A regularly scheduled meeting of the Carson City Planning Commission was held on Monday, December 20, 1999, at the Community Center Sierra Room, 851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada, beginning at 3:30 p.m.

PRESENT: Chairperson Allan Christianson, Vice Chairperson Alan Rogers, and Commissioners Verne Horton, Keith Larkin, William Mally, and Roger Sedway

STAFF PRESENT: Community Development Director Walter Sullivan, Deputy District Attorney Neil Rombardo, Senior Planner Juan Guzman, Senior Engineer John Givlin, and Recording Secretary Katherine McLaughlin (P.C. 12/20/99 Tape 1-0001)

NOTE: Unless otherwise indicated, each item was introduced by the Chairperson. Staff then presented/clarified the staff report/supporting documentation. Any other individuals who spoke are listed immediately following the item heading. A tape recording of these proceedings is on file in the Clerk-Recorder's office. This tape is available for review and inspection during normal business hours.

A. ROLL CALL, DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE - Chairperson Christianson convened the meeting at 3:35 p.m. Roll call was taken and a quorum was present although Commissioner Wipfli was absent. Chairperson Christianson lead the Pledge of Allegiance.

B, DISCUSSION AND ACTION TO APPROVE MINUTES FOR THE SPECIAL DECEMBER 6, 1999, MEETING AND THE REGULAR NOVEMBER 22, 1999, MEETING (1-0012) - Commissioner Rogers corrected the spelling of State Public Works Board Representative Craig DeFriez' name in the November 22nd Minutes. Commissioner Larkin corrected the vote on Items G-1a and b in the November 22nd Minutes to indicated that he had abstained. Chairperson Christianson indicated he would abstain on the December 20th meetings as he had been absent from that meeting. Commissioner Rogers moved to approve the Minutes of the November 22, 1999, Minutes. Commissioner Mally seconded the motion. Commissioner Rogers continued his motion to include the vote amendment and the typographical correction to the name DeFriez. Commissioner Mally concurred. The motion was voted and carried 6-0.

Commissioner Horton moved to approve the Minutes of the Special Meeting of December 6th as presented. Commissioner Mally seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

C. PUBLIC COMMENTS (1-0051) - None.

D. AGENDA MODIFICATIONS (1-0060) - None.

E. DISCLOSURES (1-0062) - Commissioner Mally indicated his intent to abstain on the Genescritti Item. Commissioner Larkin disclosed his business relationship with the applicant/property owner regarding Item G-8 and that he was aware of different information from that contained in the packet. Deputy District Attorney Rombardo indicated that Commissioner Larkin did not have a conflict of interest due to the business relationship.

F. CONSENT AGENDA (1-0077)

F-1. U-96/97-31a - DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON THE REVIEW OF A PREVIOUSLY APPROVED SPECIAL USE PERMIT FROM ALAN A. MOSS

F-2. U-79-30 - DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON THE REVIEW OF A PREVIOUSLY APPROVED SPECIAL USE PERMIT FROM CINDERLITE - Commissioner Rogers moved to approve Items F-1 and F-2 as recommended. Commissioner Horton seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0.

G. PUBLIC HEARINGS

G-1. MPE-96/97-3 - DISCUSSION AND ACTION TO APPROVE A RESOLUTION AND TO

ADOPT THE OPEN SPACE MASTER PLAN (1-0102) - Community Development Director Walter Sullivan, Open Space Advisory Committee Chairperson Steve Hartman - Comments explained the need to reconsider this item and the meetings which had been held on the plan. Public comments were solicited but none given. Commissioner Mally moved that the Planning Commission approve Resolution No. 1999-RPC-5 adopting the Open Space Master Element and recommend that the Board of Supervisors concur with the approval of the adoption of the Open Space Master Plan Element based on the above noted findings. Commissioner Sedway seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0.

