



# MINUTES

## Joint Meeting

### Reno City Planning Commission and Washoe County Planning Commission



**Thursday, April 26, 2018 • 6:00 PM**

**Reno City Council Chamber, One East First Street, Reno, NV 89501**

<b>Reno City Planning Commissioners</b>	
Peter Gower, Chair 326-8860	
Mark Johnson, Vice Chair	Paul Olivas
Britton Griffith	John Marshall
Ed Hawkins	Kevin Weiske
<b>Washoe County Planning Commissioners</b>	
Sarah Chvilicek, Chair	
Larry Chesney, Vice Chair	Francine Donshick
James Barnes	Philip Horan
Thomas B. Bruce	Michael W. Lawson

### Agenda Items

**1 Pledge of Allegiance**

Commissioner Marshall led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**2 Roll Call**

Attendee Name	Title	Status	Arrived
Peter Gower	Chairman	Present	
Mark Johnson	Vice Chairman	Present	
Britton Griffith	Commissioner	Present	
Ed Hawkins	Commissioner	Present	
Paul Olivas	Commissioner	Present	
John Marshall	Commissioner	Present	
Kevin Weiske	Commissioner	Present	
Sarah Chvilicek	Chairman	Present	
Larry Chesney	Vice Chairman	Present	
James Barnes	Commissioner	Present	
Thomas B. Bruce	Commissioner	Present	
Francine Donshick	Commissioner	Present	
Philip Horan	Commissioner	Present	
Michael W. Lawson	Commissioner	Present	

*The meeting was called to order at 6:00 PM.*

### 3 Public Comment

Michael Welling discussed infrastructure concerns.

Denise Ross spoke on behalf of Tammy Holt-Still and discussed concerns regarding development and wastewater capacity.

Carlos Archuleta discussed his opposition to development in the North Valleys without the needed infrastructure improvements.

Russ Earle discussed sewer effluent and fire concerns. Growth needs to be responsible and well planned.

Tracy Hall discussed her flooded property in Lemmon Valley.

Danny Cleous discussed concerns regarding the flood issues in the North Valleys.

Frank Benedickt discussed the need for the road from Sun Valley to 395 to be widened before more building is done out there.

Sharalyn Barney discussed flooding in Lemmon Valley and water quality concerns.

### 4 Public Hearings

- 4.1 **Resolution No. :** Staff Report (For Possible Action – Recommendation to Washoe County Commission and Reno City Council): Washoe County Resolution No. \_\_\_\_\_ and City of Reno Resolution No. 09-17 Case No. LDC18-00026 (United Federal Credit Union MPA) – A request has been made by Andrew Young of The Redmond Company for a Master Plan amendment within the Special Planning Area/Reno Stead Corridor Joint Plan to re-designate ±2.57 acres of Low Density Suburban/Rural Residential (1 – 2.5 acre lots) and ±1.02 acres of Open Space to ±2.73 acres of General Commercial and ±0.86 acres of Open Space. The Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan is a master plan under the joint jurisdiction of the City of Reno and Washoe County and requires approval by both entities for any changes. The ±3.6 acre site (APN 086-380-20 & -21) is located on the west side of Lemmon Drive, ±403 feet north of its intersection with Sky Vista Parkway and has City of Reno zoning designations of Arterial Commercial (AC), Large Lot Residential – 1 acre (LLR1), and Large Lot Residential – 2.5 acres (LLR2.5). This request to amend the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan requires joint hearings before the City of Reno and Washoe County. jdb [Ward 4] 6:26 PM

Stacie Huggins, Wood Rodgers, gave an overview of the project. (PowerPoint

presentation is attached.)

Jeff Borchardt, Associate Planner, presented the staff report. Staff is recommending approval.

Chair Gower and Commissioner Marshall had no disclosures. The remaining City of Reno Commissioners present disclosed that they visited the site and/or spoke with applicant's representative.

Commissioner Bruce disclosed that he drove by the site. The remaining Washoe County Commissioners present had no disclosures.

At this time Chair Gower opened public comment for this item.

Danny Cleous spoke in opposition stating that this should not be zoned commercial because of the hill on the property.

Rob Sheets spoke in opposition discussing traffic concerns.

Hearing and seeing no further public comment requests, Chair Gower closed public comment.

