

MINUTES
Carson City Planning Commission and Growth Management Commission Regular Meeting
Wednesday, July 28, 2021 ● 5:00 PM
Community Center Robert “Bob” Crowell Boardroom
851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada

Commission Members

Chair – Charles Borders, Jr.
Commissioner – Paul Esswein
Commissioner – Sena Loyd
Commissioner – Teri Preston

Vice Chair – Jay Wiggins
Commissioner – Nathaniel Killgore
Commissioner – Richard Perry

Staff

Hope Sullivan, Community Development Director
Heather Ferris, Planning Manager
Todd Reese, Deputy District Attorney
Tamar Warren, Senior Public Meetings Clerk

NOTE: A recording of these proceedings, the board’s agenda materials, and any written comments or documentation provided to the Public Meeting Clerk 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 and the approved minutes of this meeting are available on www.Carson.org/minutes.

GROWTH MANAGEMENT COMMISSION

1. CALL TO ORDER – GROWTH MANAGEMENT COMMISSION

(5:00:37) – Chairperson Borders called the Growth Management Commission meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

(5:00:51) – Roll was called, and a quorum was present.

Attendee Name	Status	Arrived
Chairperson Charles Borders, Jr.	Present	
Vice Chair Jay Wiggins	Present	
Commissioner Paul Esswein	Present	
Commissioner Nathaniel Killgore	Present	
Commissioner Sena Loyd	Absent	
Commissioner Richard Perry	Present	
Commissioner Teri Preston	Absent	

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

(5:01:09) – Commissioner Killgore led the Pledge of Allegiance.

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS

(5:01:33) – Chairperson Borders entertained public comments; however, none were forthcoming.

5. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – June 30, 2021.

(5:02:06) – Chairperson Borders introduced the item and entertained comments or changes, and when none were forthcoming, a motion.

(5:02:22) – Commissioner Esswein moved to approve the minutes of the June 30, 2021 Growth Management Commission meeting as presented. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Perry.

RESULT:	APPROVED (5-0-0)
MOVER:	Esswein
SECONDER:	Perry
AYES:	Borders, Esswein, Killgore, Perry, Wiggins
NAYS:	None
ABSTENTIONS:	None
ABSENT:	Loyd, Preston

6. MEETING ITEMS

6.A GM-2021-0131: FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO CONSIDER REGARDING A REQUEST FOR A GROWTH MANAGEMENT APPROVAL TO ALLOW FOR A DAILY WATER USAGE ABOVE 15,000 GALLONS PER DAY FOR A PROPOSED DRIVE-THROUGH CARWASH ON PROPERTY ZONED RETAIL COMMERCIAL (RC), LOCATED AT 3390 S. CARSON STREET, APN 009-111-28.

(5:03:00) – Chairperson Borders introduced the item. Ms. Sullivan announced that due to a noticing error, this item will be removed from the agenda and will be agendized for the next meeting.

7. PUBLIC COMMENT

(5:03:22) – Chairperson Borders entertained public comments; however, none were forthcoming.

8. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: ADJOURN AS THE GROWTH MANAGEMENT COMMISSION

(5:03:47) – Chairperson Borders adjourned the Growth Management Commission meeting at 5:03 p.m.

PLANNING COMMISSION

9. CALL TO ORDER – PLANNING COMMISSION

(5:03:49) – Chairperson Borders called the Planning Commission meeting to order at 5:03 p.m.

10. ROLL CALL AND DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

(5:03:58) – Roll was called, and a quorum was present.

Attendee Name	Status	Arrived
Chairperson Charles Borders, Jr.	Present	
Vice Chair Jay Wiggins	Present	
Commissioner Paul Esswein	Present	
Commissioner Nathaniel Killgore	Present	
Commissioner Sena Loyd	Absent	
Commissioner Richard Perry	Present	
Commissioner Teri Preston	Present	5:09 p.m.

