

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

TRANSCRIPT MINUTES

STUDY SESSION

CITY OF SPARKS PLANNING COMMISSION

Tuesday, July 30, 2019
12:00 p.m. to 1:00 p.m.

Sparks City Hall Downstairs Training Room
431 Prater Way
Sparks, Nevada

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

A P P E A R A N C E S

Commission Members Present:

- Scott Carey, Chair
- Shelley Read, Vice Chair
- David Blaco
- Mary Brock
- James Fewins
- Frank Petersen
- Dian VanderWell

Staff Present:

- Alyson McCormick
Assistant City Attorney

- Armando Ornelas
Assistant Community Services Director

- Ian Crittenden
Senior Planner

- Jon Ericson
City Engineer

- Marilie Smith
Administrative Secretary
Community Services Department

Other Participants:

(None)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

I N D E X

ITEM	PAGE
1. CALL TO ORDER	4
2. ROLL CALL	4
3. REVIEW OF THE AUGUST 1, 2019 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING AGENDA	5
4. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS	28
5. PUBLIC COMMENT	30
6. SYNOPSIS OF CITY COUNCIL MEETING	30
7. COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSIONERS	31
8. ADJOURNMENT	34

1 SPARKS, NEVADA, TUESDAY, JULY 30, 2019, 12:00 P.M.

2 -oOo-

3 CHAIRMAN CAREY: All right. I got 12:00 noon.
4 So I'll go ahead and call this meeting to order. This
5 is the Sparks Planning Commission Study Session of
6 July 30, 2019. Welcome, everybody.

7 Could you please call the roll.

8 MS. SMITH: Commissioner Carey?

9 CHAIRMAN CAREY: Present.

10 MS. SMITH: Commissioner Read?

11 COMMISSIONER READ: Here.

12 MS. SMITH: Commissioner Blaco?

13 COMMISSIONER BLACO: Here.

14 MS. SMITH: Commissioner Brock?

15 COMMISSIONER BROCK: Here.

16 MS. SMITH: Commissioner Fewins?

17 COMMISSIONER FEWINS: Here.

18 MS. SMITH: Commissioner Petersen?

19 COMMISSIONER PETERSEN: Yeah. Yeah, I'm here.
20 I had a mouthful.

21 MS. SMITH: Commissioner VanderWell?

22 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Here.

23 MS. SMITH: Assistant City Attorney Alyson
24 McCormick?

25 MS. MCCORMICK: Here.

1 MS. SMITH: Assistant Community Services
2 Director Armando Ornelas?

3 MR. ORNELAS: Here.

4 CHAIRMAN CAREY: Thank you very much for that.
5 It's great to have a full house, full Commission for
6 this Planning Commission Study Session.

7 We have a pretty light agenda for our next
8 meeting coming up on Thursday. So we'll move into that.
9 Our only item on the agenda is PCN19-0023, conditional
10 use permit for a car wash.

11 MR. CRITTENDEN: Chairman Carey, members of the
12 Planning Commission, Ian Crittenden, Senior Planner.

13 As stated, this is a conditional use permit
14 request to construct and operate a car wash on a site at
15 the intersection of McCarran Boulevard and Wedekind
16 Road.

17 I was going through my notes earlier, and I'm
18 not on the first page anymore.

19 The site has a PO zoning, or Professional
20 Office zoning, and it has a C, or Commercial,
21 Comprehensive Plan Land Use designation.

22 The Planning Commission previously approved a
23 conditional use permit for an approximately
24 5,369-square-foot car wash in 2016 on this site. That
25 approval expired in 2018 because construction had not

1 been initiated and the use had not been established.
2 This application has been submitted by Blue Wave Car
3 Wash.

4 Car washes are permitted in the PO zoning
5 district subject to approval of a conditional use
6 permit.

7 The applicant is proposing to construct and
8 operate an approximately 4,512-square-foot tunnel-type
9 car wash.

10 You can see here, this would be the car wash
11 building. Here's McCarran Boulevard and Wedekind Road.
12 The stacking would come this way through the pay kiosk
13 area and then through the car wash.

14 And then all of then all of the washing
15 machinery would be located inside of the structure for
16 the car wash. Also, in the parking area, they will have
17 canopies and vacuum stations. The vacuum equipment will
18 be housed in these two small structures on the east side
19 of the site.

