



# Storey County Planning Commission

## Meeting Agenda

Thursday, November 3, 2016 6:00 p.m.  
Storey County Courthouse, District Courtroom  
26 South "B" Street, Virginia City, Nevada

*Larry Prater – Chairman*

*Virgil Bucchianeri – Planning Commissioner*

*Pamela Smith – Planning Commissioner*

*John Herrington – Planning Commissioner*

*Jim Hindle – Vice-Chairman*

*Kris Thompson – Planning Commissioner*

*Laura Kekule – Planning Commissioner*

---

All items include discussion and possible action to approve, modify, deny, or continue unless marked otherwise.

1. **Call to Order at 6:00 p.m.**
2. **Roll Call**
3. **Pledge of Allegiance**
4. **Discussion/Possible Action:** Approval of Agenda for November 3, 2016
5. **Discussion/Possible Action:** Approval of Minutes for September 1, 2016.
6. **Discussion/Possible Action:** Amendments to the Planning Department Development Application including, but not limited to, required submittals to land use applications.
7. **Discussion Only/No Possible Action:** Public workshop to discuss possible updates to Title 17 Storey County Zoning Ordinance and/or other Storey County Codes, as applicable, establishing design standards for certain residential and multi-family residential land uses in Storey County. Public participation is encouraged. Preliminary concept drafts and other correspondence may be obtained from the Planning Department website at [www.storeycounty.org/521/Updates](http://www.storeycounty.org/521/Updates), at 775.847.1144, or from [planning@storeycounty.org](mailto:planning@storeycounty.org).
8. **Discussion Only/No Possible Action:** Public workshop to discuss possible updates to Title 16 Subdivisions, Title 17 Zoning, and/or other Storey County Codes, as applicable, pertaining to applications, procedures, public hearings, and actions for land subdivisions, tentative and final maps, fees, and other such related matters. Public participation is encouraged. Preliminary concept drafts and other correspondence may be obtained from the Planning Department website at [www.storeycounty.org/521/Updates](http://www.storeycounty.org/521/Updates), at 775.847.1144, or from [planning@storeycounty.org](mailto:planning@storeycounty.org).
9. **Discussion/Possible Action:** Determination of next Planning Commission meeting.
10. **Discussion/Possible Action:** Approval of Claims.
11. **Correspondence** (no action)
12. **Public Comment** (no action)
13. **Staff** (no action)
14. **Board Comments** (no action)
15. **Adjournment**

**Notes:**

Note: Additional information pertaining to any item on this agenda may be requested from the Planning Department (775-847-1144).

- Note: There may be a quorum of Storey County Commissioners in attendance, but no action or discussion will be taken by the Commissioners.
- Note: Public comment will be allowed after each item on the agenda (this comment should be limited to the item on the agenda). Public comment will also be allowed at the end of each meeting (this comment should be limited to matters not on the agenda).

**Certification of Posting**

I, Lyndi Renaud, on behalf of the Storey County Planning Commission, do hereby certify that I posted, or caused to be posted, a copy of this Agenda at the following locations on or before October 25, 2016: Virginia City Post Office; Storey County Courthouse; Virginia City Fire Station 71; Virginia City RV Park; Mark Twain Community Center; Rainbow Bend Clubhouse; Lockwood Community Center; Lockwood Fire Station; Virginia City Highlands Fire Station; and the Virginia City Highlands mailbox buildings.

By Lyndi Renaud, Secretary



# STOREY COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

Thursday, September 1, 2016 6:00 p.m.  
Storey County Courthouse, District Courtroom  
26 South "B" Street, Virginia City, Nevada

## MEETING MINUTES

CHAIRMAN: Larry Prater

VICE-CHAIRMAN: Jim Hindle

COMMISSIONERS:

