**CLARK COUNTY COMMUNITY PLAN WORKING GROUP**

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

---

**MINUTES**
**Community Plan Work Group Meeting**
**August 6, 2015 – 6:00 P.M.**

**Attendees:**

Chris Dingell, Focus Group
Robert Orgill, Paradise
Charles Martin, Winchester
Amy Beaulieu, Whitney
Michael Dias, Sunrise
Dave Chestnut, Enterprise
Cheryl Wilson, Enterprise
David Diffley, Lewis Operating Group
Tony Celeste, Kaempfer Crowell
Angie Heath Younce, Spring Valley
John Getter, Spring Valley
Robert Singer, Lone Mountain
Joe Pantuso, SNHB
Beth Xie, RTC
Fred Doten, Laughlin TAB

**Staff**

Mario Bermudez, Planning Manager
Kevin Smedley, Principle Planner
Garrett TerBerg, Principal Planner
Michael Popp, Senior Management Analyst
Deborah Murray, Principle Management Analyst

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.** None.

3) **Approval of the Agenda.** Motion to approve by Joe Pantuso, SNHB and Robert Orgill, Paradise TAB.

4) **Approval of the July 23, 2015 Minutes.** Motion to approve by Michael Dias, Sunrise and second by Dave Chestnut, Enterprise.

5) **Introduction to Community Land Use Categories**. Mr. Kevin Smedley reviewed with the group the current land use categories that the County uses for plan review. He also reviewed with the workgroup the history of the land use categories and zoning districts, describing that the land use categories and zoning district have almost become a one to one relationship which has resulted in a lot of nonconforming zone changes. Mr. Smedley explained that the County Commission has asked staff to review the current land use categories to see if there is any efficiency that could be gained by reducing the number of land use categories. Mr. Smedley also reviewed with the group the County's comprehensive plan element, specifically the land use element, in detail and how the goals and policies fit into it. Both Mario Bermudez, Planning Manager, and Mr. Smedley explained that the proposed land use categories represent a starting point for discussion and there is a built in assumption that if the workgroup and staff come up with fewer land use categories than in use today there will be a greater amount of scrutiny and specific findings required per application within the review process under Title 30. Mr. Getter asked what will the criteria for decision making within each of the proposed categories be, knowing that the developer is going to ask for the maximum amount in each land use category. Mr. Smedley explained that the current plan review is essentially looked at on a parcel level and if new land use categories are adopted it would require the planners to look at a particular project at a greater neighborhood level and determine compatible densities surrounding the project on a case by case basis. Mr. Bermudez cited his experiences working in San Diego and commented that it will require more scrutiny, more detailed write-ups based on the surrounding area. Ms. Cheryl Wilson agreed with Mr. Getter and commented that many of the applications that come through now and could be under this new proposal could be very subjective and feels like the devil is in the details and maybe we need to keep it to the current twenty one categories. Mr. Dias also asked for clarification on the additional

scrutiny planner would require on the developer. Mr. Smedley noted to the workgroup that just like the nonconforming zone change requirements that are currently placed upon the developer, likewise if the County were to adopt the proposed land use categories, most likely the developer would be required to provide the burden of proof and demonstrate how the project would fit into the surrounding neighborhood much like the existing process of the nonconforming zone change application today. Mr. Smedley also suggested that perhaps a preconference meeting would be warranted so that key issues are raised ahead of time. The workgroup noted that open lands designation was not included in the list of land use categories.

Mr. Smedley began the discussion of the potential new land use categories with reviewing the proposed Estate Residential category and discussion on development along arterials, using 660' as an example from the rights of way to the interior for buffering. Mr. Smedley acknowledged 660' over 330' because staffs concern is that the 330' buffer would create a battleground for development and not leave much for a transition into the RNP. This would only occur by adopting the Estate Residential and eliminating most of the office profession that now exists. Within the proposed 660', appropriate uses under this proposed category with arterial edges would include R-D, R-1, R-2, CRT, C-P, and C-1. Mr. Chestnut commented that it would be difficult for homeowners in the RNP to accept 660' and that 330' would be more acceptable. He also commented that it makes sense to develop out to the arterial but again it would be on a case by case basis on how it is developed. The workgroup and staff discussed existing residential already developed to the arterial on major arterials and concluded that residential along an arterial should stay consistent by allowing up to 4 units to the acre. The workgroup came to a consensus that the proposed Estate Residential will work subject to desired zoning, R-U, R-A, R-E and arterial edge zoning R-D, R-1, CRT, and C-P along the edge, depending on the area. The workgroup discussed that R-2 and C-1 are too dense and too tall. The workgroup also rejected C-1 based on commercial services being too close to residential areas. Mr. Smedley summarized the RNP overlay that is currently 330' from any arterial should be kept in consideration when addressing any buffering. The workgroup suggested that residential development should be kept at 3-5 dwelling units to the acre in that area. Along with residential being developed out to the arterial, specifically C-P should have possibly broader uses with a use permit. Additionally there would be a need to amend R-D to be allowed 4 units to the acre and eliminating R-2 and C-1 from Estate Residential because they are too intense for buffering for arterial where RNP is designated. And if there is an RNP overlay within an area where there currently is 660' buffer, then residential uses should be only permitted with restriction on heights. Within Sunrise Manor along Charleston Blvd only R-E lots should be developed to be consistent with existing development. Open lands needs to be addressed in a category and was not listed among land uses.

The workgroup then moved on to Low Residential. Mr. Getter commend staff for their efforts for addressing the arterial edges in both Estate and Residential Low and gave an example of a project that came before Spring Valley TAB at Russell and Torrey Pines, where R-1 was approved abutting the RNP area on the interior a residential and transitioned up to 8 units to the acre on the arterial edges. He cited that most of the units have sold along Russell Road and Torrey Pines with greater density R-2 could perhaps be the arterial edge. Michael Dias commented that he would feel more comfortable with R-2 being moved to Residential Medium category. Mr. Smedley asked the group if there should be a new category between the proposed low and medium categories explaining that the proposed residential low was created by combining the existing residential low and residential suburban. He also asked if the group could be comfortable with R-1 developing up to 5 units to the acre. Mr. Dias indicated he would be more comfortable with R-1 with a maximum density of 5 units to the acre. Mr. Tony Celeste asked for clarification on the possibility that the categories and zoning densities could be amended without creating a new category. Mario Bermudez commented that it is highly unlikely that zoning densities will be opened up for changes but the categories and perhaps R-D could be room for discussion. The meeting closed with staff's recommendation to bring back for the next meeting a revised Estate and Residential Low modifications and new proposal for the workgroup to look at. The workgroup for the next meeting will also be reviewing the remainder of the Residential Categories along with Commercial.

6) **Public Comment.** None.

7) **The next date and location for a regular meeting of the Clark County Community Plan Work Group is tentatively scheduled for September 3, 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