20 The applicant has indicated that their proposed
21 hours of operation are 8:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. seven days
22 a week. Staff does not believe that a condition
23 restricting those hours of operation is necessary to
24 make this use compatible or -- yeah, compatible with
25 adjacent uses.

1 The site is adjacent -- if we go back up to the
2 site plan, we can see, or the vicinity map, you can see
3 the site is adjacent to Wildcreek Golf Course to kind of
4 the north and the west, to other office uses to the
5 east. And then across McCarran they are adjacent to
6 some multi-family residential, they're kind of duplexes
7 on the south side of McCarran there.

8 Noise issues can be of concern when you have
9 the operation of a car wash adjacent to or near
10 residential uses. But because the car wash equipment
11 and the vacuum equipment will be located inside of
12 structures, and that the distance across McCarran here
13 is approximately 130 feet, and the existing soundwall
14 adjacent to the residential, and the ambient noise just
15 from the traffic along McCarran, we, staff feels that
16 the noise impacts will be adequately addressed and
17 mitigated for this use.

18 The proposed landscaping is in substantial
19 compliance with the requirements of SMC 20.04.006, which
20 is the landscape and screen section. They have a
21 variety of plant materials as well as some nonplant
22 materials on the site. They actually gave us a
23 materials board, for lack of a better word, of the
24 materials there, the plants they'll be using, the
25 different trees and shrubs, as well as some plants and

1 flowers that will be used on the site.

2 They also gave us a sheet showing what some of
3 the rock and gravel will look like. They had some
4 things indicated on the site plan. You know, one was
5 called Shadow Ridge. And staff, we had to ask them,
6 "What is that? We assume gravel, but you gave us no
7 indication of what that specifically was." So they gave
8 us a good demonstration of what those materials were.

9 They actually had a section. You may have seen
10 it in the application. They had a section that was
11 shown as see the revegetation on the east side of the
12 site. Like here. And staff asked them to do something.
13 This area actually has some stormwater conveyance under
14 and over the top of it. And they were concerned about
15 putting down, you know, grass and some other landscaping
16 and the potential for that to not work out so well with
17 impeding that flow. And so we asked them to use, you
18 know, just some rock and different nonvegetative
19 landscaping. And they, so they updated their plan. But
20 you may have seen both. And we wanted to explain why
21 that had changed.

22 Go back. Oh, this actually works fine, if we
23 look at this. The parking requirement for car washes in
24 the City code is one space per 1,500 square feet. The
25 proposed building is 4,512 square feet. So three

1 parking spaces would be required per code. They are
2 proposing or have planned on their site plan 29 spaces.
3 So there are adequate parking spaces for this use.

4 There are no specific stacking standards in
5 City code for car washes. However, SMC 20.03.16 gives
6 us stacking standards for drive-through restaurants,
7 which is approximately 160 square feet. Staff did a
8 quick measurement of the distance from here, including
9 the doubling distance here, and they have approximately
10 600 feet of stacking distance, which is nearly four
11 times the amount required for a drive-through business.
12 And staff felt that they have adequate stacking distance
13 for this use.

14 The applicant also submitted a traffic impact
15 study. The study estimated the average daily trips to
16 be 778 daily trips, or 775, excuse me, with a peak-hour
17 of 78, peak-hour p.m. trips of 78. Typically, staff
18 would not require a traffic study if the peak-hour trips
19 are less than 80. But because of the location of this
20 site, adjacent to an NDOT-controlled road into McCarran,
21 and that they are proposing an access point off of
22 McCarran that is in close proximity to Wedekind Road and
23 McCarran intersection, staff felt it was appropriate and
24 reasonable to request a traffic study as part of their
25 submittal.

1 The applicant has been working with NDOT to
2 have their proposed roadway and improvements and their
3 site access improvements approved by NDOT.

4 If the Planning Commission approves this
5 request, and then the NDOT subsequently denies the
6 access request on McCarran, and the applicant still
7 wants to move forward, they will have to return to
8 Planning Commission to amend their site plan to remove
9 the access point off McCarran, just so the Planning
10 Commission is aware kind of how that will work out.
11 We've actually proposed Condition Number 5 that would
12 require that the applicant submit documentation of NDOT
13 permits prior to receiving any permits from the City of
14 Sparks for construction on the site.

