



CLARK COUNTY COMMUNITY PLAN WORKING GROUP

PUEBLO ROOM
CLARK COUNTY GOVERNMENT CENTER
500 S. GRAND CENTRAL PARKWAY
THURSDAY, July 17, 2014 – 6:30 P.M.

MINUTES Community Plan Work Group Meeting June 19, 2014 – 6:30 P.M.

Attendees:

Dave Chestnut - Enterprise
Fred Doten - Laughlin
Pamela Walker- Laughlin
Kathleen Maciula - Whitney
Danielle Walliser A.I.A., NCARB - Sunrise
Maggie Gouldby – Whitney
Kathleen Maciula - Whitney
Robert Singer - Lone Mountain
Robert Orgill - Paradise
John Getter - Spring Valley
Michael Dias - Sunrise
Cheryl Wilson – Enterprise
Vivian Kilarski – Planning Commission

Staff

Michael Popp, Senior Management Analyst
Kevin Smedley, Principal Planner
Shane Ammerman, Asst. Manager
Jon Wardlaw, Planning Manager
Deborah Murray, Planning Manager Laughlin
Garrett TerBerg, Principal Planner
Daniel Sinagra, Principal Planner

- 1) **Call to Order.** Michael Popp called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m.
- 2) **Welcome and Introduction**
- 3) **Public Comment.** None.
- 4) **Approval of the Agenda.** John Getter, Spring Valley proposed item #8 be heard before #6 and #7. Motion to approve by Dave Chestnut, and second by John Getter.
- 5) **Approval of the Minutes.** John Getter had two corrections, one spelling and to have policy discussion moved up as the first item heard. Policies will be permanently moved as the first item to be heard.. Dave Chestnut wanted noted in the minutes that local roads were a problem, specifically vacations of streets. Motion to approve by Dave Chestnut, second by John Getter.
- 6) **Community Plan Template.** No Report.
- 7) **Land Use Categories.** No Report.
- 8) **Planning Policies.** Prior to this presentation, Jon Wardlaw interjected and gave an overview on showing how the Comprehensive Planning Department internally processes development applications. Jon provided several charts to explain how a new proposed process of managing and review applications would conceivably work. Jon explained each step of the new proposed development review versus the old review. Under the new proposal Jon talked about plan review and conformity. Jon introduced to the group a compatibility matrix chart and explained it is in working progress and could be used as a tool to determine whether a land use application is compatible with a particular planning designation. Jon asked if the group could help refine the compatibility chart. Shifting to policies, Jon walked the group through another chart

explaining that the current planning policies found at the back of each land use plan would be moved to the land use element under the new proposal. And that Garrett TerBerg, principle planner was currently working on separating the policies into one of the eight comprehensive plan elements. After Jon's presentation the group commented that a number of policies are not regulatory nor enforceable and asked staff if part of the goal of overhauling the policies included updating the County's Title 30 and putting the force of law behind the existing policies. Jon explained that staff is looking for consensus approval for the process of separation of policies. Garrett briefed the group on the current status of separating policies. Garrett provided the group with a booklet of current Spring Valley policies that were broken down into three different colored categories. The three color categories were divided into areas a. Policies to be moved to comprehensive plan, b. Duplicate policies, and c. Design orientated policies. The workgroup asked how staff plans to manage policies that are specific to each town. Staff explained that it is the intention to save those type of unique policies and that they may have to be separated into different and specific topics in the land use comp element to accomplish this. The workgroup was concerned that they would not have a part or role in the consolidation of policies. Staff explained that staff would bring back the policies that have been separated or have been identified as candidates for elimination for the workgroups review. Staff also addressed workgroup comments regarding the weak points with current policies and that some town have rural, city and suburban lifestyles and land use designations that have to be taken into account when consolidating policies into the overall land use element. The workgroup agreed on the process staff presented and suggested staff move forward subject that each town could review their own town policies when completed.

9) Implementation. Shane Ammerman provided handouts and reviewed the capability matrix chart with the workgroup. Shane explained that each of the zoning categories on the matrix were rated based on the compatibility valuation criteria (in yellow) next to the matrix. Shane explained that the criteria in the compatibility valuation box was used to determine whether a zoning districts are compatible or not so compatible to other zoning district. Shane walked the group through current process for submittals and compared it new proposal under the new proposal staff would have different levels of review based on the compatibility analysis. The workgroup asked how current precedents would work with this matrix. Staff explained that every application should be taken in case by case regardless of history. The workgroup expressed that this new proposal would definitely be more structured than the current subjective process but also could be viewed as positive process or could subject the County to more scrutiny and complaints. Staff agreed and added that with a new process there would be more consistency and less subjectivity in the current review process and that using a compatibility matrix with criteria would provide for a more defensible process if challenged then the County currently uses. The workgroup asked if this proposed project would change the master plan. Staff answered yes and that it will change the current land use planning process from pre-zoning process to true master planning process and will provide greater flexibility. Members of the workgroup commented how much of the staff reports and information that comes before them seems to conflicts with each other, and with Title 30 and with the policies. Staff will bring back a more detailed implementation plan for the July meeting.

10) Public Comment. No input from Public. .

11) The next date and location for a regular meeting of the Clark County Community Plan Work Group is tentatively scheduled for July 17, 2014 at 6:30 p.m. in the Pueblo Room.

12) Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at 7:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