11. PUBLIC COMMENT

(5:04:16) – Chairperson Borders entertained public comments on non-agendized items; however, none were forthcoming.

12. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – June 30, 2021

(5:04:52) – Chairperson Borders introduced the item and entertained comments or corrections and when none were forthcoming, a motion.

(5:42:30) – Vice Chair Wiggins moved to approve the minutes of the June 30, 2021 Planning Commission meeting as presented. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Esswein.

RESULT:	APPROVED (5-0-0)
MOVER:	Wiggins
SECONDER:	Esswein
AYES:	Borders, Wiggins, Esswein, Killgore, Perry
NAYS:	None
ABSTENTIONS:	None
ABSENT:	Loyd, Preston

13. MEETING ITEMS

13.A PUBLIC HEARING: LU-2021-0216 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A REQUEST FOR A SPECIAL USE PERMIT TO ALLOW A CONGREGATE CARE FACILITY FOR THE RESIDENTIAL TREATMENT OF SUBSTANCE ABUSE ON PROPERTY ZONED GENERAL COMMERCIAL (GC) LOCATED AT 1807 E LONG STREET, APN 002-225-01.

(5:05:35) – Chairperson Borders introduced the item. Ms. Ferris presented the subject property and the Staff Report, which is incorporated into the record, and noted that no public comment had been received for or against the project. Commissioner Preston read into the record a disclosure statement and noted that due to conflict of interest she would not participate in discussion and would abstain from voting. Commissioner Perry inquired about the applicant’s program.

(5:11:37) – Applicant Caroline Basagoitia gave information on the substance abuse and mental health treatments they would provide to serve the Carson City community. There were no additional questions; therefore, Chairperson Borders entertained a motion.

(5:13:25) – Peggy Kraus was informed that detox would not be offered to the patients. Ms. Ferris clarified that upon the sale of property, the existing Special Use Permit will no longer be valid.

(5:15:00) – Vice Chair Wiggins moved to approve LU-2021-0216 based on the ability to make the required findings and subject to the conditions of approval included in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Killgore.

RESULT:	APPROVED (5-0-1)
MOVER:	Wiggins
SECONDER:	Killgore
AYES:	Borders, Wiggins, Esswein, Killgore, Perry
NAYS:	None
ABSTENTIONS:	Preston
ABSENT:	Loyd

13.B LU-2021-0219 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A REQUEST FOR A SPECIAL USE PERMIT TO ALLOW FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A PERSONAL STORAGE FACILITY ADJACENT TO RESIDENTIAL USES TO EXCEED THE 14 FOOT HEIGHT LIMITATION, ON A PROPERTY ZONED GENERAL COMMERCIAL (GC), LOCATED ON THE EAST SIDE OF STATE STREET, APPROXIMATELY 350 FEET NORTH OF E WILLIAM STREET, APN 002-442-03.

(5:15:49) – Chairperson Borders introduced the item. Ms. Ferris presented the Staff Report, incorporated into the record, and noted receipt of two written public comments which are also incorporated into the record as late material. She also responded to clarifying questions.

(5:21:45) – U-Haul project manager Josh Tornbom introduced himself and noted his agreement to the Conditions of approval. He also noted that the larger building, north of the parcel, would be three-stories high (45 feet) and climate-controlled, while the building south of the parcel will also be 45 feet tall with stackable “U-boxes.”

(5:23:22) – U-Haul Marketing Company President Chris Piedra introduced himself and clarified that the loading and unloading of the storage facility would take place inside the building to minimize noise. He also explained that the south building would have a forklift operate on the loading dock on the east but

mostly inside the building as well with the goal of minimizing the noise. Ms. Ferris informed Vice Chair Wiggins that the setbacks would be a minimum of 30 feet on the north side, with a request to add berms and enhanced landscaping to the north and west property lines. She also clarified that in the General Commercial zoning district the height limit is 45 feet for any other commercial use. Mr. Tornbom informed Commissioner Esswein that there would be a cross-easement between the two facilities. Chairperson Borders entertained public comments.