Mr. Borchardt explained for Commissioner Hawkins that a portion of the site is currently zoned Arterial Commercial (AC) and that does not match with the current underlying Master Plan land use designation on the property. By changing the Master Plan land use designation to General Commercial (GC) the zoning and Master Plan designations would be consistent with each other. Also, getting an Open Space (OS) designation that matches the contours on the property will protect the 30% slopes.

Mr. Borchardt explained for Commissioner Lawson that realigning better conforms to the contours and protects the portion of the slopes that are 30% or greater.

Mr. Borchardt explained for Commissioner Olivas that the Master Plan land use designation will match the boundaries of the existing zoning designations on the site and would make the process for the zoning map amendment (ZMA) cleaner and more streamlined.

Mr. Borchardt confirmed for Commissioner Marshall that this is an intensification of the existing land use designation. The existing land use designation has a low density suburban/rural residential designation, but the existing zoning on the

property is AC so if somebody wanted to build something there they would already be able to under the existing zoning. There is also a portion on the back side of the site that is zoned large lot residential. The change in the Master Plan land use to Open Space in this area would support a future zone change to Open Space.

Mr. Borchardt pointed out for Commissioner Donshick the existing slopes that would be protected and where they would have to grade in order to accommodate some sort of commercial development. He also explained that the water flow from the property would need to be analyzed as part of the special use permit (SUP) process and that is not what is under consideration today with the Master Plan Amendment (MPA).

Mr. Borchardt explained for Commissioner Chvilicek that when Walgreens came in it met all the AC standards. He confirmed that there is an inconsistency between the AC zoning and GC Master Plan land use designations.

Shawnee Dunagan, Associate Civil Engineer, responded to Commissioner Chvilicek's questions regarding traffic concerns expressed by members of the public. Currently there is a double yellow line and no left turns are supposed to occur. We would require a traffic study when a project comes forward to analyze what could be done.

Mr. Borchardt confirmed for Commissioner Weiske that this is an MPA and there is no project associated with it. There is an SUP that has been submitted that will come back before the Reno Planning Commission at a later date. Because this is an amendment to the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan it requires approval from both the Reno Planning Commission and the Washoe County Commission, however once the project comes through it would just require the City of Reno Planning Commission approval.

Mr. Borchardt explained for Commissioner Marshall that the property to the south was able to develop commercially because almost the entire property falls within the AC zoning designation. The subject site contains a small portion of Large Lot Residential (LLR) zoning that is not consistent with surrounding land use designations or current uses and is virtually undevelopable. The applicant came in with a zoning map amendment request to change the LLR1 portion to AC and to change the LLR2.5 to Open Space. Once staff looked into the existing land use designations under the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan we realized those would be inconsistent. So the applicant had to come back and do an amendment to the Joint Plan in order for them to process the zoning map amendment (ZMA).

Commissioner Marshall stated that really the key thing here is changing the land use to support getting rid of the LLR1 to facilitate a commercial project.

Mr. Borchardt confirmed that is correct.

Mr. Borchardt clarified for Commissioner Horan that this MPA is not necessarily for a specific project. They could go away and someone else could come onto this site. It is better to use the site with AC to be consistent with the adjacent C sites and to preserve the hill slope with OS. They are going through this with the intention of building a bank, but if the bank goes away this site could still be going forward with some sort of SUP.

Commissioner Horan stated that we wouldn't be here if there wasn't this project that was ready to go.

Commissioner Lawson asked what the difference in traffic generation would be between two homes on the site versus a bank.

Ms. Dunagan explained that is not part of this process and that will be analyzed with the SUP process.

Commissioner Lawson stated that it is problematic that we seek zone changes in advance of SUPs and in advance of an applicant doing a study. The result continues to be building opportunity for increased traffic congestion and flooding potential, and incremental deterioration of existing communities without accurate information. I have seen enough of it. My personal views are that we need better information available before we engage in decisions that potentially affect the community in a negative manner.

Commissioner Marshall stated that tonight we have two items on our agenda that are both for zone intensification in the North Valleys. Next week we will hear an item we asked for relating to sewer capacity and potential in the North Valleys. I am disturbed that we are having to make these decisions for intensifications prior to having that requested presentation. I would rather have the presentation on the North Valleys first before having to make decisions on these items.

