

MINUTES
Carson City Planning Commission Regular Meeting
Wednesday, January 26, 2022, ● 5:00 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 Kilgore

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

(5:02:45) – Chairperson Borders called the meeting to order at 5:02 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

(5:02:52) – 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	Absent	
Commissioner Sena Loyd	Present	
Commissioner Richard Perry	Present	
Commissioner Teri Preston	Present	

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

(5:03:14) – Commissioner Preston led the Pledge of Allegiance.

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS

(5:03:46) – Chairperson Borders noted his and Commissioner Preston’s reappointments to the Planning Commission by the Board of Supervisors and entertained public comments on non-agendized items.

(5:05:10) – Sam Flakus introduced himself and read a prepared statement regarding the demolition of the V&T Engine House and called on prospective tenants to boycott the proposed Altair development (item 6.D).

(5:06:55) – Chairperson Borders announced that 6.A would be heard after item 6.D.

5. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – DECEMBER 15, 2021

(5:07:09) – Chairperson Borders introduced the item and entertained changes, corrections, or a motion.

(5:07:20) – Vice Chair Wiggins moved to approve the minutes of the December 15, 2021, meeting as presented. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Preston and carried 5-0-1, with Commissioner Esswein abstaining as he was not present at that meeting.

6. MEETING ITEMS

6.A FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION TO ELECT A PLANNING COMMISSION CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR.

(7:17:46) – Chairperson Borders introduced the item, explained that he had already served the two one-year terms as chair and could not be nominated again. He also entertained nominations.

(7:18:12) – Commissioner Esswein moved to nominate Vice Chair Wiggins to the position of Chair and Commissioner Perry to the position of Vice Chair.

(7:18:34) – Vice Chair Wiggins moved to nominate Commissioner Preston as Vice Chair.

(7:18:45) – Commissioner Esswein withdrew the second half of his his original motion and moved to nominate Vice Chair Wiggins as Chair and Commissioner Preston as Vice Chair. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Perry. Chairperson Borders called for the vote.

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

6.B LU-2021-0398 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A REQUEST TO AMEND A SPECIAL USE PERMIT (“SUP”) TO ALLOW FOR

A 36-UNIT MULTIFAMILY APARTMENT COMPLEX, LU-2019-0077, INCORPORATING ADDITIONAL ADJACENT PARCELS INTO THE PROJECT SITE ZONED RETAIL COMMERCIAL (“RC”) AND MULTI-FAMILY APARTMENTS (“MFA”), LOCATED AT 1421 NORTH CARSON STREET, APNS 002-136-01, -04, AND -05.

(5:07:50) – Chairperson Borders introduced the item. Chairperson Borders and Commissioner Perry read into the record prepared disclosure statements, advised of no disqualifying conflict of interest, and stated that they would participate in discussion and action.

(5:10:10) – Associate Planner Heather Manzo gave background and presented the Staff Report, which is incorporated into the record. She also referenced late material introduced in the form of public comment and incorporated into the record, by George Georgeson, the owner of two adjacent properties. Ms. Manzo noted the additional late material, also incorporated into the record, which included a recommendation by Staff to add two more conditions of approval to mitigate potential impacts to abutting properties. The added conditions 17 and 18 would read:

17. Prior to the issuance of a site improvement permit, the applicant shall demonstrate that the detention basins have been located and designed in a manner that infiltration will not impact the crawl spaces of the abutting residences.

18. Prior to the issuance of a site improvement permit, the applicant shall relocate the dog run to a minimum of 10 feet away from the abutting properties located to the northeast of the site.

(10:16:01) – Ms. Manzo and Development Engineer Stephen Pottéy responded to clarifying questions. Commissioner Esswein was informed that after the 10-year project life, should the property be subject to another project, a new Special Use Permit would be required.

