

Board of County Commissioners

CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

JAMES B. GIBSON
Chair
JUSTIN JONES
Vice Chair
MARILYN K. KIRKPATRICK
WILLIAM MCCURDY II
ROSS MILLER
MICHAEL NAFT
TICK SEGERBLOM

COMMISSION CHAMBERS, GOVERNMENT CENTER
500 SOUTH GRAND CENTRAL PARKWAY
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89106
WEDNESDAY MARCH 8, 2023

The Board of County Commissioners of Clark County, Nevada met in recessed regular session in full conformity with law and bylaws of said Board at the regular place of meeting in the Commission Chambers, Government Center, Las Vegas, Clark County, Nevada on Wednesday, the 8th day of March 2023, at the hour of 9:00 a.m. The meeting was called to order at 9:03 a.m. by Chair Gibson and on roll call, the following members were present, constituting a quorum of the members:

CALL TO ORDER

CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS:

Jim Gibson
Justin Jones
Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick
Ross Miller
Michael Naft
Tick Segerblom

Absent:

William McCurdy II

Also Present:

Robert Warhola, Deputy District Attorney
Nancy Amundsen, Director, Comprehensive Planning
Sami Real, Deputy Director, Comprehensive Planning
Antonio Papazian, Manager, Development Review
Jason Allswang, Senior Plan Checker
Tammy McMahan, Office Services Supervisor
Keri Miller, Deputy Clerk

ITEM NO. 1 Public Comment

JIM GIBSON

Good morning. We welcome you to our zoning meeting this morning. The first item of business is public comment. This is a time when you have up to three minutes to comment on any item that is on our agenda. The final public comment period is a time when you can talk about anything, but the beginning is related to the agenda. So if... what we'd like is for you to give us your name, spell your last name, give us the item number that you're addressing, and then please limit your comments to three minutes. Good morning.

PAUL BAGLEY

Good morning. My name's Paul Bagley. I live at 5560 East Owens. Item Number 11. The school, when we went to our meeting, they said they're gonna start out with one hundred to - between 100 and 200 students, and they have about 170 parking spots. Not all students are gonna drive a vehicle to the school, so the first year or two the parking probably isn't gonna be a problem. But we were also told when the people are leaving the school, there will be no left turn onto Owens from their parking lot, which will move all the traffic onto Christy Lane. And once they move to 600 students, like they planned, they're not gonna have enough room to park, and where are they gonna park? Are they gonna park on the streets? Down Christy? Down Owens? And also in the morning when they're dropping off and in the afternoon, there's gonna be a line of cars on Owens waiting to get to the single gate to make the loop around to drop off or pick up their kids.

And people that are getting out, even though there's no left hand turn, they'll probably go across all lanes of traffic to make a left turn on Christy Lane. It's gonna put a lot of pressure on the people down Christy Lane. There's schools that get out, there's a grade school and a high school that have the traffic now on Christy, so this is gonna multiply it. They talked about a traffic signal going in in a couple years, and a traffic signal's just gonna make it even worse, unless it's a demand. If it's a timed traffic signal, people are gonna be waiting forever. Right now in the morning, we live three houses up, and at 7:00 in the morning, we can't get out of our driveway, just with the traffic we have today for people going to work, people going to school, and that's about it. We just don't think this is good for our area. We wish that if they're gonna have students, they need to limit it to 300, 'cause once they get to 600 students, it's gonna be a major problem in the area. It's already gonna be a problem for us. That's about all I have to say.

GIBSON

Thank you.

BAGLEY

Thank you.

GIBSON

Morning.

PATRICK BURRY

Good morning. My name is Patrick Burry, I live on Christy Lane. I've been to all the meetings. And everybody has a hurt feelings report about vehicles coming up and down the street, people parking in front of their houses, this is about school, this is about teaching kids future construction the hurt feelings report, last time I remember that the citizens own the street, the citizens own the parking spots. Now, let's get to the kids. When I was in 9th and 10th grade, I didn't wanna study biology, trigonometry, chemistry, I wanted to study something that would put me to use. Now, 50% of all the construction that's going on in this city are from -

BURRY

50% of the workers are from California and Arizona. Let's teach these kids how to keep our money in our backyard, our taxpayers. The future of this city is the kids. Let's talk about the kids learning something. And the sign right in front of me says this is Women's Month. 50% of all the workers at the convention center assemble walls and doors. 50% of the women is the workforce. We have women that build high rises. We need to teach our children a trade.

As far as traffic goes, that'll always work itself out. There's 25 mile an hour speed limits. It was addressed three times by the engineers. They went as far as shutting off the whole entrance on one side of the future school, and I still hear the hurt feelings report from these people. They got hurt feelings. They don't own the parking spots. Again, let's put our children to work. Again, if they wanna study trades, they could join the military and join the combat engineers and they'll be way ahead. You know, the military needs kids that come in the military that know construction. Again nobody ever addressed the kids needs, it was always about their selfish, "Don't park in front of my house." Thank you.