Commissioner Olivas stated that he does not see a house going in the LLR area on the hill. It is probably a good place for a project like this. My concerns are regarding tradeoffs that have previously been made. There was mention of the road being a reason for the need for this change but whoever owned the land previously made the decision to put the road in so I don't buy that as a rationale to change the zoning. This is not high quality OS but I can't make the finding to

convert it to something more commercial.

Commissioner Horan expressed concern about making MPAs for project specific things.

Commissioner Donshick mentioned traffic concerns.

Commissioner Chesney stated that MPAs are killing the purpose of a master plan and he cannot support this.

Commissioner Chvilicek stated the area that causes the most trouble is that the Walgreen property is not zoned Commercial. We have a responsibility to protect Open Space. Moving forward with a problematic designation where a commercial property already exists but has not been changed to commercial is very troubling.

Mr. Borchardt clarified that the Walgreens property and the subject site are zoned commercial. Also, the Walgreens property is not part of this request. We are requesting a change to the Master Plan so the zoning on the subject site will be consistent.

Commissioner Marshall disagreed and stated that we are not here because the zoning is inconsistent, we are here to change zoning to facilitate a project.

Mr. Borchardt clarified we are changing the Master Plan.

Commissioner Marshall continued stating that the request is to change the Master Plan to facilitate a project that allows additional commercial development within the area that wouldn't otherwise occur without the amendment.

Mr. Borchardt demonstrated on a map what area would be changed. LLR2.5 will be changed to OS. In order for a zone change to occur you must have a consistent MPA.

***It was moved by Commissioner Lawson, seconded by Commissioner Bruce, in the case of LDC18-00026 (United Federal Credit Union MPA), to deny the Master Plan amendment.***

Nate Edwards, Legal Counsel for Washoe County, asked that there be some discussion or statement of findings before there is a vote on the motion.

Commissioner Lawson cited the findings that could not be made. I do not find

that this MPA is in the general interest and health of the general public. I do not find it is consistent with the concept of retention of OS. For those reasons I made the motion to deny. The MPA is inconsistent with the desired pattern of growth.

*The motion to deny carried unanimously with seven (7) commissioners present.*

*It was moved by Commissioner Weiske, seconded by Commissioner Griffith, in the case of LDC18-00026 (United Federal Credit Union MPA), based upon compliance with the applicable considerations, to adopt the proposed amendment to the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan by resolution and recommend that the City Council do the same, subject to conformance review by the Regional Planning Agency.*

Commissioner Marshall stated that he will be voting against the motion primarily based on the reduction of OS. I find it to be inconsistent with the direction of our new general plan in terms of being able to provide intensified uses consistent with available resources and services.

*The motion carried with five (5) in favor and two (2) oppositions by Commissioners Marshall and Olivas.*

Karl Hall, City Attorney, explained for Chair Gower that the approval and denial are recommendations so the appeal process does not have to be read into the record. They are recommendations that will be sent to Reno City Council and Washoe County Commission for final decision.

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>APPROVED [5 TO 2]</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Kevin Weiske, Commissioner
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Britton Griffith, Commissioner
<b>AYES:</b>	Gower, Johnson, Griffith, Hawkins, Weiske
<b>NAYS:</b>	Paul Olivas, John Marshall

- 4.2 **Resolution No. :** Staff Report (For Possible Action – Recommendation to Washoe County Commission and Reno City Council): Washoe County Resolution No. \_\_\_\_\_ and City of Reno Resolution No. 02-17 Case No. LDC17-00043 (Echeverria Peavine Property) – A request has been made by Peavine Investors, LLC to amend the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan (RSCJP). The RSCJP is a master plan that is under the joint jurisdiction of Washoe County and the City of Reno and requires approval by both entities for any changes. If approved, the proposed amendment would remove ±559.3 acres from the RSCJP area and re-designate it with only a City of Reno Master Plan Land Use designation. The applicant is also requesting an amendment to the City of Reno Master Plan Land Use

Designation from Special Planning Area/Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan/High Density Rural (5 to 2.5 acre minimum lot size) on ±143.0 acres (between 29 and 57 dwelling units) and Special Planning Area/Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan/General Rural (1 dwelling unit per 40 acres) on ±416.3 acres (maximum 10 dwelling units) to City of Reno Single Family Neighborhood (SF) (2 to 8 dwelling units per acre) on ±373.3 acres (between 747 and 3,004 dwelling units), Suburban Mixed Use (SMU) on ±145.5 acres, and Parks Greenways and Open Space (PGOS) on ±40.5 acres. The ±559.3 acre site (APNs 081-031-39 and 081-024-08) is located ±1,700 feet south of the US 395 and Red Rock Road interchange and has City of Reno and Washoe County zoning designations of Large Lot Residential-2.5 Acres (LLR2.5) and General Rural (GR), respectively. This request to amend the RSCJP requires joint hearings before the City of Reno and Washoe County and will result in a Truckee Meadows Regional Plan Amendment if adopted. hrm [Ward 4] 7:07 PM

Andy Durling, Wood Rodgers, gave an overview of the project. (PowerPoint presentation attached.)