(5:18:55) – Applicant Jim Peckham, Executive Director of Friends in Service Helping (FISH), and project architect John Copoulos explained the program related to the project, which was to use the housing to provide technical education to disadvantaged job seekers. Mr. Peckham noted that a shuttle would be provided in four to 12 months to provide the students and their families with transportation, adding that the living would be transitional while the residents attended school. He did not expect multiple vehicles per family; hence, the request for reduced parking. Ms. Manzo explained that the “agreement” in Condition No. 8 would “obligate the applicant for a period of ten years, beginning on the date of the first certificate of occupancy for the apartments” to ensure the property would remain as intended. Vice Chair Wiggins addressed the parking concerns and recommended notifying the occupants that each unit would be provided with one parking space. Mr. Peckham cited the example of a similar facility, Richards Crossing, which had underutilized parking spaces.

(5:27:30) – Commissioner Perry was informed by Ms. Manzo that a residential apartment building would require two parking spaces per unit, and that the shuttles would be utilized based on need. Further discussion ensued regarding the parking and Ms. Manzo stated that the multifamily section

of the development had three more parking spaces than previously approved by the Planning Commission and that street parking was also available. Mr. Peckham clarified that the commercial portion would be used as a training facility, food establishments, and for non-profit organizations, not yet defined.

(5:33:28) – Mr. Copoulos inquired about Condition No. 12 and Ms. Manzo clarified that the removal of the driveway must be on the Site Improvement Permit. She also explained that the landscape setback would be prioritized over the zero setback, adding that because Carson Street is an arterial street, it would require a landscape buffer and offered to discuss the issue offline. Ms. Manzo clarified that the commercial portion of the development was not part of this Special Use Permit request. Mr. Copoulos also stated that regarding the additional recommended Conditions of Approval on the detention basins, they would abide by “whatever is in the Carson City [Municipal] Code (CCMC).” Chairperson Borders entertained public comments.

(5:42:11) – George Georgeson introduced himself as a licensed civil engineer, referenced his letter, incorporated into the record, and noted his objection to the detention basins which is “less than seven feet from [my] house.” He also noted that his property is one foot lower than the proposed development and was concerned about the soil saturation. Mr. Georgeson requested having the detention basin placed away from his property and wished to amend Condition No. 17 to include a protection of the entire adjoining property, noted in question no. 7 as “*will not result in material damage or prejudice to other property in the vicinity.*” He also recommended other locations for the detention basin. Mr. Pottéy reviewed the process Staff would use to evaluate Mr. Georgeson’s request. Commissioner Preston was informed that the proposed dog area was a dog run and not a dog park.

(5:51:33) – Robert Potter introduced himself as an adjacent property owner and expressed concern that the commercial portion of the project which might include food establishments would cause more traffic. He was not in favor of traffic on Fall Street, which was a school zone, recommending the driveway to be on Adams Street.

(5:56:16) – Eileen Potter also introduced herself as an adjacent property owner and expressed disappointment that sidewalks had not been built for the school zone to avoid walking through parked cars. She believed that if sidewalks are built for this project then a sidewalk is warranted for her street which is a school zone, so the children can walk safely.

(6:02:30) – Darren Georgeson introduced herself and he reiterated that a spill had saturated the soil on his family’s property and wished to see the detention basin location reevaluated.

(6:04:30) – Tom Gibbons introduced himself as a Carson City resident for over 50 years and expressed concern over the increased homeless population in Carson City and wished to see Mr. Georgeson’s and the Potters’ issues addressed. He also wished to be ensured that the commercial portion of the project would not become an apartment complex.

(6:08:28) – Mrs. Potter was also concerned about the project’s interference with the staging of the Nevada Day Parade.

(6:09:48) – Ms. Manzo responded to the public comments. She stated that the property was zoned for possible businesses such as a coffee shop and a drive-through; adding that the site plan could not accommodate a drive-through business as designed; however, it might, with changes to driveway accesses. She also noted that a traffic letter would be required from the applicant which would address traffic concerns. Ms. Manzo explained that the City required all new developments to install sidewalks; however, the developer is not required to extend it any further.