(5:27:20) – Matt Peterson stated that he was the owner of two properties near the subject property. He called the project “high activity industrial use trying to pose as a storage facility.” He was opposed to having a large industrial facility to be built next to the residential condominium units. Commissioner Preston gave additional background on the property and believed that the proposed project was preferable to “a bunch of little storage units, one story, with a chain link fence and concertina wire on top, you’re going to have some nice buildings,” which she believed was more appealing.

(5:30:36) - Lisa Campbell introduced herself as “an owner of Long Street HOA” and lived “in a townhome that is closest to the buildings.” Ms. Campbell did not wish to see a 45-foot-tall building when looking out her window. She believed that the lot was designated for townhomes like hers and was concerned about lowered property values. She was informed that there is an entrance on State Street. Ms. Sullivan advised listening to all public comments first then having Staff address all the questions at the same time.

(5:35:04) – Barbara Phelan introduced herself as a resident of the townhouse facing the project and stated her objection to the 45-foot project which she believed would be orange. She wished to understand why the specific location was chosen, in front of her townhouse. She recommended placing the buildings “on the other side of the lot.” Chairperson Borders entertained additional comments; however, none were forthcoming.

(5:37:55) – Ms. Sullivan clarified that the project location was zoned as General Commercial and not residential; therefore, the allowed height was 45 feet. She also clarified that had the project been a warehouse, it would not have been reviewed by the Commission; however, the design standards limit the height for personal storage which is why the item was before the Commission. Ms. Ferris clarified for Vice Chair Wiggins that the design standards would not allow for the building to be painted orange. Mr. Piedra stated they had not intended to paint the building orange. He also noted that the drainage issues had prevented them from building the facility on the other side of the lot. Ms. Ferris explained to Commissioner Perry that the project had a separate parcel number from the existing U-Haul facility. Discussion ensued regarding setbacks and Commissioner Esswein was informed that the distance between the residential units and the proposed project would be approximately 50 feet. Commissioner Perry assured the members of the public that the Commissioners do visit the project sites. Chairperson Borders entertained a motion.

(5:49:50) – Commissioner Preston moved to approve LU-2021-0219 based on the ability to make the required findings and subject to the conditions of approval included in the staff report, and that the building will not be painted orange. The motion was seconded by Vice Chair Wiggins.

RESULT:	APPROVED (4-2-0)
MOVER:	Preston
SECONDER:	Wiggins
AYES:	Borders, Wiggins, Perry, Preston
NAYS:	Esswein, Killgore
ABSTENTIONS:	None
ABSENT:	Loyd

(5:50:37) – Commissioner Esswein clarified that even though he understood that the property was commercially zoned, he was “concerned about the design of the project, and I know that we don’t necessarily approve designs, but I think it would behoove the applicant to reconsider the [side on which to build] the project.” Commissioner Killgore explained that he had voted “based completely on what I feel is best for the community.”

13.C SUB-2021-0211 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A REQUEST FOR A TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP KNOWN AS EAST NYE LANE TO CREATE 61 SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL LOTS ON A 17.0+/- ACRE PARCEL ZONED MOBILE HOME 12,000 (MH12), LOCATED EAST OF OTHA STREET AND WEST OF DEBBIE WAY BETWEEN E NYE LANE AND COLLEGE PARKWAY, APN 003-232-01.

(5:51:22) – Chairperson Borders introduced the item. Ms. Ferris presented the Staff Report, incorporated into the record, and responded to clarifying questions. She also noted that four written public comments were received and incorporated into the record with proximity to the Carson City Airport, traffic, density, and the necessary road improvements cited as concerns. Ms. Ferris explained that a Staff memo (dated July 27, 2021 and incorporated into the record as late material) had recommended modifications to Conditions of Approval 18 and 21, and had added Condition 31, based on feedback from the Interim Airport Manager.