Heather Manzo, Assistant Planner, presented the staff report. Staff received two calls from people with general questions regarding property taxes. Concerns were raised by the Neighborhood Advisory Board (NAB) from citizen input that had to do with compatibility, wildlife management, mitigation of the impacts for wildlife, supporting infrastructure and services, and industrial adjacent to residential uses. When the application initially came forward there was about 78 acres proposed to be industrial. Because there is residential surrounding the site we did have some concerns with locating industrial directly adjacent to those residences. Through work with the applicant and staff you have a revised plan before you this evening that does not include any industrial property. All of the concerns raised are really project specific concerns and before you this evening is a Master Plan Amendment (MPA) to remove this 560 acre site from the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan and to re-designate that land to City of Reno Reimagine Reno Master Plan designations of Suburban Mixed Use (SMU) on the northern portion and Single-Family Neighborhood on the southern portion. We do not have a development proposed at this time. All of the concerns that have been raised will be addressed during the zoning map amendment (ZMA) and development proposal stage should this MPA be approved. Staff would address all services and impact of development issues at the time it is proposed. Larger lots, if approved, would be promoted and desirable along the edges where existing county properties currently exist and are developed. Staff is recommending approval.

Commissioner Marshall had no disclosures. The remaining City of Reno Commissioners present disclosed that they visited the site, received emails and spoke with applicant's representative.

Commissioner Bruce disclosed that he visited the site area. Commissioner Donshick disclosed that she is acquainted with the Echeverria family. Commissioner Lawson disclosed that he visited the site and was approached by the applicant to meet but he declined per advice from Legal Counsel. The remaining Washoe County Commissioners present had no disclosures.

Nate Edwards, Legal Counsel for Washoe County, questioned Commissioner Donshick's relationship with the Echeverria family.

Commissioner Donshick explained that she is acquainted with the Echeverria family as she is the current president of the Golden Valley Property Owners Association and has worked with them regarding the Golden Valley pit reviews. She responded to Mr. Edwards' questions stating that her acquaintance does not lead her to be unable to be impartial during these proceedings and she has not made any commitments to the Echeverria family as to the outcome.

At this time Chair Gower opened public comment for this item.

Donnelle O'Neill spoke in opposition of the proposed amendment.

Jean Harris spoke in support of removing the acreage from the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan.

Danny Cleous spoke in opposition of the proposed amendment.

Sjana Wagner spoke in opposition of the proposed re-zoning.

Russ Earle spoke in opposition of the proposed amendment.

Tammy Holt-Still spoke in opposition of the proposed amendment.

Sue Carpenter spoke in opposition of the proposed amendment.

Danielle Olivieri spoke in opposition of the proposed amendment.

Nicky Simpson spoke in opposition of the proposed amendment.

Scott Burner expressed concerns regarding development in the North Valleys.

Michael Welling spoke in opposition of the proposed amendment.

Christopher Wagner submitted a comment card in opposition but did not wish to speak.

Mike Coli spoke in opposition of the proposed amendment.

Hearing and seeing no further public comment requests, Chair Gower closed public comment.

*(Commissioner Johnson absent at 7:58 p.m. and returned at 7:58 p.m.)*

Mr. Durling clarified for Commissioner Hawkins that his comments regarding the sewer plant location were referring to the fact that the nearest connection point is in Red Rock Road near Moya. He also confirmed that this would not leave any islands involved. The annexation of this property happened almost ten years ago. This is step one in a multi-step process for the future development of this property. He stated that there is no project at this point, this is just the master planning process. Because of the Joint Plan we have to start here.

Commissioner Griffith requested an explanation as to why staff feels this proposal is a better match with ReImagine Reno.

