

CLARK COUNTY COMMUNITY PLAN WORKING GROUP



**PUEBLO ROOM
CLARK COUNTY GOVERNMENT CENTER
500 S. GRAND CENTRAL PARKWAY
THURSDAY, September 17, 2015 – 6:00 P.M.**

MINUTES

Community Plan Work Group Meeting September 3, 2015 – 6:00 P.M.

Attendees:

Robert Orgill, Paradise
Charles Martin, Winchester
Amy Beaulieu, Whitney
Michael Dias, Sunrise
Dave Chestnut, Enterprise
Cheryl Wilson, Enterprise
Tony Celeste, Kaempfer Crowell
John Getter, Spring Valley
Rush Wickes, RTC
Fred Doten, Laughlin TAB
Vivian Kilarski, Planning Commission
Marilyn Kirkpatrick, County Commissioner

Staff

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.** Dave Chestnut commented on the workgroups efforts and that one of the projects goals is to eliminate nonconforming zone changes and wondered if staff has looked to Enterprise or Spring Valley and analyzed if condensing the land use categories would really eliminate nonconforming zone changes. Staff commented that the County will not know the full impact until actual applications are processed. Mr. Chestnut explained having an analysis would help meet the object of the project.
- 3) **Approval of the Agenda.** Motion to approve by Robert Orgill, Paradise TAB and second by Dave Chestnut, Enterprise.
- 4) **Approval of the August 6, 2015 Minutes.** Motion to approve by Robert Orgill, Paradise TAB and second by Dave Chestnut, Enterprise

No approval on September 17, 2015 meeting 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 discussion of 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 RE 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) **Introduction to Community Land Use Categories.** Mr. Kevin Smedley re-reviewed with the group the proposed residential land use categories with the workgroup with Residential Low capped at 5 units to the acre. The workgroup pointed out that staff omitted the category Open Land and it should be added as a category of its own. Mr. Smedley shared with the group a study he conducted from January through August and noted that even though R-2 is capped at 10 units to the acre the average was 6 units. Mr. Smedley also reviewed with the workgroup Multiple Family category. R-U-D is included in this category. Mr. Chestnut asked if compact development will come out of R-U-D. Staff talked about possibly rescoping R-U-D to more of a townhome feel. Mr. Getter asked questions about height on R-2-R4. Staff replied it's in the code and capped at 35'. Michael Dias asked if the workgroup could circle back to Residential and have a discussion the buffering along arterials, specifically in the RNP areas and instead of dictating what the desired buffering should be; it should be left to the market to determine. Mr. Dias also noted that RNP should be kept RNP on the arterial edges if existing RNP homes currently exist to create a unified development on the arterial edge. Mr. Smedley agreed and drew an example that there is typically 330' or 660' between the arterial and RNP and most areas the buffering is currently planned office professional. By moving to more effective planning than a holding designation there is more opportunity to have residential, office professional, or CRT depending on the market. The result or impact would mean more development opportunities on vacant lots that have not developed for a number of decades. The workgroup talked about RNP and the edges and Liaison Janice Ridondo commented that RNP is not shown in any category. Cheryl Wilson commented that many people get confused about the R-E zoning designation, one that it is used by the County as a holding category and two that it means 2 units to the acre which confuses the public. She continued and said that RNP means something and most residents understand what RNP stands for and that it should be set aside as its own category outside of Rural Estates with R-E as the only zoning district within it. Staff commented that the RNP is an overlay which is different than a category but that the proposed category names are merely place holder names. The workgroup recommended that the name of estate residential be changed to Rural Neighborhood Preservation up to 2 units to the acre instead to lessen the confusion. The majority of the workgroup voted in favor for all of the newly proposed Residential Categories as Mr. Smedley outlined.

