

DRAFT MINUTES
Regular Meeting
Carson City Planning Commission
Wednesday, March 30, 2016 ● 5:00 PM
Community Center Sierra Room, 851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada

Late Material

Commission Members

Chair – Paul Esswein	Vice Chair – Mark Sattler
Commissioner – Victor Castro	Commissioner – Monica Green
Commissioner – Elyse Monroy	Commissioner – Walt Owens
Commissioner – Daniel Salerno	

Staff

Lee Plemel, Community Development Director
Hope Sullivan, Planning Manager
Danny Rotter, Engineering Manager
Susan Dorr Pansky, Special Projects Administrator
Dan Yu, Deputy District Attorney
Tamar Warren, Deputy Clerk

NOTE: A recording of these proceedings, the board’s agenda materials, and any written comments or documentation provided to the recording secretary 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.

An audio recording of this meeting is available on www.Carson.org/minutes.

A. ROLL CALL, DETERMINATION OF QUORUM, AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

(5:01:04) – Chairperson Esswein called the meeting to order at 5:01 p.m. Roll was called and a quorum was present. Commissioner Green led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Attendee Name	Status	Arrived
Chairperson Paul Esswein	Present	
Vice Chairperson Mark Sattler	Present	
Commissioner Victor Castro	Present	
Commissioner Monica Green	Present	
Commissioner Elyse Monroy	Present	
Commissioner Walt Owens	Present	
Commissioner Daniel Salerno	Present	

B. PUBLIC COMMENTS

(5:02:03) – There were no public comments.

C. POSSIBLE ACTION ON APPROVAL OF MINUTES – FEBRUARY 24, 2016.

(5:02:43) – **MOTION:** I move to approve the minutes of the February 24, 2016 meeting as written.

RESULT:	APPROVED (6-0-1)
MOVER:	Sattler
SECONDER:	Salerno
AYES:	Esswein, Sattler, Castro, Monroy, Owens, Salerno
NAYS:	None
ABSTENTIONS:	Green
ABSENT:	None

D. MODIFICATIONS OF AGENDA

(5:03:14) – There were no modifications to the agenda.

(5:03:34) – Mr. Plemel introduced Hope Sullivan, the newly-hired Planning Manager.

E. DISCLOSURES

(5:04:24) – There were no disclosures.

F. PUBLIC HEARING MATTERS

F-1 SUP-16-013* FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: TO CONDUCT A FIVE-YEAR REVIEW OF A PREVIOUSLY APPROVED SPECIAL USE PERMIT, SUP-11-012, GRANTED TO THE STATE OF NEVADA, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION FOR APPLICANT OUTFRONT MEDIA (PROPERTY OWNER: STATE OF NEVADA, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION) TO ALLOW THE CONTINUED USE OF AN EXISTING OFF-PREMISES ADVERTISING (BILLBOARD) SIGN ON PROPERTY ZONED GENERAL COMMERCIAL (GC), LOCATED AT 2400 HWY 50 EAST, APN 002-105-01.

(5:04:40) – Chairperson Esswein introduced the item. Ms. Pansky presented the Staff Report and the accompanying photographs, incorporated into the record, and recommended approval.

(5:06:50) – Kevin Johnson of Outfront Media noted his agreement to the conditions of approval.

There were no public comments.

(5:07:39) – MOTION: I move to approve SUP-16-013, a Special Use Permit request from Outfront Media (property owner: State of Nevada, Department of Transportation) to allow the continued use of an existing off-premises advertising (billboard) sign on property zoned General Commercial (GC), located at 2400 Hwy 50 East, APN 002-105-01, based on the findings and subject to the conditions of approval contained in the Staff Report.

RESULT:	APPROVED (7-0-0)
MOVER:	Castro
SECONDER:	Green
AYES:	Esswein, Sattler, Castro, Green, Monroy, Owens, Salerno
NAYS:	None
ABSTENTIONS:	None
ABSENT:	None

F-2 SUP-15-080* FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FROM JOSE HERNANDEZ (PROPERTY OWNERS: JOSE AND ELIZABETH HERNANDEZ) FOR A SPECIAL USE PERMIT TO CONSTRUCT A CHURCH ON PROPERTY ZONED SINGLE FAMILY 1 ACRE (SF1A), LOCATED AT 420 CLEAR CREEK AVE., APN 009-239-01.

