structures on the property to exceed 75 percent of the size of the main residence on property zoned Single Family One Acre, located at 4589 Silver Sage Drive, APN 009-176-05 based on findings and conditions of approval contained in the Staff Report, with an additional condition, number twelve, to require six-foot, opaque fencing around the property where the cars are located to be in place before the certificate of occupancy is issued for the accessory structure.**

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>APPROVED (6-0-0)</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Stowell
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Esswein
<b>AYES:</b>	Sattler, Borders, Esswein, Salerno, Stowell, Tingle
<b>NAYS:</b>	None
<b>ABSTENTIONS:</b>	None
<b>ABSENT:</b>	Monroy

**G.4 TSM-17-184 – FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: TO MAKE A RECOMMENDATION TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS REGARDING A TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP APPLICATION FROM BLACKSTONE DEVELOPMENT GROUP INC. TO CREATE A 209 LOT SUBDIVISION ON APPROXIMATELY 58.5 ACRES WITHIN THE LOMPA RANCH NORTH SPECIFIC PLAN AREA ON**

**PROPERTY APPROVED FOR SINGLE FAMILY 6000 (SF6) ZONING, LOCATED AT 2200 E. FIFTH STREET, APN 010-041-71.**

(5:34:50) – Chairperson Sattler introduced the item. Ms. Sullivan recommended continuing this item to the April 25, 2018 Planning Commission meeting, as requested by the applicant.

**(5:35:37) – I move to continue item [G-4] TSM-17-184 to the Planning Commission meeting of April 25, 2018.**

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>APPROVED (6-0-0)</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Borders
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Salerno
<b>AYES:</b>	Sattler, Borders, Esswein, Salerno, Stowell, Tingle
<b>NAYS:</b>	None
<b>ABSTENTIONS:</b>	None
<b>ABSENT:</b>	Monroy

**G.5 ZCA-18-032 – FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: TO MAKE A RECOMMENDATION TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS REGARDING AN ORDINANCE RELATING TO MARIJUANA; AMENDING TITLE 18 (ZONING), APPENDIX A (DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS), DIVISION 1.20 (MEDICAL MARIJUANA ESTABLISHMENTS AND MARIJUANA ESTABLISHMENTS) OF THE CARSON CITY MUNICIPAL CODE TO AMEND AND CLARIFY REGULATIONS GOVERNING SIGNAGE FOR MEDICAL MARIJUANA ESTABLISHMENTS AND MARIJUANA ESTABLISHMENTS.**

(5:36:20) – Chairperson Sattler introduced the item. Mr. Plemel presented the agenda materials incorporated into the record and responded to clarifying questions. He also clarified for Chairperson Sattler that businesses may have temporary banners for 30 days within a 90-day period, adding that there are size limitations. Commissioner Stowell was informed that marijuana businesses were “limited in freestanding sign area”. Vice Chair Borders inquired about the size of the signage and Mr. Plemel explained that businesses may choose to have a 30 square foot sign or divide it into two 15 square foot signs. Commissioner Tingle received clarification that “sandwich board” type signs were currently prohibited per code, including those hand held ones by individuals. Chairperson Sattler entertained public comments.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

(5:49:15) – Will Adler, executive director of the Sierra Cannabis Coalition, explained that a business had marketed via “sign spinning” which had been deemed a violation and was not thought of as “professional or in a pharmaceutical manner” in Southern Nevada. Mr. Adler also noted his support to the clarification of the signage rules, calling it a positive change and more clarity on what can and cannot be done. Chairperson Sattler entertained additional comments, and when none were forthcoming, a motion.

**(5:51:24) – I move to recommend to the Board of Supervisors approval of an ordinance amending Title 18 Appendix, Development Standards Division 1.20 related to signage for marijuana establishments as published on the Agenda.**

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>APPROVED (5-1-0)</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Tingle
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Borders
<b>AYES:</b>	Sattler, Borders, Esswein, Stowell, Tingle
<b>NAYS:</b>	Salerno
<b>ABSTENTIONS:</b>	None
<b>ABSENT:</b>	Monroy

**G.6 MISC-18-038 – FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: CONSIDERATION OF AN APPEAL OF THE STAFF’S INTERPRETATION AND APPLICATION OF SECTION 1.13 OF THE DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS CONCERNING FENCING, AND 18.05.055 OF THE MUNICIPAL CODE REGARDING ACCESSORY STRUCTURES.**

