



CLARK COUNTY COMMUNITY PLAN WORKING GROUP

MINUTES JULY 17, 2014

Attendees:

Dave Chestnut - Enterprise
Fred Doten - Laughlin
Pamela Walker- Laughlin
Kathleen Maciula - Whitney
Danielle Walliser A.I.A., NCARB - Sunrise
Maggie Gouldby – Whitney
Robert Singer - Lone Mountain
Kelly Griffith – Lone Mountain
Angie Heath Younce – Spring Valley
Robert Orgill - Paradise
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
Daniel Kezar, Senior Planner

- 1) **Call to Order.** Michael Popp called the meeting to order in the Government Center Pueblo Room at 6:35 p.m.
- 2) **Welcome and Introduction**
- 3) **Public Comment.** None.
- 4) **Approval of the Agenda.** Motion to approve by Robert Orgill, Paradise and second by Dave Chestnut, Enterprise. Unanimously approved.
- 5) **Approval of the Minutes.** Motion to approve by Robert Singer, Lone Mt and second by Dave Chestnut, Enterprise. Unanimously approved.
- 6) **Community Plan Template.** No Report.
- 7) **Land Use Categories.** No Report.
- 8) **Planning Policies.** Prior to this presentation, Jon Wardlaw was asked to set the tone for the meeting tonight and an introduction to the policies. Jon thanked the group for helping out in the processes. Jon gave a brief overview through a department flow chart and matrix implementation chart. Jon explained that we are only in the phase of making the tool box to implement the process and thanked the group for helping put that together. Garrett TerBerg commented that there are currently over 1,600 policies currently and it's the goal to get one set of integrated policies into the Comprehensive Plan. Garrett showed the work group a three-step graphic on how the policies are being separated into the Comprehensive Plan, Design Workbook, and trash can. The workgroup asked if the policies will still be divided up into categories such as residential. Staff affirmed that the policies will be drafted for the workgroup to review. Residential will be the first category the group will receive. The workgroup also commented that a current problem is you cannot find the policies readily available or that they are redundant. Staff committed that the policies will be easily available on the internet and more streamline. Another workgroup question was whether all the policies be put into one bucket for staff and the workgroup to look at and to weed out. Staff agreed that was the best way to move forward is as a group and that those policies that are unique to a specific TAB would still remain as policies. Staff also suggested that we take one category at a time. The workgroup asked for clarification on the Design workbook, policies and both tie back into Title 30. Staff explained the difference between a policy and Title 30. The workgroup was comfortable moving forward on the process.

9) **Implementation.** Shane Ammerman provided handouts and reviewed the newest compatibility matrix chart with the workgroup. Shane explained that each of the zoning districts on the matrix were rated as high medium and low categories instead of a numbering system. Shane explained that each zoning district is rated high (Green) medium (Yellow) or low (Red) when compared to other zoning districts for compatibility. Jon Wardlaw explained that these ratings will help determine what an applicant must provide the County for the review process. Shane then walked the workgroup through the individual zoning districts and it's compatibly to other zoning districts. The workgroup agreed with staff conclusions for Hotel, UV, Public Facilities, and M2. The workgroup asked where Mixed Use Development (MUD) and other overlays come into play. The workgroup asked if the matrix chart will be posted to the web. The workgroup commented that the matrix will give a common base and uniformity to the process. Some workgroup members have trouble with providing the matrix to the public and that the matrix should also reflect nonconforming zoning districts. Staff agreed and thought the best way to accomplish this would be to put a hold on this item and come back with a different matrix or matrices that can show nonconforming zoning district when compared to other zoning districts. The workgroup also felt that the group should be working on policies more than the compatibility matrix. County staff proposed that we focus work on single policy area and a new revised matrix for the next meeting and the group agreed.

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 August 7, 2014 at 6:30 p.m. in the Pueblo Room.**

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

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Popp, Senior Management Analyst

Date