Mr. Smedley introduced the proposed Residential Commercial Category. The workgroup asked if there were minimal acreage, staff clarified that there is no minimum acreage and height restrictions of 35'. Regarding C-2 in Residential Commercial Mr. Smedley clarified that although heights for C-2 are much higher than 50', height restriction would be limited to the surrounding area. Cheryl Wilson commented that a developer will typically want to go to the highest use along Las Vegas Blvd. Staff clarified that the code specifically speaks to height set-back ratios and is used in each instance for each application that is submitted. Staff and the workgroup also talked about U-V development within this category. Mr. Smedley noted that single use or horizontal mixed use is desired under this land use category and most likely to be developed but staff will look at U-V zoning and its appropriateness within Residential Commercial category. Michael Dias noted that there was no difference between Residential Commercial category and Community Activity Center with the exception of R-U-D in Commercial Residential. To clarify, staff noted Activity Centers are designated as destination centers whereas the Residential Commercial is design for local neighborhood services. Charles Martin suggested the category name Commercial may be better changed to Retail Commercial. Commissioner Kirkpatrick asked if combining all of the commercial zoning under one category would allow other higher commercial uses to come into play. Staff explained that the planned maps designate where certain zoning commercial districts are permitted such as C-P where other commercial such as C-2 would not be allowed in residential areas. The workgroup discussed CRT. Dave Chestnut offered that CRT is good use for buffering along arterials. Michael Dias offered that if lumped into the overall Commercial category the development community would likely not use it. Mr. Dias suggested that CRT be used in the Office category. Mr. Smedley clarified that CRT is also residential categories and available for use.

The workgroup moved into discussion with the proposed category Light Manufacturing. Amy Beaulieu commented that the Whitney TAB discussed this proposed category in length and that their Board is concerned about removing Heavy Manufacturing and opportunities for job growth. Mr. Smedley explained the history of Heavy Manufacturing and its uses being moved to Apex Industrial Park. Mr. Smedley explained as existing Heavy Manufacturing goes away there will be a need to fill it with Light Manufacturing unless there is a right on the property for M2 and will stay with the property. Michael Dias commented that combining everything (M-D/M-1) into one category Light Manufacturing would be defeating the work that has been done in Sunrise to date to eliminate eye sore properties that been proposed or built. Mr. Dias further commented that having M-D and M-1 in their own categories has helped reduce blighted areas, particularly along Nellis Blvd. Staff commented that the zoning code requires specific screening and setbacks for M-D and M1 that will not change whether the land use categories stay the same or are combined. Dave Chestnut agreed with Mr. Dias and commented that the code may not address enough of M-D and M-1 screening and setback aesthetically and sited the

Union Pacific Arden Yard as an example. Staff asked clarification if the workgroup would rather separate out the categories or address outdoor storage in Title 30. Staff also suggested that we could also look at new policies to address screening and setback issues, Mr. Dias felt it would be far more difficult to enforce projects through policies. Mr. Dias would prefer separate categories and leave the current categories as they are now citing it is much clearer and easier for the public and property owners to understand what's going on. Mr. Dias is concerned that the uses between M-D and M-1 are far more different than each other and should be split into two categories, or suggests leaving it as BDRP or Industrial. The workgroup agreed with Mr. Dias. Staff will go back and look at splitting the Industrial Category and or looking at edge treatment along M-D/M-1.

The workgroup moved forward to the next category Public Facilities. Mr. Chestnut asked where quasi-public agencies fit in such as NV Energy, SW Gas, and other utilities. Staff explained that in the past they were included in Public Facilities or in Industrial or BDRP and five years ago these agencies were categorized as Institutional and treated on their own. Dave Chestnut commented that a category should be created or it should be corrected in Title 30 not allowing the exemption of quasi agencies, institutions or churches. He further commented that it may not be practicable to create a land use category and therefore would prefer in Title 30 the quasi agencies be addressed in the zoning districts. Staff commented that most of the quasi agencies are addressed with a special use permit and that typically the County does not plan for these institutions, and is more of a category used after the fact. The workgroup agreed to handle these uses through the use permit process. Staff asked if we go through the use permit route how do the maps get marked up after the fact. Michael Dias commented that it would still be referred to as the underlying zoning but just annotated on the map.

- 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 17, 2015 at 6:00 p.m. in the Pueblo Room.**
- 8) **Adjournment.** The meeting was adjourned at 7:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Popp, Senior Management Analyst

Date