

**Carson City Planning Commission Regular Meeting
Wednesday, November 15, 2022 ● 3:00 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

Hope Sullivan, Community Development Director

Heather Ferris, Planning Manager

Adam Tully, Deputy District Attorney

Stephen Pottéy, Senior Engineering Project Manager

Heather Manzo, Associate Planner

Tamar Warren, Senior Deputy 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

(3:03:28) – Chairperson Wiggins called the meeting to order at 3:03 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

(3:03:38) – 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	Absent	
Commissioner Sena Loyd	Absent	
Commissioner Richard Perry	Present	3:25 p.m.

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

(3:03:54) – Chairperson Wiggins led the Pledge of Allegiance.

4. PUBLIC COMMENTS

(3:04:19) – Chairperson Wiggins entertained public comments; however, none were forthcoming.

5. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – OCTOBER 26, 2022

(3:04:48) – Chairperson Wiggins introduced the item and entertained comments or changes; however, none were forthcoming. He also entertained a motion.

(3:05:03) – Commissioner Borders moved to approve the minutes of the October 26, 2022 meeting as presented. The motion was seconded by Vice Chair Preston.

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

6. MEETING ITEMS

6.A LU-2020-0033 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING A REQUEST FROM WOOD RODGERS, INC (“APPLICANT”) FOR A TIME EXTENSION FOR AN APPROVED SPECIAL USE PERMIT (“SUP”) TO ALLOW FOR THE CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF A CONCRETE BATCH PLANT AND ROCK CRUSHING OPERATION WITH SILOS EXCEEDING 45-FEET IN HEIGHT, ON PROPERTY ZONED GENERAL INDUSTRIAL AIRPORT (“GIA”), LOCATED AT 4500 RYAN WAY, ASSESSOR’S PARCEL NUMBER (“APN”) 005-072-06.

(3:05:30) – Chairperson Wiggins introduced the item. Ms. Ferris gave background on the project and reviewed the Staff Report with the accompanying documents. She also recommended granting the additional six-month extension (which had been erroneously agendized in the previous meeting), with a new expiration date of April 28, 2024, as discussed in the October 26, 2022 meeting.

(3:07:33) – Applicant representative Jillian Wilbrecht introduced herself and noted her agreement with the Conditions of Approval outlined in the Staff Report. She also informed Chairperson Wiggins that they anticipated approval from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) in early 2023. There were no public comments. Commissioner Borders reminded the Commission that the Special Use Permit would expire on April 28, 2024, after which the applicant would have to “start over” the Special Use Permit request. Chairperson Wiggins entertained a motion.

(3:09:50) – Commissioner Esswein moved to approve an extension of the expiration date for LU2020-0033 to April 28, 2024, as the approved Special Use Permit continues to be appropriate, and the activity permitted by the Special Use Permit will not adversely impact other properties in the area or the public interest. The motion was seconded by Chairperson Wiggins.

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

6.B LU-2022-0433 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING AN APPLICATION FROM JENNIFER CID (“APPLICANT”) FOR A SPECIAL USE PERMIT (“SUP”) TO ALLOW A BEAUTY SALON ON PROPERTY ZONED GENERAL OFFICE (“GO”), LOCATED AT 603 E ROBINSON STREET, ASSESSOR’S PARCEL NUMBER (“APN”) 004-232-01.

(3:10:35) – Chairperson Wiggins introduced the item. Ms. Ferris presented the Staff Report and accompanying documents, incorporated into the record, recommended approval, and responded to clarifying questions. In response to a question by Commissioner Esswein regarding parking, Ms. Ferris highlighted the following section of the Staff Report:

Parking standards are per Division 2 of the Carson City Development Standards (CCDS). If adequate off-street parking space is not available, CCDS 2.3.10 allows for existing buildings within the general office zoning district to utilize a combination of on-street and on-site parking as long as a minimum of 50 percent of the parking is provided for, on-site. CCDS Division 2 also allows the Director to consider an alternative standard to the parking standard identified.

(3:14:48) – Applicant Jennifer Cid introduced herself and noted her agreement with the Conditions of Approval contained in the Staff Report. She also informed Chairperson Wiggins that she would mitigate the parking issues by being dropped off at work by her husband, adding that those leasing stations at the salon would not be working at the same time. Ms. Cid explained to Commissioner Borders that she would lease space to a massage therapist and two manicurists. Vice Chair Preston received confirmation that as the building owner, Ms. Cid could build additional parking should the need arise. Chairperson Wiggins entertained public comments and when none were forthcoming, a motion. Commissioner Borders cautioned the Board that future parking issues may arise. Discussion ensued regarding the building entrance which was on Anderson Street while the address stated 603 East Robinson Street.