G-2. Z-99/00-3 - DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON A REZONING REQUEST FROM THE PLANNING COMMISSION (1-0185) - Community Development Director Walter Sullivan, John Foody, Gloria Deyhle, Mark Palmer - Mr. Sullivan's introduction corrected a typographic error in the street address for 507 North Pratt. Its APN was correct as listed. Discussion explained the Master Plan designation for the surrounding area. Public comments were solicited. Both Mr. Foody and Ms. Deyhle supported the rezoning. Mr. Sullivan explained Carol Jagoda's letter of opposition. (A copy is included in the file.) He indicated that her zoning would not be changed. He also expressed Senior Planner Sandra Danforth's appreciation to Mr. Foody for his work on the application. He then described the process to implement the zone change. Comments indicated the need for the City's sewer and water infrastructures to be upgraded before the entire area could implement the zoning change. The Utility Department has purportedly scheduled this work for the 2002-3 timeframe. Mr. Palmer suggested that development agreements be used to delineate the pro rata share of the upgrades prior to the City's replacement as a method of allowing the zoning change to occur before the improvements are installed. Mr. Sullivan committed to contacting Ms. Jagoda and discussing her concern with her and emphasized that the City did not at this time have any interest in her property or any property in her vicinity or the use of condemnation in that area. Commissioner Rogers moved to approve Z-99/00-3, a request from John T. Foody, et al., for a motion to prepare an ordinance for first reading to change the land use designation for Single Family 6,000 and from Multi-Family Duplex to Residential Office located at all the properties listed in the staff report as read by the Chairperson with the correction given by staff. Commissioner Mally seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0.

G-3. U-99/00-23 - DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON A SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FROM STEVE KASTENS, PARKS AND RECREATION DIRECTOR (1-0542) - Community Development Director Walter Sullivan, Parks and Recreation Director Steve Kastens - Discussion delineated the need for the tall fence as being due to privacy concerns for the home which is adjacent to the Mills Park playground. The adjacent property owner plans to plant several trees in his yard to reduce the visual impact. Reasons other property owners abutting Mills Park may not be interested in have a similar fence were noted. Public testimony was solicited but none given. Commissioner Horton moved to approve U-99/00-23, a special use permit request from Steve Kastens, Parks and Recreation Director, to allow removal of approximately 30 feet of an existing chain-link fence and installation of a 12 foot tall chain-link fence with Perma-Hedge screening material in the Public zoning district located at 1111 East William Street, APN 2-181-01, based on seven findings and subject to five conditions of approval contained in the staff report and with the understanding that any acknowledgements to the Commission/Board by the applicant may be considered as further stipulations or conditions of approval on this application. Commissioner Rogers seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0.

G-4. P-98/99-1 - DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON A REQUEST FROM RON KIPP FOR REVIEW AND ACTION ON THE DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT FOR HERITAGE PARK AT QUAIL RUN (1-0669) - Senior Planner Juan Guzman, Ron Kipp - Commissioner Sedway stepped from the room--4:18 p.m.--and returned--4:20 p.m.--during Mr. Guzman's introduction. (A quorum was present the entire time.) Mr. Guzman explained a change in the Assessor's parcel number for 9-769-05 to 04. His comments also indicated that the development agreement under discussion was the one which Mr. Kipp had marked "absolute final" draft. Discussion with Mr. Kipp indicated that Page 2 should contain "in accordance with this development agreement" to complete the last sentence on the page. The notifications given to prospective buyers and property owners concerning the adjacent industrial area were described. Clarification indicated that the City is now responsible for fencing the linear park. Residential Construction Tax monies may be used for this project. The fence which the developer planned to install was described. Commissioner Rogers urged Mr. Kipp to consider a sight obscuring fence along this area to provide the residents with additional privacy/security. Mr. Kipp responded by explaining that contact with the adjacent residents indicated their preference is to have the developer's fence. The detention basin is to be landscaped by the developer. The future mitigation plans for the area adjacent to the industrial zone, if warranted, included a 12 foot high sound wall. The current program includes the use of the area as a storage parking lot, a six foot block wall fence, and large caliber trees. Mr. Kipp also limned the project's phasing program. Public testimony was solicited but none given. Additional discussion on the fencing for the linear park explained staff's support of the open fencing along the linear ditch. Commissioner Mally moved to recommend approval of the development agreement to the Board of Supervisors after finding the development agreement in compliance with provisions of the Carson City Master Plan as outlined in the attached Notice of Decision for the Heritage Park Planned Unit Development and with the understanding that any acknowledgements to the Commission/Board by the applicant may be considered as further stipulations or conditions of approval on this application. Commissioner Rogers seconded the motion. Following discussion of an amendment, Commissioner Mally amended his motion to include adding to Page 2 "in accordance with this absolute final development agreement". Following further discussion Commissioner Mally again amended his motion to include the corrected Assessor's Parcel Number as provided by Mr. Guzman. Commissioner Roger concurred with the amendments. The motion was voted and carried 6-0.