Virgil Bucchianeri, John Herrington, Pamela Smith, Kris Thompson

- 
- 1. Call to Order:** The meeting was called to order by the Chair at 6:02 P.M.
  - 2. Roll Call:** Jim Hindle, Virgil Bucchianeri, John Herrington, Pamela Smith, Kris Thompson, Larry Prater.  
**Absent:** none  
**Also Present:** Planning Director Austin Osborne, Planner Jason VanHavel, Deputy D.A. Keith Loomis and County Commissioner Lance Gilman.
  - 3. Pledge of Allegiance:** The Chair led those present in the Pledge of Allegiance.
  - 4. Discussion/Possible Action:** Approval of Agenda for September 1, 2016.  
**Motion:** Approve Agenda for September 1, 2016 **Action:** Approve, **Moved by** Commissioner Hindle, **Seconded by** Commissioner Smith, **Vote:** Motion carried by unanimous vote (**summary:** Yes=6).
  - 5. Discussion/Possible Action:** Approval of Minutes for June 16, 2016.  
**Motion:** Approve Minutes for June 16, 2016 **Action:** Approve, **Moved by** Commissioner Smith, **Seconded by** Commissioner Hindle, **Vote:** Motion carried by vote (**summary:** Yes=5, Abstain = 1, Larry Prater).  
**No public comment.**
  - 6. Presentation (Annual SUP Update):** By Comstock Mining, Inc. (Gold Hill/American Flat) Special Use Permit Holder to present its annual compliance review in accordance with the conditions of Special Use Permit No. 2000-222-A-5.  
**Scott Jolcover, Comstock Mining:** Presented the annual compliance review using a power point presentation which summarized the following items:
    - Active Mining of 42 acres of 120 acres of permitted mining.
    - Mine Definition permitted acres are 20, no acres used.
    - Exploration acres permitted are 20, no acres used.
    - Active Reclamation permitted acres are 50, 15.8 acres used.
    - Fully Reclaimed acres equal 11.4.

Mr. Jolcover stated that Comstock Mining is fully compliant with all Special Use Permits conditions listed below:

- General Provisions
- Operating Plan
- Boundaries and Uses
- Environmental Controls
- Fire and Emergency
- Transportation
- General Uses
- Cultural Resources

Mr. Jolcover stated that there was no mining or exploration that took place in proximity to the Silver City Water Line, and per the Silver City Water Line Protection Plan, Storey County will be notified prior to any future activities.

Mr. Jolcover summarized the timeline for the State Route 342 realignment. It was open on November 15, 2015. The performance bond was reduced from \$3M to \$65,000 in January 2016. The project was nominated nationally for the American Transportation Award. The Gold Canyon Creek restoration that runs along State Route 342 is complete. Final pavement overlay and striping is scheduled for September 7, 2016, and should be completed by September 8, 2016.

**Reclamation:**

- Keystone Vegetation is well established. Comstock Mining won an award from the State of Nevada for the Keystone Reclamation.
- Billie the Kid and Hartford Reclamation has been advanced.
- Hydro seeding for these areas is scheduled for this fall. A BLM native seed mix is used.
- Current bonding obligation has been reduced from \$1.5M to \$500K due to all the reclamation that has been completed.
- Farr West Engineering completed the third party annual audit for the county.
- 15.8 acres have been reclaimed within the mine area; 200 native shrubs planted, 25 native trees planted, 5 grass species seeded.
- 11.4 acres have been contoured and prepared for hydro seeding.

**Air Quality Monitoring:**

Results from air quality monitoring were well under the “good” number in January 2016. Monitoring has been suspended because Comstock is not mining. Monitoring will resume with future mining activities.

- Groundwater: No changes to water management
- Noise: Initial underground blasts were heard and reported by Silver City residents when underground portal was begun in October 2015. Decibel levels were compliant with SUP requirements. Blasting quickly became inaudible on the surface as the adit progressed, which ended up going 800 feet.
- Seismic: Underground blasting was not detected by surface monitors.

**Comstock Character:**

The Comstock Foundation for History and Culture has long range plans to address the preservation of historic structures including fully documenting or mitigating archeological or surface resources affected by any undertakings, long term planning for the reclamation of the landscape, and development of a sustainable healthy economy. The Donovan Mill still remains at risk and is one of the best treasures in the state of Nevada. It is one of the only large last standing complete stamp mills on the Comstock. The foundation has spent a lot of time in the last two years continuing to raise money for it. It will take two or three million dollars to get the whole thing re-established.

**Lot 51 Update:** Comstock Mining received a Patent from the Bureau of Land Management for 24 acre Lot 51 after four years of litigation.

**Exploration and Development Plans:** Surface mining is complete. An 800 foot drift was put in, six drill bays, and 13,000 feet of core drilling was completed.

**Commissioner Herrington:** Asked what types of native trees were planted.

**Larry Gorell, Comstock Mining:** Said that Pinion and Juniper, Desert Peach, and maybe some pines were planted. Shrubs included various types of sagebrush.