15 Then, the last kind of piece of this is the
16 applicant has also submitted elevations that are in
17 substantial compliance with the designed guidelines for
18 the PO zoning district. The elevations reflect a mix of
19 materials that include both smooth and split face CMU
20 block, stucco, and a corrugated perforated metal panel
21 system. The elevations also incorporate a variety of
22 colors, including Sierra Spruce and Alpolic, Alpolic
23 Blue.

24 So the applicant submitted their elevations in
25 a couple of phases. We asked for some updates kind of

1 throughout this process. This is the most recent
2 elevation update, so we feel are in compliance. They
3 show a lot of articulation in the site, some breaks in
4 the long span of the -- I mean we're building a long
5 rectangle, that there's only so much you can do. But
6 they broke it up, and they've broken this direction.
7 You can kind of see the elevation breaks that they
8 provided.

9 But this was the color elevations they provided
10 of their original plan. Because we were trying to get
11 an understanding of what the building actually would
12 look like. So if you can kind of imagine, you know, the
13 elevation breaks that they put into the updated version
14 on there. We didn't get all of the pieces in one. We
15 got them in kind of pieces here, but.

16 And so they show a variety of colors and the
17 break in plane that we had asked for. And then this is
18 that corrugated perforated metal panel system, which, I
19 think, is part of the Blue Wave kind of like corporate
20 branding kind of stuff, that that's a piece they like to
21 have. So.

22 There are five findings related to conditional
23 use permits. Staff will cover these in-depth on
24 Thursday. Staff does believe that all of the findings
25 can be made. There is one finding, however, that staff

1 believes may be of specific import on this request, and
2 that would be Finding C4, which requires that we
3 identify, that we address identified impacts.

4 And the traffic impact on this is of specific
5 concern for this request. The proposed site access from
6 McCarran does not meet the NDOT standard for that, that
7 separation distance. And so the applicant has submitted
8 improvements to the intersection of McCarran and
9 Wedekind, which would include a median that would remove
10 the ability to turn left out of Wedekind and to go
11 through at Wedekind.

12 We feel that's something that may come up as an
13 important point to the neighbors and so forth. We felt
14 like it was NDOT's decision to determine if they want
15 those improvements. And so we left the ball in their
16 court with requiring that the applicant be able to
17 provide approved NDOT permits to the City as part of
18 their building permit process. So.

19 That is the end of my presentation. If you
20 have any questions, I would be happy to answer them.

21 CHAIRMAN CAREY: Thank you, Ian.

22 Does the Commission have any questions?

23 Commissioner Read?

24 COMMISSIONER READ: I have one question. Did
25 the applicant say why they never constructed when it was

1 approved in 2016?

2 MR. CRITTENDEN: It was a different applicant.
3 That was actually Surf Thru Car Wash who built on
4 Pyramid and Holman, right there across from the
5 Scolari's Shopping Center. They were working on this.
6 I think that they could not come to terms with NDOT as
7 far -- because there was a similar condition on their
8 approval, was that they had to have NDOT approval to
9 move forward. They couldn't get -- they couldn't work
10 that out, and they moved locations. And so that
11 expired, that approval expired.

12 And then Surf Thru came in and saw the site and
13 saw that it had a previous approval and wanted to look
14 into it as well.

15 CHAIRMAN CAREY: Commissioner VanderWell.

16 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: On the traffic study,
17 the peak of the 78.

18 MR. CRITTENDEN: M-hm (affirmative).

19 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Is that just to that
20 location?

21 MR. CRITTENDEN: Correct.

22 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Okay. So it's not
23 taking into consideration, just the traffic around?

24 MR. CRITTENDEN: No, it's that the peak --

25 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Okay.

1 MR. CRITTENDEN: -- flows on either Wedekind or
2 McCarran.

3 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Okay.

4 MR. CRITTENDEN: That's to the specific
5 business.

6 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: All right. And my
7 concern is, is because North McCarran right there is 45
8 miles an hour.

9 MR. CRITTENDEN: M-hm (affirmative).

10 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Nobody does 45 miles
11 an hour there. And if they're going to put the entrance
12 right there on McCarran, they're having people that are
13 coming to a complete, practically a complete stop to
14 turn, and I feel that that's going to cause, that's
15 going to cause issues right there. Because you see that
16 issue on Pyramid Way where the other car wash is.

17 MR. CRITTENDEN: M-hm (affirmative).

18 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: And that's just 35.

19 MR. CRITTENDEN: And that's people turning left
20 into --

21 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: M-hm (affirmative).

