

DRAFT MINUTES
Carson City Planning Commission Regular Meeting
Wednesday, December 15, 2021 ● 3:00 PM
Community Center Robert “Bob” Crowell Boardroom
851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada

Commission Members

Chair – Charles Borders, Jr.

Vice Chair – Jay Wiggins

Commissioner – Paul Esswein

Commissioner – Nathaniel Killgore

Commissioner – Sena Loyd

Commissioner – Richard Perry

Commissioner – Teri Preston

Staff

Hope Sullivan, Community Development Director

Heather Ferris, Planning Manager

Todd Reese, Deputy District Attorney

Heather Manzo, Associate Planner

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.

The approved minutes of all meetings are available on www.Carson.org/minutes.

1. CALL TO ORDER

(3:04:11) – Chairperson Borders called the meeting to order at 3:04 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

(3:04:23) – 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	Absent	
Commissioner Nathaniel Killgore	Present	5:00 p.m.
Commissioner Sena Loyd	Present	
Commissioner Richard Perry	Present	
Commissioner Teri Preston	Present	

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

(3:04:52) – Commissioner Perry led the Pledge of Allegiance.

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS

(3:05:21) – Chairperson Borders entertained public comments on non-agendized items and reminded everyone that item 6.E would be heard at 5:00 p.m. as agendized.

(3:06:31) – Charlotte Stewart introduced herself as the manager of the Villa Sierra Mobile Home Park near the proposed location of the slaughterhouse, and noted that she would not be present at 5:00 p.m. to comment on item 6.E. Ms. Stewart spoke in opposition to the slaughterhouse location as it would not provide peaceful enjoyment to the residents, and expressed concern about crime, noise, gases, and flies. She was also concerned about the reduction in home prices and the fact that they were “not notified by mail.”

(3:09:39) – Cheryl Rookwood also spoke in opposition of the slaughterhouse due to its proximity to neighborhoods. She believed the water needs, odor, and truck traffic were not consistent with the Master Plan.

(3:11:25) – Deni French explained that the television screens in the Boardroom were difficult to see due to their locations. He also requested that drivers watch out for pedestrians, since he had been very close to getting hit by speeding and careless drivers.

5. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – SEPTEMBER 29, 2021 AND NOVEMBER 16, 2021

(3:12:20) – Chairperson Borders introduced the item and entertained changes, corrections, or a motion. Mr. Reese clarified that the September 29 minutes would be approved late; however, with just cause [as no quorum was available to approve the minutes at the October meeting].

(3:12:32) – Commissioner Preston moved to approve the minutes of the September 29, 2021 meeting as presented. The motion was seconded by Vice Chair Wiggins and carried 4-0-1, with Commissioner Perry abstaining as he was not present at that meeting.

(3:14:10) – Commissioner Preston moved to approve the minutes of the November 16, 2021 meeting as presented. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Loyd and carried 5-0-0.

6. MEETING ITEMS

6.A SUB-2021-0399 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A REQUEST FOR A TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP FOR A COMMON OPEN SPACE DEVELOPMENT KNOWN AS EAST ROBINSON STREET AND NORTH SALIMAN ROAD – BLACKSTONE RANCH NORTH TO CREATE 137 SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL LOTS ON A ±41.07 ACRE PORTION OF A ±78.81 ACRE SITE WITHIN THE LOMPA RANCH NORTH SPECIFIC PLAN AREA ON PROPERTY ZONED MULTI-FAMILY DUPLEX (“MFD”), MULTI-FAMILY APARTMENTS (“MFA”), AND GENERAL COMMERCIAL (“GC”), LOCATED WEST OF INTERSTATE 580, NORTH AND EAST OF ROBINSON STREET, AND SOUTH OF EAST WILLIAM STREET, APNS 010-041-39 AND 010-041-52.

(3:14:25) – Chairperson Borders introduced the item. Ms. Manzo presented the Staff Report which included the site map and the recommended Conditions of Approval (with revisions submitted as late material). She also noted that no public comments had been received regarding the project and recommended approval based on Staff’s ability to make the required findings. Ms. Manzo responded to clarifying questions by the Commissioners.

(3:21:30) – Chairperson Borders inquired about Condition of Approval No. 29 which stated: *If sewage pumping is required, lift stations shall be privately owned and operated.* Development Engineering Project Manager Stephen Pottéy clarified that the condition would apply only if one were needed, it should be built according to the City’s standards. Commissioner Perry was informed that the school site and the park site would be offered to the School District and the Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Department and would not be part of the approval of SUB-2021-0399.