**Planning Director Osborne:** Added that BLM has a native seed mix that is appropriate for this area. The Special Use Permit (SUP) requires Comstock to use this mix in their reclamation process.

Comstock Mining is compliant with the conditions of the SUP. Planning has not received any correspondence from the NDEP, BLM, or any other agency stating that they are not in compliance. There has been no correspondence that I am aware of from the public regarding this operation.

**Discussion/Possible Action: Variance 2016-021 by Jason and Pauline Yasmer.** The Applicants are requesting a Variance for a reduced setback to ten feet from the required 30 feet front setback for the placement of a proposed garage on the property located at 21440 Delta Dr., Virginia City Highlands, Storey County, Nevada, APN: 003-014-29.

**Planner VanHavel:** Presented the staff report to the commission. The applicant requests a reduced front setback from 30 feet to 20 feet. Delta Drive has a 50 foot easement which starts at the southern edge of the applicant's property and then extends northward. The entire Delta Drive easement is on the applicant's land. The subject property is also a bit narrow for a one acre lot. It is only about 120 feet wide. The lot also has about 60 feet of elevation different from the front to the back of the property. The easement for Delta Drive, at the front of the property, is the high end, with the back of the property being about 60 feet lower. The applicant wishes to install a garage. With the Delta Drive easement, the required setback from the property line is 80 feet (50 feet Delta + 30 feet front setback). The required side setback is 15 feet. This limits the area to 90 feet in width that the garage may be installed. The Applicant has developed tentative plans for the garage and the site plan extends into the required setback by about 10 feet. The entire area is estate zoned and most of the surrounding lots are built upon. As of today, planning has received only two calls from residents living on Delta Road that wanted to complain about their neighbors. In both cases, these residents are not neighbors of Mr. Yasmer. Therefore, there has not been any public comment regarding this request.

**Discussion** between commission members and staff regarding the 50 foot road easement, the required setback distances for front and sides, and reasons for the required setback distances.

**Chairman Prater:** The Highlands developer set up CCR's and called for a 30 foot setback. The county adopted that.

**Vice Chairman Hindle:** Asked if there is any concern from the Fire Department regarding placing the garage in front of the house?

**Planner VanHavel:** Said that there was no comment from the Fire Department about this request. There is a blanket condition (condition 8 in staff report) that states the Storey County Building Department and Storey County Fire District may require additional requirements; the Applicant shall comply with these requirements. All existing and proposed infrastructure must comply with Building and Fire Codes.

**Vice Chairman Hindle:** Asked Planner VanHavel if there is any precedence here that has been approved or denied?

**Planner VanHavel:** Said that he is not familiar with any.

**Chairman Prater:** There was an issue on Cartwright Road in the Highlands. A garage was built fairly close to the road, right up against the Right of Way. The setback was maybe five feet. Cartwright Road is a main road in and out, and that was also a concern. This could have set a precedent of allowing it. After a lot of discussion, the property owner moved the garage to the required setback.

Chairman Prater doesn't see this Variance as an issue being that Delta Road is a dirt road and not a main road into Highlands.

**Planner VanHavel** read the findings into the record:

**6.1.1** That because of special circumstances applicable to the subject property, including shape, size, topography or location of surroundings, the strict application of the zoning ordinance would deprive the subject property of privileges enjoyed by other properties in the vicinity or under identical zone classification; and

**6.1.2** That the granting of the Variance is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of substantial property rights of the applicant; and

**6.1.3** That the granting of the Variance will not, under the circumstances of the particular case, adversely affect to a material degree the health or safety of persons residing or working in the area of the subject property and will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or materially injurious to property or improvements in the area of the subject property; and

**6.1.4** The proposed Variance is in compliance with all Federal, Nevada State, and Storey County regulations; and

**6.1.5** The proposed Variance is in compliance with Storey County Code 17.03.140 Variances and 17.40 Estate Zone when all Conditions of Approval are met; and

**6.1.6** The proposed Variance is in compliance with and supports the goals, objectives and policies of the 2016 Storey County Master Plan.

**Motion:** In accordance with the recommendation by Staff, the Findings under Section 6.1 of the Staff Report and other Findings deemed appropriate by the Planning Commission and in compliance with all Conditions of Approval, I, Pamela Smith, recommend approval with conditions for Variance Number 2016-021 for a reduced front setback for down to 20 feet from the required 30 feet front setback for the placement of a proposed garage on the property located at 21440 Delta Drive, Virginia City Highlands, Storey County, Nevada (APN: 003-014-29). **Action:** Approve, **Moved by** Commissioner Smith, **Seconded by** Commissioner Hindle, **Vote:** Motion carried by unanimous vote (**summary:** Yes=6).