(5:08:48) – Chairperson Esswein introduced the item and Ms. Pansky provided background and presented the Staff Report which is incorporated into the record. She noted that Staff was recommending approval with the attached conditions of approval, adding that the applicants were present and available to answer questions.

(5:13:30) – Chairperson Esswein invited Danny Rotter, Public Works Engineering Manager, to clarify the rationale behind the two driveway recommendation. Mr. Rotter believed that traffic would be dispersed better and the impact minimized to the Clear Creek Avenue intersection. Vice Chairperson Sattler was informed by Ms. Pansky that should the property be abandoned, half of the right-of-way would be acquired by the properties on the north side and the other, by the properties on the south side. Commissioner Salerno believed that the elevations had improved since the last presentation

(5:20:10) – Rob Lauder, RL Engineering and applicant representative, noted his agreement to the conditions of approval and stated that he was amenable to matching the stone colors to the stucco. He also believed that a two-driveway solution would “clear out the parking lot faster”, adding that they would do what was necessary to “be good neighbors”. Discussion ensued regarding the use of Silver Sage Drive and Center Drive as shortcuts.

(5:28:31) – Commissioner Castro inquired about the meeting the applicants conducted with the neighbors, and about the adjacent property owner support. Mr. Lauder explained that a few neighbors had attended the February meeting and their concerns were the same as those raised in the September 30, 2015 meeting. He also clarified that letters had been sent to all the neighbors who had signed the September 22, 2016 letter opposing the project.

(5:32:34) – Elizabeth Hernandez, applicant, explained that Mr. Lauder had sent the letters to the neighboring property owners; however, only five people had attended the February 11, 2015 meeting. She also added that Pastor Hernandez would speak to his congregation about the noise level and about being “good neighbors”.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

(5:34:56) – Christy Geysler, neighboring property owner, noted that they had not attended the February meeting because they were not invited. She also expressed her opposition to the project due to the expected increase in traffic. In response to a question by Commissioner Castro, Ms. Geysler stated that she had been an area resident for 22 years.

(5:37:22) – Joyce Gale Ramos, another neighbor whose letter of opposition is incorporated into the record, explained that since the building of the Snyder Avenue bridge they have become a “closed community”, and saw the proposed church as an “encroachment”. Ms. Ramos informed Commissioner Castro that she had lived in her home for 16 years.

(5:44:22) – Milton Flaim, another neighbor, inquired about the seating capacity of the church based on the 121 proposed parking spaces. He also inquired about the fire marshal’s review. Commissioner Monroy inquired and was informed that Mr. Flaim had attended the applicant’s February meeting and had his other questions answered.

In response to a question by Commissioner Castro, Mr. Flaim clarified that he opposed the project and that he had lived in his home for 30 years.

(5:48:52) – Richard Geysler, a 22-year Arthur Street resident, also stated his opposition because they could no longer enjoy the evenings due to the added lights and noise. He also expressed his frustration with speeding vehicles.

(5:32:36) – Mr. Lauder addressed the concerns raised in the public comments by noting that the parking spaces were specified by the City, based on the square footage of the assembly space. He also noted that the plans had been reviewed by the Carson City Fire Department and the Carson City Transportation Manager. Mr. Lauder added that the Stewart Community Council had denied their request to use the community parking lot. Discussion ensued regarding the number of seats and the number of the congregation members, which Pastor Jose Hernandez clarified as 110 adults and 25-35 children. In response to a question by Commissioner Castro, Pastor Hernandez stated that “only Pastor Victor” of the neighboring church was supportive of the project. Mr. Rotter described some of the traffic patterns after the building of the Snyder Avenue bridge and Mr. Geysler noted that he sees cars parked on the dirt area of the neighboring church. Vice Chairperson Sattler inquired about the fencing and was informed that a six-foot fence was allowable per the City’s development standards and without obtaining a Special Use Permit. Ms. Ramos indicated that the project is a “massive undertaking” as the property is undeveloped, and that the applicant was “not going to make it”.

(6:12:55) – Chairperson Esswein reviewed the findings which are incorporated into the record and invited input from the Commissioners. Commissioner Salerno believed that the current proposal looked better than what was originally proposed. Commissioner Green observed that the “entire community” was opposed to the project. Mr. Plemel clarified that in order for the project to be approved; all the findings must be met. Vice Chairperson Sattler explained that traffic and noise are the reason for the neighbors’ opposition.