(3:24:24) – Blackstone Development Group representative Mike Railey, Planning Manager at Christy Corporation, introduced himself, Josh Myers of Blackstone and Loren Chilson of Headway Transportation. He clarified that this was the last phase of the project and noted his agreement with the Conditions of Approval outlined in the Staff Report and revised as late material. Chairperson Borders entertained public comments. Mr. French reiterated his concern of not being able to follow the maps and recommended Staff describe the locations by color on the presented maps. Chairperson Borders entertained a motion.

(3:28:06) – Vice Chair Wiggins moved to recommend approval of tentative subdivision map SUB-2021-0399 based on the ability to make the required findings, and subject to the Conditions of Approval contained in the Staff Report and amended in Staff’s memo dated December 14, 2021. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Perry.

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

6.B LU-2021-0346 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A SPECIAL USE PERMIT TO RETAIN AN EXISTING BILLBOARD ON PROPERTY ZONED GENERAL COMMERCIAL (“GC”) LOCATED AT 4440 HWY 50 EAST, APN 008-281-11.

(3:28:54) – Chairperson Borders introduced the item. Commissioner Loyd read into the record a prepared disclosure statement, advised of a disqualifying conflict of interest, and stated that she would not participate in discussion and action.

(3:30:11) – Ms. Ferris gave background, reviewed the subject property, and presented the Staff Report, incorporated into the record, including the Conditions of Approval, highlighting Conditions 7-10 which

addressed concerns brought forth by nearby resident Kristoffer Wickstead. She also introduced Benjamin Cosio, Real Estate Manager at Lamar Advertising. Mr. Cosio explained that he had read the Conditions of Approval and was in agreement with them. Chairperson Borders entertained public comments.

(3:33:56) – Mr. Wickstead introduced himself and noted that the lighting had been dimmed; however, glare was still present on one side of his house. He still opposed billboards, calling this billboard blithe and a distraction from the peaceful enjoyment of his house. Chairperson Borders received confirmation that the Special Use Permit may be visited in a year. Commissioner Preston was also in favor of reviewing the Special Use Permit in a year. In response to an inquiry by Vice Chair Wiggins, Mr. Cosio clarified that a timer was in place for the billboard lights to run from dusk until midnight and could be turned off at different times. Chairperson Borders suggested a motion.

(3:39:56) – Chairperson Borders moved to approve LU-2021-0346, based on the findings and subject to the conditions of approval contained in the staff report with a modification to Condition No. 4 to read: “Without further notice, the subject special use permit shall expire on December 31, 2022.” The motion was seconded by Commissioner Preston.

RESULT:	APPROVED (4-0-1)
MOVER:	Borders
SECONDER:	Preston
AYES:	Borders, Wiggins, Perry, Preston
NAYS:	None
ABSTENTIONS:	Loyd
ABSENT:	Esswein, Killgore

6.C FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A ZONING MAP AMENDMENT TO CHANGE THE ZONING FROM GENERAL COMMERCIAL (“GC”) TO LIMITED INDUSTRIAL (“LI”) FOR PARCELS LOCATED AT 788 AND 900 FAIRVIEW DRIVE, ASSESSOR’S PARCEL NUMBERS (“APNS”) 009-551-08 AND 009-551-31.

(3:41:22) – Chairperson Borders introduced the item. Ms. Ferris gave background, presented the Staff Report, which is incorporated into the record, and responded to clarifying questions. Chairperson Borders opposed “creating a Zoning Map Amendment that creates a non-conforming use.” He also entertained public comments.

(3:45:16) – Mr. French inquired about the reason for the Zoning Map Amendment. Ms. Sullivan explained that her answer would apply to the next agenda as well as this one. She clarified that the City’s Master Plan was reviewed annually by this Commission and the Board of Supervisors. During the review, zoning inconsistent with the Master Plan, would be highlighted. In this case, the zoning was done to accommodate a school which no longer existed; However, while the rezoning was being considered, an application was submitted based on the existing zoning which would create a non-conforming use. Vice Chair Wiggins recommended a Zoning Map Amendment for the empty lot only. Chairperson Borders entertained further discussion and when none were forthcoming, a motion.

