

## CLARK COUNTY COMMUNITY PLAN WORKING GROUP



**PUEBLO ROOM  
CLARK COUNTY GOVERNMENT CENTER  
500 S. GRAND CENTRAL PARKWAY  
THURSDAY, October 8, 2015 – 6:00 P.M.**

---

### MINUTES

**Community Plan Work Group Meeting  
September 17, 2015 – 6:00 P.M.**

#### Attendees:

Amy Beaulieu, Whitney TAB  
Michael Dias, Sunrise TAB  
Dave Chestnut, Enterprise TAB  
Cheryl Wilson, Enterprise TAB  
Danielle Walliser, Sunrise TAB  
Rush Wicks, RTC  
Fred Doten, Laughlin TAB  
Vivian Kilarski, Planning Commission  
Chris Dingell, Focus Group  
Keith Spencer, CBRE  
David Diffley, Lewis Operating Group  
Angie heath Younce, Spring Valley TAB

#### Staff

Mario Bermudez, Planning Manager  
Shane Ammerman, Assistant Planning Manager  
Kevin Smedley, Principal Planner  
Garrett TerBerg, Principal Planner  
Michael Popp, Senior Management Analyst  
Deborah Murray, Principal Management Analyst  
Paul Doerr, Senior Planner

- 1) **Call to Order.** Michael Popp called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m. and opened the meeting with welcoming everyone to the meeting.
- 2) **Public Comment.** No comments.
- 3) **Motion to Approve Agenda.** Motion by Angie heath Younce, and second by Keith Spencer.
- 4) **Approval of the September 3, 2015 Minutes.** Motion to hold until October 8, 2015 meeting by Vivian Kilarski, and second by Dave Chestnut. No approval sent back for changes that included:
  - ✓ Meeting date and minutes and next meeting dates need to be corrected.
  - ✓ Motion makers to approve previous minutes needs correction.
  - ✓ Staff needs to correct language of residential being unanimously approved to majority approved, and also for any discussion on Rural Residential units per acre final action.
  - ✓ Add Open Lands and RNP discussion if any, and both being their own separate categories.
  - ✓ Minutes should reflect that RNP should only be developed RNP on the arterial edges if existing RNP homes exist to create a unified development on the arterial edge.
  - ✓ Minutes should also reflect R-E discussion that it's a placeholder designation is confusing to the general public.
  - ✓ Change residential language from 2 acres to the unit to 2 units to the acre.
  - ✓ The workgroup requested that the language light manufacturing and Heavy manufacturing be stricken and if need refer to the categories as BDRP or Industrial.
- 5) **Approval of the September 17, 2015 Minutes.**
- 6) **Introduction to Community Land Use Categories.** Mr. Smedley recapped suggested changes from the September 3, 2015 meeting that included adding the Open Land Use Category, and proposed the name Residential Estates is changed to Rural Neighborhood Residential because of the lengthy discussion on RNP overlay. The reasoning is to align the category name closer to the RNP overlay to avoid less confusion as was suggested in the previous meeting. Mr. Spencer from CBRE commented that he is seeing a trend to provide housing for skilled nursing and assisted living that have low