(5:52:05) – Chairperson Sattler introduced the item and outlined the hearing process, noting that Staff would present first and answer questions, followed by a presentation by the appellant who will also answer questions. After clarifications by the appellant and Staff, public comments will be heard, followed by discussion and decision by the Commission

(5:53:17) – Ms. Sullivan presented the Staff Report, which is incorporated into the record and responded to clarifying questions by the Commission. Mr. Plemel clarified that a complaint had been submitted to the City’s code enforcement department, and a case was opened on March 7, 2016 and Ms. Sullivan noted that this issue could be remedied by obtaining a Special Use Permit. She also stated that late materials were distributed prior to the start of the meeting; however, they had not been reviewed by her yet.

(5:59:55) – Kevin Benson introduced himself as the attorney representing appellant Peter Gibbons, Manager of Equity Management Services, LLC, who was also present. Mr. Benson gave background, incorporated into the record, on the fence and noted that his client had not received any violation notices prior to completion of the fence. He also stated that a dispute between Mr. Gibbons and his neighbors regarding an abandoned road had resulted in a lawsuit in early 2017. Mr. Benson gave background on the storage containers on the property as well and indicated that his client had not received the notices of violation for the fence and the storage containers until January 2018, and referenced the objection letters by Mr. Gibbons, incorporated into the record. Mr. Benson believed that per the enclosed photograph, the fence was measured by Staff “from the adjacent grade of the fence” and not “from the street grade” which would make the fence “at most five-and-a-half feet”. He also cited design standards from the Development Code, an appendix from Title 18, and provided photographs, incorporated into the late materials, of violations in other nearby neighborhoods, asking for “a little bit of reasonableness” and to reverse Staff’s decision.

(6:23:42) – Commissioner Stowell inquired about where, if not in the Development Standards, will fences be regulated and Mr. Benson believed that “the Commission would need to amend the code to make it clear that these do in fact apply to single-family residential”. Chairperson Sattler explained that in the past, the Commission had approved a wire fence and its decisions were separate from Staff’s. He also noted that the Commission’s decision may be appealed to the Board of Supervisors, adding that a Special Use Permit could also be approved by the Commission. Mr. Benson indicated that none of the other properties he had shown had obtained a Special Use Permit (SUP), which he called a costly and difficult process. Chairperson Sattler reiterated that the SUP could have been a good solution. Commissioner Tingle stated that after seeing photographs provided by the

appellant, she did not believe that an SUP should be required, unless all the other property owners undergo the same process. Mr. Plemel stated that the Code Enforcement handles violations when they are brought to their attention, and that he was not certain whether SUPs were issued for any of the properties shown in the photographs. Mr. Benson believed that the SUP process was expensive and it involved engineering fees for correct measurements. Discussion ensued regarding the complaint which had resulted in this discussion.

(6:34:53) – Appellant Peter Gibbons introduced himself as the Manager of Equity Management Service, the trustee of the Ponderosa EQ Land Trust, property owner. He also gave background on the abandonments and easements in the area, and the related lawsuit, noting that he had received many compliments on the fence. He also believed that storage containers were efficient and less costly, calling the entire process unfair.

(6:45:10) – Commissioner Esswein noted his agreement to Staff’s interpretation of the code; however, he also agreed with the appellant and believed that “for us to require you to do something other than what you’ve done with your fence would be totally unreasonable on our part”. He suggested revising the code to be clearer and stated that he would vote against the Staff’s recommendation. Ms. Sullivan wished to see Staff provide further clarification prior to a vote.

(6:47:05) – Deputy District Attorney Dan Yu indicated that he had “skimmed through” the late materials provided by the appellant prior to the start of this meeting; however, he cautioned that his comments are not meant to influence the Commission’s decision. Mr. Yu clarified that the City had been named a defendant in the previously mentioned lawsuit “because one of the types of relief that was requested in that lawsuit pertained to a request for declaratory relief”. Mr. Yu cautioned against drawing any inferences from mentioning the lawsuit. He also noted that he wasn’t certain the “equal protection” cited by the appellant was binding in Nevada, as his research was preliminary based on the late material. Mr. Yu disagreed with the appellant’s position “that by reading the prefatory provision in the Appendix [Division 1 to Title 18] that a person of reasonable or ordinary intelligence would not be able to decipher that the rest of the contextual provisions do apply to residential use districts”. Mr. Yu also acknowledged the willingness of Staff to work with the appellant instead of “issuing a red tag or a notice of violation document”.