(3:49:55) – Commissioner Perry moved to recommend to the Board of Supervisors Approval of the Zoning Map Amendment ZA-2021-0371 for APN 009-551-08 (900 Fairview Drive) and recommended leaving APN 009-551-31 (788 Fairview Drive) zoned General Commercial. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Loyd.

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

6.D MPA-2021-0416 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS CONCERNING THE ANNUAL MASTER PLAN REPORT.

(3:51:25) – Chairperson Borders introduced the item. Ms. Sullivan gave background and noted that after her presentation of the annual review in this meeting, the Commission was expected to make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. She also presented the Staff Report, which is incorporated into the record, and responded to the Commissioners’ questions. She clarified for Vice Chair Wiggins that the success metrics were based on item resolution and not on the number of code violation citations. Chairperson Borders entertained public comments.

(4:07:37) – Doreen Mack introduced herself as an interior designer and reminded the Commission that “everything is behind schedule,” pertaining to labor and materials. She also agreed that the Master Plan needed updating.

(4:09:16) – Kathleen Franco Simmons introduced herself as a Utah Street resident and thanked Ms. Sullivan for bringing forward the zoning change for the Empire Cemetery in a timely manner. She also thanked Staff for the proposed rezoning of Silver Saddle Ranch and Long Ranch to open space. She presented her recommended Master Plan edits to Staff as well. Ms. Sullivan reminded everyone that the review takes place annually and that some input may be addressed in the following year. Chairperson Borders entertained a motion.

(4:19:33) – Vice Chair Wiggins moved to recommend to the Board of Supervisors acceptance of the Master Plan Annual Report as presented by Staff. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Preston.

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

(4:20:05) – Chairperson Borders recessed the meeting until 5:00 p.m. for the time specific item 6.E.

(5:01:09) – Chairperson Borders reconvened the meeting at 5:01 p.m. Roll was called and a quorum was present. Commissioner Killgore who was noted absent earlier joined the meeting.

TIME SPECIFIC ITEM: TO BE HEARD AT 5:00 P.M.

6.E LU-2021-0308 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A REQUEST FOR A SPECIAL USE PERMIT TO ALLOW FOR A SLAUGHTERHOUSE ON PROPERTY ZONED GENERAL INDUSTRIAL (“GI”), LOCATED ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF HWY 50 E AND EAST OF DETROIT ROAD, PORTIONS OF APNS 008-371-38, 008-371-39, AND 008-371-10.

(5:01:44) – Chairperson Borders introduced the item and thanked members of the public for attending the meeting. He also read into the record a statement noting that the Commission, a body appointed by the Board of Supervisors, “is charged with making determinations on the suitability of projects based on the Master Plan, Title 18, and zoning and how that is interpreted. We do not make policy, we do not change laws, we do not move locations, we just operate under the guidelines and the things we have to work with. Those other changes that you may or may not want to see in the future, come from your Board of Supervisors whom you have elected.” He emphasized that the Commission “is interpreting what’s already written,” reminding everyone that this public hearing will begin with a presentation from Staff, another from the applicant, followed by Commissioners’ questions.

(5:03:26) – Chairperson Borders noted that once the Commission has finished its questioning, he would entertain public comments, and provided instructions on how to use the microphones, requested that all speakers introduce themselves, and provide input for three minutes. He explained that questions would be answered at the conclusion of public comments and that no dialogue will take place during public comments. Chairperson Borders also clarified for the record that the project “is not some of the things that people purport it to be. It’s not a feedlot, it’s not a livestock storage area, it’s a meat processing plant. We are not here to discuss the moralities of being a vegetarian or carnivore; we are not here to discuss any kind of a PETA subject on animal cruelty. Those are issues that do not belong in this discussion. We’re trying to discuss whether or not this facility, as a small slaughterhouse and meat processing plant, should go into

the location that it's currently sited in, and that's what we should base your testimony on." He reminded members of the public to adhere to the three-minute time limit and thanked them for being courteous at the previous slaughterhouse meeting.

(5:06:05) – Planning Manager Heather Ferris gave background and presented the Staff Report which included a detailed review of the required findings which Staff had been able to make in the affirmative, all of which are incorporated into the record. She also informed the Commission on the mailed and published notification process, explained that all public comments (including those from the September 29, 2021 meeting) that were received prior to 11 a.m. on the day of this meeting were included in the agenda materials or provided as late material, and responded to clarifying questions by the Commissioners. Ms. Ferris referenced a Staff Memorandum dated December 14, 2021 which recommended an additional Condition of Approval (please see below) requesting that the applicant provide a wetland delineation report, based on an inquiry by a member of the public, to read:

"The applicant must provide a wetland delineation report with the building permit application and, if applicable, obtain approval from the EPA for the project design as it relates to wetlands prior to any permits for construction being issued."