G-5. U-98/99-40 - DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON A REQUEST TO RESCIND A CONDITION OF APPROVAL FOR THE SIERRA VISTA MOBILE HOME PARK (1-1040) - Senior Planner Juan Guzman - Commissioner Horton stepped from the room during Mr. Guzman's introduction--4:39 p.m.--and returned--4:41 p.m. (A quorum was present the entire time.) The applicant was not present. Public testimony was solicited but none given. Discussion between Commissioner Rogers and Mr. Guzman indicated that the tree could be relocated on the property if so desired. Commissioner Rogers moved to modify Stipulation No. 1 of the Special Use Permit Number U-98/99-40 based on the original seven findings and subject to all the other remaining conditions of approval and stipulations related to Special Use Permit U-98/99-40 and U-98/99-40a with a modification of Stipulation No. 1 that the tree be relocated within the property. Commissioner Sedway seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0.

G-6. U-98/99-36 - DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON THE REVIEW OF A PREVIOUSLY APPROVED SPECIAL USE PERMIT FROM FRANK L. GENESCRITTI, SR. (1-1125) - Senior Planner Juan Guzman, Building Official Phil Herrington, Applicant's Representative Walter Fullerton - Commissioner Mally stepped from the dais during Mr. Guzman's introduction. (See disclosures.) Discussion between Mr. Guzman and the Commission explained the procedure if the extension is denied, staff's reasons for recommending a six month extension even though both residences appear to be empty at this time and no substantial work had been performed on them for approximately one year, the portion of the structure which is involved with the special use permit, and the procedure which staff will pursue if improvements are not made during the extension. Mr. Genescritti had purportedly indicated his desire/intent to move forward after January 1 if the Special Use Permit is approved. Mr. Herrington indicated that his Department had a plan which had been submitted by the Genescrittis earlier in the process. It can be used to complete the structure if the special use permit is extended. Allegedly Frank Genescritti, Jr., had lost his set of the original plans. A building permit could be issued on the plans in Mr. Herrington's files. In view of the dispute among Mr. Genescritti, the City, and the City's contractor on the wall, it should not be considered as a part of the special use permit request. The structure's wall and its grading requirements are part of the building permit for the addition. Discussion noted the amount of time spent on this project. Mr. Genescritti, Sr., had, however, cleaned up the property after a neighbor complained. No other work had been conducted. Mr. Guzman read Walter Fullerton's letter into the record. (A copy is in the file.) Mr. Fullerton requested a one year extension and elimination of "Paragraph 2" from the Conditions of Approval. Mr. Guzman reiterated staff's recommendation that only a six month extension be granted.

Mr. Fullerton indicated that there had been a fine for building without a permit and court action had allegedly been taken against Mr. Genescritti. The meeting with staff last Thursday had purportedly been a positive step forward. He indicated that he had discussed the grading/engineering concerns with Mr. Herrington and that they were willing to work with some of Mr. Herrington's grading conditions. He hoped that a lot of the problems could be put behind them and that forward movement could occur which would allow the Genescrittis to have beneficial use of their property. They intend to complete the structure and bring it up to standards by using the plans which the City has on file. He did not wish to enter into the difficulties involving the wall and supported separation of this issue. Commissioner Rogers emphasized the Commission's concerns about the lack of movement and the repeated need to discussion/act on the property. Mr. Fullerton responded that the Genescrittis had assured him that they were getting ready to move forward on the permit. They had been held up due to extenuating circumstances. If the permit is approved this evening, he intended to meet with Mr. Herrington and obtain a copy of the plans. He will then discuss the grading requirements with the City Engineer. The Genescrittis are fully prepared to move forward. The intent is to complete the project within six months barring any unforeseen circumstances. Mr. Fullerton indicated that he would be involved from the beginning of this work to its completion. He then explained his sporadic involvement with the project and personal knowledge and work with Mr. Genescritti over the years. He had only become active on the project within the last year. Chairperson Christianson complimented Messrs. Fullerton and Genescritti for meeting with staff and working out the problems so that movement could occur. Discussion incurred between Mr. Fullerton and Commissioner Sedway concerning a July letter, its "tone", and purpose. (A copy of this letter is in the file.) Mr. Fullerton expressed the hope that they were moving beyond this letter and that work could now occur.