7. **Discussion/Possible Action: Variance 2016-023 by John and Liz Huntington.** The Applicants are requesting a Variance for a reduced setback to zero feet from the required eight feet side setback and 20 feet rear setback for the placement of a proposed garage on the property located at 166 S "E" Street, Virginia City, Storey County, Nevada, APN: 001-141-08.

**Planner VanHavel:** Presented the staff report to the commission. The applicants have been working with Collins Construction. This property is located just south of the Virginia City Middle School and north of the elementary school. It abuts the elementary school. The proposed garage will be about 35 feet deep (north to south) and 30 feet wide (east to west). There is a sidewalk on the north edge of the school which the applicant believes is partly on their property. There is a steep down grade next to the sidewalk with no railing. The ground under the sidewalk also is being eroded away because of the steep grade. The sidewalk is currently closed. The applicant wishes to help the school and make the sidewalk usable.

The applicant wishes to build the garage a foot or two to the north of the sidewalk and provide slope stability and safety to the sidewalk. The applicant assumes these upgrades will assist the school. Staff contacted the school and talked with Todd Hess. He does not have a problem with the project as proposed. There has been no public comment regarding this application.

To the west of the proposed garage, there is D Street. Currently off the edge of D Street, there is a steep grade. The applicants know of at least two vehicles that have gone over the edge while trying to park along D Street. According to the applicant, the proposed garage and driveway will provide more area for safe parking along D Street. This should be an improvement to the parking situation.

It seems that because of the unique geographic features of this lot and the location of the property that the applicant is deprived of the ability to fully utilize the property. Strict application of the zoning only slightly excludes this property from the downtown Virginia City area which allows for zero setbacks.

**Discussion** between commission members and staff continued. Key issues included:

- Applicants wish to utilize entire footprint of property.
- Stabilization of sidewalk that runs along the side of the elementary school.
- Geography of the lot limits the ability to fully utilize the property.
- Possibility of changing to setback to 8 or 10 feet instead of zero.
- Supplement to the staff report: Addition of condition 12. Slope Stabilization- Modified slopes along the west and south edges of the project will be designed and constructed to be stable and have no structural impacts off applicant's property.
- Other properties in the vicinity are enjoying zero setbacks. This property is in a commercial residential (CR) zone which means that a commercial use has a zero setback which is zero front and side and ten foot rear. A residential use in the CR zone means it is subject to 8 foot side setbacks and 20 foot front and 10 foot rear setbacks.

**Vice Chairman Hindle:** Commented that if the garage is moved forward it would be within the required setback. Asked the applicant Liz Huntington if there was a reason why it is preferred to have the garage in such a way that it would require a zero setback. He also asked if there is any plan to stabilize the slope along D Street.

**Liz Huntington, Applicant:** The garage would have to be long and narrow, and the decision to put it next to the sidewalk was in order to stabilize the sidewalk. Jim Collins was supposed to be here for this meeting but he was absent. There may be a plan for a retaining wall along D Street, but Mr. Collins would have to answer that. Only one tree next to the school would be removed for this project. We have a pet cemetery along D Street too and this variance will allow that to stay.

**Planning Director Osborne:** Addressed some of the questions from the commission - Changing the condition of the variance to require a 10 foot rear setback would still work for the applicants; however, the critical setback is allowing the zero setback for the side of the garage. This would allow the trees and the pet cemetery to stay along D Street. You could also condition this to say that if there is any contest by the school district regarding the setback, the applicant would be required to have a survey taken of the property line that abuts the school. A condition for a retaining wall next to the sidewalk could also be added if desired. Regarding the condition that states that a fence or barrier be required along D Street; remove the word "guardrail". Requiring a guardrail can be very expensive. Propose that the condition say that a fence or some other such means is required to prevent any cars and people from falling down into the applicant's driveway.

**Chairman Prater:** Stated that he does not have a problem with a zero setback in this case. Both the middle school and elementary school are zero setbacks, and as you continue up north on D Street, there are zero setbacks on the east side of the street. He said he doesn't think it would be violating anything by allowing another zero setback. It makes sense that putting in a retaining wall along the sidewalk will stabilize the sidewalk.