(5:19:00) – Mr. Pottéy addressed public concerns such as water use. He stated that based on public comments, the applicant had provided an estimated water use and subsequently, citizens had provided estimates from a third-party website which he called "not a recognized source for engineering data and analysis, but it was enough to raise concern for Staff;" however, after researching sourced information, the results had been close to the applicant's data, but Staff would still recommend an annual review of water usage in the Conditions of Approval. He also addressed the wetland delineation discussed above and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) flood zone requirements, noting that the applicant was required to meet the City's regulations for developing in a flood zone. Mr. Pottéy explained that the well and river contamination issues were addressed by having the corral indoors and with the additional condition to drain into the City's sewer. He also noted that the project would be required to obtain a discharge permit from the City which would require pretreatment prior to the discharge, and responded to clarifying questions.

(5:26:11) – Applicant Representative Chris Baker of Manhard Consulting noted that the amended Conditions of Approval were acceptable to the applicant. Mr. Baker introduced applicant Mike Holcomb of Carson Valley Meats and reviewed a modified (since the September 29, 2021 meeting) presentation, which is incorporated into the record. Mr. Holcomb and Mr. Baker also responded to questions by the Commissioners. In response to questions regarding odor and noise, Mr. Baker stated that the annual review of the Special Use Permit should be able to address those concerns. Commissioner Preston noted that the on-site USDA inspector and the annual review would address the restriction of the 60 animals per week (except on approved event days) as well. Mr. Pottéy reviewed the location of the wetland area on the site map. Chairperson Borders entertained additional question and when none were forthcoming, public comments. He also reminded speakers to adhere to the three-minute limit. Written public comments in

favor of or in opposition to this item are incorporated into the record. Please note that the meeting may be viewed in its entirety, including all public comments, on the City's website at:

https://carsoncity.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view_id=2&clip_id=1939

(5:52:21) – Dr. Jennifer Verive introduced herself as an August Drive resident and read a prepared statement on behalf of the Coalition of Citizens for Peaceful Enjoyment. She referenced articles she had read and a document she had sent as public comment explaining the 33 reasons why she believed a slaughterhouse was “a bad idea.” She urged the Commission to base their decision on the peaceful enjoyment of their neighborhood and was not in favor of the location. She also noted that the project would not meet findings 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, and 7.

(5:56:34) – Robert Buttner introduced himself as a 61-year resident of Carson City and stated that, based on his construction experience, it would be “virtually impossible to ventilate [the enclosed] pens.” He questioned the term “mitigate” relating to sound and odor and explained that the animal noise would cause the neighborhood dogs to bark. Mr. Buttner urged the Commission not to follow a 1950s business model.

(6:00:07) – Joan Dotson spoke in opposition of the project because interested individuals had requested having cattle on neighboring properties near the proposed slaughterhouse for use as a feedlot.

(6:03:35) – Ana Winston introduced herself as an 18-year resident of Empire Ranch and spoke in opposition of the proposed slaughterhouse. She noted that she had spoken with Spanish-speaking residents of Villa Sierra Mobile Home Park and cited the demographics of the residents living in 42 owner-occupied homes housing 71 or more children, and adding that most of the residents had signed a petition opposing the proposed slaughterhouse. She cited the noise of the stressed animals, believed that the location is on a floodplain that flows to the Carson River, and the decrease of their property values, adding that the residents “don't have a voice.”

(6:07:45) – A speaker who did not identify herself spoke in support of Carson Valley Meats and noted that she was not a resident of Carson Valley. She stated that the Villa Sierra Mobile Home Park and the proposed slaughterhouse were both zoned as Industrial. The speaker cited a need for the processing plant for 4-H participants and for farm-to-table food. She cited the example of the meat processing plant in Reno that is in a populated area.

(6:10:32) – Roger Maxwell introduced himself as an Empire Ranch resident and requested information on “how are they going to wash [the enclosed facility] down?” He also believed that non-residents of Carson City should “not be able to talk here.”