(5:57:14) – Engineering Project Manager Steven Pottéy addressed Condition 29, highlighting that it provided the developer with two alternatives to choose from. He also explained that the Traffic Impact Study had recommended striping the intersection of Airport Road and College Parkway to facilitate left turns onto College Parkway; however, Staff did not recommend it due to insufficient space. Ms. Ferris and Mr. Pottéy also responded to clarifying questions by the Board.

(6:03:10) – Applicant representative and Manhard Consulting Land Planner Karen Downs referenced a PowerPoint presentation, incorporated into the record, and noted that she agreed with the Conditions of Approval, including the amendments recommended by Ms. Ferris earlier. She also responded to clarifying questions by the Commission and indicated that they would base their gate decision on the recommendations of the Carson City Fire Department. She also informed Commissioner Perry that each lot would have its own yard. Chairperson Borders entertained public comments.

(6:07:16) – Norma Sanchez introduced herself as a resident of East Nye Lane and Mayflower way and stated that she had also submitted her comments via email. Ms. Sanchez was in favor of the road and

sidewalk improvements; however, she was concerned about the high-speed drivers on East Nye Lane and Airport road and the safety of the neighborhood and the children. She requested that the issue is addressed, especially with the addition of 61 more homes.

(6:09:53) – Cricket VonJames introduced herself and noted that she lived across from the subject property. She expressed concern about the excessive speed in the area and recommended a form of speed reduction. She also recommended reduced construction hours and wished to see the City address the lack of water pressure in the area.

(6:12:20) – William Dixon also introduced himself as an area resident and expressed concern over the density of the homes and the loss of views from his home. Mr. Dixon believed that 12 hours and weekends would be excessive operating hours.

(6:15:44) – James Gotchy introduced himself as a resident adjacent to the project. He was concerned about the drainage ditch and the telephone poles along East Nye Lane rendering the road unsafe. Mr. Gotchy was also concerned about the cars leaving the two shops in the area. Additionally, he believed that the homes near the runway would experience airplanes taking off and landing above their homes. He believed East Nye Lane must be rehabilitated. Chairperson Borders clarified that the reconstruction of East Nye Lane was not the agenda item now. Mr. Pottéy explained that East Nye Lane was currently a Minor Collector street. Ms. Sullivan stated that she would obtain Mr. Gotchy's contact information and pass it on to the transportation manager. Mr. Gotchy was also inquired about the residential construction tax.

(6:25:20) – Ms. Ferris responded to the issues raised in public comment, noting that the modified Conditions of Approval had been approved by the Airport. She also stated that the construction hours may be amended. Mr. Pottéy addressed the traffic issues noting that he would forward the speed concern to the Transportation Department to see if the Carson City Sheriff's Office would address it prior to considering traffic calming devices. He indicated that as previously noted, the ideal situation would be to extend the sidewalk on East Nye Lane; however, as outlined above that would not be possible, adding that the street had a wide shoulder for pedestrian and parking use. Mr. Pottéy believed that the water system would be improved but he was not sure how it would impact the pressure. He also stated that a drainage pipe and curb and gutter and a drainage pipe would be installed on the north side of the street but the drainage that serves other parts of town will remain on the south side. Mr. Pottéy clarified that the parking on the corner of Airport Road and East Nye Lane was outside the scope of this review as it is an existing commercial use and would require a permit for that facility. Ms. Ferris informed Commissioner Perry that the residential construction tax only applied to new construction and not to existing residences. Commissioner Perry requested looking into the traffic concerns on East Nye Lane outside the scope of this project and City Engineer Randy Rice noted that they would begin the dialogue with the Sheriff's Office and the Transportation Department. Discussion ensued on construction start times and Vice Chair Wiggins reminded the Commission that reducing the construction hours would extend the project. Commissioner Killgore did not wish to have any construction on Sundays. Chairperson Borders entertained a motion.