(1-1536) Public testimony was solicited but none given. Mr. Guzman read Robin Eppard's letter into the record opposing staff's recommendation that a six month extension be granted. She was willing to accept whatever decision the Commission takes. (A copy is in the file.) Mr. Guzman explained that he had contacted Ms. Eppard and advised her of the recommendation and the rationale for it.

Commissioner Horton acknowledged the difficulties encountered for both the City and the Genescrittis regarding the project during the last three years. He was willing to support a six month extension and indicated his opposition to any further renewals beyond that period. He recommended staff pursue the course outlined if the project is not completed during this six month period. Commissioner Larkin expressed his feeling that the six month extension should be adequate for completion of the project. He also noted that he had not been here when the Commission originally considered the special use permit three years ago.

Commissioner Horton moved to grant a six month extension for U-98/99-36 in order to facilitate Mr. Frank Genescritti's compliance with the Carson City Municipal Code Section 18.02.067, et al., and 15.0.030. Commissioner Rogers seconded the motion. Motion carried 4-1-1-1 with Commissioner Sedway voting Naye, Commissioner Mally abstaining, and Commissioner Wipfli absent.

Mr. Sullivan explained and thanked Deputy District Attorney Melanie Bruketta for her assistance with this matter.

BREAK: A 15 minute recess was declared at 5:05 p.m. A quorum of the Commission was present when Chairperson Christianson reconvened the meeting at 5:20 p.m. although Commissioner Mally had not returned and Commissioner Wipfli was absent.

G-7. U-98/99-48 - DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON A REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF A PREVIOUSLY APPROVED SPECIAL USE PERMIT FROM ROGER A. MITCHELL (1-1605) - Senior Planner Juan Guzman, Roger Mitchell - Commissioner Mally returned during Mr. Guzman's introduction--5:22 p.m. Comments emphasized that the difference between this applicant's request and the previous applicant's is that this applicant has completed a majority of his project. Mr. Guzman indicated that the extension would expire on May 15. Mr. Mitchell concurred with the report. Public testimony was solicited but none given. Commissioner Rogers moved to extend Special Use Permit U-98/99-40 for a final time until May 15, 2000, based on the original findings and conditions of approval of the Special Use Permit. Commissioner Horton seconded the motion. Discussion reiterated that the permit would be valid until May 15, 2000. The motion was voted and carried 6-0.

G-8. U-98/99-32 - DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON THE REVIEW OF A PREVIOUSLY APPROVED SPECIAL USE PERMIT FROM ARNOLD AND ELFRIEDA WETZSTEIN (1-1709) - Senior Planner Juan Guzman, Deputy District Attorney Neil Rombardo - The applicant was not present. Discussion clarified that the Wetzsteins are the property owners and that the applicants are Bryan and Kristine Parker. Mr. Rombardo opined that the agenda and staff report, although conflicting in the ownership/application information, provided adequate information to allow the Commission to act on the application today. Commissioner Horton moved that the Planning Commission find Special use Permit application U-98/99-32 in compliance with the conditions of approval and that no further review be required until December 2000 unless the Office of

Community Development becomes aware of any violation of this Special Use Permit that cannot be resolved by staff. Commissioner Larkin seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0.

G-9. M-99/00-6 - DISCUSSION AND ACTION REGARDING PLANNING COMMISSION CONCURRENCE WITH STAFF INTERPRETATION OF CCMC 18.05.045(13) and CCMC 18.05.023(11b) (1-1805) - Community Development Director Walter Sullivan - Discussion questioned the term "single-panel van" and suggested that the vehicle be called a panel van. Clarification by Mr. Sullivan indicated that the passenger van should contain a minimum of one passenger seat. He also revised the definition to indicated that the van should be designed to carry passengers and not products. Commissioner Rogers suggested the definition be that the van be designed to a minimum of one passenger and a maximum of eight. Discussion suggested defining the size of the cargo bay rather than delineating the number of passengers. Reasons this approach had not been used were explained by Mr. Sullivan. Chairperson Christianson explained the trucking industry's use of carrying capacity weight to designate the type of van and indicated that the industry called the vehicle Mr. Sullivan was attempting to describe a "bobtail". Further discussion noted that there are "ten" passenger vans on the market. Commissioner Mally suggested the term "detached cargo space" and "bobtail" be used. Mr. Rombardo noted the need to revise all ordinances which currently use the term "single panel van" if other terms are used. Mr. Sullivan requested a 30 day continuance to allow staff time to rewrite the definition. Chairperson Christianson volunteered to provide the industry standards. Commissioner Larkin also pointed out that the vehicle sizes could be changed which would require an amendment to the ordinances each time a change is made. Public testimony was solicited but none given. Commissioner Horton moved to continue Item M-99/00-6 until the January meeting of the Regional Planning Commission. Commissioner Rogers seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0.