GIBSON

So, what we're going to do is we're going to pull Item 11. We'll hear it so that you'll all have an opportunity, those of you who have not yet spoken can speak at that time. And so we'll pull that from the consent agenda. So anyone else that wishes to comment on something other than Item 11, please come forward.

MELANIE STOUT

Good morning. My name is Melanie Stout, S-T-O-U-T. I live on Lisa Lane. I am here for Item 4, Chancellor Manor. And as a neighbor of Horses for Heroes, I live about one mile west straight down La Madre. I tell you, this has been such an asset to our rural preservation neighborhood. A little about my background, I'm, you know, I was riding before I was even walking. I'm a veteran myself, and we all know Sid and Bill help the veterans. I'm still working at the base. I'm civil service, so I work with combat search and rescue to test helicopters. I'm also the IRTA, which is director of resiliency training for my unit. I'm also a nonprofit West Regional Commander of Vet Nevada, Alaska, and Hawaii. And what we do is raise money for injured military members and veterans in our local community. So I've been very involved in the community, and appreciate what this city has to offer everybody. And Horses for Heroes is one of those things that is absolutely essential, it's crucial, it just helps these veterans, teachers, first responders get through the tough stuff that those people in that line of work see every day.

So we are actually going to put together some – um - events with my squadron and the nonprofit Nation of Patriots – um - over at Horses for Heroes. So we are very, very excited about partnering with them, just to help even more people. Um - it's just a - a really unique asset in the Las Vegas Valley, so we would love to see it continue for as long as possible. So, thank you so much for your time this morning.

GIBSON

Thank you. Is there anyone else who wishes to speak?

BONNIE CONDON

Good morning, council. My name is Bonnie Condon, and I'm with American Mobile Home Park. I am here to ask - excuse me, I am on the agenda of Number 16. This has to do in reference to landscaping. We are asking if – we were told that a wall would go up in between the two properties, and we are asking that that wall could go up sooner than maybe planned. We are getting wild coyotes into

CONDON

our park at this time as of the last two weeks. We're not sure, but we think that they're trying to deviate from putting the wall down to divide the two pieces of property, that there was a contract for trees to be planted and sprinklers to be onto the trees, and we would like this to be amended in and to stay in there. This will cut down the noise, and so that we don't have to see the property next door either. This will also help crime from people jumping the wall and going back and forth. Thank you for your time.

GIBSON

Thank you.

NANCY AMUNDSEN

The consultant for this Item is here, and I'm sure she understands that we would require that they have a wall and we would require the appropriate buffers on the site.

GIBSON

Thank you. Is there anyone else who wishes to speak on this item, or on any item during the public comment period? There being no one then, Miss Amundsen, we're ready to go.

ITEM NO. 2 Approval of the Agenda After Considering Requests to Add, Hold, or Delete Items. (For possible action)

AMUNDSEN

The second item is the approval of the agenda. After considering any additions or deletions of items, staff has the following requests: for the audience and applicants' information, please be aware that additional renotification fees may be required if 85 days have passed since initial notification, or there were modifications to the original application.

Hold to the March 22, 2023 BCC meeting: Item 12 UC-23-0007, Item 13 VS-22-0709, Item 14 WS-22-0708, and Item 17 CP-23-900037.

Hold to the April 5th, 2023 BCC meeting: Item 5 ET-22-400136 (UC-19-0668).

The above public hearing items are going to be open as a public hearing and immediately recessed until the dates as stated. With these deletions, which are Items 5, 12, 13, 14 and 17, the agenda stands ready for your approval.

GIBSON

Thank you. Any other comments or concerns from members of the Board? If not, I'll entertain a motion.

JUSTIN JONES

Move approval.

GIBSON

Please cast your votes on your motion for approval by Commissioner Jones. The motion carries.

ACTION:

It was moved by Commissioner Justin Jones, and carried by the following vote, that the agenda be approved:

VOTING AYE:

Jim Gibson, Justin Jones, Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick, Ross Miller, Michael Naft, Tick Segerblom

VOTING NAY:

None

ABSENT:

William McCurdy II

ABSTAIN: None

ITEM NO. 3 Approval of minutes. (For possible action)

AMUNDSEN Next item is the approval of minutes. The minutes of the February 8, 2023 zoning meeting are ready for your approval.

JONES (unintelligible)

GIBSON There's a motion for approval by Commissioner Jones, any discussion? Please cast your votes. The motion carries.