(6:38:11) – Commissioner Killgore moved to recommend approval of Tentative Subdivision Map SUB-2021-0211 based on the ability to make the required findings and subject to the conditions of approval [including the amendments submitted as late material via the Staff Memo dated July 27, 2021 consisting of Conditions 18, 21, and 31] and with the amended Condition 9 to indicate there will not be any construction on Sundays. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Perry.

RESULT:	APPROVED (6-0-0)
MOVER:	Killgore
SECONDER:	Perry
AYES:	Borders, Wiggins, Esswein, Killgore, Perry, Preston
NAYS:	None
ABSTENTIONS:	None
ABSENT:	Loyd

(6:38:58) – Chairperson Borders recessed the meeting.

(6:46:02) – Chairperson Borders reconvened the meeting.

ITEMS 13.D, 13.E, AND 13.F

(6:46:23) – Chairperson Borders introduced items 13.D, 13.E, and 13.F and noted that the items will be discussed concurrently but will be acted upon separately. Ms. Ferris reviewed the Staff Report, incorporated into the record, and responded to clarifying questions. She also acknowledged receipt of 31 written public comments, incorporated into the record as late material, and provided to the Commission. Ms. Ferris noted that the concerns outlined in the public comments were density, setbacks, traffic and pedestrian safety, parking, and noticing of surrounding property owners. She stated that density was set via the Special Use Permit, the parking standards would be met with the construction of a two-car garage per residence and with 35 on-site spaces, and noticing was consistent with the Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) and Carson City Municipal Code (CCMC) standards to 60 property owners within 600 feet of the subject site. She stated that the applicant had applied for a variance which Staff would support since the intent of the increased setback was to protect adjacent residences (which in this case was a park) and recommended that the applicant record a deed restriction at the time the final map is submitted for recordation, disclosing the project’s proximity to the existing park and the inconvenience or discomfort including but not limited to noise, glare, or physical activity that could result from living in close proximity to such a use.

(6:53:28) – Mr. Pottéy addressed pedestrian safety noting that West College Parkway and Oak Ridge Drive have extra wide pedestrian pathways which are offset from the street via a landscaping buffer, citing the existence of crosswalks and intersections as well. He also noted that based on traffic modeling data, the project would have little or no detrimental effect on vehicular or pedestrian traffic and a traffic impact study would be required. Both Mr. Pottéy and Ms. Ferris also responded to clarifying questions by the Commissioners.

(6:56:15) – Applicant representative Chris Baker, planning manager, Manhard Consulting, introduced Applicant Mark Turner and referenced a PowerPoint presentation, incorporated into the record and highlighted several sections. He also noted the applicant’s agreement to the Conditions of Approval

outlined in the Staff Report and responded to clarifying questions. Chairperson Borders entertained public comments.

(7:03:45) – Silver Oak resident John Munson highlighted the overgrowth in the median on Silver Oak Drive and the lack of lighting as safety concerns.

(7:04:50) – Richard Schnaible introduced himself as a 45-year resident of Carson City and believed that Oakridge Drive is a narrow street and wished to see single family residences built instead of condominiums. He also cited overcrowding the area and recommended building multi-family residences where “the old K-Mart building is” in north Carson City.

(7:08:32) – Scott Munson also introduced himself as an area resident and addressed several issues such as not having the right development in the neighborhood and objected to the high-density residences. Mr. Munson also cited speeding and congestion, and suggested not allowing the project “in one of the single, nicest neighborhoods in Carson City.”

(7:15:53) – Jason Fatzer introduced himself as an Oakridge Drive resident who “lives across the street from the park.” Mr. Fatzer was concerned that “no real traffic study was done” as the college had been shut down due to the pandemic. He was worried about the young families moving into the high-density residences and “possible teenage kids hanging out at the park” as they had called the Sheriff’s Office for after hour activities at the park at times.