(6:56:10) – Ms. Sullivan noted that she had complimented the fence in August 2016, in addition to others Mr. Gibbons had received. She also noted that after a conversation with the appellant, she had been under the impression that he would apply for an SUP. Ms. Sullivan clarified that the intent of a letter sent to Mr. Gibbons was not a final notice of code violation. She believed that responses received from Mr. Gibbons to letters by, Assistant Planner Kathe Green indicated that “there was a disagreement in how the code was being applied”; therefore, she had given Mr. Gibbons an opportunity to appeal. She also stated for the record that she had no previous knowledge of the easement lawsuit.

(6:59:12) – Chairperson Sattler entertained public comments; however, none were forthcoming.

(6:59:27) – Mr. Benson apologized for their interpretation of Ms. Sullivan’s letter and appreciated her offer to appeal. He believed that Mr. Gibbons “has a different takeaway from that conversation in August”, and noted that there were two other visits by the City for other reasons, which had not indicated a code violation pertaining to the fence. He also reiterated his reasons why the Commission should vote against Staff’s recommendation. Vice Chair Borders was informed that the storage containers had a roof, not attached to the façade. Commissioner Stowell noted her support to Staff’s interpretation, adding that “everybody has to go through the permit process” either before or after beginning construction. She believed that the cited section of code has always been

pertinent for “all districts of 1.13” and that it applied to all residential structures, regardless of the structure’s beauty. Commissioner Salerno stated his agreement with Commissioner Stowell’s comments. He believed that the SUP process “would solve this problem very easily” without the dollars spent on legal fees. Vice Chair Borders referenced the appellant’s map that showed code violations and believed “there’s no way...there aren’t some SUPs in there”. He also believed that a gas meter inspector would not “question a wall” because that was not he or she was tasked to do, adding that an SUP would “solve all these problems”. Chairperson Sattler entertained a motion.

**(7:12:05) – I move to affirm the Staff’s interpretation and application of Section 1.13 of the Development Standards concerning fencing.**

**(7:12:17) – I move to affirm the Staff’s interpretation and application of Carson City Municipal Code 18.05.055 regarding accessory structures.**

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>APPROVED (4-2-0)</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Stowell
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Salerno
<b>AYES:</b>	Sattler, Borders, Salerno, Stowell
<b>NAYS:</b>	Esswein, Tingle
<b>ABSTENTIONS:</b>	None
<b>ABSENT:</b>	Monroy

(7:13:05) – Ms. Sullivan suggested having Commissioners Esswein and Tingle state their reasons for opposing the motion, should the appeal be heard by the Board of Supervisors. Commissioner Esswein stated that he had done so earlier. Commissioner Tingle stated that the evidence presented by Mr. Benson “the pictures of the fences and the storage containers, and I would hazard a guess, and this is just a guess, that not every one of those owners of those fences got SUPs for those fences, and I understand code enforcement is challenged in staffing...but the length of time that it took for the whole process to unfold to the point where Mr. Gibbons filed his appeal, I believe that is a little bit unreasonable for Mr. Gibbons to have thought that there’s still a problem here.” She also indicated that she did not want to see that fence torn down.

**H. Staff Reports (non-action items)**

**H.1 - DIRECTOR'S REPORT TO THE COMMISSION.**

(7:15:25) – Mr. Plemel noted that next meeting’s agenda would include an SUP for a multi-family apartments in a Commercial zoning and the tentative subdivision map that was continued from this meeting.

**- FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS.**

**- COMMISSIONER REPORTS/COMMENTS.**

(7:15:57) – Commissioner Tingle inquired about an area being cleared on Curry Street near the Railroad Museum. Mr. Plemel noted that no permit had been received yet for that property; however, he offered to look into it and respond to Commissioner Tingle. Chairperson Sattler received confirmation that a next step for Item G-6 could be an appeal to the Board of Supervisors.

**I. PUBLIC COMMENT**

No public was present for comments.

**J. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: ADJOURNMENT**

(7:18:10) – Vice Chair Borders moved to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Salerno. Chairperson Sattler adjourned the meeting at 7:18 p.m.

The Minutes of the March 28, 2018 Carson City Planning Commission meeting are so approved this 30<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2018.

---

MARK SATTLER, Chair