ACTION: It was moved by Commissioner Justin Jones, and carried by the following vote, that the minutes be approved:

VOTING AYE: Jim Gibson, Justin Jones, Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick, Ross Miller, Michael Naft, Tick Segerblom
VOTING NAY: None
ABSENT: William McCurdy II
ABSTAIN: None

ROUTINE ACTION ITEMS (4-19)

AMUNDSEN Next are the routine action items, which consist of Items 4 through 19, except those items previously deleted, and Items 4, 8 and 11, which will be heard separately. These items may be considered together on one motion and are subject to the re - conditions listed with each agenda item, unless modified.

Staff has the following request: Item Number 16 ZC-23-0002, we request we add a condition: per revised plans.

If there are no objections from the audience, the public hearing is now open, and the routine action portion of the agenda stands ready for your approval.

JONES (unintelligible)

GIBSON There's a motion for approval as per the briefing we just received from Nancy Amundsen. Please cast your votes if there are no discussions. The motion carries. Thank you.

ACTION: It was moved by Commissioner Justin Jones, and carried by the following vote, that the routine action items be approved:

VOTING AYE: Jim Gibson, Justin Jones, Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick, Ross Miller, Michael Naft, Tick Segerblom
VOTING NAY: None
ABSENT: William McCurdy II
ABSTAIN: None

ITEM NO. 4 AR-23-400001 (UC-21-0630)-CHANCELLOR MANOR, LC:

USE PERMITS FIRST APPLICATION FOR REVIEW for the following: 1) permit a horse riding/rental stable; 2) reduce minimum area required for a horse riding/rental stable; 3) allow a boarding stall, corral, and pen area within the front yard where required to be located within the side or rear yard; 4) allow alternative landscaping along all side and rear property lines; and 5) increase the maximum number of Agriculture - Livestock, (small) animals (no longer needed).

WAIVERS OF DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS for the following: 1) eliminate street landscaping; 2) eliminate parking lot landscaping; 3) allow alternative landscaping adjacent to a less intensive use; 4) reduce setbacks for structures; 5) reduce setback from the right-of-way for existing structures; 6) permit an existing non-decorative fence; 7) increase fence height; 8) eliminate trash enclosure; 9) reduce access gate setback; 10) allow modified street standards; and 11) waive full off-site improvements (curb, gutter, sidewalk, streetlights, and partial paving).

DESIGN REVIEW for an existing horse riding/rental stable and associated structures in conjunction with an existing single family residence on 2.2 acres in an R-E (Rural Estates Residential) (RNP-I) Zone. Generally located on the west side of Miller Lane, 1,000 feet north of Lone Mountain Road within Lone Mountain. RM/jgh/syp (For possible action)

AMUNDSEN

Next is Item 4 AR-23-400001 (UC-21-0630), use permits first application for review for the following: permit a horse riding rental stable; reduce minimum area required for a horse riding rental stable; allow a boarding stall, corral and pen area within the front yard where required to be located within the side or rear yard; allow alternative landscaping along all side and rear property lines; increase the maximum number of agricultural livestock small animals, which is no longer needed. Waiver of development standards for the following: eliminate street landscaping, eliminate parking lot landscaping, allow alternative landscaping adjacent to a less intense use, reduce setbacks for structures, reduce setback from the right-of-way for existing structures, permit an existing non-decorative fence, increase fen - fence height, eliminate trash enclosure, reduce access gate setback, allow modified street standards, waive full off-site improvements (curb, gutters, sidewalks, street lights and partial paving). Design review for an existing horse riding rental stable and associated structures in conjunction with an existing single family residence on 2.2 acres in an R-E (Rural Estates Residential) (RNP-1) Zone, generally located on the west side of Miller Lane, 1,000 feet north of Lone Mountain Road within Lone Mountain.

GIBSON

This is an item that has attracted a number of people here. Is the applicant here with us today?

SIDNEY KNOTT

Good morning.

GIBSON

Do you have

KNOTT

My name is... Pardon me?

GIBSON

Go ahead.

KNOTT

Thank you. My name is Sidney Knott, K-N-O-T-T. Do I have to tell where I live? I reside at 104 Rancho Vista Drive, Las Vegas, Nevada 89106. Good morning, Commissioner Miller. Good morning Chairman Gibson, Vice Chairman Jones, and the Board of County Commissioners. On behalf of the local heroes we serve, our volunteers, neighbors and team, we would like to thank the Commission and Commissioner Miller especially for your support of our vision to provide affordable programs and life changing experiences, while preserving a historic rural equestrian property for the community. We are grateful to all of you for your

KNOTT

leadership and support. Horses for Heroes provides affordable, low cost, sometimes free programs with donated and semi-retired horses that empower, engage, inspire, educate, and yes, entertain those local heroes in our community whose call of duty is to protect, serve, teach and heal.