(3:19:20) – Armando Cid introduced himself as the co-owner of the property and explained that the bus stop in front of the building had taken three parking spots away from the tenants. Discussion ensued

regarding the bus stop. City Engineer Randall Rice explained that the bus stop was an “existing use;” however he recommended a conversation with the City’s Transportation Division. Mr. Rice also noted that he was the “addressing official” of Carson City and stated that if the Commission or the applicant felt strongly about the address change, they could request it; however, that would come with a cost associated with new letterheads, business cards, etc. There were no public comments; therefore, Chairperson Wiggins entertained a motion.

(3:23:03) – Commissioner Borders moved to approve Special Use Permit LU-2022-0433 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 (4-0-0)
MOVER:	Borders
SECONDER:	Esswein
AYES:	Wiggins, Preston, Borders, Esswein
NAYS:	None
ABSTENTIONS:	None
ABSENT:	Killgore, Loyd, Perry

6.C LU-2022-0439 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING AN APPLICATION FROM THE ADVOCATES TO END DOMESTIC VIOLENCE (“APPLICANT”) FOR A SPECIAL USE PERMIT (“SUP”) TO ALLOW FOR A MULTI-FAMILY DWELLING ON PROPERTY ZONED GENERAL COMMERCIAL (“GC”), LOCATED AT 3649 GORDON STREET, ASSESSOR’S PARCEL NUMBER (“APN”) 008-303-41.

(3:23:40) – Chairperson Wiggins introduced the item. Ms. Ferris reviewed the Staff Report and accompanying documentation, both of which are incorporated into the record, and responded to clarifying questions.

(3:27:10) – Applicant representative and Monte Vista Consulting Principal Michael Vicks explained that they had reviewed and agreed with the Conditions of Approval included in the Staff Report. He also reviewed the project and responded to clarifying questions. Applicant Lisa Lee, Executive Director of Advocates to End Domestic Violence, informed Commissioner Esswein that the current plan was not to provide permanent housing; however, she noted that “it could be, down the line,” should there be no need for transitional units. Ms. Lee clarified for Commissioner Esswein that the storage units would be used by tenants to store their belongings and explained that masonry fencing, security fencing, and concrete walls would provide security. She also explained to Commissioner Perry that the storage units would be used by the tenants and her organization (to store records) and would not be rented out. Chairperson Wiggins entertained public comments.

(3:35:05) – Deni French spoke in support of the project and believed it was “really needed.” Vice Chair Preston called the project “a stellar addition to our community.” There were no other public comments; therefore, Chairperson Wiggins entertained a motion.

(3:37:14) – Vice Chair Preston moved to approve Special Use Permit LU-2022-0439 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 Esswein.

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

6.D ZA-2022-0403 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING AN APPLICATION FROM WILL ADLER ON BEHALF OF GREEN THUMB INDUSTRIES INC. (“APPLICANT”) FOR A RECOMMENDATION TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS (“BOARD”) REGARDING AN ORDINANCE ADDING MARIJUANA RETAIL STORES AND MEDICAL MARIJUANA DISPENSARIES TO THE RETAIL COMMERCIAL (“RC”) USE DISTRICT AND AMENDING THE LOCATION REQUIREMENTS FOR MEDICAL MARIJUANA DISPENSARIES AND MARIJUANA RETAIL STORES IN THE GENERAL COMMERCIAL (“GC”) AND GENERAL INDUSTRIAL (“GI”) USE DISTRICTS.

(3:39:34) – Chairperson Wiggins introduced the item. Ms. Ferris presented the Staff Report and accompanying documentation, both of which are incorporated into the record, and responded to clarifying questions. She noted receipt of public comments (also incorporated into the record) and recommended denial of the application (as a recommendation from the Planning Commission to the Board of Supervisors) due to Staff’s inability to make the findings outlined in the Staff Report. Ms. Ferris highlighted the following two options provided for the Commission’s consideration by the applicant (and incorporated into the Staff Report):

Option 1: Amend Carson City Municipal Code (CCMC) 18.04.130 to allow medical marijuana dispensaries and marijuana retail stores as a conditional use in the Retail Commercial (RC) use district; and amend CCMC 18.04.135 and 18.04.150 to allow marijuana retail stores and medical marijuana dispensaries in the GC and GI use districts, as a conditional use, without being limited by specific Section, Township, and Range.