(6:24:43) – MOTION: “I make a motion for approval that a landscaping and mounds be provided to Staff for their approval and that the two driveway system be utilized as shown in the plan that is before us, because I think that dissipation of traffic would work much better this way rather than having all the traffic unload onto one street, and I think that we shouldn’t have any restrictions on a left turn or a right turn until perhaps after there’s experience that makes sense to have left turn only.” Commissioner Monroy seconded the motion “for discussion purposes”.

(6:26:11) – Commissioner Monroy indicated that she appreciated the due diligence and the changes to the plan made by the applicant after the previous Commission and neighborhood meeting; however she was concerned about the lack of support for the project by the community. Commissioner Salerno cited the zoning ordinance that allowed churches in residential communities with a Special Use Permit. Commissioner Owens objected to the tone of the letter written by Maria Vega, area resident, adding that he had visited the property twice and did not believe another church “was in line” for that neighborhood. Vice Chairperson Sattler also expressed concern over the lack of support from the neighbors, adding that he had “difficulty” with several of the findings in the Staff Report.

RESULT:	Failed (1-6-0)
MOVER:	Salerno
SECONDER:	Monroy
AYES:	Salerno
NAYS:	Esswein, Sattler, Castro, Green, Monroy, Owens
ABSTENTIONS:	None
ABSENT:	None

(6:34:10) – Chairperson Esswein entertained another motion to deny the request based on specific findings outlined in the Staff Report.

(6:34:41) – I move to deny SUP-15-080 a Special Use Permit request from Jose and Elizabeth Hernandez to allow construction of a church on a Single Family 1 Acre (SF1A) zone, located at 420 Clear Creek Ave., [APN 009-239-01] based on the fact that the applicant did not meet findings number 2, 3, and 5.

(6:35:45) – Mr. Plemel clarified that the findings are those discussed preceding this motion.

RESULT:	APPROVED (6-1-0)
MOVER:	Monroy
SECONDER:	Sattler
AYES:	Esswein, Sattler, Castro, Green, Monroy, Owens
NAYS:	Salerno
ABSTENTIONS:	None
ABSENT:	None

(6:36:26) – Mr. Plemel noted that this was the final decision on the Special Use Permit unless appealed to the board of supervisors within 10 days, at which time the public would be notified by the Planning Department.

(6:37:43) – Chairperson Esswein recessed the meeting.

(6:44:12) – Chairperson Esswein reconvened the meeting. A quorum was still present

F-3 TPUD-16-012 FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FROM SILVER OAK DEVELOPMENT, L.P. (PROPERTY OWNER: SILVER OAK DEVELOPMENT CO., LTD.) TO MODIFY THE SILVER OAK PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT TO ADD 31 SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL LOTS IN A NEW PHASE TO BE KNOWN AS SILVER OAK PHASE 21, ON PROPERTY ZONED SINGLE FAMILY 12,000 – PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT (SF12-P), LOCATED AT 2951 OAK RIDGE DRIVE, APN 007-462-12.

(6:44:32) – Chairperson Esswein introduced the item. Ms. Pansky presented the Staff Report which is incorporated into the record. Commissioner Salerno inquired about a particular open area and Ms. Pansky read for the record the conditions of approval for the landscaping portion. Discussion ensued regarding the vacant property adjacent to the subject property and Ms. Pansky clarified that it belonged to a different owner.

(6:56:22) – MarkTurner, applicant, confirmed that the development would not connect to Nye Lane, “out of respect to the neighbors” there. He also clarified for Commissioner Salerno that the information regarding fences was included in the packets. Commissioner Castro was informed that the new homes would be consistent with existing Silver Oak development landscaping and fencing. Mr. Turner clarified for Vice Chairperson Sattler that realigning the street would not cause changes to the driveway locations.

PUBLIC COMMENT

(7:03:15) – Donna DePauw introduced herself as a Carson City and West Nye Lane resident. Ms. DePauw noted that she did not foresee any issues and commended the developers for working with their adjacent neighbors.

(7:04:58) – I move to recommend to the Board of Supervisors approval of TPUD-16-012, a modification to the Silver Oak Planned Unit Development to add 31 single family residential lots in a new phase to be known as Silver Oak Phase 21, on property zoned Single Family 12,000 – Planned Unit Development, located at 2951 Oak Ridge Drive, APN 007-462-12, based on the findings and subject to the conditions of approval in the Staff Report.

(7:05:40) – Commissioner Monroy expressed support for the project; however, she wondered why the Carson City School District had selected not to build a school on the subject property, based on projected growth.