I wanna take a moment to thank all of you for your spirit of collaboration for this community. Without your leadership, the nonprofit community in this area would not be able to thrive and survive. We certainly applaud all that you do in all of your districts for all the nonprofits in this community.

Today, we are here for our conditional review to report that we have complied with the conditions of approval given by this Board in December of 2021, specifically at the Horses for Heroes Family Equestrian Center, operating at 4975 North Miller Lane, a property owned by Chancellor Manor LC, and leased by Horses for Heroes, we have met in our meeting the following conditions: daily activities take place Monday through Saturday, small group activities are limited to 20 per group, once a week activities and birthday parties, maximum of 30 per group, workshops serving veterans, seniors, addiction programs, maximum of 40 per group. We have one going on this morning at our center. While twice a year fundraising events are allowed, we do not hold large scale fundraisers that require a parking plan. All ongoing programs and activities generate revenue to support our nonprofit and sustain operations. Seasonal kids camp with daily camp activities, maximum of 30 campers with specific hours of operation, October to April, 8:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. with summer dates allowed eight - 6:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m.

All banners on the outside of the property were removed within 30 days of receiving the NOFA. Visitor access is only on La Madre, and all parking is on site. Our small on-site parking lot limits the number of people who can attend events at our center. All activities at the ranch are by appointment, and we limit capacity through online registration. We have a contract with Republic Services to pick up trash three times per week. We are working with staff to ensure ADA compliance. We have installed an ADA compliant port-a-john. We have two designated handicap parking spaces, and we have been advised that our surface is compliant according to Section 302 Ground Surfaces of the 2010 Federal ADA Standards for Accessible Design.

We have installed opaque mesh screen on the existing fence along the south, east, north and west property lines, and have replaced these sections as needed. We have obtained three business licenses, and they are renewed annually. Our gates remain open during business hours. We have completed the right-of-way spandrel dedication. We are meeting with the property owner regarding the restrictive covenant agreement, and we have purchased for \$20,000 a one-acre commercial water right. I'd like to add that as tenants of this 51 year old ranch property, at our own expense and with the support of our community properties, we have invested more than \$80,000 in upgrades and improvements to enhance the function and appearance of this aging property, including a new roof on the barn, installing energy efficient and water saving fixtures and appliances, painted the house and barn inside and out, installed concrete walkways to improve accessibility for all our guests, and we have a caretaker who lives on site seven days a week.

KNOTT

As we begin our 17th year serving local heroes and their families, and our fifth year in the Lone Mountain Rural Preservation Neighborhood, we are proud of our accomplishments and proud to be part of this community. We hope to have your s - continued support of our application.

Finally, I would like to take a moment to say thank you to those of you who took time to be here this morning and ask that you raise your hands to show your support. I also have with me 60 - 66 signed letters from neighbors and members, and I'd like to personally hand these to Commissioner Miller at this time. Thank you. That concludes my remarks.

GIBSON

Thank you. This is a public hearing is there anyone who wishes to comment during the public hearing on this item?

THOMAS MITCHELL

Good morning, Commissioners. My name is Thomas Mitchell, M-I-T-C-H-E-L-L. I live at 4940 Conough Lane, which is on the southwest corner of the Horses for Heroes property. Yes, I'm the – for those of you who've been around a while, I'm the former newspaper editor. My wife Jo and I have lived at this property for 23 years. There has been livestock on it all of those years. But for the past, going on five years now, it has been much cleaner, quieter, fewer (laughs) flies in the neighborhood. The staff and the volunteers at Horses for Heroes keep the place immaculate. In fact, our home is probably closer to the horse stalls than the house on the property, so we have found them to be excellent neighbors over the years, and would love to see them to get an extension of their use permit, if not for one, maybe for five years. I'd like to see them continue to be good neighbors of ours.

They're always open to... They have open houses, and we're invited over. They keep us informed about when they're doing things. It's been one of our better neighbors all these years. We appreciate them. And also, we appreciate the mission that they have taken on to help these first responders, military people, veterans and others, and their children. In fact, the most noise we get from that property is the sound of children laughing, and it's quite enjoyable. I think when I've gone over there for open houses, I've listened to some of the people who have been there, some of the adults, and they felt it's a - not only just recreation there, it's been quite therapeutic for them, it's helped them to continue their lives, particularly those who may have had a little bit of trauma over the years. And the children of course, always love to see them riding the horses and enjoying themselves. So, I will keep it brief for you. Thank you, gentleman -

GIBSON

Thank you.

MITCHELL

- and lady.

GIBSON

Is there anyone else who wishes to speak on this item? There being no one, the public hearing is closed. Commissioner Miller?