(6:11:26) – Doreen Mack reintroduced herself as a Carson City resident and president of the Downtown 2020 Group. Ms. Mack read a prepared statement, incorporated into the record as late material, opposing the project at the proposed location. She recommended that it be moved to either Lyon County or Douglas County as a slaughterhouse was not conducive to the City's vision.

(6:15:39) – Glenn Conant introduced himself as an Empire Ranch resident and noted his opposition to the proposed location of the slaughterhouse. He was opposed to the term “mixed-use” for the project and believed that the quality and character of the established neighborhood will not be maintained. He called the location discriminatory based on the ethnic makeup of the neighboring mobile home park.

(6:19:14) – Lyndsey Chichester introduced herself as a Carson City resident and an agricultural educator who works with 4-H students. She believed that youth are still interested in agriculture and clarified that the chemicals sprayed on the animal remains are to ensure they are not used for consumption. Ms. Chichester stated that the animal waste will be disposed of in the sewer, just like human waste is. She also noted her support for Carson Valley Meats and the project.

(6:22:00) – Chris Carver introduced himself as a Carson City resident and urged the [Community Development] Director to investigate the evidence submitted by the applicant to address the areas covered by Title 18. Mr. Carver believed that “this applicant and the Planning Director failed to do that,” as the project was not consistent with the Master Plan elements because it represented “a new agricultural activity.” He referenced a petition signed by project opponents and noted that none of the support was from adjacent property owners. Mr. Carver believed that the water usage was poorly addressed by the applicant and Staff, and questioned whether the project complied with “our vision of an Urban Carson City” and “do the corporate interests of Ms. [Karen] Sinclair have more value than the rights of residents in the neighboring properties?” He added that this may be the right project but in the wrong place.

(6:25:05) – Kathleen Franco Simmons reintroduced herself and noted that she was speaking on behalf of herself and her parents, Diane and George Howard. Ms. Simmons’ written comments are incorporated into the record as late material. She believed that Finding No. 2 could not be made by locating a slaughterhouse 913 feet from their family home as it would impact the peaceful enjoyment of their property. She also stated that “the Conditions of Approval are inadequate and are not responsive to our concerns and questions.” She believed that Findings 1 and 4 could not be made either. She encouraged the Commissioners to read her written comments detailing her concerns regarding the consistency with the Master Plan.

(6:29:02) – Paula Peters read into the record her written statement, incorporated into the record as late material, in opposition to the proposed slaughterhouse within the City limits. Ms. Peters cited loss of property values, odor, noise, and truck traffic increase on Highway 50.

(6:32:05) – Charlie Abowd introduced himself as a Carson City resident for 44 years. He cited his experience in the farm-to-table business and the struggles that local producers faced. Mr. Abowd highlighted the participation of the 250 Carson High School students in the agriculture program since the establishment of the Greenhouse Project, and their participation in Future Farmers of America.

(6:34:50) – Bethany Love introduced herself as “a parent of a 4-H child” who had an opportunity that she did not have growing up. She cited the benefits of raising, selling, and “the heartbreak” of losing an animal. Ms. Love also praised the work of Ms. Sinclair in educating hundreds of 4-H children. She believed that

the trailers used to bring in the animals would be small and there would not be any odor, adding that she preferred purchasing from small ranchers and not large meat companies.

(6:38:29) – Deni French appreciated the Commissioners’ dilemma and did not oppose a meat processing plant even though he did not consume beef or pork. However, he did not believe that the location was not ideal and inquired why an existing processing plant had been closed in the past. He also stated that he had attended a public meeting regarding the slaughterhouse project and had many questions regarding the sewage and waste. Mr. French recommended finding another location for the slaughterhouse.

(6:42:30) – Frank Recchi introduced himself as a resident of Morgan Mill Road and expressed disappointment in defending “our neighborhoods against the construction of a slaughterhouse nearby.” He was not in favor of “this kind of civic improvement” that would increase coyotes, vermin, truck noise, insects, the pollution of the Carson River, and the decrease in property values. Mr. Recchi did not believe the site was suitable for a slaughterhouse and noted that the project had been rejected by two other communities.

(6:45:35) – Maxine Nietz introduced herself and objected to the term “conjecture” used by Mr. Baker. She also stated that the chemical Denature was toxic and had been “banned in many places.” Ms. Nietz believed that the enclosed pens could cause the applicants to hold the animals for additional time periods without being noticed. She objected to the use of City water to wash the waste which she stated was more toxic than human waste because of the blood-borne pathogens. She referenced the maps she had provided that would show how the Carson River water would be polluted, and recommended that the water be addressed by the Growth Management Commission, highlighting flood and retention basin maintenance concerns. Ms. Nietz believed that the Carson City Municipal Code was developed to protect the citizens of Carson City.