22 MR. CRITTENDEN: -- into there?

23 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: They're turning right
24 in, not left.

25 MR. CRITTENDEN: They're turning right in?

1 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Turning right in,
2 because they have to come to a complete stop, almost a
3 complete stop to turn in.

4 MR. CRITTENDEN: M-hm (affirmative).

5 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: So I mean, I guess,
6 it's just my concern is, my main concern is truly the
7 traffic.

8 MR. CRITTENDEN: Sure.

9 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: And even with the
10 suggestion of doing the median and everything else, I
11 mean it's going to, it's just going to put more impact
12 on those people that live on Wedekind. And we've
13 already put a high school up there. So I'm just
14 concerned about, I'm just concerned about --

15 MR. CRITTENDEN: Absolutely.

16 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: -- more traffic right
17 there.

18 MR. CRITTENDEN: Absolutely.

19 CHAIRMAN CAREY: Commissioner Fewins.

20 COMMISSIONER FEWINS: So, Ian, before, I
21 thought they had the deceleration lane. They were don't
22 go to -- and I'm going back in memory here. But they
23 were going to have a deceleration lane, and they had got
24 an easement from the -- I think, it was the church
25 there, at the time, on the north end, to really extend

1 that decel lane.

2 Yeah, this one looks a lot shorter than what we
3 saw. So. But, but I just want to clarify. We're not
4 looking at, essentially, that. We're looking at --
5 because that's going to be an NDOT --

6 MR. CRITTENDEN: Correct.

7 COMMISSIONER FEWINS: -- thing.

8 MR. CRITTENDEN: They will have to approve the
9 safety figuration specifics of both this turn-in and any
10 improvements at the intersection.

11 The previous -- if I remember correctly, and
12 like you said it's been a little while -- I remember
13 correctly, we required them to get NDOT approval because
14 there was a series of easements they would have had to
15 got, received --

16 COMMISSIONER FEWINS: That's correct.

17 MR. CRITTENDEN: -- in order to get the decel
18 lane that they were proposing. And, I think, that was
19 part of the reason that it never worked out, was they
20 couldn't get those, those easements figured out.

21 I don't believe that the other proposal ever
22 contemplated the restrictions at --

23 COMMISSIONER FEWINS: Correct.

24 MR. CRITTENDEN: -- at Wedekind. And so that
25 may have been a difference, too, to NDOT. We haven't

1 been specifically, you know, privy to all of those
2 conversations.

3 COMMISSIONER FEWINS: But, again, no NDOT
4 approval, or any dramatic changes is going to have to
5 come back through us?

6 MR. CRITTENDEN: Correct.

7 COMMISSIONER FEWINS: And I could see that
8 probably that maybe that lane coming in on the --
9 turning north off of McCarran is probably going to be
10 the sticking point for them, I would imagine.

11 MR. CRITTENDEN: Yeah.

12 COMMISSIONER FEWINS: The concerns Commissioner
13 VanderWell has talked about.

14 MR. CRITTENDEN: That would be anticipated.
15 And that was the reason for the proposed Condition 5.

16 COMMISSIONER FEWINS: Thank you, Ian.

17 MR. CRITTENDEN: This is substantially similar
18 to the recommendations and so forth that we gave to the
19 previous approval on the site.

20 CHAIRMAN CAREY: Commissioner Blaco.

21 COMMISSIONER BLACO: Yes. Do you know when the
22 NDOT is supposed to be looking at this? Is it just --

23 MR. CRITTENDEN: I believe, they've already
24 been in conversations with them up to this point. As
25 far as when they would receive approval, we don't know

1 that yet.

2 COMMISSIONER BLACO: Could the applicant use
3 our approval as leverage against NDOT to get this design
4 approved?

5 MR. CRITTENDEN: I'm not aware of that they
6 could or not. That may be a question that the City
7 Engineer may be able to answer.

8 COMMISSIONER BLACO: Okay.

9 MR. ERICSON: Throw me under the bus. What was
10 the question?

11 COMMISSIONER BLACO: Well, what I'm thinking is
12 if we approve this, could the applicant take our
13 approval to NDOT and say, "Well, the City of Sparks
14 approved it"?

15 MR. ERICSON: No. No.

16 COMMISSIONER BLACO: They probably won't do
17 that.

18 MR. ERICSON: It's their -- that road is under
19 their purview. And so they have a completely different
20 permitting process.