Option 2: Amend CCMC 18.04.130 to allow medical marijuana dispensaries and marijuana retail stores as a conditional use in the RC use district in specific Sections, Townships, and Ranges; and amend

CCMC 18.04.135 and 18.04.150 to expand the Sections, Townships, and Ranges where marijuana retail stores and medical marijuana dispensaries are allowed in the GC and GI use districts.

(3:46:25) – Applicant Green Thumb Industries (GTI) representative Will Adler of Silver State Government Relations introduced himself and referenced a late material letter and map (incorporated into the record) he had provided to the Commissioners. Mr. Adler gave background on GTI and noted that they believed four cannabis dispensaries would be “too restrictive” in the currently allowed zoning. He explained that at this time medical dispensaries and recreational retail stores are limited to the General Commercial (GC) and General Industrial (GI) use districts with the limitations outlined in the supporting documentation. He also noted that GTI was the holder of the fourth dispensary license in Carson City and wished to operate it; however, in order to be successful, they were requesting to be able to have a retail store in areas zoned as Retail Commercial (RC) as well, as highlighted on the previously referenced late material map. Mr. Adler explained that there were no available properties in the current “zoning bubble,” adding that they would still follow the restrictions outlined in CCDS such as distance from preschools and schools, daycares, parks, and other facilities the primary services of which were to provide recreational opportunities to children, and the proximity from residential zoning districts. He also noted that there had been no issues with the Carson City Sheriff’s Office with the current dispensaries. Mr. Adler noted that he preferred Option 2 of their previously noted proposals.

(3:55:46) – Chairperson Wiggins inquired about restrictions in other counties and Mr. Adler explained that some restrictions such as proximity to drug rehabilitation centers had been added in other counties and noted that the cannabis dispensaries and shops were allowed in RC-zoned areas in Reno. He also believed that Carson City had the most “detailed and limited zoning restrictions.” Commissioner Esswein, who noted that several counties in Nevada had rejected marijuana dispensaries, was informed that GTI had received its second license (awarded in 2018) through an acquisition. Mr. Adler clarified for Vice Chair Preston that the operational deadline or a plan to become operational, for the second GTI license, was February 5, 2023. Ms. Ferris informed Vice Chair Preston that the most recent approval of a marijuana retail establishment was in an area zoned (GC) and had been zoned that way since the mid-1970s. Commissioner Perry explained that Mr. Adler had been opposed to the Commission’s recommendation to the Board of Supervisors to increase the number of marijuana establishments because “there wasn’t enough business for more than two licenses,” and asked what had changed. Mr. Adler provided additional background and indicated that having two stores in close proximity to each other was the issue. Commissioner Borders inquired about the consequences of losing the entitlement to the fourth license and Mr. Reese called the outcome an “unknown.”

(4:12:08) – Vice Chair Preston noted that the RC and GC zoning “are not far apart and that needs to be addressed” in the Title 18 review. She also recommended activating the license in the GC zone “as a placeholder.” Mr. Adler noted that they had looked into that possibility; however, there were no available properties. Chairperson Wiggins entertained public comments.

(4:14:45) – Mr. French expressed disappointment that the public had voted against dispensaries; however, the Board of Supervisors had done “a quick switch on us. Now we’re hurrying how to zone a piece of

problematic piece of life.” He preferred to see the Master Plan “a little bit more set” and did not believe that having a license would not “give you license to just build where you want.” He recommended “staying within the restrictions,” and wanted to apply that for other developments. Chairperson Wiggins acknowledged receiving written public comments (incorporated into the record.)

(4:18:22) – Mr. Adler reiterated that GTI had been a “good operator” in Carson City and believed that they would continue their practices in other areas and requested being allowed to operate in other zoning areas. Commissioner Borders thanked Mr. Adler for his efforts and confirmed that the Commission was not questioning the fact that GTI had been “a good neighbor” to Carson City. However, he believed that the Commission was getting mixed messages from the Board of Supervisors also and cited the Board’s decision to allow four establishments, against the Commission’s recommendations. Chairperson Wiggins thought that the Special Use Permit process “is a good way to vet specifics” and believed that finding a place was “super restrictive.” He was in agreement with Mr. Adler’s suggested Option 1. Commissioner Perry agreed with Staff’s recommendation that Finding No. 2 could not be made. He also referenced the public comments that were “universally opposed to adding or changing the zoning code.” He believed that some residents feared that the changes would “open up areas in the downtown area” and legislative changes may legalize the cannabis lounges which most residents opposed, causing “detrimental impacts to other properties in the vicinity” and did not see a compelling reason to change the zoning.