**Planner VanHavel read the findings into the record:**

**6.1.1** That because of special circumstances applicable to the subject property, including shape, size, topography or location of surroundings, the strict application of the zoning ordinance would deprive the subject property of privileges enjoyed by other properties in the vicinity or under identical zone classification; and

**6.1.2** That the granting of the Variance is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of substantial property rights of the applicant; and

**6.1.3** That the granting of the Variance will not, under the circumstances of the particular case, adversely affect to a material degree the health or safety of persons residing or working in the area of the subject property and will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or materially injurious to property or improvements in the area of the subject property; and

**6.1.4** The proposed Variance is in compliance with all Federal, Nevada State, and Storey County regulations; and

**6.1.5** The proposed Variance is in compliance with Storey County Code 17.03.140 Variances and 17.30 CR Commercial Residential Zone when all Conditions of Approval are met; and

**6.1.6** The proposed Variance is in compliance with and supports the goals, objectives and policies of the 2016 Storey County Master Plan.

**Motion:** In accordance with the recommendation by Staff, the Findings under Section 6.1 of the Staff Report and other Findings deemed appropriate by the Planning Commission and in compliance with all Conditions of Approval, I, Jim Hindle, recommend approval with conditions and additional conditions (12 and 13). **Slope Stabilization.** Modified slopes along the west and south edges of the project will be designed and constructed to be stable and have no structural impacts off applicant's property.

**Property Line.** In the event that the property line between the applicant and the Hugh Gallagher Elementary School becomes disputed, the applicant will utilize a certified land surveyor to identify the property line's true location. for Variance Number 2016-023 for a reduced setback to zero feet from the required eight feet side setback and 20 feet rear setback for the placement of a proposed garage on the property located at 166 S "E" Street, Virginia City, Storey County, Nevada, APN: 001-141-08.

**Action:** Approve, **Moved by** Commissioner Hindle, **Seconded by** Commissioner Smith, **Vote:** Motion carried by unanimous vote (**summary:** Yes=6).

8. **Discussion Only/No Possible Action:** Public workshop to discuss possible updates to Title 17 Storey County Zoning Ordinance and/or other Storey County Codes, as applicable, establishing design standards for certain residential and multi-family residential land uses in Storey County. Public participation is encouraged. Preliminary concept drafts and other correspondence may be obtained from the Planning Department website at [www.storeycounty.org/521/Updates](http://www.storeycounty.org/521/Updates), at 775.847.1144, or from [planning@storeycounty.org](mailto:planning@storeycounty.org).

**Planning Director Osborne:** The master plan talks about how we address subdivisions and large housing developments and design standards such as the industrial professional zone which we don't have yet. Design standards will address multi-family and other types of uses and how they interact with other types of uses. There is a bit of misalignment between the Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS), and misalignment between Titles 16 and 17. Updates to Title 16 and 17 will address these misalignments.

- Title 16 is a subdivision ordinance; the processes of how to subdivide land (tentative maps), and required street widths, right of way widths, etc.
- Relationship between the zoning, the Planned Unit Development (PUD), subdivision map, and the NRS.
- Address the current zoning in Virginia City that prohibits PUDs. Potentially allow this zoning to be considered on a case by case basis.
- Address current language that states when a PUD is proposed on land that is designated Estate or Residential zone, mixed use is not allowed. This is something that needs to be discussed, that being whether or not we want a mixed use allowed in certain areas.
- Design standards deal with everything from the ground layout of a development to the buildings themselves.
- Language addressing multi-family design requirements and standards will be reviewed, but we don't want to become an architectural review committee.
- Clarification of language in requirements for tentative and final maps needs to be more compliant with NRS.
- Language regarding "open space" needs to be adjusted to align more with NRS.

**Commissioner Herrington:** Asked about a PUD having mixed use. Does that mean that the zoning would have to be changed from, for example, Residential to Commercial Residential?

**Planning Director Osborne:** There would have to be a zoning overlay over existing zoning to allow for a PUD zone. The PUD would dictate uses therein as allowed by zoning.

**Chairman Prater:** Typically, PUDs are developed with their own CCRs. It should be a condition that the county review and approve them along with the PUD.

**Planning Director Osborne:** That is correct and reviewing and approving the CCRs would be a part of the PUD's conditions.