(6:10:25) – Mr. Pottéy addressed the Conditions of Approval, stating that Staff was content with them and noted that based on the concerns from the adjacent properties, Condition No. 17 was added. Ms. Sullivan clarified that the City reviews the Nevada Day Parade route annually and issues a permit. Commissioner Preston believed that the term “dog run” in Condition No. 18 implied a structure; therefore, she recommended changing the name to a dog walking area or a dog curbing area. Vice Chair Wiggins suggested changing the phrase “abutting residences” in Condition No. 17 to “adjoining residences.” Mr. Copoulos clarified for Commissioner Perry that the drainage area would most likely be where the dog walk area is located. He stated that the soil had to be studied and noted that an entrance on Fall Street was not likely, but would require a review by the City’s Fire Department. City Engineer Randall Rice addressed the City’s sidewalk issues and explained the funding problems, noting that they had received Redevelopment Authority grants; however, this area was outside the Redevelopment Area. He recommended using Carson Connect to be evaluated.

(6:22:26) – Mr. Peckham stated his agreement to the Conditions of Approval and noted that they would meet with Staff “to make sure we’re on the same page.” He also was amenable to changing the term “dog run” to “dog walk.” Vice Chair Wiggins received confirmation from Mr. Peckham that he agreed to the change of the phrase from “abutting residences” in Condition No. 17 to “adjoining residences.” Chairperson Borders entertained a motion.

(6:24:15) – Vice Chair Wiggins moved to recommend approval of special use permit LU-2021-0398 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 January 25, 2022, with the following changes: Changing “abutting residences” in Condition No. 17 to “adjoining residences,” changing “dog run” to “dog walk” in Condition No. 18, and changing “prior to the issuance of a site improvement permit” to “concurrent with the issuance of a site improvement permit” in Condition No. 12. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Esswein.

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

6.C LU-2021-0449 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A REQUEST FOR A SPECIAL USE PERMIT (“SUP”) FOR A MULTIFAMILY APARTMENT COMPLEX ON PROPERTY ZONED GENERAL COMMERCIAL (“GC”) AND MULTI-FAMILY APARTMENT – SPECIFIC PLAN AREA (“MFA-SPA”) LOCATED AT 1630, 1636, AND 1650 BROWN STREET AND 3679 AND 3689 GORDON STREET, APNS 008-303-15, -16, -21, -36, -37, AND -39.

(6:25:56) – Chairperson Borders introduced the item. Ms. Manzo presented the Staff Report and supporting documentation, including late material, all of which are incorporated into the record. She also responded to clarifying questions by the Commissioners. Commissioner Esswein recommended unifying the zoning when combining the multiple properties; however, Ms. Manzo noted that CCMC allowed split zoning in a property. Mr. Pottéy clarified for Commissioner Perry that the Fire Department had approved the single point of access to the property and noted that a drainage study had been done and that there was an overflow to the detention basin.

(6:34:36) – Applicant Dwight Millard explained that he had read and was in agreement with the Conditions of Approval outlined in the Staff Report. He also requested looking into the Specific Plan Area (SPA) and the drainage requirements citing additional cost to his development versus those who had not paid additional fees. Ms. Manzo clarified that Condition No. 2 is lifted from CCMC and explained that Staff’s interpretation of the permits was “as long as the first permit comes in within that 12-month period, and permits are continually taken out and construction continues, then the Special Use Permit will be active for the construction of Phase 2.” She also noted that extensions are noted in Condition No. 3. Mr. Millard stated that the COVID-19 pandemic caused many of the delays and extensions. He also was amenable to having the split-zoning issue addressed during the Commission’s annual review. Chairperson Borders entertained public comments; however, none were forthcoming.

(6:42:07) – Ms. Sullivan provided background on the SPA and Mr. Millard clarified that they had incurred additional costs to provide walkways and ensure that residents did not walk around the building. Discussion ensued regarding Condition No. 10 and Mr. Millard noted that he was awaiting verification on his understanding of his pro-rata share. Chairperson Borders entertained additional discussion and when none were forthcoming, a motion.

(6:50:30) – Vice Chair Wiggins moved to recommend approval of Special Use Permit LU-2021-0449 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 January 25, 2022. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Perry.

