



CLARK COUNTY COMMUNITY PLAN WORKING GROUP

ODC 3
CLARK COUNTY GOVERNMENT CENTER
500 S. GRAND CENTRAL PARKWAY
THURSDAY, MAY 22 – 6:30 P.M.

MINUTES Community Plan Work Group Meeting June 5, 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
Susan Philipp- Paradise
Robert Singer - Lone Mountain
Stacy Goff Lindburg – Lone Mountain
John Getter - Spring Valley
Angie Heath Younce - Spring Valley
Jason Thompson - 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

- 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 #9 be heard before #7 and #8. Motion to approve by Angie Heath Younce, and second by Dave Chestnut.
- 5) **Approval of the Minutes.** Motion to approve by Dave Chestnut, second by John Getter.
- 6) **Meeting Rules.** No new meeting rules.
- 7) **Community Plan Template.** Jon Wardlaw gave members an overview of the transportation template. Jon explained the background for each topic of transportation and asked if staff has generally covered the areas on transportation. He walked through transit, roadways, bicycle paths, and pedestrian walkways. Jon explained that each land use update might be different from each other because of the different needs for that town. He used Laughlin river walk as an example for unique trails. Jon asked the group to come back and let staff know what have we left out or what do we need to improve. The group suggested we look at right of way preservation due the number of vacations in the valley. It was commented that feasibility and cost benefit analysis for transportation (trails, bikes) should be looked when developing the transportation section of the land use report. Other members commented the need for a comprehensive zoning strategy through disincentives for traditional road travel and to create more of a walk, bike community. Jon concluded the goal is to create the best effective method to transport people by the best effective methods. The group generally agreed to the transportation topic subject that the County address vacations.

- 8) **Land Use Categories.** Kevin Smedley gave members an overview of the proposed Land Use Categories. 22 land use categories and 23 zoning districts have been the driver for this project. Kevin explained Land Use Plans became pre-zoning documents over time. Page 4 was reviewed in the Land Use Category document. Commercial categories were reviewed. CP, C1 and C2 were reviewed with the workgroup. The group on the illustrations for commercial and mixed use and to be careful on the types of illustration use in the document so that the County is not giving the impression of a specific desired development. The work group also commented that this category may be too vague and needs to be sensitive to residential area. Certain criteria or buffering should be developed next to sensitive residential areas. The group explained the problem of separating uses and the need to eliminate hard edges. The group also commented on conforming zones changes do not require plans which can be a problem not knowing what will be built and continuity with development. The group voted that the commercial portion of the document needs work and should be brought back for review with some criteria addressing hard edges and assurances using Title 30 (teeth) that there is continuity between commercial and residential.
- 9) **Planning Policies.** Garrett TerBerg reviewed the Comprehensive Plan and the elements. There were questions on existing individual town policies and goals. A suggestion that Spring Valley may be a template for other towns to follow. Garrett explained that all existing policies are in review for duplications, redundancy, out dated policies and eventually would be moved to the Comprehensive Plan under Land Use Element. The suggestion is once consolidated policies are approved then the policies would come out of the town board report and migrate into the Land Use element. Staff informed the group that the policies are being sorted into different categories “buckets” and will be brought back to the working group as a review document. Spring Valley is the first draft document presented to the group. Spring Valley draft policies document will be brought back to the next meeting.
- 10) **Implementation.** Shane Ammerman reviewed 1) Land Use Applications, 2) Design guidelines and policies, 3) Conformity Review. Shane reviewed conformity with the group and the need to figure out what kind of criteria should be create in reviewing a land use applications. Shane reviewed cities such as Austin, Baltimore, Philadelphia, and Montgomery Maryland and each of these jurisdictions for their methodology in using criteria for land use applications process. Staff will continue to look in Title 30 for existing criteria and other cities in the southwest to develop a draft process for internal conformity review. The working group also commented on the lack of text on treatment between zoning districts, specifically RNP areas. Staff would look into these concerns. The general sense from staff is that we should work on the implementation section more than presenting zoning categories. The group would like staff to also include the development of goals and policies concurrent with the implementation section.
- 11) **Public Comment.** No input from Public. .
- 12) **The next date and location for a regular meeting of the Clark County Community Plan Work Group is tentatively scheduled for June 19 at 6:30 p.m. in the Pueblo Room.**
- 13) **Adjournment.** The meeting was adjourned at 7:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Popp, Senior Management Analyst

Date