21 COMMISSIONER BLACO: Okay.

22 MR. ERICSON: Yeah.

23 COMMISSIONER PETERSEN: Can I ask a question,
24 please? Do you know if any of any of the high school is
25 proposing releasing any traffic count on Wedekind?

1 MR. ERICSON: No, it's not. It's all upon
2 Sullivan.

3 CHAIRMAN CAREY: Armando.

4 MR. ORNELAS: Armando Ornelas, Assistant
5 Community Services Director.

6 Commissioner Blaco, I mean, you know, to the
7 extent that it's applicable, the City's approval in the
8 case of the last car wash didn't, didn't get -- yeah,
9 make any difference to, you know, how they -- I think,
10 they approached it on the technical merits.

11 COMMISSIONER BLACO: Okay. And what were you
12 saying that their proposed action was, is to make a
13 right turn only off of Wedekind onto, headed westbound
14 onto McCarran?

15 MR. CRITTENDEN: Sure. You can see the
16 proposed, that's a -- I don't know what they call those,
17 but it's a median that allows you a left turn off of
18 McCarran onto Wedekind and a left turn off of McCarran
19 onto Wedekind going south. But from Wedekind you would
20 not be able to go through or turn left. You would only
21 be able to do a right-in and right-out onto Wedekind,
22 basically in both directions.

23 COMMISSIONER BLACO: So that won't stop
24 pedestrians from crossing that road, would it?

25 MR. CRITTENDEN: No, it would not.

1 COMMISSIONER BLACO: Okay. And I expressed
2 some concern about the high school and that
3 intersection, specifically with pedestrians being my
4 main concern now, especially since the nearest bus stop
5 is across McCarran, York and Rock.

6 CHAIRMAN CAREY: Commissioner Read.

7 COMMISSIONER READ: Can you bring up the photo
8 of the site, the bigger picture?

9 MR. CRITTENDEN: That one?

10 COMMISSIONER READ: That one.

11 MR. CRITTENDEN: Yeah.

12 COMMISSIONER READ: Where is the high school
13 exactly in the --

14 MR. CRITTENDEN: It's actually kind of off.

15 COMMISSIONER READ: High. Okay.

16 MR. CRITTENDEN: Off this. Yeah, it's the
17 north section up here.

18 COMMISSIONER READ: That's what I thought.

19 Okay. All right. Thank you.

20 COMMISSIONER BLACO: I have one more question.

21 CHAIRMAN CAREY: Commissioner Blaco.

22 COMMISSIONER BLACO: Do they have any plans to
23 like install any kind of like convenience store or
24 anything coupled with this? Is it just straight up a
25 car wash office and no other amenities whatsoever?

1 MR. CRITTENDEN: No, it's just the car wash and
2 vacuums.

3 COMMISSIONER BLACO: Okay.

4 MR. CRITTENDEN: But discussions with them,
5 they did say they would have staffing there during
6 business hours, but only ever -- you know, I think, they
7 said they anticipated a maximum of three staff members
8 at any time.

9 COMMISSIONER BLACO: Are they allowed to change
10 that in any way without prior approval?

11 MR. CRITTENDEN: We would not typically affect
12 them as far as how they wanted to staff their business.

13 COMMISSIONER BLACO: Okay.

14 MR. CRITTENDEN: If they did want to change the
15 uses that they have there, they potentially could have
16 impacts. We didn't, I didn't look through the code to
17 see, you know, how a convenience store would
18 particularly impact this site, but. And we would have
19 to evaluate that request as they wanted to do it. They
20 wouldn't just be able to do it without.

21 COMMISSIONER BLACO: To move forward in the
22 plans?

23 MR. CRITTENDEN: No.

24 COMMISSIONER BLACO: Just kind of afraid there
25 would be pedestrian traffic.

1 MR. CRITTENDEN: Like I said, it would have
2 impacts, especially if they wanted to do additional
3 square footage. I don't know that they could put --
4 they wouldn't be able to put a convenience store of any
5 kind into the existing structure that they're proposing.
6 They would have to for the new structure, which would
7 have traffic impacts, and we would, we'd be going
8 through a lot of this same process, if not the same
9 process, over again.