(4:26:24) – Vice Chair Preston noted that she had studied the maps (incorporated into the record) carefully and noted that there had been many non-conforming uses. She did not wish to be faced with a Special Use Permit “in an area that does not comply;” therefore, she would vote against the item. Commissioner Borders noted that he also could not make Finding No. 2. Commissioner Esswein was in favor of having a general discussion about allowing types of uses in various districts but did not wish to have it for one business. Chairperson Wiggins invited Mr. Adler to make final comments.

(4:29:40) – Mr. Adler reiterated his comment that Option 2 would limit the impact on the City. He also believed that the Board of Supervisors had voted to make all four licenses to become operational; however, the zoning restrictions were an impediment to his client’s business. He cited the impact made by liquor stores which resulted in more incidents and explained that the cannabis dispensaries had no reported incidents. Chairperson Wiggins entertained a motion. Commissioner Perry informed Mr. Adler that Option No, 2 “was better” and acknowledged that Title 18 should be revisited in a workshop format.

(4:34:19) – Commissioner Perry moved to recommend to the Board of Supervisors denial of the requested Zoning Code Amendment based on the inability to make the findings as outlined in the Staff Report. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Borders.

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

(4:34:37) – Chairperson Wiggins explained his “nay” vote. He believed that the applicant had been able to make Finding No. 2 by demonstrating through maps that the allowed zoning area was “extremely limited.” He also believed that the RC and GC areas should be expanded, adding that “Staff has the burden to help the applicant meet those requirements, and I don’t think Staff actually provided enough guidance in that regard.”

(4:36:21) – Chairperson Wiggins recessed the meeting.

(5:01:14) – Chairperson Wiggins reconvened the meeting. A quorum was still present.

THE FOLLOWING ITEMS WILL NOT BE HEARD BEFORE 5:00 PM

6.E LU-2022-0435 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING AN APPLICATION FROM MARSHALL STOKES (“APPLICANT”) FOR A SPECIAL USE PERMIT (“SUP”) TO ESTABLISH A TATTOO PARLOR ON A PROPERTY ZONED RETAIL COMMERCIAL (“RC”) LOCATED AT 1802 NORTH CARSON STREET, ASSESSOR’S PARCEL NUMBER (“APN”) 001-091-08.

(5:01:24) – Chairperson Wiggins introduced the item. Ms. Manzo presented the Staff Report and supporting documentation, all of which are incorporated into the record, and recommended approval based on the fact that Staff had been able to make all the necessary findings and noted that no public comments had been received regarding the item.

(5:02:58) – Applicant Marshall Stokes stated that he agreed with the Conditions of Approval outlined in the Staff Report. He also responded to clarifying questions by the Commissioners. There were no public comments; therefore, Chairperson Wiggins entertained a motion.

(5:04:52) – Vice Chair Preston moved to approve the special use permit Case No. LU-2022-0435 based on the ability to make the required findings, and subject to the Conditions of Approval contained in the Staff Report. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Esswein.

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

6.F LU-2022-0430 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING AN APPLICATION FROM LENNAR RENO, LLC (“APPLICANT”) FOR A SPECIAL USE PERMIT (“SUP”) TO ALLOW A TEMPORARY TRACT SALES OFFICE, MODEL HOMES, PARKING AREA AND ADVERTISING SIGNAGE ON PROPERTIES ZONED SINGLE FAMILY 6,000 – SPECIFIC PLAN AREA (“SF6-SPA”) LOCATED AT 10, 36, 76 AND 101 WILDCAT PEAK DRIVE, ASSESSOR’S PARCEL NUMBERS (“APNS”) 004-401-01 THROUGH -03 AND 004-402-02.

(5:05:44) – Chairperson Wiggins introduced the item. Ms. Manzo presented the Staff Report with supporting documentation and highlighted Condition of Approval No 9 which states:

Prior to the issuance of a permit for signage, the Applicant shall submit a plan to demonstrate that all signs will be constructed to meet sight distance requirements. Model home signage shall be consistent with the approved sign package, except as modified below:

- *A maximum of eight flag signs may be located along the project frontages*
- *Banners shall be prohibited*
- *All signage shall be removed upon the sale of the last lot*

(5:08:04) – Ms. Manzo recommended approval, noting that Staff had been able to make all necessary findings. She also responded to clarifying questions by the Commissioners. Commissioner Borders was informed that there was no end date to the Special Use Permit and a Condition of Approval required the removal of the signage once the model homes are converted to single-family homes. Discussion ensued on whether a Special Use Permit should be required for model homes.