G-10. M-99/00-7 - DISCUSSION AND ACTION BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION TO AMEND THE REDEVELOPMENT PLAN AND DISTRICT (1-2055) AND G-11. M-99/00-8 - DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON A REQUEST FROM THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION TO INITIATE A CHANGE OF LAND USE (1-2205) - Community Development Director Walter Sullivan, Principal Planner Rob Joiner, Deputy District Attorney Neil Rombardo, Parks and Recreation Commission Chairperson Larry Osborne, Parks and Recreation Director Steve Kastens, Janet Riggs, Joan Karsten, Karson Kruzers President Jack Anderson, Marvin Young - Staff comments repeatedly iterated that the request is for only 15 acres currently used for parking and does not include the park itself. Due to the related nature of the items, G-11 was added to the discussion. Mr. Rombardo requested, if the Commission moves to approve the request, that the resolution be adopted as approved by the Redevelopment Authority. Zoning around the 15 acres is General Commercial except for Fuji Park. Discussion between Commissioner Mally and staff indicated that tax incentives have not been offered. A special use permit will be required if the project moves forward. Commissioner Mally expressed his opposition to the proposal and requested the record reflect his opposition. He felt that Costco should pay for a new Fuji Park. His traffic concerns were noted and should be addressed later in the project. The Commission could not consider these issues as they had not been agendized. If adequate parking is not provided for that project, a variance would be required. Staff could/would not waive the special use permit or variance requirements. This application is the first step in the process. Commissioner Rogers indicated that the application is required only if the property is added to the Redevelopment District. There will be more public meetings and planning discussions before the project is constructed. Benefits of using the Redevelopment process were limned. Development standards as well as the life, health and safety issues will still be required and addressed. The site had only become viable when the Highway 395/50 interchange was revised. Mr. Joiner indicated that the funds would be allocated to Redevelopment projects but this was not the primary reason for recommending the process. The process had been suggested in an effort to expedite the procedure. The current Master Plan designates the site as General Commercial. The 15 acres is, however, the only parcel on the north side of Clear Creek which was not already zoned General Commercial.

Chairperson Osborne limned the Commission's discussion and action on the proposal. The area is purportedly used by six to seven events per year for overflow parking. Mr. Kastens had committed to working with these users to find other parking areas/solutions. Mr. Osborne, as Executive Vice President for the Chamber of Commerce, described the Chamber and its Board of Directors' support for the program based on their concern about the continued erosion of the City's economic base. Commissioner Rogers then explained his knowledge of the reasons for leaving the parcel zoned General Commercial when the last Master Plan was created. He felt that the users had taken it for granted that the area was part of the park and questioned the impact approving the request would have on the Park's Master Plan. Chairperson Osborne noted that its Master Plan was developed in 1991. He also explained former Commissioner Jay Meierdierck's comments which indicated that a Master Plan for Fuji Park, if developed today, would look a great deal different from the 1991 plan. Mr. Kastens then described the 1994 Fuji Park Master Plan, its Barrone revisions, and the reasons it had not been developed. The current plan designates the 15 acres as a parking lot. He also explained the Commission's action which would direct any funding obtained by the sale of the property toward relocation of the current fairgrounds within the community. Testimony at the Redevelopment Authority meeting by the Members, who are also the Board of Supervisors, supported this recommendation. Clarification by Mr. Kastens indicated that his Department will continue to pursue the current Master Plan as it now exists for the south side of Clear Creek. He also indicated that a title search has not been conducted to the extent done for the 15 acres, however, he felt that there were encumbrances on the other portion of Fuji Park which may prohibit its sale. Under his concept, relocation would only be considered if and when a sale is considered even though the Commission had committed to looking for a relocation site. Discussion between Commissioner Rogers and Mr. Kastens indicated that development of a new Fuji Park Master Plan should be undertaken. Mr. Kastens expressed his feeling that the purpose behind retaining the proceeds from the sale had been to use the funds for improvements to Fuji Park which could include a parking area on the west end. There are no plans at this time to relocate the park. Commissioner Larkin questioned the wisdom of this program particularly if the entire park is eventually sold for commercial development. Justification for using the 15 acres for parking by the park users was felt to be based on historical use. Reasons for purchasing the acreage had not been established by staff. Mr. Kastens agreed that the Land Use Master Plan had not included a change in the designation and that it had been left open for designation after the Park Master Plan is developed. Mr. Sullivan then limned the Land Use Master Plan designation for the 15 acres on the north side of Fuji Park.

