

DRAFT MINUTES
Carson City Planning Commission Regular Meeting
Wednesday, April 27, 2022 ● 5:00 PM
Community Center Robert “Bob” Crowell Boardroom
851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada

Commission Members

Chair – Jay Wiggins

Vice Chair – Teri Preston

Commissioner – Charles Borders, Jr.

Commissioner – Paul Esswein

Commissioner – Nathaniel Killgore

Commissioner – Sena Loyd

Commissioner – Richard Perry

Staff

Heather Ferris, Planning Manager

Todd Reese, Deputy District Attorney (via WebEx)

Mihaela Neagos, Deputy District Attorney

Stephen Pottéy, Sr. Project Manager

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

(5:00:41) – Chairperson Wiggins called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

(5:00:49) – Roll was called, and a quorum was present.

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

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

(5:01:10) – Commissioner Borders led the Pledge of Allegiance.

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS

(5:01:34) – Chairperson Wiggins entertained public comments on non-agendized items; however, none were forthcoming.

5. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – MARCH 30, 2022

(5:02:27) – Chairperson Wiggins introduced the item and entertained changes, corrections, or a motion.

(5:02:34) – Commissioner Borders moved to approve the minutes of the March 30, 2022 meeting as presented. The motion was seconded by Vice Chair Preston and carried 6-0-0.

6. MEETING ITEMS

6.A LU-2022-0061 – FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A REQUEST FOR A SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR A FENCE LOCATED WITHIN THE FRONT SETBACK AREA WHICH EXCEEDS THE ALLOWABLE FENCE HEIGHT ON PROPERTY ZONED SINGLE FAMILY - 1 ACRE (“SF1A”) AND IS LOCATED AT 3809 PONDEROSA DRIVE, APN 009-137-07.

(5:02:54) – Chairperson Wiggins introduced the item. Ms. Manzo presented the Staff Report, accompanying documentation, and late material, all of which are incorporated into the record. She explained that the request consisted of a 6-foot-tall fence, constructed of solid reinforced block for the first 3 feet above grade and additional 3 feet of open view iron and was located on the front property line. Ms. Manzo noted that since the fence was taller than the height allowed by Carson City Development Standards, which stated that a sight obscuring fence may not exceed three feet in height when located in the front building setback. She also reviewed the Conditions of Approval, incorporated into the Staff Report. Ms. Manzo explained that notices were sent to 35 neighbors and that Staff had received one voicemail message from a neighbor opposed to the fence, noting that the fence was unattractive, responded to clarifying questions by the Commissioners, and acknowledged the presence of the applicant in the audience. Discussion ensued regarding the fence which had been built in 2016 without a permit by the previous property owner and Ms. Manzo referenced a lawsuit to which the current owner was not a party.

(5:08:19) – Janet Thomas introduced herself as the new owner of the property and noted that she agreed with the Conditions of Approval. She also clarified that the gate was not automatic. Chairperson Wiggins entertained public comments.

(5:11:52) – Jane Gangitano introduced herself as a neighbor and noted that she could see through the fence and did not object to it, adding that it would increase property values. She believed that there were other fences higher and more obstructive than this fence and called the actions of the Planning Department “bullying” as a result of which many neighbors had not wished to construct such fences.

(5:15:47) – Peter Gibbons introduced himself as “a managing partner of the former owner [of the property].” He referenced the previous litigation and believed that the City’s code regarding the item was “unfair.” He also clarified that the water meter would be moved away from the fence; however, they were having issues with finding a new plumber.

(5:17:25) – Roman Davrempler introduced himself as the builder of the fence and stated that the Special Use Permit was not requested because of the belief that it would be turned down, after paying the fee. Chairperson Wiggins entertained discussion.

(5:18:41) – Vice Chair Preston inquired about building permits, and Mr. Pott y stated that a building permit would be required for the 72-inch columns. Mr. Davrempler clarified that the column was made of concrete and not stone. Chairperson Wiggins noted that he empathized with the Special Use Permit costs; however, he highlighted the fact that without the proper steps the fence had an impact on the water meter in this case. He also entertained a motion.

(5:21:54) – Commissioner Perry moved to approve Special Use Permit LU-2022-0061, based on the ability to make all findings and subject to the Conditions of Approval contained in the Staff Report. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Killgore.