Ms. Manzo explained that when evaluating the new Master Plan there were a lot of goals, policies and guiding principles that were outlined in the staff report. In addition, the site is within a cooperative planning area so one of the goals of the Joint Plan was to offer up that coordinated effort and to mitigate and address concerns of that urban interface with Washoe County properties. So with cooperative planning those policies that are adopted as part of the City of Reno Code do require that lot matching and open space buffers are provided. With the combination of the policies identified in the staff report, as well as it being a cooperative planning area, staff did feel that the concerns related to compatibility for a future project could be met with the proposed Master Plan designation.

Ms. Manzo explained for Commissioner Griffith that the fire department did provide comments on this and the closest fire station is in Stead with a response time of 10-13 minutes. We do anticipate that those items would need to be addressed before any development could be approved in this location.

Commissioner Weiske asked why we want the County removed from this planning effort if cooperative planning is a good thing.

Ms. Manzo explained that the difficulties arise when trying to apply the Joint Plan policies to the City of Reno zoning. The application of the translation between the Joint Plan and the City of Reno zoning can be difficult. In addition, a lot of the ReImagine Reno guiding principles, goals and policies did work to encompass and incorporate a lot of the policies that are contained in the Joint Plan.

Mr. Durling further explained that they cannot apply the new ReImagine Reno land use designations to this property because they are hamstrung by the current Joint Plan. The Joint Plan does not support those land use designations. The applicant wants out of the Joint Plan in order to be able to actively plan this property in the context of ReImagine Reno.

Claudia Hanson, Planning Manager, stated that with the StoneGate Project a fire department is required so another fire station would not be needed for this area.

Commissioner Chvilicek asked if there is a way to amend the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan to have the two entities involved in development of the property taking into consideration the surrounding area plans. She also stated that it is offensive that the applicant's representative says that she as the Chair of the Washoe County Planning Commission is not able to adapt or understand City of Reno Planning.

Mr. Durling clarified that was not his intent. Our stance is that the designations that are now incorporated in ReImagine Reno do not translate into the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan. There are not compatible land use designations that can serve the housing studies and other elements of the ReImagine Reno plan that we are trying to accomplish. The SMU designation is very flexible and allows for a number of uses that are not supported in other designations. This is an appropriate planning process. This is getting us to a next step forward so we can engage in a meaningful conversation about what the future development of this property can be.

Commissioner Chvilicek expressed concern that if this is approved this evening, Washoe County no longer has a voice in this process.

Mr. Durling explained that Washoe County's voice is included in the Master Plan process. Because this project is subject to cooperative planning, that process includes both County staff as well as a requirement for us to go to the Citizen Advisory Board (CAB). Because it will be a project of regional significance it will be elevated to the Regional Planning Commission where there are three Washoe County seats.

Commissioner Chvilicek explained for Commission Horan that she confirmed with Washoe County planning staff and legal counsel that their decision tonight is either to remove or maintain this property in the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan.

Ms. Manzo explained for Commissioner Marshall that they do not have information regarding the number of County versus City of Reno residents in the broader North Valleys. She also explained that there are opportunities in the site to provide for jobs/housing balance.

Commissioner Donshick expressed concerns regarding safety and health issues related to police and fire response times. She also stated that she is at a loss and does not have all the facts regarding the references being made to the ReImagine Reno plan.

Ms. Manzo reminded the commission that the Washoe County Planning Commission at this time is looking only at whether or not this site should be removed from the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan. She also stated that staff did provide a link to the ReImagine Reno document for those who do not have a paper copy.

Sienna Reid, Senior Planner, provided background on conversations that took place regarding the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan as part of the Master Plan update process. She explained for Commissioner Marshall that general discussions were had with residents and the development community. There have also been some general staff level discussions about the joint planning area being potentially removed. Removing the joint planning area is something that can only be done through the Regional Plan Amendment process and that is something that the planning staff of Reno and Washoe County would like to explore. We have heard feedback from the development community that they would like to explore that as well.

Ms. Reid explained for Commissioner Marshall the analysis of proposed land use designations included in the staff report.

Commissioner Bruce stated that he does not find that the proposed amendment is consistent with the policies and action programs of the Master Plan and is not compatible with the existing or planned adjacent land uses. He believes it will adversely impact the public health, safety or welfare. He questions the availability of facilities findings in terms of effluent, fire and police safety.