10 COMMISSIONER BLACO: Okay. Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN CAREY: Okay. I had a couple
12 questions, Ian. Were there any, I guess, piggybacking
13 off the traffic questions, were there any improvements
14 to this intersection from the high school project that
15 we received? I know there was a substantial amount of
16 off-site pedestrian and traffic improvements. I was
17 just curious, with respect to this proposed conditional
18 use and this interchange, what the applicant is
19 proposing, if that affects any of the --

20 MR. CRITTENDEN: The impact there? Not that
21 I'm aware of. I can look into that and get back to you
22 on Thursday. But not that I'm aware of.

23 CHAIRMAN CAREY: That would be helpful, I
24 think, for the record and for this Commission's review.

25 I had a question. If we could go back to the

1 site plan. Where is the location of the vacuums going
2 to be? Is it just on the east side, or is it also on
3 the --

4 MR. CRITTENDEN: There is a structure here and
5 a structure here. They'll be enclosed structures using
6 the same, similar materials to the main structure, a
7 combination of split and smooth CMU blocks and some
8 stucco, similar colors, so that they match and are
9 consistent with the rest of the site.

10 CHAIRMAN CAREY: Now, was that reflected in the
11 elevations of --

12 MR. CRITTENDEN: They did not submit elevations
13 for those specific buildings. They just did for the
14 main structure.

15 CHAIRMAN CAREY: Okay.

16 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Commissioner Carey.

17 CHAIRMAN CAREY: Okay.

18 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Where are -- okay.
19 We can see where their -- the entrance is. Where is the
20 exit?

21 MR. CRITTENDEN: The exit will be only onto
22 Wedekind Road. There's only a right-in from McCarran,
23 and then they would have to exit onto Wedekind Road and
24 come out to McCarran or go back up the back side.
25 Although I'm assuming that the traffic study would show

1 the predominance of those cars going to McCarran.

2 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Okay. Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN CAREY: And so by being enclosed
4 with -- getting back to the --

5 MR. CRITTENDEN: M-hm (affirmative).

6 CHAIRMAN CAREY: -- vacuum, so it's going to be
7 enclosed on the north, west and south?

8 MR. CRITTENDEN: They're actually enclosed on
9 all four sides. They just have big double doors so they
10 can get in and do whatever maintenance they need to do
11 to those.

12 CHAIRMAN CAREY: Ah.

13 MR. CRITTENDEN: So they have big swing open
14 doors so they can get in and do maintenance to those as
15 needed. Obviously, they got to empty them out and all
16 those kind of things.

17 CHAIRMAN CAREY: That's interesting.

18 MR. CRITTENDEN: Yeah.

19 CHAIRMAN CAREY: Would it be possible to get
20 some elevations of that or a picture of it that, an
21 example?

22 MR. CRITTENDEN: I could talk to the applicant
23 and see, see what their --

24 CHAIRMAN CAREY: I really haven't sign anything
25 like that, I think.

1 MR. CRITTENDEN: Yeah. I mean it would be
2 similar to a track enclosure, except with a roof.

3 CHAIRMAN CAREY: Yeah.

4 MR. CRITTENDEN: You know, but it's their
5 structures, their buildings that they would put on the
6 site, and they'd be enclosed for that specific purpose.
7 But I will talk to the applicant about your concerns and
8 see if they can supply to us elevations for those two
9 buildings.

10 CHAIRMAN CAREY: And then is there a wall on
11 the east property line there, or is just going to be
12 landscaping and whatever? Because, I think, there's
13 like an existing chain-link fence there.

14 MR. CRITTENDEN: There's an existing chain-link
15 and landscaping. They have not proposed any new fencing
16 or a wall or anything like that.

17 CHAIRMAN CAREY: Okay. What is the distance
18 from the vacuums to that existing office uses?

19 MR. CRITTENDEN: I don't know that number off
20 the top of my head, but I could find that out.

21 CHAIRMAN CAREY: I'd be curious to kind of take
22 a look at that. And if we have any noise levels, you
23 know, projected noise levels with what the enclosure
24 would it be without it, I think, that's a key thing, to
25 my review, looking at compatibility and that, in that

1 finding.