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

6.B AB-2022-0086 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A REQUEST FOR THE ABANDONMENT OF A PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY (BALSAM STREET) TOTALING APPROXIMATELY 60 FEET, ABUTTING THE PROPERTIES LOCATED AT 5179 SILVER SAGE DRIVE, APN 009-232-03, 5229 SILVER SAGE DRIVE, APN 009-233-01, AND 5290 CENTER DRIVE, APN 009-233-02.

(5:22:22) – Chairperson Wiggins introduced the item. Ms. Ferris presented the Staff Report which is incorporated into the record and recommended approval based on Staff having made all seven findings of fact in the affirmative. She also introduced Todd Enke of Resource Concepts, Inc. as the applicant representative and responded to clarifying questions. Chairperson Wiggins was informed that the abandonment request had been initiated by the three homeowners.

(5:25:17) – Mr. Enke noted that he had read and agreed with the Conditions of Approval outlined in the Staff Report and stated that the abandonment of an easement was also underway.

(5:27:32) – Commissioner Perry moved to recommend that the Board of Supervisors approve the abandonment of Balsam Street, based on the findings and subject to the Conditions of Approval contained in the Staff Report. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Borders.

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

6.C LU-2022-0118 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A REQUEST FOR AN AMENDMENT TO A SPECIAL USE PERMIT (SUP-17-085) TO ALLOW FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A HOOP HOUSE ON PROPERTY ZONED PUBLIC (“P”) LOCATED AT 208 CORBETT STREET, APN 002-138-17.

(5:27:58) – Chairperson Wiggins introduced the item. Commissioners Borders and Esswein read into the record prepared disclosure statements, advised of no disqualifying conflict of interest, and stated that they would participate in discussion and action. Commissioner Perry also read into the record a prepared disclosure statement, advised of a disqualifying conflict of interest, and stated that he would not participate in discussion and action.

(5:31:02) – Ms. Ferris gave background and reviewed key elements of the Staff Report and accompanying documents, all of which are incorporated into the record. She also stated that no public comments were received regarding the item and introduced applicant Mark Korinek, Director of Operations, Carson City School District. Mr. Korinek noted that he had read and agreed with the Conditions of Approval outlined in the Staff Report. Chairperson Wiggins entertained Commissioner or public comments and when none were forthcoming, a motion.

(5:33:44) – Vice Chair Preston moved to approve LU-2022-0118 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:	Preston
SECONDER:	Killgore
AYES:	Wiggins, Preston, Borders, Esswein, Killgore
NAYS:	None
ABSTENTIONS:	Perry
ABSENT:	Loyd

6.D LU-2022-0116 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A REQUEST FOR A SPECIAL USE PERMIT (“SUP”) TO ALLOW FOR THE

CONSTRUCTION OF A 682 SQUARE FOOT GUEST BUILDING ON PROPERTY ZONED SINGLE-FAMILY-6,000 (“SF6”) LOCATED AT 1802 RAND AVENUE, APN 002-231-04.

(5:34:24) – Chairperson Wiggins introduced the item. Ms. Ferris introduced the subject property and presented the Staff Report, along with accompanying documents, all of which are incorporated into the record. She also highlighted that a guest building may only be occupied by the family members of the primary residence, as defined by Title 18 of the Carson City Municipal Code, and their nonpaying guests, noting that guest buildings may not be rented as secondary dwelling units. Ms. Ferris recommended approval based on Staff’s ability to make all the findings of fact. She also, along with Mr. Pottéy responded to clarifying questions.

(5:38:39) – Applicant Riley Waterhouse explained that the guest house would be used by them, while family members would move into the main house. He also noted his agreement with the Conditions of Approval outlined in the Staff Report. There were no public or Commissioner comments; therefore, Chairperson Wiggins entertained a motion.

(5:39:24) – Commissioner Borders moved to approve the LU-2022-0116 based on the findings and subject to the Conditions of Approval contained in the Staff Report. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Esswein.

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

6.E LU-2022-0117 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A REQUEST FOR SPECIAL USE PERMIT (“SUP”) TO ALLOW FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A CHILDCARE FACILITY ON PROPERTY ZONED SINGLE FAMILY – 6,000 (“SF6”) LOCATED AT 2894 PINEBROOK DRIVE, APN 010-471-12.