(5:10:20) – Applicant Tom Sosa of Lennar Reno, LLC informed the Commission that he had read and agreed with the Conditions of Approval outlined in the Staff Report. He also informed Commissioner Borders that Lot No. 65 would be a vacant lot. Chairperson Wiggins entertained public comments. Mr. French inquired whether the model homes would have inhabitants, security personnel, or staff. Ms. Manzo clarified that the Special Use Permit was “specific to the sales tract,” adding that no one would live in the homes because they would be used for business during the time they are designated as model homes.

Chairperson Wiggins entertained additional commissioner discussion and when none were forthcoming, a motion.

(5:16:11) – Commissioner Esswein moved to approve special use permit LU-2022-0430, based on the findings and subject to the conditions of approval contained in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Perry.

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

6.G LU-2022-0467 DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING AN APPLICATION FROM SUSAN MAROC (“APPLICANT”) FOR A SPECIAL USE PERMIT (“SUP”) TO ALLOW A REPLACEMENT AUTO BODY PAINT BOOTH AND AN ASSOCIATED BUILDING AND AN EXISTING AUTO BODY REPAIR FACILITY ON PROPERTY ZONED LIMITED INDUSTRIAL (“LI”), LOCATED AT 2344 CONESTOGA DRIVE, ASSESSOR’S PARCEL NUMBER (“APN”) 008-816-52.

(5:16:45) – Chairperson Wiggins introduced the item. Ms. Manzo explained that the item had been withdrawn at the request of the applicant and recommended continuing it “without a date certain.”

(5:18:11) – Chairperson Wiggins moved to continue the item to date uncertain. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Esswein.

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

6.H LU-2022-0326 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING AN APPLICATION FROM PETER WILDAY (“APPLICANT”) FOR A SPECIAL USE PERMIT (“SUP”) TO ALLOW FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A CONGREGATE CARE FACILITY AND MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL UNITS ON A PROPERTY ZONED RETAIL

COMMERCIAL (“RC”) LOCATED AT 4500 NORTH CARSON STREET, ASSESSOR’S PARCEL NUMBER (“APN”) 007-531-26.

(5:18:34) – Chairperson Wiggins introduced the item. Ms. Manzo explained that this item might require a Growth Management application; therefore, she recommended hearing it during the Planning Commission/Growth Management Commission meeting on December 20, 2022.

(5:19:44) – Chairperson Wiggins moved to continue the item to the December 20, 2022 meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Borders.

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

7. STAFF REPORTS (NON-ACTION ITEMS)

- DIRECTOR'S REPORT TO THE COMMISSION.

(5:32:20) – Ms. Sullivan announced that the Growth Management Commission would meet on December 20, 2022, during which the Public Works Department would provide a presentation on water usage analysis and the impact of growth on City Roads. She also noted that the Master Plan Annual Report, the Lompa East apartments, the Master Plan amendments, a North Carson Street billboard, an accessory structure Special Use Permit request, and a 178-unit apartment complex, would be agendized for the next meeting.

- FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS.

(5:20:22) – Ms. Manzo noted that the December 20, 2022 meeting would start early due to the number of agenda items, adding that the Commissioners would be notified of the start time as soon as possible. Commissioner Borders explained that a previously scheduled event would require the attendance of three Commissioners; therefore, an early start would be preferable.

- COMMISSIONER REPORTS/COMMENTS

(5:21:27) – Mr. Reese informed the Commission that Title 18 was being revised by the District Attorney’s Office and stated that he would advise the City Manager’s and the District Attorney’s Offices that the Planning Commission had requested a review prior to presenting the item to the Board of Supervisors. In response to a question by Vice Chair Preston, Ms. Manzo explained that item 6.H addressed a small congregate care facility and could not be compared to a multi-family property. Commissioner Perry requested a “roads presentation” and a discussion on road maintenance. He also requested a discussion on floodplains and floodplain maps.

8. PUBLIC COMMENT

(5:35:33) – Chairperson Wiggins entertained final public comments. Mr. French highlighted “overwhelming developments” in his recent visit to California and Arizona. He encouraged the Commission to consider open spaces within walking distance. Mr. French commented on item 6.A, noting that he had wished the rock-crushing operation would operate Monday through Friday, instead of Monday through Saturday. He also noted that a lot of wildlife was moving within the community.

9. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: ADJOURNMENT

(5:38:42) – Chairperson Wiggins adjourned the meeting at 5:38 p.m.

The Minutes of the November 15, 2022 Carson City Planning Commission meeting are so approved on this 20th day of December 2022.

From: agctry.a9@outlook.com
To: [Planning Department](#)
Subject: Input for LU-2022-0433- 603 E. Robinson St
Date: Tuesday, November 8, 2022 3:26:23 PM

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

I don't think a beauty shop is a good fit for that location. The biggest problem is with parking; there is not enough parking available on the premises.

This was a problem with the former tenant at his location (counseling services) and will be with a beauty shop. There is already a shortage of parking in the area due to the Public Defender's Office (511 E. Robinson). Their lot is not big enough to meet the needs and overflows too much to the streets.

David Aunkst
508 E. Spear St
775-410-7266

Monday, November 14, 2022

TO: Heather Ferris, Planning Manager

FROM: Catherine Moser, address: 512 E. Spear Street, Carson City 702-274-0185

RE: Nov. 15, 2022 Planning Commission Item 6B, 2022-0433

Ms. Ferris: my apologies that I will not be able to comment in person at the 11/15 Planning Commission meeting regarding the above item. I do have a comment and hope it is noted to the Commission.

First, I wish the applicant, Jennifer Cid, success in her business. I agree that the use (a beauty salon) is appropriate in this interface neighborhood. My one issue concerns on-street parking. While this property does offer off-street parking, it is limited in size. I would estimate maybe three to four cars at once. One side of the property fronts Robinson Street and there is a bus stop directly in front of the property. No parking there. People being what they are, and a business should grow, it is a matter of time that whatever best intentions the applicant has about her clients using the off-street lot for parking will be out of control. Additionally, the neighbor across from this property, a government office, is using on-street parking as overflow for their parking lot. Ms. Cid's clients will be in competition for spaces, and will begin parking further into the residential neighborhood. I am sure you can understand where my comments are going on this; that is, the parking situation will escalate and other problems will develop.

As an example, at the corner of Walsh and Spear, there are now three businesses operating there that are using on-street parking for employees and clients, with little to no off-street parking offered. The result is a density of vehicles that impair cross-traffic visibility and narrow the through-traffic lane. This is now a safety issue. Ms. Cid's application offers a similar outcome.

I will refrain using the word insist. Perhaps the Planning Commission will consider:

- Tabling the application for 30 days;
- Directing the applicant to meet with the appropriate Planning Department folks (the Traffic Engineer?) for the purpose of developing a comprehensive, site-specific parking plan;
- Developing that plan should include input from immediate neighbors;
- Once agreed on, the language of the plan be incorporated into Conditions for this application.

It is my belief that this is not the last time the Planning Commission will have to tackle these problems of coexistence between business and residential, that they will have to endure the same arguments repeatedly. They are ultimately solvable other than the lazy response of telling residents to "suck it up," or "move elsewhere." I am sure there is some sort of Master Plan criteria being applied to this neighborhood aside from GO outlines. I suggest that the time has come to "tweak" those criteria so that it is more responsive to this unique neighborhood. Is there an appetite for a new master plan here?

From: [CCEO](#)
To: [Planning Department](#)
Subject: FW: Marijuana Dispensaries
Date: Tuesday, October 25, 2022 8:57:25 AM

Rachael Evanson | Office Manager
Executive Office | Carson City, A Consolidated Municipality
201 N. Carson Street, Suite 2, Carson City, NV 89701
Direct: 775-283-7125 | Office: 775-887-2100 | Fax: 775-887-2286
<http://www.carson.org>

From: Carson City <webmaster@carson.org>
Sent: Monday, October 24, 2022 12:09 PM
To: CCEO <CCEO@carson.org>
Subject: Marijuana Dispensaries

Message submitted from the <Carson City> website.

Site Visitor Name: Michael Goldeen
Site Visitor Email: michael@goldeen.com

Today's Appeal brings news that Green Thumb Industries, a Chicago-based marijuana retailer, is asking the city to change where dispensaries — both retail and medical — can be located within the general commercial and general industrial zoning districts.

Their request gives off an odor of "bait and switch". I'm sure the Board has its reasons for the present rules. Nothing has changed that they should be reviewed.

Marijuana sales are a new thing, and besides somewhat controversial as in "bring in legal, higher priced, taxed outfits and shady black marketeers will follow".