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

6.D LU-2021-0452 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A REQUEST FOR A SPECIAL USE PERMIT (“SUP”) TO ALLOW ALTERNATIVE COMPLIANCE OF THE DOWNTOWN MIXED USE STANDARDS, SPECIFICALLY STANDARDS RELATED TO A MIXED USE REQUIREMENT, THE SIDEWALK SPECIFICATION, TRANSPARENCY, AND BUILDING ENVELOPE STEP-BACK REQUIREMENTS RELATIVE TO A MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ON PROPERTY ZONED DOWNTOWN MIXED USE (“DT-MU”), LOCATED AT 201 E. WILLIAM STREET AND 222 E. WASHINGTON STREET, APNS 002-161-06 AND 002-161-07.

(6:52:01) – Chairperson Borders introduced the item. Ms. Ferris presented the Staff Report and supporting documentation including late material, and responded to clarifying questions. Additionally, Ms. Ferris recommended the addition of Condition No. 13 to read: *A lot line deletion shall be completed prior to the issuance of any building permits.*” She noted the receipt of one public comment, incorporated into the record, recommended approval, and introduced applicant Tony Hama. Mr. Pottéy clarified that during the Major Project Review (MPR) process, Staff had explained to the applicant that according to CCMC, frontage improvements were required per the Development Standards; however, due to a City project planned on the East William Street frontage, the applicant could provide the City the amount they would have spent on the landscaping of the project. Mr. Pottéy also responded to Commissioners’ questions. Discussion ensued regarding the traffic generated on Stewart Street and Mr. Pottéy informed Commissioner Preston that this Special Use Permit was for the sidewalk improvements and not traffic and Ms. Ferris clarified that the traffic issues would be addressed during the building permit process.

(7:09-27) – Mr. Hama provided clarifications to questions by the Commissioners and informed Commissioner Loyd that the environmental issues would be handled by a “qualified environmental engineer” to monitor and follow the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection (NDEP) protocol. He also acknowledged reading and agreeing with all the Conditions of Approval without modifications. Chair Borders advised Staff to work with the applicant regarding traffic. Commissioner Perry recommended that the applicant acknowledge the history of the development location and, in response to public comment,

commemorate it with a plaque or a sign as a goodwill gesture to the City. Mr. Hama explained that they had received input from the Historic Resources Commission regarding the historic location of the project and were considering elements such as stone or brick. Commissioner Loyd was informed that there might be 5-6 charging stations for electric vehicles. Chairperson Borders entertained additional comments and when none were forthcoming, a motion.

(7:16:52) – Commissioner Esswein moved to approve LU-2021-0452, based on the findings and subject to the Conditions of Approval contained in the Staff Report and amended in Staff’s memo dated January 25, 2022. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Perry.

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

7. STAFF REPORTS (NON-ACTION ITEMS)

- DIRECTOR'S REPORT TO THE COMMISSION

(7:19:50) – Ms. Sullivan updated the Commission on the Board of Supervisors activities and noted that the Board had agreed with all the Planning Commission recommendations. She also noted that the Board had an informal discussion about the recommended Title 18 amendments, remarking that the Board had not been in favor of allowing metal storage containers and had requested larger lots for the accessory dwellings. Ms. Sullivan explained to the Commission that the Board had accepted the Master Plan Report; however, they had requested a comprehensive list of mapping corrections. The Board had also prioritized Title 18 over the V&T zoning.

- FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

None discussed.

- COMMISSIONER REPORTS/COMMENTS

None discussed.

8. PUBLIC COMMENT

(7:24:13) – Chairperson Wiggins entertained public comments; however, none were forthcoming.

9. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: ADJOURNMENT

(7:24:25) – Chairperson Wiggins adjourned the meeting at 7:25 p.m.

The Minutes of the January 26, 2022, Carson City Planning Commission meeting are so approved this 23rd day of February 2022.

From: [Karen Johansen](#)
To: [Planning Department](#)
Subject: Public Comment for Planning Commission Meeting 2/26/22
Date: Tuesday, January 25, 2022 2:57:03 PM

This message originated outside of Carson City's email system. Use caution if this message contains attachments, links, or requests for information.

The downtown "Altair" property (Nevada Appeal, Jan 22, 2022, page A11) includes the site of the Virginia & Truckee Railroad's huge and historic locomotive-and-shops building. I hope the unidentified Altair developer plans to incorporate substantial architectural tributes to that magnificent V&T structure.

Steve VanDenburgh