(5:39:57) – Chairperson Wiggins introduced the item. Ms. Manzo presented the Staff Report and supporting documents. She referenced a letter objecting to the item, received as late material, and responded to clarifying questions. She also informed Chair Wiggins that there were five similar home-based childcare businesses in Carson City. Ms. Manzo clarified for Commissioner Perry that the State was responsible for the childcare permit; however, the applicant would obtain a business license from Carson City.

(5:43:33) – Applicant Lizbeth Jauregui introduced herself and gave background on her experience as a childcare provider. She also stated her agreement with the Conditions of Approval outlined in the Staff Report. Commissioner Borders complimented Ms. Jauregui on a well-written application. Chairperson Wiggins entertained public comments.

(5:45:28) – Robert Hernandez introduced himself as Ms. Jauregui’s next-door neighbor explaining that he was concerned about the noise at first; however, there had been no traffic or noise issues. He also called the applicant “a great neighbor.” Chairperson Wiggins also complimented Ms. Jauregui on a well-written application and was pleased to see the staggered drop-off and pick-up times. He also entertained a motion.

(5:46:35) – Vice Chair Preston moved to approve the Special Use Permit in Case No. LU-2022-0117 based on the ability to make the required findings, and subject to the Conditions of Approval contained in the STAFF REPORT. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Killgore.

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

6.F LU-2022-0119 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A REQUEST FOR SPECIAL USE PERMIT (“SUP”) TO ALLOW FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A 126-UNIT MULTIFAMILY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT INCLUDING THE CONSTRUCTION OF RETAINING WALLS WITHIN THE REQUIRED SETBACK ON PROPERTIES ZONED RETAIL COMMERCIAL (“RC”) LOCATED AT THE INTERSECTION OF ROOP STREET AND NORTHRIDGE DRIVE, APNS 002-101-77 AND 002-104-01.

(5:47:18) – Chairperson Wiggins introduced the item. Ms. Manzo presented the project information which is incorporated into the Staff Report and the accompanying documentation, all of which are incorporated into the record and recommended approval, based on Staff having made all the findings. She, along with Mr. Pottéy, responded to clarifying questions and highlighted the public comments, included as late material, for and against the project. Mr. Pottéy highlighted the two traffic impact studies incorporated into the record as well. The Commissioners expressed concern that Roop Street was “heavily traveled” and were worried about accidents as a result of sight distance issues. Ms. Manzo clarified that there would be four phases to the construction; however, they would be independent of each other in terms of construction.

(6:07:49) – The applicant team of Stacie Huggins, Wood Rogers, Inc., and Matthew Fleming, Northern Nevada Community Housing (NNCH) Executive Director, introduced themselves, gave background on NNCH, and reviewed a PowerPoint presentation, incorporated into the record, and responded to clarifying questions. Brian Gant, Principal at Wood Rogers, Inc. addressed the traffic area of concern “the left turn out of the south driveway” and believed that the down grade helped visibility. Further discussion ensued regarding the traffic concerns. Vice Chair Preston was concerned that many vehicles would use Roop

Street to go to the office buildings or for meals, and that the upcoming residents will add to the congestion and the danger. She recommended widening the heavily congested areas of Roop Street. Nate Hudson introduced himself as the project architect with Formgrey Studio and noted that there would be a total of 54 one-bedroom and 72 two-bedroom units. Mr. Fleming recommended visiting the Valley Springs property across the street to see the “same people, same services...[and] the exact same makeup,” calling it an award-winning project for Nevada. He explained that the parking lot there was empty and that they had not created congestion or crime. Mr. Fleming noted that the veterans living in those communities deserved better housing and proximity to amenities. Commissioner Perry was informed that 85 percent of Valley Springs residents were veterans. Chairperson Wiggins entertained public comments and reminded the audience to adhere to the three-minute time limit.

(6:36:46) – Patrick Hartman introduced himself as an area resident and expressed disappointment that “all of the Northridge residents” had not been notified. He objected to the “fast-tracking” of the project and to the fact that the only notifications had been to those within 600 feet of the project. Mr. Hartman was also concerned about the traffic, lighting, noise, and obstruction of views, and believed excess vehicles would park near their homes and believed that the units not occupied by veterans would become “low income” housing.