Commissioner Sedway questioned the justification for designating the site as part of the Redevelopment District. He also voiced his concern with such a piecemeal approach, the precedence which would be established, the reasons all of the City owned property is not similarly designated, and his feeling that if Costco does develop on the site that commercial interests would soon want the remainder of Fuji Park. Mr. Joiner responded by explaining that the majority of City owned property is developed. Undeveloped sites could be sold/traded in the future. Each site would have to be considered on a case-by-case basis. He also explained his contact with the adjacent property owners on Clear Creek, who own commercially zoned property, support the concept and noted the benefits they may derive from it. Commissioner Sedway acknowledged the benefits of using the Redevelopment process over other disposal mechanisms. He felt certain that other City owned property, including developed sites, will be attractive to buyers in the future.

Mr. Rombardo explained the Redevelopment statutes mandating a finding of: blight within the legal definition before an area could be added to the Redevelopment district and that the addition is necessary to further development in the Redevelopment area. The site was felt to be under developed and the Redevelopment District's tax base is stagnant and not growing. An outside parcel will increase the tax funds and provide for additional redevelopment. Other park property could not be included unless these requirements could be fulfilled. He agreed with Commissioner Sedway that under this definition of blight, the developed portion of Fuji Park would not comply with the Statutes.

Discussion ensued between Commissioner Sedway and Messrs. Sullivan and Joiner concerning the amount of parking which may be required and staff's inability to waive this or any other special use permit requirement. Mr. Sullivan also explained that large commercial developers, such as K-mart, often provide so much more parking than that required that staff must limit the amount. He did not feel that a commercial developer would undercut his parking as it would limit sales. (Commissioner Horton stepped from the room at 6:30 p.m. and returned at 6:32 p.m. A quorum was present the entire time.)

Discussion ensued on the definition of blight, the term "under developed", and the reasons staff had brought the matter to the Commission.

(1-3401) (2-0004) Public testimony was solicited. Chairperson Christianson requested the speakers to restrict their testimony to three minutes and not restate previous comments. Ms. Riggs questioned why master plans change and the City's inability to develop parks as planned. She voiced her concern about the lack of areas where horses could be ridden in the City and the ability to eliminate wetlands. Although paving the entire community and development of industrial/commercial sites provide for the economic well-being of the City, it does not provide a quality of life she wished to see here. She wished she had enough money to acquire all of the property and develop the fairgrounds so that the State fair could be held here. Ms. Karsten did not feel that the property was blighted. Use of the fairgrounds and the 15 acre site over the years was described. She questioned other sites where similar uses would be allowed. She pointed out the impact large commercial operations have on small stores and questioned whether Costco would remain or leave as Ernst had after a short while. The loss of the parking area would have a negative impact on the fairgrounds and its usage. Mr. Anderson described the parking required for his event(s), the need for a similar parking area, and his event's use of the area which had been tentatively identified as a potential replacement for the public parking area. He questioned the need to expedite the sale and the per foot sale price. Reasons the City had failed to make improvements to the park were noted. He felt that Costco would create additional reasons to not make the improvements. The usage is purportedly dropping due to the lack of improvements. He questioned the reasons Mills Park is not added to the Redevelopment District. The proposal will create a loss of tax revenue for the school district. The park master plan had designated the area for parking. Community value should be included in the comparison of economic values. He urged the Commission to slow the process and allow a careful evaluation of the proposal. Mr. Young felt that Costco was playing Carson City against Douglas County. Only the higher bidder will win.

