

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the March 6, 2006 Meeting

Page 1

A meeting of the Carson City Planning Commission was scheduled for 5:30 p.m. on Monday, March 6, 2006 in the Community Center Sierra Room, 851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada.

PRESENT: Chairperson John Peery
Vice Chairperson Mark Kimbrough
Connie Bisbee
Craig Mullet
Roy Semmens
William Vance

STAFF: Andrew Burnham, Public Works Department Director
Walter Sullivan, Planning and Community Development Director
Lee Plemel, Principal Planner
Roger Moellendorf, Parks and Recreation Department Director
Juan Guzman, Open Space Manager
Vern Krahn, Park Planner
Joe McCarthy, Economic Development / Redevelopment Manager
Angela Barosso, Economic Development / Redevelopment Officer
Ben Herman, Consultant
Darcie White, Consultant
Kathleen King, Recording Secretary

NOTE: A recording of these proceedings, the commission's agenda materials, and any written comments or documentation provided to the recording secretary during the meeting are public record on file in the Clerk-Recorder's Office. These materials are available for review during regular business hours.

A. CALL TO ORDER, DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM, AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE (5:30:22) - Chairperson Peery called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. Roll was called; a quorum was present. Commissioner Reynolds was absent. Commissioner Vance led the pledge of allegiance.

B. DISCLOSURES (5:31:12) - None.

C. CONSENT AGENDA (5:31:22) - None.

D. PUBLIC HEARING

D-1. DISCUSSION ONLY TO TAKE COMMENTS FROM THE PLANNING COMMISSION AND THE GENERAL PUBLIC ON THE DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE MASTER PLAN TO DEVELOP A FINAL COMPREHENSIVE MASTER PLAN FOR ADOPTION (5:32:15) - Mr. Plemel thanked the commissioners for their attendance. He provided an overview of the agenda materials, and advised of presentations made to various business and community groups. He referred to the February 28, 2006 memo included in the agenda materials, and advised of not having received a great deal of public comment since the last workshop. He reviewed the time table for adoption of the master

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the March 6, 2006 Meeting

Page 2

plan. He explained the purpose of a master plan as a policy document to provide guidance for future land use decisions. He provided an overview of the presentation, and introduced Ben Herman and Darcie White of Clarion Associates, and the previously listed City staff.

Mr. Herman provided an overview of the presentation made in December and of the revised document. He reviewed significant changes to the draft master plan, chapter by chapter. Commissioner Mullet noted inconsistency in the table of contents because of the latest revision. In response to a question, Mr. Plemel explained that the list on pages 1-4 and 1-5 represents a framework of plans permitted by statute. Commissioner Bisbee advised she would provide a list of typographical errors to staff.

Ms. White provided an overview of the revisions to Chapters 2 and 3. In response to a question regarding accessory dwellings, Mr. Plemel read policy 2.2c into the record. He advised that the master plan is not the means by which accessory dwellings would be allowed to be used as affordable housing. The master plan language is policy which provides for the future consideration of allowing accessory dwellings to be used as housing. The specifics of zoning districts, limitations on size, etc. would have to be determined in the future. Mr. Herman advised the language was deliberate in that accessory dwellings represent one of the best sources of affordable housing for a community. The primary issue isn't as much about who lives there as compatibility. Mr. Herman suggested flagging the policy with regard to the action plan. He noted that the language of policy 2.2c doesn't change regulations, but suggests considering accessory dwellings as housing.

Mr. Herman advised that minor wording changes were made in Chapter 4, and that extensive revisions were made to Chapter 5. Mr. McCarthy provided background information on the involvement of Jeremy Aguero and Applied Analysis in developing Chapter 5. He reviewed revisions to Chapter 5 and, in response to a question, explained strategic tourism activity revenue / sales tax activity revenue ("STAR") bonds. Commissioner Mullet suggested "affordable housing" is no longer a relevant term, and expressed a preference for a more appropriate definition. He discussed the importance of development incentives for entry level housing. Mr. McCarthy agreed there are other terms which are more clear than "affordable." Chairperson Peery thanked Mr. McCarthy.

Ms. White reviewed Guiding Principle 8 and the corresponding Downtown Character Areas map in Chapter 6. At Chairperson Peery's request, Mr. Herman reviewed Goal 8-1c - Enhanced Pedestrian Environment. Mr. Plemel provided background information with regard to corresponding plans for the downtown area. In response to a question, Ms. White advised that most of the policies reflected in the master plan were carried forward from the affordable housing plan. Commissioner Mullet reiterated the suggestion to include long-range incentives. Mr. Herman advised that the text on page 6-13 would be "cleaned up."

Commissioner Vance suggested addressing energy efficiency as its own separate section or goal. He noted that energy efficiency had become even more of an issue over the course of the master planning process, and expressed concern over limiting it to the affordable housing section. Ms. White referred to page 3-2, and reviewed Goal 1.1, Policies e and f. Commissioner Vance expressed the opinion that the importance of energy efficiency in development and redevelopment "cannot be overstated." Commissioner Mullet commented on the long-term benefits of energy efficient construction. Discussion took place regarding the language of Policy 1.1f, and Commissioner Vance suggested using a stronger word than "encourage." Mr. Herman offered to discuss revised language with Public Works staff. Commissioner Vance suggested not limiting the language to what is currently possible.

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the March 6, 2006 Meeting

Page 3

Mr. Herman reviewed fairly minor revisions to Chapter 7, including additional policies. Ms. White advised that updated maps had been incorporated into Chapter 8, and that the placeholder for the Vice Canyon SPA had been removed. Mr. Herman reviewed revisions to Chapter 9, priority action item 2, Establish Interim Mixed-Use Evaluation Criteria. Ms. White advised that economic policies had been incorporated, beginning at page 9-9 through page 9-12. Mr. Herman and Ms. White reviewed revisions and additions to the Appendices. Mr. Plemel provided background information on, and an overview of, Appendix C. Mr. Herman described application of the Mixed-Use Evaluation Criteria.