(6:41:34) – Georgia Kinkella introduced herself as an area resident and a veteran. She noted that she agreed with Mr. Hartman’s comments and was concerned about “losing the view” and believed that the noise level would increase even more. She did not want “other cars in our neighborhood” and was concerned about the reduction of their property values.

(6:44:10) – Karen Lantz-Feith stated she was a resident of Northridge and called it a “thoroughfare.” She believed the traffic will worsen with the new development.

(6:45:46) – Kirsten Menshew Human Resources Director at Northern Nevada Community Housing Resource Board noted that she had worked with NNCH for over five years, and had assisted with the Valley Springs development, which she noted had a waiting list of over 700 with almost 600 who were veterans. She also highlighted the need for veterans and workforce housing.

(6:46:46) – Cynthia Crist-Stommel introduced herself as the site director of Nation’s Finest in Carson City, an organization that “helps veterans gain stable housing.” She explained that they have seen an increased demand for veterans’ housing and added that half of the veteran population at Valley Springs had been placed by them and considered it an alternative to homelessness in the veterans’ population.

(6:48:37) – Kevin McGrath introduced himself as a neighbor of Mr. Hartman and requested a delay in the Commission’s decision as he had not received a notice and wished to read the information. He agreed with his neighbor’s concerns and believed that, as a paramedic, he had seen a delay in response time in three-story buildings. He was also concerned with parking issues and objected to the multi-phased construction issues.

(6:51:01) – Joseph Sylvester introduced himself as the manager of Valley Springs Apartments and explained that the elevators at both sites would accommodate gurneys and four paramedics. He also explained that most of their tenants are elderly and on fixed incomes, and do not own vehicles and noted that most of those who park in their lots do not live in that complex. He stated that the Veterans Administration (VA) will pick up the residents in their buses.

(6:52:45) – Tomasz Bartoszyn introduced himself as an area resident and a veteran who believed the project was great; however, the location was “really bad” because of traffic and the noise which would add to the truck noise coming from Walmart.

(6:53:48) – David Overland introduced himself as a Northridge resident and expressed concern regarding the traffic, especially near the roundabout. He noted that it was already a major artery, adding that Valley Springs was set back further and believed it would be difficult to have emergency vehicles and snow trucks reach their neighborhoods. He also believed that the property was designated as commercial property and did not believe that it could accommodate a project that dense without impacting pedestrian and vehicle safety.

(6:58:38) – Mike Hunt agreed with Mr. Overland and noted that even though veterans needed homes, this was “not a good area for it.” He believed that it would not be “civilized living when you start packing more and more people in an area that it’s not a good area for it.” He also stated that the icy conditions have caused crashes. Chairperson Wiggins invited Staff to address the issues.

(7:00:48) – Ms. Manzo clarified that the Planning Department follows “the code standard for public notification” which she explained was to property owners within 600 feet of the subject property with a minimum of at least 30 residences; however, if there were fewer than that number in the notification area, it would be extended to additional residents to meet that number. Ms. Manzo explained that 97 property owners and 126 mobile home park residents had been notified per the code requirements.

(7:01:57) – Mr. Pottéy acknowledged hearing the Commissioners’ and the public’s concerns regarding sight distance and recommended adding another Condition of Approval “related to analyzing sight distance at the proposed driveways and at the crosswalk at the top of the hill.” He also clarified that the Special Use Permit was based on the proposed use in the Retail Commercial (RC) zoning, which allows high traffic generating uses and it meets the sight distance standards. Mr. Pottéy noted that a bus stop was accessible a thousand feet away near Walmart. Mr. Overland brought up the migration route of animals and believed that if their route was impacted, they would “end up on the streets.”