impacts to the neighborhood that would be good candidates for edge treatment that could not qualify under the proposed arterial edge treatment and as the population ages there will be higher need for this type of development into residential neighborhoods. Staff agreed and explained that there exists a couple of example of this type of mix, and through a use permit under Title 30, it could be allowed. The workgroup expressed concern for the title Rural Neighborhood Residential and that the category should be named Rural Neighborhood Preservation because of the underlying land use is something other than RNP and that there are inconsistencies in the category name, underlying land use and RNP Zoning overlay that cause mass confusion. A few members of the workgroup expressed that in earlier years the County did have a category named Rural Neighborhood Preservation. A few members disagreed indicating that it would cause the reverse confusion and that categories and zoning districts should never be named the same. Cheryl Walker indicated the name Rural Neighborhood Preservation be used as the name of a category, Michael Dias agreed and suggested further the Rural Neighborhood Preservation should be its own category with 2 units to the acre and should have R-E to the arterial edges. Vivian Kilarski asked Mr. Dias if under this new proposal to create Rural Neighborhood Preservation category with just RE as a zoning district would have a change of the zoning districts in the proposed Rural Neighborhood category to which he replied it wouldn't. Staff did comment that specific direction from the Board was to get away from the one to one relationship with zoning and land use categories. Ms. Walliser commented that the county proposed Rural Neighborhood Residential with R-U, R-A and R-E as zoning districts clearly leads and she supported a separate category called RNP with R-E as a single zoning district. David Diffley asked what then is the difference the between the new RNP category and the proposed Rural Neighborhood Residential? Mr. Dias explained first the name Rural Neighborhood Residential name should be changed to Estate Residential or large lot because the RNP and the confusion of R-E as a holding pattern and as a zoning district has been a giant confusing issue to people and the only thing that has settled that issue is the County's zoning overlay district and which has outlined specific areas that have established half acre lots that have been agreed upon by the people in these areas should remain half acre lots and that we should be consistent by using the name Rural Neighborhood Preservation as areas that have already been established as existing R-E neighborhoods, and again for master planning Mr. Dias does not foresee any future master plan having just an RNP being established out in an area open vacant land; that's going to be R-E and up to the developer to do as they see fit and when there are sufficient in number of R-E established properties that's where the RNP have been coming over to help protect those established neighborhoods. Mr. Dias continued that it's not a zoning category or land use category that going used out in an open vacant land area rather and an established area that should be saved and protected and be consistent to what the public knows and accepts. Mr. Diffley asked again what differences are there between the two categories. Mr. Dias explained that under Rural Neighborhood Residential you can have the arterial edge treatments that that allows greater density where in Sunrise you already have all of the arterials within the RNP established areas, so Sunrise does not want that type of buffering. Mr. Smedley clarified that there might be some confusion where there are some RNP that arterials that go through them, those arterials are not being affected and we are talking about the edge of an RNP then that would have a treatment. Staff further commented on a workgroup comment that Rural Neighborhood Residential would further non-conforming zone changes and that staff wanted to clarify it would because the highest maximum density is R-E which is two units to the acre and everything else is under 2 units and having those three zoning district in the Rural Neighborhood Residential does no harm and if a developer wanted to do a R-A and R-U it would be conforming. The group by vote was split 6-5 in favor of keeping Rural Neighborhood Residential the same and not to create a separate RNP category. Staff will brief management and the Commission we did not receive consensus on this item.

Mr. Smedley reviewed the September 3, 2015 recommend category changes (commercial through public facilities) with the workgroup having no changes. The next category introduced by Mr. Smedley was the category Employment Center. Dave Chestnut asked if Employment Center is replacing BDRP, and why not keep BDRP as a category. Mr. Dias commented that this category was very close to Manufacturing category and that there was previous discussion on splitting up the two categories. Staff explained the goal and direction by the Board was to get away zoning to land use category relationship and it was requested we finish discussion on the Employment Center category discussion before we go back and talk about the Manufacturing Category. Chris Dingell commented that he liked the title Employment center and it sounds better than manufacturing for economic development. Mr. Dias commented again that the only difference between the Manufacturing Category and the Employment Category is C-P and it will be confusing, and suggests that with M-D the campus style could be used without having to use C-P and just leave C-P out of there, again M-D and/or M-1 could be used as Employment Center and then split out the M-D and M-1 under BDRP and Industrial so there is consistency. Mr. Dias continued to explain that if all of Industrial is painted in Sunrise Manor in one color they have lost what they have worked on for 15 years and it would be a step backwards and not a step forward. Staff explained the reason they included C-P is because of operations like the company Switch where you have a 6 or 7 story office building which would not be encouraged under M-D adjacent to their facility, and within that 6 or 7 story office building there are