(6:51:38) – John Dooley introduced himself as a Washoe Valley resident who raised cattle and a Carson City business owner. Mr. Dooley spoke in favor of the project calling it “a critical part of the supply chain that exists between ranchers and restaurants.” He noted that there were 10 [cannabis] dispensaries south of Reno but not a boutique butcher, who he believed were being “pushed out,” and praised the University of Nevada Reno (UNR) facility Mr. Holcomb had previously managed. Mr. Dooley was also in favor of having Conditions of Approval.

(6:55:40) – Sabine Harmer introduced herself as a Carson City native and a Texas A&M University student. She believed that the project should be called a processing plant and not a slaughterhouse. Ms. Harmer noted that she lived near a processing plant that followed the same regulations as the proposed project and explained that she had not experienced any noise, flies, or odor.

(6:58:43) – Kayla Holcomb introduced herself as a 4-H member who raised cows and sheep, and believed that the slaughterhouse was important to have their animals processed. She praised similar facilities that had been important to the youth, and recommended that the Commission approve the facility.

(7:01:25) – Chairperson Borders recessed the meeting.

(7:13:11) – Chairperson Borders reconvened the meeting. A quorum was still present.

(7:13:39) – Kendra Wilson introduced herself as a resident and business owner of Carson City and noted the City’s many improvements. She did not; however, believe that the proposed slaughterhouse would generate pride in Carson City. Ms. Wilson believed that the approval of the slaughterhouse would “put the periodic convenience of out of towners above the everyday quality of life of the residents, your constituents, [and] above your pride in Carson City.”

(7:16:48) – Roger Rakow introduced himself as a Carson City resident since 1970. He also expressed concern regarding the underground water. Mr. Rakow was also concerned about the contaminants that could seep underground and inquired about how the blood would be treated.

(7:20:23) – Linda Buchanan introduced herself as a Hells Bells Road resident with a well, and expressed concerned about the high levels of nitrogen and phosphorus sent to the sewage treatment plant and to the community. She also highlighted her support of 4-H; however, she believed that the project would not bring pride to Carson City.

(7:23:08) – Chris Pattison introduced herself as an area resident who lives less than half a mile away from the project site. He believed that all objections have been overcome and called the UNR facility a clean place.

(7:24:45) – Joylyn Harmer introduced herself as a Washoe Valley resident and a Carson City business owner. Ms. Harmer praised the work done by Staff to prepare for the item and recommended approval. She stated that she had been unable to schedule the processing of lambs in Fallon and praised the agriculture building and the meat processing plant at UNR. She also noted that when she visited the UNR facility and had detected no odor.

(7:28:35) – Peter Bader introduced himself and distributed images which he noted showed the water flowing in two places on the property. He also did not object to the slaughterhouse, but did not approve of the location because he believed his property value would decrease. Mr. Bader did not approve of the zoning change from Light Industrial to General Industrial. Chairperson Borders closed the public comments and invited Staff to respond to the questions.

(7:31:45) – Ms. Ferris explained that the water usage requirements would not trigger a Growth Management Review. Mr. Pottéy noted that the City had capacity to support the water and sewer needs of the proposed project. He also clarified that the environmental control/discharge permit would dictate what denaturing chemicals can or cannot be used. Mr. Pottéy stated that a wetland delineation report would be required to ensure no wetland areas would be encroached upon, adding that the applicant must meet all City standards for flood zones and ensure that the finished floor is two feet above the base flood elevation. He stated that because the operation would drain into the sewer, there would not be a reason to pollute the ground water.