(7:06:09) – Vice Chair Preston called Valley Springs “a beautiful project;” however, she noted that it was on Hot Spring Road which was not subject to the same traffic as Roop Street. She was also informed by Ms. Manzo that the parking spaces of the project were reduced based on the data from the Valley Springs property’s parking usage. Chair Wiggins noted that fewer cars by occupants would reduce the number of drivers and cars. Commissioner Esswein objected to the term “fast-tracking” referred to the project in public comment. He clarified that upon submission of the project, the City had 65 days to review and

present it to the Planning Commission for approval based on State law. He also believed that “discrimination against low-income people should not be allowed,” in reference to a public comment objecting to the low-income housing, and stated it would not affect how he, as a Commissioner, would vote. Commissioner Borders requested that Mr. Pottéy present the added Condition of Approval regarding sight distance improvement. Mr. Pottéy recommended the following addition (Condition No. 11) to the Conditions of Approval:

11. Prior to the issuance of the first site improvement permit, plans shall include an updated traffic impact study that analyzes the sight distance at all four proposed driveways and at the crosswalk on Northridge Drive east of the project. Any potential vehicular or pedestrian conflicts that arise from poor sight distance must be mitigated with the site improvement permit.

(7:11:00) – Commissioner Perry was informed by Ms. Manzo that mailed notifications go out at least 10 days prior to the public hearing. She also stated that this notification had also been published in the *Nevada Appeal*. Commissioner Perry explained that there were no statutes or regulations regarding views and noted that in this case, it appeared that some were addressed in this case. He also acknowledged that “we are starting to have a congestion issue on Northridge at this intersection.” He recommended looking into other ways of connecting the neighborhoods and was not concerned about the parking space reduction because it catered to a population that typically did not have many cars, adding that should this have been a commercial development, it would not have appeared before the Planning Commission. Ms. Kinkella wished that the Commission would take into consideration the fact that the mobile home park was separated from the development by a wall, unlike the other residents.

(7:18:27) – Commissioner Killgore noted that he was familiar with the area and stated that he had seen accidents there. He also said that he had sided with the public in the past, and was in favor of doing so. He stated “you will get my vote on this issue,” and hoped to sway other commissioners to vote with him. Commissioner Border received confirmation from Ms. Huggins that the applicant was acceptable to Condition No. 11 proposed by Mr. Pottéy noted earlier. He also was in favor of the reduced parking as both Richards Crossing and Valley Springs did not utilize the entire parking. He also did not fault the developers for the issues with the City’s streets and reminded everyone that the RC zoning could allow other undesirable uses as well. Chairperson Wiggins was in favor of Condition No. 11, and he entertained a motion.

(7:24:25) – Commissioner Borders moved to approve the special use permit LU-2022-0119 based on the ability to make the required findings, and subject to the conditions of approval contained in the staff report with the addition of Condition No. 11 read into the record by Mr. Pottéy:

11. Prior to the issuance of the first site improvement permit, plans shall include an updated traffic impact study that analyzes the sight distance at all four proposed driveways and at the crosswalk on Northridge Drive east of the project. Any potential vehicular or pedestrian conflicts that arise from poor sight distance must be mitigated with the site improvement permit.

The motion was seconded by Chairperson Wiggins.

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

(7:25:10) – Commissioner Killgore explained that his “nay” vote was because “I believe that it adds additional dangers to the neighborhood by way of traffic being too congested in this area, specifically when the weather hits. And of course, siding with public opinion.” Chairperson Wiggins reminded the community members of the appeal process and advised that they contact the Planning Department regarding the process.

(7:26:10) – Chairperson Wiggins recessed the meeting to allow members of the public to exit the room.

(7:30:50) – Chairperson Wiggins reconvened the meeting.

7. STAFF REPORTS (NON-ACTION ITEMS)

- DIRECTOR'S REPORT TO THE COMMISSION

None.

- FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

(7:31:09) – Ms. Ferris announced that a Variance, a text amendment, and Zoning Map and Master Plan Map amendments would be agendized for the next meeting.

- COMMISSIONER REPORTS/COMMENTS

(7:32:52) – Chairperson Wiggins entertained reports or comments from the Commissioners; however, none were forthcoming.

8. PUBLIC COMMENT

(7:32:50) – Chairperson Wiggins entertained final public comments; however, none were forthcoming.

9. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: ADJOURNMENT

(7:33:30) – Chairperson Wiggins adjourned the meeting at 7:33 p.m.

The Minutes of the April 27, 2022 Carson City Planning Commission meeting are so approved this 25th day of May, 2022.