You've done enough so far. Time to wait and see.

From: [Michel Hobby](#)
To: [Lori Bagwell](#); [Maurice White](#); [Stan Jones](#); [Stacey Giomi](#); lschutte@carson.org; [Planning Department](#)
Subject: Expanding zones for Marijuana shops
Date: Sunday, October 30, 2022 9:14:03 PM

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

We want to start with thanking Stacey Giomi and Lisa Schuette for being the only two Supervisors who voted no on the two additional Marijuana shops in Carson City. These two Supervisors listened to the people they represent and did what was right. The people of Carson want a clean and safe town, not more Marijuana shops to create additional decay of our once beautiful Carson City. Stan Jones and Maurice White voted in favor of additional shops, and neglected the wishes of those they represent, and bowed to the Big Money People. Then came the deciding vote. A big yes from our Mayor, Lori Bagwell. She stated, "There isn't an easy answer here", so instead of voting NO, she caved in with a big yes vote! Shame on you, when the correct answer should have been no.

Now, the Marijuana owners are back and want to expand zones within the city on where they can operate. Our Mayor, and Supervisors Jones, and White did the people of Carson City no good. We agree with Planning Commissioner Richard Perry and his remark "It's opening a can of worms we don't know the impacts of". Planning Manager, Heather Ferris stated that staff recommended denial because the change could create "incompatibility with existing uses." Nice to know that we the people of Carson City do have some people working on our behalf and trying to do the right thing. The big money guys are back again, along with their powerful attorneys, and the fight is on. No thanks to Maurice White, Lori Bagwell, or Stan Jones. Supervisor Stan Jones told me by email, the shops were bringing in big money. So big money is more important, and the decay of our town just grows like a cancer.

Our thanks go out to Stacey Giomi, Lisa Schuette, Richard Perry, and Heather Ferris for trying to do what is right and for the people of our community. So many of us are waiting for the outcome. Yes indeed, a big can of worms has been opened, by the few that ignored the community and voted yes on additional Marijuana shops, and now the big pushers are back, making more demands.

Planning Commissioner Nathaniel Killgore said he'd like to see more public comment, so here is one, and we speak for many. The public is always asked for input, but a lot of us agree, we write, and show up, and no one listens. Decisions are already locked in.

Michel and Marilyn Hobby

From: [Planning Department](#)
To: [Heather Ferris](#)
Subject: FW: Expanding zones for Marijuana shops
Date: Monday, October 31, 2022 8:18:15 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Thank you,

Cecilia Rice

Community Development – Office Specialist
108 E. Proctor Street
775.887.2180
crice@carson.org



From: Michel Hobby <mandm747@att.net>
Sent: Sunday, October 30, 2022 9:12 PM
To: Lori Bagwell <LBagwell@carson.org>; Maurice White <mwhite@carson.org>; Stan Jones <sjones@carson.org>; Stacey Giomi <sgiomi@carson.org>; Ischutte@carson.org; Planning Department <planning@carson.org>
Subject: Expanding zones for Marijuana shops

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

We want to start with thanking Stacey Giomi and Lisa Schuette for being the only two Supervisors who voted no on the two additional Marijuana shops in Carson City. These two Supervisors listened to the people they represent and did what was right. The people of Carson want a clean and safe town, not more Marijuana shops to create additional decay of our once beautiful Carson City. Stan Jones and Maurice White voted in favor of additional shops, and neglected the wishes of those they represent, and bowed to the Big Money People. Then came the deciding vote. A big yes from our Mayor, Lori Bagwell. She stated, "There isn't an easy answer here", so instead of voting NO, she caved in with a big yes vote! Shame on you, when the correct answer should have been no.

Now, the Marijuana owners are back and want to expand zones within the city on where they can operate. Our Mayor, and Supervisors Jones, and White did the people of Carson City no good. We agree with Planning Commissioner Richard Perry and his remark "It's opening a can of worms we don't know the impacts of". Planning Manager, Heather Ferris stated that staff recommended denial because

the change could create "incompatibility with existing uses." Nice to know that we the people of Carson City do have some people working on our behalf and trying to do the right thing. The big money guys are back again, along with their powerful attorneys, and the fight is on. No thanks to Maurice White, Lori Bagwell, or Stan Jones. Supervisor Stan Jones told me by email, the shops were bringing in big money. So big money is more important, and the decay of our town just grows like a cancer.