2 Any other questions from the Commission on this
3 item?

4 Okay.

5 COMMISSIONER BLACO: I have a question
6 actually.

7 CHAIRMAN CAREY: Commissioner Blaco, sure.

8 COMMISSIONER BLACO: Would it even be possible
9 to restrict pedestrian access crossing McCarran? Is
10 that even like within our realm of possibility to get
11 rid of that crosswalk, or does it just have to be there?
12 Because this is, I just feel like that's just adding
13 another layer of complexity and another --

14 MR. CRITTENDEN: So those existing crosswalks
15 there.

16 COMMISSIONER BLACO: M-hm (affirmative).

17 MR. CRITTENDEN: And you'd want them to remove
18 one. We wouldn't remove that crosswalk.

19 COMMISSIONER BLACO: Yeah, I know. I was just
20 wondering if that was a possibility, if at some time in
21 the future it proved to become problematic and we would
22 be able to revisit this somehow, or?

23 MR. CRITTENDEN: We wouldn't revisit this
24 through this. It's not even our road.

25 COMMISSIONER BLACO: Oh, okay.

1 MR. CRITTENDEN: It's NDOT's road. I mean, I
2 guess, they could do as they saw fit. But, typically,
3 we wouldn't remove pedestrian infrastructure.

4 COMMISSIONER BLACO: Okay.

5 MR. ERICSON: I'd like to add a comment. Jon
6 Ericson, City Engineer.

7 The safety improvement that the applicant is
8 proposing is the control of access so that it just
9 reduces the conflicts at the intersection.

10 COMMISSIONER BLACO: Yeah.

11 MR. ERICSON: With regards to the removal of
12 the crosswalk, that would have to be an NDOT safety
13 project.

14 COMMISSIONER BLACO: M-hm (affirmative).

15 MR. ERICSON: And so staff could look into that
16 with NDOT.

17 COMMISSIONER BLACO: How high are those
18 miggins, the proposed miggins that will be used?

19 MR. ERICSON: Oh, they're typically six, eight
20 inches tall.

21 COMMISSIONER BLACO: Okay. They're not,
22 they're not going impede the view.

23 MR. ERICSON: And it's -- they refer to it as a
24 worm island because it's just, it's just two pieces of
25 curb back-to-back.

1 COMMISSIONER BLACO: Okay. Thank you.

2 MR. ERICSON: Yeah.

3 CHAIRMAN CAREY: Thanks for that, Jon.

4 Okay. Any other questions from the Commission
5 on this one?

6 Okay. Hearing none. Thank you, Ian.

7 We'll move on to our agenda here. I have
8 informational items.

9 MR. ORNELAS: I've got three, and then Marilie
10 has a couple of things. Armando Ornelas, Assistant
11 Community Services Director.

12 First of all, I think, those of you who served
13 on the original Planning Commission are aware that the
14 Executive Director, Kim Robinson, is resigning effective
15 October 2nd. So I thought maybe that would be of
16 interest to the rest of the Commission.

17 Secondly, there will be no second Planning
18 Commission meeting this month. So there will be no
19 meeting on August 15th.

20 I wanted to let you know that we are still
21 working on the scheduling of the joint City
22 Council/Planning Commission workshop on fiscal impact
23 analysis work that the City contracted for. We may do
24 that as early as August 26, or it may slip to the second
25 meeting in September. We'll apprise you of the date as

1 soon as it gets scheduled.

2 CHAIRMAN CAREY: Okay. Thank you for that.

3 MR. ORNELAS: And, I think, Marilie, you had a
4 couple items.

5 MS. SMITH: Yeah. So, first of all, I just
6 wanted to kind of update you guys on the Commissioner
7 Mary Brock's replacement. I have not received a
8 recommendation from the Mayor yet. So I will put a
9 feeler out for that. But at this point, the earliest
10 that could get on the City Council meeting agenda would
11 be for the 26th, because today is the deadline for the
12 12th.

13 And then the other thing I kind of just want
14 you guys to be thinking about is, with Mary's
15 resignation, we will need to fill an alternate spot for
16 regional. And Commissioner Petersen has also resigned
17 from regional, so we have a regular spot as well. So
18 that's something we're going to need to think about.
19 And I will put that on the September Planning Commission
20 agenda.

21 CHAIRMAN CAREY: Okay. Thank you for that.

22 Any questions from the Commission on those
23 staff items?

24 A lot of work coming up for us.

25 MS. SMITH: Right. And I mean --

1 CHAIRMAN CAREY: Appreciate that.

2 MS. SMITH: We might want to wait until we get
3 Mary's replacement seated and going, before you guys
4 pick new regionals. I'll leave that up to you.