Ms. Manzo explained for Commissioner Johnson that the SMU does have a

different character than the land uses that are available in the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan. There is a variety of non-residential zones that would be allowed under the SMU category. There isn't however a minimum density requirement for that zone so while MF30 is identified as appropriate there is no minimum density required in SMU.

Mr. Durling explained for Commissioner Johnson that SMU allows them the flexibility to address other things in ReImagine Reno and provide a full spectrum of housing so we can address what the housing study identified as missing housing products.

Commissioner Johnson asked if there is a process to keep the County involvement and to amend the existing Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan to allow for the type of use that the applicant is looking for.

Mr. Durling stated part of the difficulty with the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan is the difficult and arduous process involved.

Commissioner Johnson stated that based on feedback we are getting from the audience, the process should be arduous because there are a number of questions that need to be asked.

Commissioner Hawkins stated that because existing Washoe County residents play such an integral part of this proposed amendment we need to stay in the Joint Plan together.

Commissioner Chesney stated that there is enough approved but not yet built housing to accommodate growth for the next 20 years. And yet we constantly see developers trying to get huge developments approved before the updated Regional Plan is approved. For that reason I am uncomfortable with the County relinquishing any influence they can have on this corridor and cannot support the requested amendment.

Commissioner Horan stated there are unintended consequences to Washoe County residences if we don't remain a part of this. He wants to continue to be a part of this process.

Commissioner Donshick expressed concern regarding traffic issues and other impacts and she cannot support this request.

Commissioner Lawson expressed concerns regarding traffic, property tax structure, and water issues. He is opposed to losing a voice in this process.

Commissioner Marshall stated that he finds that the proposal is inconsistent with the Regional Plan. We should be engaging consistently with our partners. If that means a difficult process of amending the zoning to achieve our goals, we should take that route rather than seek to avoid cooperating and directly participating with our joint partners. The second issues before the Reno Planning Commission regarding whether or not Master Plan designation should change, it is intensifying zoning with a product that is not needed at this time and there are not adequate services available. He cannot make the necessary findings to approve the withdrawal of the area from the Joint Plan or to change the Master Plan at this time in the manner that is being proposed.

Commissioner Weiske agreed that the County should not step back. He disagrees with what the proposed changes in the Master Plan are for future higher density growth patterns and is prepared to deny both requests.

Commissioner Chvilicek discussed opportunity to further amend the Joint Plan to include compatible uses with the Master Plan.

Commissioner Johnson discussed the need to have staff do everything they can to make the timeline for this process as efficient as possible in a joint planning situation.

***It was moved by Commissioner Hawkins, seconded by Commissioner Weiske, in the case of LDC17-00043 (Echeverria Peavine Property), to deny the request to amend the Reno-Stead Corridor Joint Plan and to remain under joint jurisdiction. The motion to deny carried with six (6) in favor and one (1) opposition by Commissioner Olivas.***

Karl Hall, Reno Legal Counsel, stated that he will prepare a resolution and outline the reasons discussed for not removing the property from the Joint Plan.

***It was moved by Commissioner Chesney, seconded by Commissioner Lawson, in the case of LDC17-00043 (Echeverria Peavine Property), to deny removal of the property from the joint planning area.***

Mr. Edwards asked that the maker of the motion state the findings that cannot be made.

Commissioner Chesney stated that he does not find that it is appropriate to meet the compatible land uses, there are not available facilities to handle the change, and it does not meet the desired pattern of growth.

*The motion to deny carried unanimously with seven (7) commissioners present.*

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>DENIED [6 TO 1]</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Ed Hawkins, Commissioner
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Kevin Weiske, Commissioner
<b>AYES:</b>	Gower, Johnson, Griffith, Hawkins, Marshall, Weiske
<b>NAYS:</b>	Paul Olivas

## **5 Public Comment**

Danny Cleous expressed desire that both commissions be involved with more of the development in North Valleys and thanked the commissioners for their decision.

Denise Ross thanked the commissioners for their decision and hoped they will continue to remember the people in the flood zone in future decisions.

Carlos Archuleta thanked the commissioners for their decision and hoped they have the same considerations when it comes to Golden Valley.

Bette Schmidt thanked the commissioners for their decision.

Nancy Horvath thanked the commissioners for their cooperation and willingness to listen to residents.

## **6 Adjournment (For Possible Action)**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:02 p.m.