

**MINUTES**  
**Regular Meeting**  
**Carson City Planning Commission**  
**Wednesday, January 29, 2020 ● 5:00 PM**  
**Community Center Sierra Room**  
**851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada**

**Commission Members**

<b>Vice Chair – Charles Borders, Jr.</b>	<b>Commissioner – Alex Dawers</b>
<b>Commissioner – Paul Esswein</b>	<b>Commissioner – Teri Preston</b>
<b>Commissioner – Hope Tingle</b>	<b>Commissioner – Jay Wiggins</b>

**Staff**

Hope Sullivan, Planning Manager  
Benjamin Johnson, Deputy District Attorney  
Heather Ferris, Associate Planner  
Stephen Pott y, Senior Project Manager  
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.

The audio recording and approved minutes of this meeting are available on [www.Carson.org/minutes](http://www.Carson.org/minutes).

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

Vice Chairperson Borders called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. Roll was called. A quorum was present. Commissioner Wiggins led the Pledge of Allegiance.

<b>Attendee Name</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Arrived</b>
Vice Chair Charles Borders, Jr.	Present	
Commissioner Alex Dawers	Present	
Commissioner Paul Esswein	Present	
Commissioner Teri Preston	Present	
Commissioner Hope Tingle	Present	
Commissioner Jay Wiggins	Present	

**B. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Vice Chair Borders entertained public comments. Deni French introduced himself and spoke in favor of protecting current homeowners “as related to projects such as Lompa Ranch and Andersen Ranch,” especially regarding changing water tables and floodplain areas. He called upon the Commissioners to “reconsider [Title] 17, [Chapter] 10 [Open Space] as a better route” to understand the per-acre requirements for said properties. Mr. French cited a Supreme Court ruling against the City of Reno

regarding flooding and feared that Carson City could be held liable for possible flooding issues. He recommended having liability agreements signed to protect the City.

**C. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – DECEMBER 17, 2019**

Vice Chair Borders introduced the item and entertained comments, corrections, or changes; and when none were forthcoming, a motion.

**MOTION: Commissioner Tingle moved to approve the minutes of the December 17, 2019 Planning Commission meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Dawers.**

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>APPROVED (5-0-1)</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Tingle
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Borders
<b>AYES:</b>	Borders, Dawers, Preston, Tingle, Wiggins
<b>NAYS:</b>	None
<b>ABSTENTIONS:</b>	Esswein
<b>ABSENT:</b>	None

**D. MODIFICATION OF AGENDA**

Vice Chair Borders introduced the item and noted that items E.1 through E.4 were related. He requested clarification from Ms. Sullivan on the best way to proceed. Ms. Sullivan believed no modification was necessary to the agenda; however, she noted that all four items will be presented by Staff and the applicant as a single presentation, and recommended the Commission hear a single set of public comments for all four items. However, she stated that the Commission must take four separate actions in the form of one motion per item. Mr. Johnson indicated that the Vice Chair did not have to read each agenda item separately into the record and could indicate they would discuss all four if Staff described what the items were during their presentations.

**E. MEETING ITEMS**

**PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS E.1-E.4**

Vice Chairperson Borders noted that items E-1 through E-4 would be discussed simultaneously; however, they would be acted upon individually.

Ms. Ferris introduced the subject property and presented the Staff Report (for items E.1-E.4). She also responded to clarifying questions by the Commissioners, recommended approval because all the findings of fact are made in the affirmative and noted that no public comments had been received to date. Ms. Ferris acknowledged the presence of applicant John Krmptotic, who would provide a presentation as well. Commissioner Tingle expressed concern that the project would overburden the schools and the healthcare system and create additional traffic with the possibility of 74 more vehicles should residents not use their

garages for parking. Ms. Ferris confirmed for Vice Chair Borders that “the City is not willing to accept the street as a public street.” Discussion ensued regarding street abandonment and Ms. Ferris suggested that the applicant would be the one to better elaborate their discussions with NV Energy.

(5:26:50) – Commissioner Tingle was informed that trees would be required; however, they would not be considered a “full visual buffer”. Commissioner Preston requested having the homeowners association (HOA) be responsible for the retention basins and the easements and to ensure that they would not become the responsibilities of the City. Ms. Ferris informed Commissioner Dawers that the minimum setback for the rear yards is five feet.