5 MR. ORNELAS: Well, the one thing I would say
6 with regard to the replacement of Commissioner Petersen
7 on the Regional Planning Commission, they are looking to
8 move into the hearing process for the Regional Plan
9 update. So, I think, we would need those seats in
10 place.

11 CHAIRMAN CAREY: Okay. Would the September
12 meeting be appropriate?

13 MR. ORNELAS: Yeah, I think, we would.

14 CHAIRMAN CAREY: Okay. Yeah, it seems like
15 that would be, we would definitely want to fill that.
16 Whoever gets that seat will be jumping kind of right
17 into it. And that's good. I'm glad that everything's
18 moving, moving forward. We'll tackle those items moving
19 forward.

20 Okay. The next item on the agenda is public
21 comment. Is there any public comment to the Planning
22 Commission, or Study Session?

23 I see none, and I'll close the public comment
24 period. We'll bring it back for a City Council update.

25 MR. ORNELAS: So there is no update on the City

1 Council. As you may recall, you met two weeks ago as
2 the Capital Improvements Advisory Committee and that we
3 updated you on the first meeting in July. The City
4 Council did not conduct a second meeting in July. And
5 so there are no updates.

6 CHAIRMAN CAREY: Okay. Pretty quick, pretty
7 easy update.

8 All right. Move on to comments from the
9 Commission. Is there any Commissioners who have any,
10 any comments?

11 Commissioner VanderWell.

12 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: I don't know if this
13 is something for maybe educational service purposes for
14 the Planning Commission. I was at a meeting yesterday
15 afternoon at TMWA, because they're proposing new rate
16 updates and stuff like that. And the reason I was
17 invited is because the fees for multi-family is going up
18 exponentially. And so parts of the development
19 community and things like that are concerned because of
20 affordable housing and things like that. So.

21 And what it has to do with is the highest cost
22 is on irrigation. So I don't know if that's something
23 that you could possibly, you know, at least get a
24 presentation, so that we understand. Because I realize
25 we just had the presentation on the sewer, you know, the

1 sewer being updated and the fees going up. So I don't
2 know if this is something for informational purposes as
3 well.

4 MR. ORNELAS: Give staff an opportunity to look
5 into it.

6 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Oh, yeah.

7 MR. ORNELAS: And if we are able to, we will
8 reach out to TMWA and maybe see what we could do.

9 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: Okay. I brought in
10 here with me a copy of what I had yesterday.

11 MR. ORNELAS: All right. Yeah, if you want to
12 share that, we could certainly distribute that. Yeah.

13 COMMISSIONER VANDERWELL: I'd be happy to.

14 CHAIRMAN CAREY: Yeah, that would be great.
15 Thanks, Commissioner VanderWell, for that. I think,
16 that's something to keep track. Because I know, when we
17 did the last sewer update, there was substantial
18 increase in fees for multi-family, looked at that. So
19 if you would give that info to the Planning Commission,
20 that would be great. Thank you.

21 Any other questions, or comments from the
22 Commission?

23 I had one quick one. And thanks, Marilie, for
24 putting this out.

25 Parks and Rec Department, they are embarking on

1 a public outreach process for the arts and culture
2 overlay for downtown. It's called Together We Are
3 Sparks. Essentially, you know, this Commission has
4 oversight over the Comprehensive Plan. And one of the
5 big goals in the Comprehensive Plan is arts and culture,
6 and there's some policies and goals with respect to
7 that. So I thought it would be -- bring it up to the
8 Commission, put on the radar.

9 They're seeking input from the public. There's
10 a survey you can take online. TogetherSparks.com, I
11 think, is the URL.

12 But, also, there's an opportunity at upcoming
13 special events. There's two actual art pieces that the
14 department commissioned. One's a big, giant bicycle
15 where you can rent your ideas for arts and culture. And
16 they're kind of looking for specific input on a new
17 thing. The other one's a big, giant easel.

18 So it's kind of a unique way of getting out
19 outreach. So keep an eye out for that. For Hot August
20 Nights, I think, it will be out there, Rib Cook Off, and
21 then the 3rd Thursday events.

22 But I figured, if you could take a look at the
23 information, help spread the word, get some more input
24 for Parks and Rec, I think, it would be a good thing.
25 Arts and culture is a good thing for our downtown.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

So thank you very much for that.

Any other comments from the Commission?

Okay. Seeing none, we'll call this one
adjourned at 12:33 p.m.

Thanks, everyone.

-oOo-