a number of other office business within that building and typically light manufacturing does not employ a lot of people, they tend to store goods temporarily. Dave Chestnut asked how you keep storage out of an Employment Center if you have M-1. Staff sees M-1 within the Employment Category being written and described properly for desired uses within the Employment Center and as applications are reviewed and meet the intent of the Employment Center then that's how they would move forward with the application. Keith Spencer offered an example like Tesla who is a big employer who would have outside storage and it would meet the criteria of Employment Center and this it would be on a case by case basis. Mr. Dias asked that there is a lot of M-D and M-1 in Sunrise TAB and a lot that is under the Nellis AFB APZ, and if there was any other places in the valley and are we creating a category just for those areas which will create a lot of confusion. Staff mentioned Arden and Henderson have locations. Amy Beaulieu of Whitney TAB said she would not feel comfortable having Black Mountain designated as an Employment Center and sees it more in the Manufacturing category. Dave Chestnut commented that one could make the case for two separate uses, one less intense than the other, such as manufacturing being something like Ken's Salad Dressing, where the Employment Center being something like the company Switch or the Business Park south of McCarran airport. Mr. Dias asked if under those examples wouldn't it be more appropriate for C-P and M-D rather than having it M-1 in this category as well. Keith Spencer made a motion to keep the Employment category as it is. The motion failed with a 5-5 tie with Vivian Kilarski not voting. Staff asked for clarification on what do you do with places like Switch. Mr. Chestnut suggested that companies like this be placed under manufacturing. Ms. Kilarski wondered if doing that would create a non-conforming zone change for companies like Switch in the future. Mr. Dias commented that M-D would allow for outside storage with a use permit. Mr. Chestnut offered a motion to accept Employment Center with the exception of having M-1. The motion failed with a 5-5 tie again with Vivian Kilarski not voting. Cheryl Wilson spoke to the outdoor storage issue and certain restrictions and not seeing storage associated with BDRP. Ultimately Ms. Kilarski cast her support in favor of the first motion made by Keith Spencer to support Employment as it was introduced. Mr. Dias asked as land use category from a town board's perspective what premise do we try to use to fit this in our land use category and where would this be so appropriate. Staff commented that there would be a lot of places appropriate especially where there are transportation corridors.

The workgroup decided to circle back and have discussion on the Manufacturing category. Mr. Dias expressed that C-P and M-D should be in its own category with M-1 in another namely BDRP and Industrial categories. Mr. Dias expressed concern that on the Sunrise land use map that all of the light colored blue would be changed to dark blue and create a massive problem, specifically the M-1 (Darker Blue) is kept within the APZ's near Nellis AFB and if there is one solid "color" there will be no distinction where certain uses zoning would be allowed bleed out into the rest of Sunrise. Mr. Bermudez from staff stated they could make that distinction because the zoning code and airport environs prohibit where M-1 can be approved and his understanding from the previous meeting and the workgroups discussion on Manufacturing centered only on outside storage, site visibility and buffering all of which are addressed in Title 30, conditions of approval and policy not with the category. Paul Doerr from staff offered help in understand Mr. Dias position where if the map is colored in one color it will lead to confusion where M-1 starts and ends and where M-D picks up from there. Mr. Dias agreed and said not only him but one color will confuse the public and by separating it out it will make it easier for the public and develop to understand and not try to push for a different zoning district in an area where it's inappropriate. Mr. Chestnut asked how this category would work with residential where currently BDRP which replace office professional is used to buffer the neighborhoods. Staff commented that along the 215 Beltway and along I-15 we will see that, but other areas that do not have easy access to surface transportation we will see it restricted to M-D or M-1. Mr. Dias also commented that in Sunrise a lot of existing residential is within the blue areas and it's another reason to have the lighter blue up against the residential for buffering and mixing the two M-D and M-1 we are diluting what is already well established master plan at this point. David Duffley asked there are other locations where M-1 didn't have a good buffering situation. Mr. Chestnut commented pointed out in Enterprise a lot of designated M-1 went to R-2 housing and so now you have a defunct plan where there is not good buffering. Mr. Dias motioned that the proposed Manufacturing category be split into separate categories. The motion was supported by the majority of members.