(5:29:56) – Mr. Krmpotic acknowledged reading the Staff Report in detail and noted their agreement with the conditions of approval except the private street requirement. He expressed concern over the maintenance of a private street, which he believed would be better maintained as a public street. Mr. Krmpotic hoped the City would reconsider that item. He also gave background on the easement reflected in the drawings in the Staff Report, noting that the terms were “dictated” by NV Energy.

(5:34:13) – Monte Vista Consulting Principal Michael Vicks explained that the existing trees shown as part of the Staff Report belonged to the adjacent development; therefore, they would stay. Discussion ensued regarding the garage and Mr. Vicks explained that a truck (as long as it is not lifted) could fit through the seven-foot high garage door. He also noted that Emerson drive would be the highlighted roadway section and “the interior driveway will be the special section.” Mr. Pottéy confirmed for Commissioner Esswein that the special section was acceptable to the City as an “infill development”. Mr. Krmpotic confirmed that the NV Energy easement would be gated and the HOA would not have any control over it. Vice Chairperson Borders entertained public comments.

(5:39:55) – Mr. French objected to the bike routes because the concrete barriers blocked more of the residents’ view. He also requested additional information on the NV Energy easement.

(5:42:51) – Mike Honpa and Robin Gracio representing three congregations of Jehovah’s Witnesses did not object “to the lessening of the Variance”; however, they requested proper fencing to ensure safety and to be protected from liability when people use their parking lot as a shortcut to Walmart. They also acknowledged the presence of the trees on their property and stated that they maintain them. Mr. Gracio also wished to know what type of barrier would be placed between the development and the Kingdom Hall. Ms. Ferris explained that a “six-foot” privacy fence would separate the properties. She also showed on the map the road to the NV Energy substation, adding that the public would be unable to access it.

(5:46:19) – Mr. Pottéy explained that the City did not wish to be responsible for maintaining streets that only benefit a subdivision. Ms. Ferris clarified for Commissioner Dawers that the setbacks are measured from the center line of the road. Commissioner Preston noted her experience with HOAs and agreed with the City’s decision not to maintain the subdivision-specific roads. Commissioner Esswein noted “I’m having a problem with the Variance based upon the fact that [the developer is] getting an extra privilege that other residents in the neighborhood do not get by allowing the Variance.” Mr. Krmpotic explained

that they were concerned about the privacy of the adjacent property and that they were committed “to whatever it takes to make it right,” including additional trees if needed on the South side of the property. He also responded to Commissioner Esswein’s concern, noting that without the 20-foot setback “we’d lose a bank of houses and then the project goes away.” Ms. Sullivan noted that Staff are not always fond of variances; however, in this case the adjacent property did not have residences and the developer had allowed for the setbacks. Vice Chair Borders recommended taking action by following the agenda items and entertained a motion.

**PUBLIC HEARING**

**E.1 VAR-2019-0003 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A REQUEST FOR A VARIANCE TO REDUCE THE REAR YARD SETBACK FOR THE HOMES ABUTTING THE SOUTH PROPERTY LINE ON PROPERTY ZONED NEIGHBORHOOD BUSINESS (NB), LOCATED AT EMERSON DRIVE, APN 002-751-07.**

**MOTION: Commissioner Preston moved approve VAR-2019-0003 based on the ability to make the required findings and subject to the conditions of approval. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Wiggins.**

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>APPROVED (4-2-0)</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Preston
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Wiggins
<b>AYES:</b>	Borders, Dawers, Preston, Wiggins
<b>NAYS:</b>	Esswein, Tingle
<b>ABSTENTIONS:</b>	None
<b>ABSENT:</b>	None

(6:01:09) – Commissioner Tingle explained that her “nay” vote was due to her disagreement with Finding #3 which states the project “*will have little or no detrimental effect on vehicular or pedestrian traffic.*” She also disagreed with Finding # which states the project “will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, convenience and welfare.”

**PUBLIC HEARING**

**E.2 SUP-2019-00000166 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A REQUEST FOR A SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR A 37-UNIT SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ON PROPERTY ZONED NEIGHBORHOOD BUSINESS (NB), LOCATED ON EMERSON DRIVE, NORTH OF COLLEGE PARKWAY, APN 002-751-07.**

(6:01:44) – MOTION: Vice Chair Borders moved to approve SUP 2019-00000166 based on the ability to make the required findings and subject to the conditions of approval. Commissioner Preston seconded the Motion.