(7:18:36) – Area resident Harold Duralde stated that cars parked in their common areas as a result of the overflow from the park. He was concerned about the reduced property values as well.

(7:21:20) – Michael Moriarty, another area resident, echoed the previous comments. He believed the building the condominiums in the Silver Oak area was “like putting lipstick on a pig.” He preferred single-family homes in the area.

(7:22:42) – Anne Gray inquired about the zoning and wished to understand why it was zoned Retail Commercial. She also wished to understand the true impact of the traffic once all homes are built and inquired whether the HOA could regulate the noise issues should the units be rented to college students. Ms. Gray was also concerned about the water usage.

(7:26:08) – Rita Sandoval stated that she had moved to the area a year ago because it was a safe, peaceful, and quiet area and was concerned that would change. She was also concerned about the density of the development.

(7:27:55) – Jim Foley introduced himself as a Carson City resident for 48 years and provided a history of the property, which he had owned for 17 years. He noted the opposition to the Silver Oak development when it was being built and called the project “beautiful” and believed it was needed in Carson City.

(7:33:08) – Christine Nash noted that park users utilize the street for parking making it “too narrow.”

(7:35:00) – George Nash also objected to the high-density development and indicated that the park was not in good shape. He also requested a definition of Open Space.

(7:36:46) – Ms. Ferris responded to the public comments noting that the proposed development was within what’s allowed in the Master Plan. She reiterated that the noticing was done in accordance with CCMC and NRS. Mr. Pottéy addressed the traffic issues noted in public comments. He stated that street lighting must meet the City’s development standards and explained that the median is maintained by the Parks and Recreation Department and that he would escalate the earlier request to them. Mr. Pottéy noted that the traffic study was done for the overall Silver Oak project, adding that the City monitored the traffic impact of developments and reviewed the traffic models regularly, which had included the college traffic. He stated that the streets met the tentative map requirements and that the left turn lane met the street standards. As for the speed on College Parkway, he stated that it would be escalated to the Sheriff’s Office. Upon the request by Chairperson Borders, Ms. Ferris presented the tentative map review process and the Board of Supervisors’ approval timeline. She also responded to clarifying questions by the Commissioners.

(7:47:23) – Commissioner Perry was informed by Mr. Turner that the project was not going to become student housing as it would be priced at about \$475,000 per unit based on lumber and other costs. He also provided additional information on the landscaping. Chairperson Borders believed a better buffer should be placed near the park. Mr. Turner stated that a separate HOA would manage this development. Discussion ensued regarding the demographics of the purchasers of townhomes/condominiums

13.D LU-2021-0218 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A REQUEST FOR A SPECIAL USE PERMIT TO ALLOW FOR A 52-UNIT ATTACHED SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ON 3.45 ACRES ZONED NEIGHBORHOOD BUSINESS PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT (NB-P), LOCATED AT 1147 W COLLEGE PARKWAY, APNS 007-462-16 AND 007-462-17.

(8:04:30) – Based on the discussion above, Chairperson Borders entertained a motion.

(8:04:47) – Commissioner Perry moved to approve Special Use Permit LU-2021-0218 based on the ability to make the required findings and subject to the conditions of approval as outlined in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Preston.

RESULT:	APPROVED (5-1-0)
MOVER:	Perry
SECONDER:	Preston
AYES:	Borders, Wiggins, Esswein, Perry, Preston
NAYS:	Killgore
ABSTENTIONS:	None
ABSENT:	Loyd

13.E VAR-2021-0232 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A REQUEST FOR A VARIANCE TO REDUCE THE SETBACK ALONG THE SOUTH-EASTERN PROPERTY LINE, ADJACENT TO JOHN MANKINS PARK, ON 3.45 ACRES ZONED NEIGHBORHOOD BUSINESS PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT (NB-P), LOCATED AT 1147 W COLLEGE PARKWAY, APNS 007-462-16 AND 007-462-17.