The workgroup moved forward to the next proposed land use category Resort. Amy Beaulieu commented that Boulder Highway falls under Whitney TAB and she does not see Boulder Highway classified as a Resort Corridor because it's not a tourist destination and maybe we need another descriptor for the Boulder Highway area such as Boulder Highway Gaming Corridor as an example. Staff said they would work on something to bring back to the group to address Boulder Highway and the other Neighborhood Resorts outside of the Strip. Dave Chestnut comment about one of the problems they have in Enterprise is the state gaming mandated H-1 along the corridor which does not allow a lot of options. Staff commented that the State does not designate H-1 zoning, the State designates where gaming is allowed and doesn't mandate H-1 if it is planned that way by the County. Mr. Dias asked if R-4 should be included in the Resort category

citing that R-4 along the Boulder Highway would be a good since it's so spread out. Staff commented that R-4 is 4 stories (35') and wouldn't be typically appropriate in the Resort Category but staff also commented that C-2 which is allowed which is 50' and with a use permit can go as high as 100'. Ms. Kilarski commented that she like the idea of have R-4 as an option in the Resort Category. Staff in Laughlin also commented that R-4 for Laughlin would work well there. Dave Chestnut asked if UV in the Resort Category would be a good fit. Staff commented that UV is regulated by the overlay. Amy Beaulieu noted that R-V-P was not included in Resort and felt it would be appropriate since R-V-P does exist along Boulder Highway with Sam's Town. Staff commented that R-V-P is now allowed in Commercial General and that Title 30 was amended because of issues in outlying areas having R-V-P as a standalone park. A motion was made by Chris Dingell to approve the Resort category and to include R-V-P and R-4. The motion was approved by the majority.

The workgroup continued on the next two categories Community Activity Center and Regional Activity Center. Mr. Smedley commented that the County currently has a Mixed Use Overlay District throughout the valley but really nowhere in a land use plan where a center of activity is designated so as part of this process the County is looking at do that and it would be limited and done through the public plan update process. Mr. Smedley gave the Maryland Parkway corridor as an example of where it could be implemented. Mr. Smedley explained that the Community Activity Center would be less intensive with R-3 and R-4 and the focus being more residential but allowing a commercial component within it. The emphasis that it is local to the surrounding community, where the Regional Activity Center would be more of a destination center like the new Downtown Summerlin with higher density residential mixed with mid-rise commercial surround it. Mr. Dias noted the comparison between Community Activity Center and the Mixed Commercial Category with RUD being the only difference in Mixed Commercial and noted to try to make a distinction between the two would be difficult and unnecessary. Danielle Walliser commented that the County would be surprised that a lot of what the County is proposing would not happen the way we think it may happen, that there are other mechanisms that could be employed to plant the seeds of the Activity Centers, and once these centers are in place and people have a chance to "chew on it" for a while they will become self-evident. Ms. Walliser continued to talk about revitalization of areas in the City of Las Vegas that she worked such as the artist colony cultural corridors and areas in the downtown, but specifically to the County Ms. Walliser mentioned that the east side is prime for redevelopment, and that there are areas that are border-line blighted and all of the mechanisms that need to be assembled to create one of these activity centers have not been explored yet. Dave Chestnut asked if the County has explored a minimum area for an activity center and that a minimum of 10 acres could be a developable size. Mr. Chestnut also asked staff if the County would be willing to add CRT in the Mixed Commercial and Community Activity Center categories which would provide a real transition to housing in the surrounding area. Mr. Dias made a motion to eliminate the Community Activity Center since it is the same as Mixed Commercial and in addition add CRT to the Mixed Commercial. The motion passed with a 6-5 vote. Ms. Kilarski asked about the horizontal and vertical mixed not being included into the Mixed Commercial category so does that mean that everything as far as form that was in the Community Activity Center category will now go into Mixed Commercial. Mr. Dias maker of the motion said yes. Mr. Dingell explained why he didn't support it because the Mixed Use Category was more of a local serving residential category to him and when the public sees something like Community Activity Center on a map they will know it's going to be a little more intense. Ms. Walliser also mentioned why she could not support it because of the same reasons Mr. Dingell gave and felt having both categories was an important distinction to make, and that Community Activity Center implies something more than just commercial and office uses or mixed use it implies a new way of doing things and thinking about creating redevelopment efforts within a neighborhoods. Ms. Walliser felt there were not enough of descriptors in the Community Activity Center description such as new urbanism or revitalization language that could have been included. Staff commented and provided a PowerPoint slide adding that a Community Activity Center would have transportation nodes such as BRT or light rail that is much different than the Mixed Commercial Category. Ms. Walliser concluded that when you talk about a Community Activity Center it is a much more holistic category than Mixed Commercial. Keith Spencer commented that a place like China Town in Spring Valley fits a Community Activity Center type and has become a themed area. Dave Chestnut commented that still the two categories are identical and until there are changes to Title 30 there won't be a difference. Staff closed the discussion that staff agreed with Ms. Walliser comments and these activity nodes are meant to capture the imagination and create a sense of place, a sense of belonging, and most of the other categories don't do that and staff would recommend that the group consider flipping the Mixed Commercial with Community Activity Center and eliminate Mixed Commercial. The group agreed and unanimously voted to move the RUD and add CRT to the Community Activity Center. Regional Activity Center was discussed by the group. Mr. Smedley commented that it is a category for highly dense and concentrated residential locations. Ms. Walliser noted that the Community Activity Centers (which implies a small village) are incubators that grow up into being Regional Activity Centers which will evolve into downtowns. Mr. Dias pointed out the similarity of both the Resort and Regional Activity Center with the same exact zoning distinctions