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>APPROVED (6-0-0)</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Borders
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Preston
<b>AYES:</b>	Borders, Dawers, Esswein, Preston, Tingle, Wiggins
<b>NAYS:</b>	None
<b>ABSTENTIONS:</b>	None
<b>ABSENT:</b>	None

**PUBLIC HEARING**

**E.3 LU-2019-0080 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A REQUEST FOR A SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR TANDEM PARKING ON PROPERTY ZONED NEIGHBORHOOD BUSINESS (NB), LOCATED AT LOCATED AT EMERSON DRIVE, APN 002-751-07.**

(6:02:31) – MOTION: Vice Chair Borders moved to approve LU-2019-0080 based on the ability to make the required findings and subject to the conditions of approval. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Esswein.

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>APPROVED (6-0-0)</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Borders
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Esswein
<b>AYES:</b>	Borders, Dawers, Esswein, Preston, Tingle, Wiggins
<b>NAYS:</b>	None
<b>ABSTENTIONS:</b>	None
<b>ABSENT:</b>	None

**PUBLIC HEARING**

**E.4 TSM-2019-00000165 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A REQUEST FOR A TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP TO CREATE 37 SINGLE FAMILY LOTS ON A 5.5-ACRE PARCEL ZONED NEIGHBORHOOD BUSINESS (NB) KNOWN AS EMERSON TOWNHOMES, LOCATED ON EMERSON DRIVE, NORTH OF COLLEGE PARKWAY, APN 002-751-07.**

(6:02:31) – MOTION: Vice Chair Borders moved to recommend, to the Board of Supervisors, approval of TSM-2019-00000165 based on the ability to make the required findings and subject to the conditions of approval. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Esswein

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>APPROVED (5-1-0)</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Borders
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Esswein
<b>AYES:</b>	Borders, Dawers, Esswein, Preston, Wiggins
<b>NAYS:</b>	Tingle
<b>ABSTENTIONS:</b>	None
<b>ABSENT:</b>	None

(6:04:02) – Commissioner Esswein explained that even though he had voted “no” on the Variance portion, he believed that “this is a good project.”

**PUBLIC HEARING**

**E.5 LU-2019-0078 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A REQUEST FOR A SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR A MULTIFAMILY APARTMENT COMPLEX ON PROPERTY ZONED GENERAL COMMERCIAL (GC) AND MULTI-FAMILY APARTMENT SPECIFIC PLAN AREA (MFA-SPA), LOCATED AT 3679 AND 3689 GORDON STREET, 1630, 1636 AND 1650 BROWN STREET, APN’S 008-303-15, -16, -21, -36, 37 AND -39.**

(6:04:20) – Vice Chairperson Borders introduced the item. Ms. Sullivan presented the Staff Report, incorporated into the record, and responded to clarifying questions by the Commissioners. Discussion ensued regarding Commission Tingle’s concern for overcrowded schools. Commissioner Dawers noted it was his concern as well; however, he believed it was “the School District’s responsibility to provide schooling for building, and I think that if we do get a little bit too into not approving developments because our current education system or our education ability won’t sustain it, I think we really sacrifice growth which is a big problem.” Commissioner Esswein was concerned about having a single entrance for an 80-unit development and Ms. Sullivan stated that she had discussed it with the Fire Marshall who was “okay with it.” Mr. Pottéy clarified for Commissioner Esswein that the stated property improvements were for the Brown Street side.

(6:14:50) – Property developer Dwight Millard introduced himself and confirmed that he had read the conditions of approval to which he agreed; however, he was not certain what the agreements stated in conditions #15 and #16 would be regarding the storm drain and the sewer lift station. Vice Chairperson Borders entertained public comments.

(6:15:44) – Linda Buchanan introduced herself as the Founder and Executive Director of Catmandu, a cage free cat shelter on Brown Street. Ms. Buchanan described Brown Street as a “racetrack” and expressed concern about an increase in vehicles going up and down the street and posing a danger to pedestrians and animals. She noted frequent, regular accidents at the intersection of Highway 50 and Brown Street that raised concern regarding the additional traffic. She also pointed out that Brown Street currently has very little drainage, and because the field that absorbs much of the moisture would be paved over with houses and parking lots, she was concerned about the runoff. Additionally, she was concerned about the parking issues the development would create.

(6:19:02) – Deni French introduced himself and agreed with Ms. Buchanan’s remarks that Brown Street looks like a racetrack, and he inquired whether the City was considering the area of development to be a private community with the applicant being responsible for the roads, of which he would be in favor.