In response to a question, Mr. Plemel advised that implementing energy efficiency standards will require more discussion and possible changes to the Carson City Municipal Code. Vice Chairperson Kimbrough expressed appreciation for the work invested in the master plan. He suggested addressing gaming regulations within the community, and expressed concern with regard to casinos “popping up all over town.” Mr. Plemel advised that gaming had been considered in general terms as a commercial use. Mr. McCarthy advised the question had been posed most recently by a number of people. He further advised of an existing ordinance, through the business licensing process, requiring one hundred rooms for any new gaming project. The last stand-alone gaming project will be at the Bodine’s site. Mr. McCarthy explained the intent of the ordinance. He agreed that consideration should be given to appropriate locations for gaming projects, but does not anticipate many more other than the possibility of transitional projects. In response to a question, Mr. Herman suggested a statement reflecting Mr. McCarthy’s comments could be included in the plan. He expressed reluctance to attempting to develop policy direction because there had been no input from the community over the course of the master planning process. Mr. McCarthy advised that other communities in Nevada are considering their land use and zoning requirements to identify appropriate locations for gaming that meets community standards.

Chairperson Peery provided the staff members an opportunity make comment. When none was forthcoming, he opened this item to public comment.

(6:41:50) Jerry Vivant advised that the Andersen / Jarrard properties reflected on the map included in the agenda materials appeared to be different than that which was displayed in the meeting room. Chairperson Peery agreed and advised that the map displayed in the meeting room had been updated. Mr. Vivant referred to negotiations between the Andersen / Jarrard families and the City, and expressed the opinion that the map should reflect the “intent ... of Carson City, not necessarily what’s in place or a fact.” In response to a question, Mr. Plemel provided background information on the master plan designation of the subject property, and discussions between City staff, the property owners, and the Open Space Manager to pursue purchase of the property. Mr. Vivant expressed the understanding the property owners agreed to not present any new development proposals. Mr. Plemel explained the property could be developed under the current conservation reserve zoning designation. Any other higher density proposal would have to be first presented to the Planning Commission. Mr. Vivant expressed the opinion the City is acting contrary to the intent of the master plan. In response to a question, Mr. Plemel advised the City will report back to the Planning Commission in six months on the status of negotiations toward purchase of the subject property by the Open Space Program. If no progress is made by that time, City staff will present the application for master plan designation to the Planning Commission for a decision.

(6:48:58) Dave Campbell pointed out, on the displayed map, BLM land bisected by Bennett Avenue and lying between Conte Drive and Gentry Lane. He advised the land was originally designated to be developed as residential property, and noted it is designated as public and quasi-public. He suggested the

CARSON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the March 6, 2006 Meeting

Page 4

land would be more appropriately designated as open space. Mr. Plemel explained the purpose for the public designation. He advised the subject property has a well site on it and serves as a major drainage course. He suggested drainage improvements may be necessary in the area at some time in the future which would preclude an open space designation. Mr. Campbell suggested that open space “doesn’t necessarily mean primitive or wild.” He referred to page B-9, and noted the statement that public lands may be suitable for future urban development. He expressed concern that although the City may not intend to develop the property, “that doesn’t mean the guys next year won’t.” He reiterated the preference for designating the land as open space. Chairperson Peery advised that no sitting board can encumber a future board’s decision. Mr. Campbell suggested that designating the land as open space would task the Open Space Advisory Committee with its care and maintenance and therefore serve as a protection for the land. Mr. Plemel clarified that designating the land as open space on the map wouldn’t require the Open Space Advisory Committee’s stewardship. He committed to discussing future potential uses of the property with staff. He advised that the land would be more appropriately designated by the BLM on their plan, as it is currently in BLM ownership. Mr. Campbell expressed an interest in encumbering the property as open space in the lands bill. Mr. Campbell referred to page 1-6, Planning and Property Rights, and suggested addressing *Kelo vs. New Britain, Connecticut* “as a policy of Carson City that we’re not going to do that.” He expressed the opinion that property owners should have the right to decide with regard to energy efficiency; that it should not be mandated by government.

(6:54:43) Russ Carpenter, a resident of Carson City, expressed the hope the commission wouldn’t encourage too strongly revision to the term “affordable housing.” “Entry level” housing or some other term “puts a stigma on it.” Mr. Carpenter expressed agreement with Commissioner Vance’s encouragement to promote energy efficiency “in at least new construction.” He noted there didn’t appear to be many revenue producing properties designated on the map. He expressed appreciation for the open forum in which the master plan had been developed, and commended the consultants. He commended the project, and expressed the opinion that “now is a good time to put down some strong suggestions on what you want Carson City to look like.”

Chairperson Peery called for additional public comment and, when none was forthcoming, called for additional comments from the commissioners and staff. Commissioner Semmens commended staff and the consultants on the draft master plan and revisions to the same. Chairperson Peery commented on the investment of time and effort, and commended everyone involved in the process. Mr. Plemel thanked everyone, particularly the citizens who had participated in the process. He agreed the process had been good and that the consultants had done an excellent job. He reviewed the schedule of future meetings. Chairperson Peery commented on the amount of public participation in the master planning process, and thanked the citizens for their attendance and participation.

E. ACTION ON ADJOURNMENT (7:00:29) Commissioner Semmens moved to adjourn the meeting at 7:00 p.m. Commissioner Vance seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0.

The Minutes of the March 6, 2006 Carson City Planning Commission meeting are so approved this 26th day of April, 2006.

JOHN PEERY, Chair