(2-0086) Mr. Rombardo clarified that the City could negotiate with anyone so desired when this point is reached in the process. Mr. Joiner indicated that the property currently does not generate any taxes, therefore, the school district will not lose revenue. It will receive property taxes on the parcel after the Redevelopment District sunsets. The Board of Supervisors and the Redevelopment Authority are considering this issue. Mr. Kastens then indicated that, although he had not researched the potential, a multi-use park similar to Fuji could be located on several BLM sites within the community. A list of several was provided. Chairperson Christianson suggested using Question 18 funds to improve a portion of the Silver Saddle Ranch, which is under BLM control. Mr. Kastens suggested splitting the park's passive and active events which would eliminate some of the competition that occurs when several events are held at the same time. He also explained the activities which had used the 15 acre site during the years when a Carson City fair was held. He then noted comments about the horse arena from an individual who felt it was hazardous to horses, however, the same individual was seen using the arena today. Comments indicated that the purpose behind having Mr. Kastens seek another site was due to the concern about conflicting uses. Discussion also indicated that if the negotiations are unsuccessful, the parcel could be removed from the Redevelopment District by Board action.

Commissioner Horton moved that the Planning Commission move to recommend to the Board of Supervisors approval of a resolution recommending an amendment to the Redevelopment Plan Area by adding real property located at 700 Clear Creek Road, Carson City, Nevada, APN 9-302-05, known as the north parking lot of Fuji Park, to the existing Redevelopment area pursuant to NRS 279.608. Commissioner Sedway seconded the motion. Following discussion, Commissioner Horton amended his motion to include in accordance with the Redevelopment Authority Resolution as requested by the District Attorney. Commissioner Sedway concurred. Motion carried 5-1-0-1 with Commissioner Mally voting Naye and Commissioner Wipfli absent.

Commissioner Horton moved to direct staff to initiate a change of land use forthwith for APN 9-302-05 owned by Carson City, approximately 15 acres of land from Public, P, to General Commercial, GC, and to properly notice the subject change of land use pursuant to Title 18, specifically, CCMC 18.02.106. Commissioner Sedway seconded the motion. Motion carried 4-2-0-1 with Commissioners Larkin and Mally voting Naye and Commissioner Wipfli absent.

G-12. DISCUSSION AND ACTION APPROVING A RESOLUTION COMMENDING PLANNING COMMISSIONER VERNE HORTON; AND G-13. DISCUSSION AND ACTION APPROVING A RESOLUTION COMMENDING PLANNING COMMISSIONER DEBORAH UHART (2-0240) - Community Development Director Sullivan read the resolution for Commissioner Horton into the record. Comments supported adding to the resolution his terms as Chairperson. Senior Planner Guzman read the resolution for Commissioner Uhart into the record. (Commissioner Horton stepped away from the dais. A quorum was still present.) Commissioner Rogers noted that Commissioner Horton had served as his Vice Chair and then he had served as Commissioner Horton's Vice Chair. Commissioner Rogers moved to adopt Resolution No. 1999-RPC-6 on behalf of Verne Horton and Resolution No. 1999-RPC-7 on behalf of Deborah Uhart. Commissioners Mally and Sedway seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0-1-1 with Commissioner Horton abstaining and Commissioner Wipfli absent.

H. INTERNAL COMMUNICATION AND ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

H-1. STAFF BRIEFING ON THE STATUS OF COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS AND CORRESPONDENCE (2-0398) - (Commissioner Horton returned to the dais.) Mr. Sullivan reported on the Board's actions approving on second reading the manufactured housing code revisions and Lyon County's decisions regarding a similar County code revision. The Board also approved a final map, the CDBG housing rehabilitation standards program, and holding the Farmers' Market in the pavilion.

H-2. FUTURE COMMISSION ITEMS AND DATES (2-0416) - The next meeting is scheduled for January 26 in the Sierra Room.

I. ADJOURNMENT (2-0454) - Commissioner Horton moved to adjourn. Commissioner Mally seconded the motion. Motion carried 6-0. Chairperson Christianson adjourned the meeting at 7:10 p.m.

The Minutes of the December 20, 1999, Carson City Planning Commission meeting

ARE SO APPROVED ON___January_26___, 2000.

_/s/_______________________________________
Allan Christianson, Chairperson