(6:20:07) – Ms. Sullivan responded to the public comments and stated that that condition #19.b required the project to install half-street improvements including curb, gutter, sidewalk and half-street paving on its property. She also noted that drainage was an issue; therefore, Staff had condition #15 in place which reads: *“Prior to issuing a site improvement permit, the project must enter into a development agreement to pay its pro rata share for regional storm drain improvements to satisfy BSSPA 4.2. The City will provide data from the regional flood study that is currently underway for the area and will assist the applicant in determining the necessary regional mitigation and the required pro rata share contribution.”* Ms. Sullivan clarified for Mr. French that there would be no streets as the project would become one lot with a parking lot which will be privately maintained. Mr. Pottéy stated that a traffic study had not been necessary based on the crash response data. He also offered to refer the speeding issues to the Transportation Department. Commissioner Dawers believed that the project was well suited for the area. Vice Chair Borders entertained a motion.

**(6:24:50) – MOTION: Commissioner Dawers moved to recommend approval of LU-2019-0078 based on the ability to make the required findings, and subject to the conditions of approval contained in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Esswein.**

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>APPROVED (6-0-0)</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Dawers
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Esswein
<b>AYES:</b>	Borders, Dawers, Esswein, Preston, Tingle, Wiggins
<b>NAYS:</b>	None
<b>ABSTENTIONS:</b>	None
<b>ABSENT:</b>	None

(6:25:41) – Commissioner Preston thanked Mr. Millard for bringing affordable housing to the area.

## PUBLIC HEARING

### **E.6 LU-2019-0077 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A REQUEST FOR A SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR A MULTI-FAMILY APARTMENT COMPLEX WITH COMMERCIAL SPACE ON PROPERTY ZONED RETAIL COMMERCIAL (RC), LOCATED AT 1421 NORTH CARSON STREET, APN 002-136-01.**

(6:26:04) – Vice Chair Borders introduced the item and Ms. Sullivan presented that Staff Report, incorporated into the record. Both Ms. Sullivan and Mr. Pottéy responded to clarifying questions by the Commissioners. Commissioner Esswein referenced Conditions #21 and #22 and wished to be assured that the City was paying an appropriate share when reimbursing the developer for the cost the Sewer Main replacement. Mr. Pottéy explained that the City would review the received proposals. Commissioner Tingle called the project “excellent”. In response to a question by Commissioner Wiggins, Ms. Sullivan believed the 10-year shuttle service was a long-enough timeframe but not cumbersome. Discussion ensued regarding parking and Ms. Sullivan noted that “the development agreement will obligate the programming that’s being contemplated.”

(6:39:01) – Applicant Jim Peckham introduced himself as the Executive Director of Friends in Service Helping (FISH) and noted his acceptance to the conditions of approval. He also explained that the project was for a transitional housing to create a talent pool for employers and to provide skills for better employment. Mr. Peckham stated that the entrance to the complex would be from side streets. Project architect John Copoulos believed that although the proposed situation (shuttling the residents for their educational needs) was an experiment for Carson City, it was “taking place all along the West Coast” with affordable housing residents. Mr. Copoulos noted that they were planning to discuss the public transportation needs for better Jump Around Carson (JAC) bus access with the City. Commissioner Esswein spoke in favor of reduced parking in general. Vice Chair Borders entertained public comments.

(6:46:53) – Mr. French stated that he did not believe the location was child-friendly and recommended off-site parking for the residents.

(6:48:50) – Jim Phillips introduced himself as a resident on Park Street and inquired about what would be done when people cannot park inside the project. He inquired whether the project has been compared to an existing, similar property. Mr. Phillips wished to understand what kind of security would be provided, who would manage the property, and who will control the property. He also requested information on recreation for kids, and where pets would go.

(6:52:23) – Ms. Sullivan cited condition #5 which states “*As part of the site improvement plan application, the applicant shall provide an updated open space exhibit, demonstrating compliance with Section 1.18.6. The site improvement permit will not be issued until the open space exhibit meets the requirements.*” She noted that the applicant had stated meeting the 150 square feet-per-unit requirement; however, she wished to see a detailed analysis prior to construction. Ms. Sullivan also explained that the Fire Marshall had

approved the development and noted that just like any apartment complex, this development would not have on-site security.