**Commissioner Thompson:** Asked if the process is to do a complete re-write of Title 16, and would we then take that re-write to all the communities for their input, then finalize it?

**Planning Director Osborne:** A complete re-write is not necessary, just a restructuring. A lot of work has been done here between 2009 and 2012. Many of the standards that exist will stay.

**Vice Chairman Hindle:** Asked if our zoning standards are community specific or a county wide application.

**Planning Director Osborne:** Zoning maps are county wide and community specific and they conform to the master plan maps.

**Discussion between Planning Director Osborne and Vice Chairman Hindle** about Painted Rock zoning and PUD potential standards and requirements, and alignment with the master plan to keep the county a "rural" county.

9. **Discussion Only/No Possible Action:** Public workshop to discuss possible updates to Title 16 Subdivisions, Title 17 Zoning, and/or other Storey County Codes, as applicable, pertaining to applications, procedures, public hearings, and actions for land subdivisions, tentative and final maps, fees, and other such related matters. Public participation is encouraged. Preliminary concept drafts and other correspondence may be obtained from the Planning Department website at [www.storeycounty.org/521/Updates](http://www.storeycounty.org/521/Updates), at 775.847.1144, or from [planning@storeycounty.org](mailto:planning@storeycounty.org).

**Agenda item 9 was discussed during agenda item 8.**

10. **Discussion/Possible Action:** Determination of next planning commission meeting.

**Motion:** Next planning commission meeting to be held on Thursday October 6, 2016 at the Storey County Courthouse, District Courtroom, Virginia City, NV at 6:00 p.m., **Action:** Approve, **Moved by** Commissioner Smith, **Seconded by** Commissioner Thompson, **Vote:** Motion carried by unanimous vote (**summary:** Yes=6).

**Planning Director Osborne:** The USGS will be at the October 6 meeting and will give a presentation on water conditions in the Highlands and Mark Twain.

11. **Discussion/Possible Action:** Approval of claims - None

12. **Correspondence (No Action) - None**

13. **Public Comment (No Action) - None**

14. **Staff (No Action):**

**Planning Director Osborne:**

-The United States Geological Survey (USGS) presented their preliminary findings regarding underground water quantity and other conditions for the Mark Twain Estates and the Virginia City Highlands. Mr. Osborne summarized the findings and reminded the commission that the USGS is working with staff to schedule a presentation with the planning commission and public.

-Shared information from the Nevada Legislative Committee to Study Water and what bill drafts may come forth in the 2017 legislative session regarding regulating certain domestic wells in areas designated as "critical management areas". Discussion centered on various ways that the State Engineer's Office may address over-appropriated water basins in Nevada through new legislation.

-Still working with the BLM on the Storey County Lands Act known as "Restoring Storey County Act". Storey County and the BLM are working together to get language to clarify the public law on transferring the land, or to write bill drafts for this clarification in Congress. The BLM is cooperating with the county and the parties have a mutual interest in getting this task accomplished.

-There will be a Charter between the county and the Carson Water Subconservancy District (CWSD) on a County Commission agenda in October. This Charter is to possibly allow us to join some elements of the CWSD. This would make us available for funding provided from FEMA to the district, and then to the county. This will help us study Mark Twain Flooding and potentially implement flooding mitigation in Mark Twain.

**Planner VanHavel:**

-Sign Ordinance: Staff will resume updating the Sign Ordinance within a couple of months now that the master plan is complete.

-Cherie Nevin and I applied to NDOT for rural transportation alternatives funding to address deficiencies on C Street including the curbs and gutters, and sidewalks along C Street. NDOT complimented us that this was one of the few complete applications that they received. We are scheduled to do a presentation to their decision committee in a couple of weeks.

**Deputy D.A. Loomis:** Asked if this will address ADA requirements.

**Planner VanHavel:** One of the components that we are asking for is to restore some of the stairs along Taylor Street between B and C streets; however there will have to be an ADA component to go with that. Tentatively we scoped to have an elevator in the back of the Old American Hotel parking lot to be able to accommodate the ADA elements. As curbs are put in, the ramps will have to be ADA compliant.

**15. Board Comments (No Action) -**

**Chairman Prater:** Thanked Staff, commissioners and everyone involved for their work on the master plan.

**Planning Director Osborne:** Thanked the current commissioners and past commissioners for their participation and work in updating and approving the master plan.

**16. Adjournment (No Action) -** The meeting was adjourned at 8:00 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

By Lyndi Renaud