ROSS MILLER

Thank you. Well, thank you to - all the - everyone for coming in support. This was on the consent agenda. I had it pulled just to see if there'd been any opposition to this item today. There's been none. Nor was there any opposition at the Town Board. Obviously this has come before us before, and we've heard some complaints from some cranky neighbors alleging that there was some level of

MILLER

non-compliance. So, thank you to the organization for doing a tremendous job in complying with all these requirements over the last year. That said, it's obviously a tremendous organization, a huge asset for the community. I've heard an outpouring of support come into my office even to - to Mister Mitchell's point about kids that are happy riding these horses. Talked to some kids that are sons or daughters of friends of mine. One little boy – the Lacey boy likes to ride Tex. And then there's a Dalton boy that likes to ride Lacey. So I've heard it directly from a number of people as the impact that this organization has, and proud to support it.

That said, I would make a motion to approve the special use permit extension and do so indefinitely; remove the provision that we bring it back for review for public hearing with the understanding that if there - it does raise concerns about non-compliance, that we could always bring it back for potential revocation if things change, but it sounds like they've done an incredible job. And so I don't see a need to bring it further forward for public review at this time. I would ask for additional modification to whatever existing conditions are applicable, the provision that mandated that they only have once a week activities and birthday parties for a maximum of 30 per group, that we would modify that so that there's no more than 35 activities or birthday parties per year but at no event that there be no more than two per week.

Also that the trash pickup - we would reduce that from no less than three times a week to no less than two times a week and that the - obviously maintain the provision, and I just wanna get confirmation from Sidney that they're willing to do this - that they have three months to execute the required restrictive covenant agreement, which is applicable in this jurisdiction and applies to everybody. Is that a condition that you would accept? I - seeing she (unintelligible).

GIBSON

Would you please step up to the microphone? Thank you. Give us your name again and then tell us whether you accept that provision, those provisions.

KNOTT

Thank you. Sidney Knott, President, Founder, Executive Director of Horses for Heroes. Yes, I do accept those conditions, Commissioner, thank you.

MILLER

Great. Thank you.

GIBSON

There's a motion for approval with the conditions as noted by Commissioner Miller. Any discussion on this motion? Please cast your votes. The motion carries. Thank you. Thank you for coming today.

ACTION:

It was moved by Commissioner Ross Miller, and carried by the following vote, that the application be approved subject to staff and additional conditions:

VOTING AYE:

Jim Gibson, Justin Jones, Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick, Ross Miller, Michael Naft, Tick Segerblom

VOTING NAY:

None

ABSENT:

William McCurdy II

ABSTAIN:

None

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL -
Comprehensive Planning

- Activities and birthday party limitation changed to allow up to 35 activities per year, no more than 2 per week, no more than 30 per group;
- Trash pick-up twice a week (previously 3 times);
- Continue to work with staff regarding the ADA parking requirement.
- Applicant is advised that a substantial change in circumstances or regulations may warrant denial or added conditions to an extension of time and application for review; and that the extension of time may be denied if the project has not commenced or there has been no substantial work towards completion within the time specified.

Public Works - Development Review

- 3 months to execute the required Restrictive Covenant Agreement (deed restrictions);
- Compliance with previous conditions.

Fire Prevention Bureau

- Applicant is advised to submit plans for review and approval prior to installing any gates, speed humps (speed bumps not allowed), and any other Fire Apparatus Access Roadway obstructions.

Clark County Water Reclamation District (CCWRD)

- Applicant is advised that this property is currently serviced by a septic system with regard to sewage disposal; this system falls under the jurisdiction of the Southern Nevada Health District; this property is within 400 feet of City of Las Vegas public sanitary sewer; and that for any sanitary sewer needs, applicant is advised to contact the City of Las Vegas.

ITEM NO. 5 ET-22-400136 (UC-19-0668)-3900 PARADISE RESI OWNER SPE, LLC:

HOLDOVER USE PERMITS SECOND EXTENSION OF TIME for the following: 1) multiple family residential development; and 2) increase density.

WAIVERS OF DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS for the following: 1) increase building height; and 2) reduce parking lot landscaping.

DESIGN REVIEW for a multiple family residential development on 5.4 acres in an H-1 (Limited Resort and Apartment) Zone. Generally located 250 feet east of Paradise Road, 625 feet south of Twain Avenue within Paradise. TS/dd/syp (For possible action)

ACTION: Deleted from the agenda (held to April 5, 2023 per Commissioner Segerblom).

ITEM NO. 6 ET-23-400002 (ZC-19-0777)-USA:

WAIVER OF DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS SECOND EXTENSION OF TIME to reduce departure distance on Tee Pee Lane.