(6:53:22) – Based on a question by Commissioner Wiggins, she recommended the following modification to condition #13: *“This Special Use Permit is approved based on the applicant limiting tenancy to those participating in the applicant-run job training program and the applicant providing a shuttle service to transport residents to classes. If this operation is modified, the Special Use Permit is nullified, and a new Special Use Permit will be required so that the operator can explain how parking will be handled.”*

(6:54:30) – Based on a question from Commissioner Dawers, Mr. Peckham noted that four types of programs will be offered which will require proficiency in Math and English, adding that they expect a nine-month to a one-year stay. He also believed rideshare will be another option to remedy parking and transportation issues. He explained to Vice Chair Borders that a shuttle van may not be the method of transportation in the future if technology changes; however, he would accept the modification to condition #13. Commissioner Dawers thanked FISH for their contribution to the Community. Commissioner Tingle believed this program would be part of the Community Health improvement Planning. Mr. Peckham noted that this is a seven or eight program partnership.

(7:00:14) – Ms. Sullivan offered the following modification to condition #19: *“Prior to the issuance of construction permits a trip generation analysis contemplating the entire project must be provided for review and approval by the City Engineer. Mitigations identified in the analysis must be implemented.”* She also recommended adding to the end of conditions #21 and #22 the following wording: *“provided the City Engineer has agreed to the cost in advance of the construction.”* Further discussion ensued regarding condition #13 and the majority of the Commission was in favor of Ms. Sullivan’s recommendation. Mr. Peckham clarified that the property was currently called The Whistle Stop Inn and not the Back on Track Inn. Vice Chair Borders entertained a motion.

**(7:05:48) – MOTION: Commissioner Esswein moved to recommend approval of LU-2019-0077 based on the ability to make the required findings, and subject to the conditions of approval contained in the Staff Report and as amended. Commissioner Tingle seconded the motion.**

(7:06:08) – Ms. Sullivan clarified that the modifications were to conditions # 13, 19, 21, and 22.

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>APPROVED (6-0-0)</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Esswein
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Tingle
<b>AYES:</b>	Borders, Dawers, Esswein, Preston, Tingle, Wiggins
<b>NAYS:</b>	None
<b>ABSTENTIONS:</b>	None
<b>ABSENT:</b>	None

**PUBLIC HEARING**

**E.7 LU-2019-0081 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A REQUEST FOR A SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR A NEW WIRELESS COMMUNICATIONS FACILITY ON PROPERTY ZONED GENERAL COMMERCIAL (GC), LOCATED AT 4209 SOUTH CARSON STREET, APN 009-125-24.**

(7:06:38) – Vice Chair Borders introduced the item. Ms. Sullivan presented the Staff Report, incorporated into the record, and responded to clarifying questions. She also introduced applicant Sara King of Epic Wireless, who explained to Commissioner Wiggins that they would accommodate the Commission’s request to paint the tower a different color. Vice Chair Borders referenced condition #9 which specified the color requirements. Ms. King noted her agreement to all conditions of approval outlined in the Staff Report. She also clarified for Commissioner Wiggins that a 100-foot pole would be a better choice for co-locations since it will withstand a specific weight and environmental conditions. Discussion ensued regarding co-location and Ms. King noted that it would have been their first choice; however, physically, for commercial availability this structure was needed for wireless coverage. Ms. Sullivan explained that she had discussed other co-locations with the applicant. Vice Chair Borders entertained public comments.

(7:16:52) – Mr. French believed G5 was a work-in-progress and had not yet been proven safe. He also preferred a grey or sky-blue color for the tower. Ms. Sullivan explained to Mr. French that she had not discussed all the conditions of approval because the City had built in many requirements; therefore, in this case “subjectivity was minimal”. Vice Chair Borders entertained a motion.

**(7:23:01) – MOTION: Commissioner Wiggins moved to approve LU-2019-0081, based on the 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>	Wiggins
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Dawers
<b>AYES:</b>	Borders, Dawers, Esswein, Preston, Tingle, Wiggins
<b>NAYS:</b>	None
<b>ABSTENTIONS:</b>	None
<b>ABSENT:</b>	None

**PUBLIC HEARING**

**E.8 ZA-2019-0005 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A RECOMMENDATION TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS FOR AN ORDINANCE RELATING TO MARIJUANA DISPENSARIES; 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 REGULATIONS GOVERNING HOURS OF OPERATION AND SIGNAGE FOR MEDICAL MARIJUANA ESTABLISHMENTS AND MARIJUANA ESTABLISHMENTS.**

(7:23:34) – Vice Chair Borders introduced the item. Ms. Ferris presented the Staff Report and provided the Staff recommendation to approve the expanded hours but to deny the request for the increased signage. She also noted the presence of applicant William Adler in the audience and responded to clarifying questions. In response to a question by Commissioner Esswein, Ms. Ferris believed that the medical and the recreational businesses were operating on the same premises in Carson City.