(8:05:28) – Based on the discussion above, Chairperson Borders entertained a motion.

(8:05:31) – Commissioner Perry moved to approve a Major Variance VAR-2021-0232 based on the ability to make the required findings and subject to the conditions of approval included in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Preston.

RESULT:	FAILED (3-3-0)
MOVER:	Perry
SECONDER:	Preston
AYES:	Wiggins, Perry, Preston
NAYS:	Borders, Esswein, Killgore
ABSTENTIONS:	None
ABSENT:	Loyd

(8:07:02) – Ms. Sullivan recommended obtaining explanations on the “nay” votes in case the decision is appealed. Chairperson Borders believed the project was “too close” adding that he would have voted in the affirmative should there have been four fewer units to the project. Commissioner Killgore thought that the project did not “suit the community.” Commissioner Esswein did not believe that the project met the criteria for a variance.

(8:08:42) – Chairperson Borders recessed the meeting.

(8:10:07) – Chairperson Borders reconvened the meeting.

13.F SUB-2021-0215 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A REQUEST FOR A TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP KNOWN AS SILVER OAK AT COLLEGE PARKWAY TO CREATE 52 LOTS FOR ATTACHED SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCES ON TWO PARCELS TOTALING 3.45 ACRES ZONED NEIGHBORHOOD BUSINESS PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT (NB-P), LOCATED AT 1147 W COLLEGE PARKWAY, APNS 007-462-16 AND 007-462-17.

(8:10:26) – Based on the discussion above, Chairperson Borders entertained a motion.

(8:10:28) – Chairperson Borders moved to recommend approval of Tentative Subdivision Map SUB-2021-0215 to the Board of Supervisors based on the ability to make the required findings and subject to the conditions of approval included in the staff report including the modification to Condition of Approval 19, and with the additional condition that the setback requirement along the property line that is shared with the park will be met. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Esswein.

RESULT:	APPROVED (5-1-0)
MOVER:	Borders
SECONDER:	Esswein
AYES:	Borders, Wiggins, Esswein, Perry, Preston
NAYS:	Killgore
ABSTENTIONS:	None
ABSENT:	Loyd

(8:14:30) – Commissioner Esswein reminded everyone that the zoning code and the development standards have been in place for years, and that the Board complies with those standards. He stated that this project complies with the standards, with the exception of the variance portion. He also encouraged the public to participate in the Planning Division’s current review of the development code. Ms. Sullivan recommended contacting the Planning Division if interested.

14H. STAFF REPORTS (NON-ACTION ITEMS)

- DIRECTOR'S REPORT TO THE COMMISSION

(8:15:48) – Chairperson Borders introduced the item. Ms. Sullivan updated the Commission on the last Board of Supervisors’ activities relating the Planning Commission.

- FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

(8:16:00) – Ms. Sullivan expected to continue the Growth Management application that was pulled from this meeting’s agenda (6.A). Additionally, a Master Plan and Zoning Map amendment, an amendment to the Lompa project, a Special Use Permit, and an update on the soccer fields were being planned for discussion in September.

- COMMISSIONER REPORTS/COMMENTS

There were no Commissioner reports or comments.

15I. PUBLIC COMMENT ~~Public Comment~~**

(8:18:22) – Chairperson Borders entertained final public comments. Ann Gray requested the removal of speaker’s name from the record; however, Commissioner Preston reminded everyone that the information must be incorporated into the record per the Open Meeting Law. Ms. Sullivan introduced the newly hired Associate Planner, Heather Manzo.

16. ~~The public is invited at this time to comment on and discuss any topic that is relevant to, or within the authority of the Planning Commission including any matter that is not specifically included on the agenda as an action item.~~

J. — FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: ADJOURNMENT

(8:22:01) – Chairperson Borders adjourned the meeting at 8:22 p.m.

The Minutes of the, July 28, 2021 Carson City Planning Commission meeting are so approved this 25th day of August, 2021.