with the exception of R-4. Mr. Spencer felt that both are distinct from each other and the Regional Activity Center implies to him a downtown Summerlin where the Resort Category implies the Las Vegas Strip where one is more community oriented and the other is more tourist oriented. Mr. Dingell offered a suggestion of getting rid of the H-1 descriptor in Regional Activity Center since that is driven by state law. Ms. Kilarski suggested that we may not want to get rid of gaming because of areas like the Boulder Highway. Staff also commented that State law now dictates where gaming can go and H-1 does not give you the right for gaming since state law and County code have separation requirements as well. Mr. Dingell made a motion to eliminate H-1 from the Regional Activity Center. Staff also pointed out that downtown Summerlin has the gaming with the Red Rock Casino and would be considered a Regional Activity Center. David Diffley asked if zoning categories are the only things that distinguish them from other categories or are there policy difference between them and/or if there were policies that were for each category you might consider keeping both categories. Staff agreed with Mr. Diffley that policies can make the distinction, but again it's also the code and NRS that will dictate where gaming can go. Mr. Bermudez continued with the example of applying for H-1 near a school or residential and said you may get the commercial uses for H-1 but because it's close to a school or neighborhood you would not get the use permit for gaming. Mr. Dias offered instead of having the category Resort why not just have a single category called Regional Activity Center because the Strip is a Regional Activity Center with all of the same zoning districts as the Resort category and sees no reason why we should have two land use categories with the exact same zoning districts. Amy Beaulieu disagreed with Mr. Dias and suggested that there is a difference between the Strip and the Boulder Highway corridor versus the Regional Activity Center like a Summerlin or Town Square and maybe the issue is calling it a Regional Activity Center and that it may need to be called something else. Ms. Beaulieu had trouble with the word Regional because it denotes something much bigger than what we are. Ms. Walliser commented that gaming companies like Sam's Town have tried to be Community Activity Centers unto themselves, like self-contained and like Red Rock Casino the same thing self-contained, where they try to be these islands of Community Activity Center on one property but a real Community Activity Center implies going beyond that. Ms. Walliser also agrees that the category Resort is iconic category unto itself and used the example of when she worked for the City of Las Vegas working on Fremont Street Experience and being careful to not mess with the iconic image of Fremont Street of Glitter Gulch and when stuff came out of the woodwork because of the sensitivity of it and we should think seriously about it before we eliminate it because there may be a lot of push back on it. Keith Spencer seconded Ms. Walliser comments and said the group needs to think globally and that Las Vegas is a resort location and that is broadcasted to the world and a marketing tool and when we bring in people to Las Vegas and say here's our Resort corridor they get it right away because that's what we've built it on and we need to think that way with all of these categories. Mr. Smedley commented that as he has listened to the discussion he see that missing is C-P for office towers. Mr. Smedley used the example of downtown Summerlin where there is the mall then the transition to office then to the Red Rock Resort. The group then discussed height of H-1, C-2 and using C-P as a buffer to residential. Chris Dingell offered a motion to have C-P included into the Regional Activity Center category. The group supported this motion.

7) **The next date and location for a regular meeting of the Clark County Community Plan Work Group is tentatively scheduled for October 22, 2015 at 6:00 p.m. in the Pueblo Room.**

8) **Adjournment.** The meeting was adjourned at 8:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Michael Popp, Senior Management Analyst

---

Date