DESIGN REVIEW for a park on 10.0 acres in a P-F (Public Facility) zone. Generally located on the southwest corner of Patrick Lane and Tee Pee Lane within Spring Valley (description on file). JJ/jm/syp (For possible action)

ACTION: It was moved by Commissioner Justin Jones, and carried by the following vote, that the application be approved subject to staff conditions:

VOTING AYE:	Jim Gibson, Justin Jones, Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick, Ross Miller, Michael Naft, Tick Segerblom
VOTING NAY:	None
ABSENT:	William McCurdy II
ABSTAIN:	None

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL -
Comprehensive Planning

- Until November 20, 2024 to commence.
- Applicant is advised that the County is currently rewriting Title 30 and future land use applications, including applications for extensions of time, will be reviewed for conformance with the regulations in place at the time of application; a substantial change in circumstances or regulations may warrant denial or added conditions to an extension of time; and that the extension of time may be denied if the project has not commenced or there has been no substantial work towards completion within the time specified.

Public Works - Development Review

- Compliance with previous conditions.

ITEM NO. 7 ET-23-400003 (WS-20-0512)-B & R FOUR, LLC:

WAIVER OF DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS FIRST EXTENSION OF TIME to increase wall height.

DESIGN REVIEWS for the following: 1) increase finished grade; and 2) a single family residential development on 4.1 acres in an R-E (Rural Estates Residential) (RNP-I) Zone. Generally located on the southwest corner of Cougar Avenue and La Cienega Street within Enterprise. MN/tpd/syp (For possible action)

ACTION: It was moved by Commissioner Justin Jones, and carried by the following vote, that the application be approved subject to staff conditions:

VOTING AYE:	Jim Gibson, Justin Jones, Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick, Ross Miller, Michael Naft, Tick Segerblom
VOTING NAY:	None
ABSENT:	William McCurdy II
ABSTAIN:	None

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL -
Current Planning

- Until January 6, 2025 to commence.
- Applicant is advised that the County is currently rewriting Title 30 and future land use applications, including applications for extensions of time, will be reviewed for conformance with the regulations in place at the time of application; a substantial change in circumstances or regulations may warrant denial or added conditions to an extension of time; and that the extension of time may be denied if the project has not commenced or there has been no substantial work towards completion within the time specified.

Public Works - Development Review

- Compliance with previous conditions.

ITEM NO. 8 ET-23-400004 (NZN-18-0813)-MKAT CAPITAL GROUP, LLC:

HOLDOVER ZONE CHANGE SECOND EXTENSION OF TIME to reclassify 2.5 acres from an R-E (Rural Estates Residential) (AE-60) Zone to a C-P (Office and Professional) (AE-60) Zone in the CMA Design Overlay District.

USE PERMIT for a proposed major training facility.

WAIVER OF DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS to allow modified driveway design standards.

DESIGN REVIEW for a major training facility and office complex. Generally located on the east side of Santa Margarita Street, 300 feet south of Patrick Lane within Spring Valley (description on file). MN/dd/syp (For possible action)

AMUNDSEN Next is Item 8, ET-23-400004 (NZN-18-0813), hold over zone change second extension of time to reclassify 2.5 acres from an R-E (Rural Estates Residential) (AE-60) Zone to a C-P (Office and Professional) (AE-60) Zone in the CMA

AMUNDSEN

Design Overlay District. Use permit for a proposed major training facility. Waiver of development standards to allow modified driveway design standards. Design review for a major training facility and office complex. Generally located on the east side of Santa Margarita Street, 300 feet south of Patrick Lane within Spring Valley.

GIBSON

Good morning. Is there someone here on behalf of the applicant? Commissioner Naft –

MICHAEL NAFT

Thank you, Mister Chairman. I'm sorry there's nobody here. Unfortunately, this is a second extension of time for me, I've only... be my inclination to approve that if there were real extenuating circumstances. And because the justification on this letter went to far as to indicate that there are gonna be changes to the design, it seems to me that they could come back through the process. So I'm gonna move for denial of Item 8.

GIBSON

So, if we're going to take action like that, then let me open the public hearing. This is a public hearing on Item 8. Is there anyone here who wishes to speak on this item? There being no one, the public hearing is closed. There is a motion for denial of Item 8 by Commissioner Naft. Any discussion on the motion? Please cast your votes. That motion carries.