(7:31:15) – Mr. Adler of Silver State Government Relations introduced himself as a representative of Rise and Sierra Wellness and noted that the establishments also operated in Reno/Washoe County and had expanded hours there. He also noted that the application was primarily for the expanded retail hours; however, the signage would match the applicants’ business models elsewhere. Ms. Ferris provided further background on the Nevada Revised Statute that the City had used upon which it had based its signage requirements. Discussion ensued regarding zoning of the retail marijuana establishments and Ms. Ferris clarified for Commissioner Dawers that since the recreational marijuana facilities must operate in a medical marijuana dispensary in Carson City, they are required to have signage consistent with pharmacies or medical offices. Vice Chair Borders entertained public comments.

(7:41:58) – Travis Legatzke introduced himself and encouraged the Commission to recommend approval of the item due to the tax revenue that the City could gain without subjecting other residents to that burden. Also, by expanding the hours of operation, they would accommodate residents who do not work normal 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. jobs. He referred to how alcohol-serving bars and restaurants operate. Commissioner Dawers believed that the sign regulation was “a total form of government control.” Vice Chair Borders entertained additional comments and when none were forthcoming, a motion.

**(7:45:13) – MOTION: Commissioner Dawers moved to recommend to the Board of Supervisors approval of ZA-2019-0005, an ordinance amending Title 18 Appendix, Division 1, Section 1.20 to expand hours of operation for medical marijuana dispensaries and retail marijuana stores. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Esswein.**

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>APPROVED (6-0-0)</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Dawers
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Esswein
<b>AYES:</b>	Borders, Dawers, Esswein, Preston, Tingle, Wiggins
<b>NAYS:</b>	None
<b>ABSTENTIONS:</b>	None
<b>ABSENT:</b>	None

(7:46:13) – MOTION: Commissioner Dawers moved to recommend to the Board of Supervisors to accept the request to allow increased signage for the [marijuana] facilities to be “in line with other retail uses. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Tingle.

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>FAILED (2-4-0)</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Dawers
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Tingle
<b>AYES:</b>	Dawers, Tingle
<b>NAYS:</b>	Borders, Esswein, Preston, Wiggins
<b>ABSTENTIONS:</b>	None
<b>ABSENT:</b>	None

**F. STAFF REPORTS (NON-ACTION ITEMS)**

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

(7:48:48) – Ms. Sullivan explained that she had requested that the Board of Supervisors return the Tahoe Western Asphalt appeal, to be heard at their February 6, 2020 meeting, to the Planning Commission due to new information which she could not introduce to the Board of Supervisors. She also updated the Commission on the Board of Supervisors’ approval of the Tandem Parking Regulations for single family home, and their expansion of the approval for Planned Unit Developments. Ms. Sullivan announced that the Board of Supervisors had also approved the Andersen Ranch Development and had limited the homes on the northern property line to single-story. She believed that the Planning Commission vacancy might be filled during the second Board of Supervisors meeting in February.

**- FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

(7:47:54) – Ms. Sullivan announced an upcoming Zoning Map Amendment, a Tentative Map Update, a Special Use Permit for a sign, a right-of-way abandonment, and possibly a return agenda item regarding Tahoe Western Asphalt as possible agenda items for the February Planning Commission meeting.

**- COMMISSIONER REPORTS/COMMENTS**

**G. PUBLIC COMMENT**

(7:52:57) – Mr. French addressed the Commission and apologized for his angry demeanor during the meeting, as he was concerned about health and safety, especially regarding the communications tower discussed in Item E.7. He emphasized that he appreciated the Commission and did not intend to reflect a lack of respect for the Commission’s efforts. He stated that the agenda materials and format were difficult to follow.

**H. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: FOR ADJOURNMENT**

**(7:55:58) – Vice Chairperson Borders adjourned the meeting at 7:55 p.m.**

The Minutes of the, January 29, 2020 Carson City Planning Commission meeting are so approved this 26<sup>th</sup> day of February 2020.