(7:36:10) – Ms. Ferris recommended modifying Condition No. 3 to read: *All development shall be substantially in accordance with the development plans approved with this application, including the floor plan, building elevations and landscaping as presented during the December 15, 2021 Planning Commission meeting ~~except as otherwise modified by the conditions of approval herein.~~*

(7:36:52) – Chairperson Borders entertained discussion among the Commissioners. Commissioner Perry highlighted the difficulty of making a decision when some residential property is in an industrial zoning. He also noted that he had read all the material submitted to the Commission and had done due diligence by visiting Wolf Pack Meats in Reno which he called a similar operation. Commissioner Perry described the operation as clean “like a hospital” with an on-site USDA inspector. He explained the collection and disposal of blood and noted that no odors were detected, except for the butcher shop which “smelled like a butcher shop.” He concluded that if the proposed slaughterhouse ran like the one in Reno, there would be no impact on the residents, adding that after his visit “I can’t come up with a reason myself to say I have a finding against this.” Commissioner Perry also cited the example of the Tahoe Western Asphalt plant that had a Conditional Special Use Permit with a one-year review, which was revoked last year due to neighbor complaints and because it was not being operated well.

(7:43:15) – Commissioner Preston thanked everyone for attending the meeting and noted that she, along with all the Commission members, had read all the information provided to them in the past week as “we take it very seriously.” She called herself an almost 63-year Carson City resident and remembered the ranches of the past and, as a member of a development family, had developed most of the ranches. Commissioner Preston gave background on the property that was now deteriorating and explained that during the September meeting the residents of the Villa Sierra Mobile Home Park had stated that they had problems with their sewer system. She noted that one of the Conditions of Approval was to upgrade that sewer system which she called a benefit to the mobile home park. She also provided a personal example of managing a property across from Wolf Pack Meats and had received no complaints, noting that no large trucks were used to deliver the animals as most ranchers were using their personal trailers to bring their individual animals.

(7:48:40) – Commissioner Preston clarified that the project was not a feedlot or a stockyard which collected animal waste and polluted the water, and explained that she had looked into why Douglas County had not approved the project and had found out that there was no infrastructure of sewer and water to support the project. She reminded everyone that when a building supply company had occupied the property, semi-trucks were part of the traffic using Highway 50, which would not be the case with the proposed slaughterhouse, adding that her traffic concerns were addressed by having a controlled intersection. Commissioner Preston considered the footprint of the processing plant rather small and addressed the issue of having the plant in Lyon County by noting it could not accommodate the infrastructure. Based on how the project would be mitigated, she did not see any reason for denial of the Special Use Permit.

(7:51:12) – Commissioner Loyd noted her appreciation for the tremendous amount of information provided by the members of the public. She clarified that the Special Use Permit request was for a specific use not for an exception. She did not see a cause for denying it at this time; however, she agreed with Vice Chair

Wiggins' suggestion of including specific Conditions of Approval to allow the Commission to take specific action in the future should issues arise.

(7:52:19) – Commissioner Killgore wished to “absolutely commend the developers on what they’ve gone through to make the changes. That is huge.” He noted that per his inquiry during the September meeting, the unloading of the animals would also take place indoors now. However, Commissioner Killgore also stated that despite all the changes made by the applicant, his position would not change, based on how the community had spoken against the project.

(7:53:14) – Vice Chair Wiggins noted that the subject property was zoned General Industrial and that adjacent properties were similarly zoned. He did not believe that the proposed slaughterhouse should emit offensive odors and objectionable noise; however, he cited the Waste Management facility, the concrete plant, or the automobile repair business did not have the same level of requirements. He understood the fact that the slaughterhouse Special Use Permit was being considered after the residences had been established and that is why he was recommending an additional Condition of Approval (No. 29) to read: *no odors emitted, or noise greater than 80 decibels [heard] at the property line*. Ms. Ferris recommended making them two separate Conditions to read:

30. *No odors shall be realized at the property line.*

31. *Noise levels at the property line shall not exceed 80 decibels.*

(7:55:28) – Commissioner Perry believed that the noise level was measurable; however, he expressed concern regarding the measurement of odors. He recommended adding descriptors to the term odors. Ms. Ferris recommended using the term *odors relating to the processing plant*. Mr. Reese did not believe that odors were “quantitatively measurable.” Ms. Sullivan cited the example of Tahoe Western Asphalt where the odors were investigated. She also stated that she had enforced horse facility odor issues in other communities and noted that Ms. Ferris’ suggestion above was sufficient and could be refined at the one-year review mark if needed, adding that they had dealt with odors at the asphalt and marijuana facilities.

(7:59:24) – Chairperson Borders explained that during the September 29, 2021 meeting when the slaughterhouse project was first discussed, a car wash Special Use Permit, which would use 29,000 gallons of water per day, was approved “and there was no human cry.” He believed that this Commission, which is also the Growth Management Commission, took the stewardship of the City’s water seriously, and hoped that “the community would be as sensitive about things that don’t necessarily happen in their backyard.” Chairperson Borders highlighted the fact that the Commission had been putting “teeth into the Special Use Permits that we approve,” citing the one-year-review requirement to ensure all the conditions were met.