ACTION:

It was moved by Commissioner Michael Naft, and carried by the following vote, that the application be denied:

VOTING AYE:

Jim Gibson, Justin Jones, Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick, Ross Miller, Michael Naft, Tick Segerblom

VOTING NAY:

None

ABSENT:

William McCurdy II

ABSTAIN:

None

ITEM NO. 9 ET-23-400006 (ZC-18-0819)-THE MESA'S AT LOGANDALE, LLC:

USE PERMIT SECOND EXTENSION OF TIME for a single family residential detached planned unit development. DESIGN REVIEWS for the following: 1) proposed single family residential detached planned unit development; and 2) hammerhead street design on 79.0 acres in an R-E (Rural Estates Residential) Zone. Generally located on the south side of Gubler Avenue and the east side of Yamashita Street within Moapa Valley (description on file). MK/tpd/syp (For possible action)

ACTION:

It was moved by Commissioner Justin Jones, and carried by the following vote, that the application be approved subject to staff conditions:

VOTING AYE:

Jim Gibson, Justin Jones, Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick, Ross Miller, Michael Naft, Tick Segerblom

VOTING NAY:

None

ABSENT:

William McCurdy II

ABSTAIN:

None

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL -
Current Planning

- Until December 19, 2024 to commence.
- Applicant is advised that the County is currently rewriting Title 30 and future land use applications, including applications for extensions of time, will be reviewed for conformance with the regulations in place at the time of application; a substantial change in circumstances or regulations may warrant denial or added conditions to an extension of time; and that the extension of time may be denied if the project has not commenced or there has been no substantial work towards completion within the time specified.

Public Works - Development Review

- Compliance with previous conditions.

ITEM NO. 10 ET-23-400007 (VS-18-0820)-THE MESA'S AT LOGANDALE, LLC:

VACATE AND ABANDON SECOND EXTENSION OF TIME portions of a right-of-way being Whitmore Street located between Gubler Avenue and Claridge Avenue and Ash Street located between Gubler Avenue and Claridge Avenue within Moapa Valley (description on file). MK/tpd/syp (For possible action)

ACTION: It was moved by Commissioner Justin Jones, and carried by the following vote, that the application be approved subject to staff conditions:

VOTING AYE:	Jim Gibson, Justin Jones, Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick, Ross Miller, Michael Naft, Tick Segerblom
VOTING NAY:	None
ABSENT:	William McCurdy II
ABSTAIN:	None

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL -

Current Planning

- Until December 19, 2024 to record.
- Applicant is advised that the County is currently rewriting Title 30 and future land use applications, including applications for extensions of time, will be reviewed for conformance with the regulations in place at the time of application; a substantial change in circumstances or regulations may warrant denial or added conditions to an extension of time; the extension of time may be denied if the project has not commenced or there has been no substantial work towards completion within the time specified; and that re-approval by utility companies is required.

Public Works - Development Review

- Compliance with previous conditions.

ITEM NO. 11 UC-23-0003-CHURCH ASSEMBLY GOD KOREAN:

USE PERMITS for the following: 1) school; 2) allow accessory structures (modular classroom buildings) not architecturally compatible with the principal building; and 3) waive applicable design standards for accessory structures.

WAIVERS OF DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS for the following: 1) reduce height/setback ratio; 2) reduce parking; 3) landscaping; 4) allow signage; 5) reduce access gate setback; 6) permit alternative parking space dimensions; 7) reduce the pedestrian walkway width from the adjacent public sidewalk to the principal building entrance; and 8) allow modified driveway design standards.

DESIGN REVIEWS for the following: 1) school; 2) signage; 3) alternative parking lot landscaping; and 4) finished grade on 4.0 acres in an R-E (Rural Estates Residential) Zone. Generally located on the south side of Owens Avenue and the east side of Bledsoe Lane within Sunrise Manor. TS/md/syp (For possible action)

AMUNDSEN

Next is Item 11, UC-23-0003, use permits for the following: a school, allow accessory structures, modular classroom buildings not architecturally compatible

AMUNDSEN

with the principal building, waive applicable design standards for accessory structures. Waivers of development standards for the following: reduce height setback ratio, reduce parking landscaping, allow signage, reduce access gate setback, permit alternative parking space dimensions, reduce the pedestrian walkway width from the adjacent public sidewalk to the principle building entrance and allow modified driveway design standards. Design reviews for the following: a school, signage, alternative parking lot landscaping and finished grade on 4.0 acres in an R-E (Rural Estates Residential) Zone, generally located on the south side of Owens Avenue and the east side of Bledsoe Lane within Sunrise Manor. In addition, staff has a couple of additional conditions for this item: a limitation of 200 students the first year, with a total of 400 thereafter, one year review as a public hearing per revised plans.

GIBSON

Good morning, Mister Gronauer.

BOB GRONAUER

Good morning, Mister Chairman and Commissioners. My name is Bob Gronauer, 1980 Festival Plaza Drive. To my right is Julie Carver, she's the Executive Director with Southern Nevada Trade School. What I'd like to do is I'm gonna let Julie introduce the school itself, which is a charter school that's on your agenda, and then she'll turn it back to me, and then I'm gonna just highlight some of the issues that have been brought up by the neighbors in our voluntary neighborhood meetings, and how we've tried to address those issues. So, I'll turn it over to Julie.