RESULT:	APPROVED (7-0-0)
MOVER:	Sattler
SECONDER:	Castro
AYES:	Esswein, Sattler, Castro, Green, Monroy, Owens, Salerno
NAYS:	None
ABSTENTIONS:	None
ABSENT:	None

(7:07:50) – Ms. Pansky noted that this item would be heard by the Board of Supervisors on April 21, 2016 for final approval.

F-4 SUP-16-014* FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: TO CONSIDER A REQUEST FROM CARSON CAR CENTER PROPERTIES (PROPERTY OWNER: ARNE HOEL AND KATHY TRIPLETT/STATE OF NEVADA – LEASE) FOR A SPECIAL USE PERMIT TO EXCEED THE MAXIMUM ALLOWED SIGNAGE FOR A USED CAR DEALERSHIP AND FOR THE PERMANENT USE OF A PROMOTIONAL TENT ON PROPERTY ZONED GENERAL COMMERCIAL (GC), LOCATED AT 3659 S. CARSON STREET, APN 009-122-03 AND 04.

(7:08:02) – Chairperson Esswein introduced the item and Ms. Pansky presented the Staff Report which is incorporated into the record, and recommended approval. She noted that Staff had not received any opposition to the signage; however, the applicant was instructed to remove signage in excess of what was allowed by the Carson City Municipal Code as one of the conditions for approval. Vice Chairperson Sattler was informed that there were controls in place for the removal or the replacement of deteriorated banners and flags. Commissioner Castro was informed that there were no time limits for the signs. Ms. Pansky also informed Commissioner Salerno that new car dealerships operated under different signage standards.

(7:17:40) – Chris Baker, Manhard Consulting and applicant representative, noted that the current signage is not what is being proposed. He also stated that he was in agreement with the conditions of approval outlined by Staff. Vice Chairperson Sattler commented that the color choices were well executed, compared to the prior business colors, and Commissioner Castro agreed.

There were no public comments.

(7:21:10) - I move to approve SUP-16-014, a request from Carson Car Center Properties (property owner: Arne Hoel and Kathy Triplett/State of Nevada) for a Special Use Permit to exceed the maximum allowed signage for a used car dealership and for the permanent use of a promotional tent on property zoned General Commercial (GC), located at 3659 S. Carson Street, APN 009-122-03 and 04, based on the findings and subject to the conditions of approval contained in the Staff Report.

(7:22:30) – Mr. Plemel and Mr. Rotter clarified that the State of Nevada portion belonged to NDOT; however, it would be the property of Carson City, at which time the abandonment or leasing decisions would be made.

RESULT:	APPROVED (7-0-0)
MOVER:	Castro
SECONDER:	Sattler
AYES:	Esswein, Sattler, Castro, Green, Monroy, Owens, Salerno
NAYS:	None
ABSTENTIONS:	None
ABSENT:	None

G. STAFF REPORTS (NON-ACTION ITEMS)

G-1 DIRECTOR'S REPORT TO THE COMMISSION.

(7:24:04) – Mr. Plemel stated that the Emerson/College Parkway Zoning Map Amendment second reading, the Lompa Ranch Zoning Map Amendment, the Arts and Culture Master Plan, and the one percent increase in the room tax to pay for an Arts and Culture position were approved by the Board of Supervisors. Me. Plemel also announced that the Redevelopment Authority had also approved a Façade Improvement Program for all commercial properties in the Redevelopment District, cost-shared by the property owners.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

(7:25:55) – Mr. Plemel indicated that two Special Use Permit requests from the Carson City School District would be reviewed in April, in addition to a Special Use Permit and a Variance Application for the Bella Lago multi-family project and an application for a tentative subdivision map.

COMMISSIONER REPORTS/COMMENTS

(7:31:19) – Chairperson Esswein inquired about the Anderson Ranch project and Mr. Plemel noted that a public meeting was currently scheduled, prior to submitting an application. Commissioner Castro inquired about the status of the speed bumps on Oakridge Drive, and Mr. Rotter explained that the noise would be a concern for the residents; therefore, a three-way stop was being considered instead.

H. PUBLIC COMMENT

(7:32:13) – None.

I. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: FOR ADJOURNMENT

(7:32:24) – **MOTION: Commissioner Castro moved to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Vice Chairperson Sattler .** The meeting was adjourned at 7:33 p.m.

The Minutes of the March 30, 2016 Carson City Planning Commission meeting are so approved this 27th day of April, 2016.

PAUL ESSWEIN, Chair