Our thanks go out to Stacey Giomi, Lisa Schuette, Richard Perry, and Heather Ferris for trying to do what is right and for the people of our community. So many of us are waiting for the outcome. Yes indeed, a big can of worms has been opened, by the few that ignored the community and voted yes on additional Marijuana shops, and now the big pushers are back, making more demands.

Planning Commissioner Nathaniel Killgore said he'd like to see more public comment, so here is one, and we speak for many. The public is always asked for input, but a lot of us agree, we write, and show up, and no one listens. Decisions are already locked in.

Michel and Marilyn Hobdy

From: [Colleen C Lyons](#)
To: [Planning Department](#)
Subject: Re: Proposed Pot dispensary zone change
Date: Wednesday, October 26, 2022 11:07:48 AM

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

Planner Commissioners —

I'm a resident of the old westside of Carson City since 1992. I have supported all of the redevelopment that has occurred in downtown Carson City to include The Brewery Arts Center, Adams Hub, improvements to South Carson and those proposed to E. William St. BUT, I am adamantly opposed to rezoning for pot dispensaries to be located in general commercial zones. I strongly believe this is not a way to "revitalize" Carson City. Rather it will depreciate, diminish and downright denigrate the quaint and historical nature of downtown Carson City.

By Nevada law, marijuana can only be consumed on private property and having dispensaries in downtown would certainly give the impression to residents and tourists alike that not only is marijuana legal in Nevada but you can smoke/consume it anywhere.

Just as I wouldn't want to see a corner 24/7 liquor store or a strip club in the downtown corridor, I don't want a pot dispensary. We have niche bars, cigar and hookah lounges. Those are enough.

Carson's current ordinance of 2014 has restricted marijuana dispensaries to the seeming outskirts of Carson City. I support continuation of that planning ordinance.

Colleen Lyons
Sent from my iPhone

> On Oct 26, 2022, at 10:58 AM, Colleen C Lyons <ccl Lyons223@icloud.com> wrote:

>

> Planner Commissioners —

> I'm a resident of the old westside of Carson City since 1992. I have supported all of the redevelopment that has occurred in downtown Carson City to include The Brewery Arts Center, Adams Hub, improvements to South Carson and those proposed to E. William St. BUT, I am adamantly opposed to rezoning for pot dispensaries to be located in general commercial zones. I strongly believe this is not a way to "revitalize" Carson City. Rather it will depreciate, diminish and downright denigrate the quaint and historical nature of downtown Carson City.

> By Nevada law, marijuana can only be consumed on private property and having dispensaries in downtown would certainly give the impression to residents and tourists alike that not only is marijuana legal in Nevada but you can smoke/consume it anywhere.

> Just as I wouldn't want to see a corner 24/7 liquor store or a strip club in the downtown corridor, I don't want a pot dispensary. We have niche bars, cigar and hookah lounges. Those are enough.

> Carson's current ordinance of 2014 has restricted marijuana dispensaries to the seeming outskirts of Carson City. I support continuation of that planning ordinance.

>

> Colleen Lyons



Late Material
Received: 11/15/22
3:38 p.m.
Item 6.D
PC

November 15, 2022

Carson City Planning Commission,

Atten: Chair Wiggins and the Carson City Planning Commission,

As the Planning Commission is aware, the Carson City Board of Supervisors recently doubled the allowable number of retail cannabis stores at their September 15, 2022 meeting.

As such, our client (Green Thumb Industries, Inc.) has found themselves in need of a dispensary location for their unopened license in Carson City. I would like to take this opportunity to address the Carson City Planning Commission and inform them of our efforts to locate a suitable zoned location for a new retail cannabis store.

My team has gone through an extensive search of all the general and retail commercial properties in Carson City and have discovered no viable locations within Carson City's currently allowed general commercial zoned areas for cannabis.

We have located several other potential properties, but all of them fall outside of Carson City's allowable "zoning bubble" for retail cannabis stores.

To rectify the lack of property, we would like to ask the Carson City Planning Commission to allow the changes to the current zoning before you to move forward, as this would open up additional retail properties in the north end of town where the majority of viable retail locations are located to date.

Our recommended target location would be focused on the commercially zoned properties along the North Carson Street corridor, starting at Winnie Lane to the I 580 intersection. It would then extend north-east, encompassing commercial properties to the north of Winnie Lane and West of I-580 (taking in the Hot Spring road and W College corridors).

I believe the proposed areas would be consistent with, and similar to the areas in East Carson that currently allow for retail cannabis stores.

Your consideration of the above is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Rocky Joy', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Rocky Joy
Associate Broker
775-297-4998