(8:02:54) – Ms. Sullivan recommended hearing from the applicant on whether the additional Conditions of Approval were acceptable or not.

(8:03:11) – Mr. Baker appreciated “the public process at work” and thanked the Commission for reading the “thousands of pages” presented to them. He also believed that the annual review of the Special Use

Permit would signify that legitimate concerns are taken very seriously and that they are enforced correctly. Mr. Baker thanked “everyone for their time” and confirmed for Commissioner Wiggins and the Commission the applicant’s agreement to the additional Conditions of Approval.

(8:06:08) – Ms. Ferris reiterated the proposed additional Conditions of Approval to which Mr. Baker had agreed:

30. *No odors related to the processing of animals shall be realized at the property line.*

31. *Noise levels at the property line shall not exceed 80 decibels.*

(8:06:45) – Ms. Sullivan recommended capturing each Commissioner’s affirmative vote and their indication that they can make the requirement findings, or specify which findings they could not make should they vote against the project.

(8:07:30) – Vice Chair Wiggins moved to approve Special Use Permit LU-2021-0308 based on the findings and subject to the Conditions of Approval contained in the Staff Report and in the amended in Staff’s memo dated December 14, 2021. Additionally, based on discussion during this meeting, to include the following added Conditions of Approval:

29. *The applicant must provide a wetland delineation report with the building permit application and, if applicable, obtain approval from the EPA for the project design as it relates to wetlands prior to any permits for construction being issued.*

30. *No odors related to the processing of animals shall be realized at the property line.*

31. *Noise levels at the property line shall not exceed 80 decibels.*

Commissioner Preston seconded the motion. Chair Borders requested a roll call vote.

- **Chairperson Borders:** Aye – able to make all findings of fact in the affirmative.
- **Vice Chair Wiggins:** Aye – meets all Conditions of approval, including: 29, 30, 31.
- **Commissioner Loyd:** Aye – able to make all findings of fact in the affirmative.
- **Commissioner Killgore:** Nay – “I do not find that it meets a few of the conditions which I stated last month and that did not change.”
- **Commissioner Perry:** Aye – able to make all findings of fact in the affirmative.
- **Commissioner Preston:** Aye – able to make all findings of fact in the affirmative.
- **Commissioner Esswein:** Absent.

Chairperson Borders confirmed that the motion carried 5-1-0 with one absence.

(8:11:00) – Chairperson Borders thanked all attendees for their civility and for their input.

7. STAFF REPORTS (NON-ACTION ITEMS)

- DIRECTOR'S REPORT TO THE COMMISSION

(8:20:33) – Ms. Sullivan noted that the due date for January meeting’s applications was yet to come; therefore, she could not announce the upcoming agenda items. She also confirmed that the Commission would meet next on January 26, 2022 to continue the Title 18 discussion.

- FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

(8:21:27) – Ms. Sullivan confirmed that the Commission would elect a chair and a vice chair at the next meeting, and announced that there would be two vacancy appointments by the Board of Supervisors.

- COMMISSIONER REPORTS/COMMENTS

(8:21:50) – Vice Chair Wiggins was informed by Ms. Sullivan that she would present the Commission’s Title 18 recommendations to the Board of Supervisors for comments and not for action.

8. PUBLIC COMMENT

(8:23:55) – Chairperson Borders entertained public comments; however, none were forthcoming. Commissioner Killgore inquired whether he could “take the 5th...if I think that it’s [going] to be controversial if I speak, that I just don’t speak.” Ms. Sullivan confirmed that he did not have to speak; however, she clarified that because item 6.E would most likely be appealed to the Board of Supervisors, the Board would benefit from knowing every Commissioner’s thought process; therefore, she had asked them to clarify their votes. Chair Borders was in favor of the clarification as well. Mr. Reese was in agreement with Ms. Sullivan’s explanation. He likened it to court processes and the explanations of judges who have a dissenting opinion.

9. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: ADJOURNMENT

(8:29:09) – Chairperson Borders adjourned the meeting at 8:29 p.m.

The Minutes of the December 15, 2021 Carson City Planning Commission meeting are so approved this 26th day of January, 2022.