JULIE CARVER

Good morning. Julie Carver, 3151 Soaring Gulls Drive. My name is Julie Carver, I'm the Executive Director for Southern Nevada Trades High School. I have a background in both traditional and trade schools, and we are a free public charter school. Our school will prepare students to succeed in college and career, so they may choose to enter the workforce, go onto college, or both. Or, as been mentioned, they can also go into the military and use their skills there as well. We have a proven model in our partner five-star Ace High School in Reno, Nevada. In our outreach efforts, we engaged over 800 local community members and found that 97.5 believed that attending a career technical high school would prepare students to enter the workforce immediately after graduation, and over 71% felt that it was important for their student to be prepared to get a high needs job directly out of high school. And this is why we chose this zip code, because of the high unemployment. And we found during our outreach that this was something that was really important to this neighborhood, that their students would be ready out of high school. They wouldn't take out loans, they would be working and pay their way through college, or continue on in a successful trade. So that's why we chose this neighborhood. We'd been very intentional. In our enrollment policy, we indicate that students within a two-mile radius will be given priority for our lottery. So all those students will be enrolled before we send it out to other zip codes, other areas, because we want this to be a neighborhood school, that's our goal, is to really lift up the families in 89110. We have over 150 families who are interested in attending our school, and this number grows daily. We have an outreach team that's in the community and we have lots of families that are in support, especially Latino families. Our goal is to build brighter futures for our students, their families, the community and the construction trades. And we believe that our school will do so. Thank you.

GRONAUER

Thank you, Julie. Now, with respect to the application, I'm gonna hit some high

points here. First, I wanna thank your staff for working with us and our consultants. As you can see through the staff report, they are recommending approval of the application, that's why it's on the consent agenda. And there were some additional conditions that I'll address as I go through this. As you can see here highlighted in yellow, we have about four acres of property. To the north of us is Owens, and to the west of us is Bledsoe. Over here, as I'm pointing out, is Christy Lane, which is to the east. Today, this is an existing Korean church with a preschool. So there's an existing use there today that you have a public facility or public use in this area for a church. And matter of fact, you have a church located over here, also on the other side of Bledsoe Lane. The reason why I point that out is 'cause some of the neighbors have said that the school that is being proposed is not compatible in the surrounding area.

So the way we look at this is, and we have agreed to disagree with the neighbors respectfully, is that the church, and there's already a preschool that is existing today in the - in the neighborhood, we believe that schools and churches, and especially as we're talking today about a charter school, is the fabric of - as a part of the community. And these types of uses should be within the community, as Julie has mentioned, where there is a need and where there is a want. As you can see on the overhead here, we've done community reach. The highlighted in red in this area are people who are in support. There's over 60 signatures that we got on one day going out canvassing in the neighborhood to reach out to the neighbors in the area who would use this school, or who are also in support of the school itself.

We do have some people from the various trades in the audience that are here to that are in, also in support of this, because as you know and you've heard throughout the years, there's a labor shortage, there's a need for this type of use. So for us, we think this is a great idea and a great opportunity for Southern Nevada to have a school like this. That being said, we had two informal, or two formal neighborhood meetings that were voluntary because it's not required to have a neighborhood meeting. And outside of those neighborhood meetings, we had additional neighborhood meetings with individuals in the area reaching out to address any concerns that they may have.

So, one of the things that you're gonna hear today, and I'm gonna show you the, on the - here's the site plan. The exciting thing about this site plan here is we're gonna keep the existing church, somewhere down in phase two we would have some classrooms, some mobile - modular buildings down to the south side of the building itself. But as you take a look at the property, as you see, if you're familiar with this property today and you see some of the upgrades, what we're doing, we think this is a good thing for the neighborhood. We're refreshing the property, we're adding trees, we're adding some other things that are trying to meet the code itself. Staff was, as I mentioned in the staff report, supporting us. So this is a good thing, in an older neighborhood coming in with a new use to refurbish the area.

One of the big issues is along here on Bledsoe. The neighbors on Bledsoe don't want any traffic on Bledsoe whatsoever. They don't want parking on Bledsoe whatsoever. And matter of fact, they don't even want people walking on Bledsoe. So one of the things that we've done, although we disagree about the pedestrian with individuals walking out on a public street on Bledsoe, we've agreed that initially we had a ped gate - here pedestrian gate, we won't have a pedestrian gate

GRONAUER

for access to have children walking out onto Bledsoe. The other thing that we said is, up in this area on the northern part of our property along Bledsoe, as I'm showing you on the overhead, we have emergency gates here, those will not be open except obviously in an emergency situation. So we're not gonna have ingress and egress going out there for circulation purposes.

There was a concern about we had two roll up doors on it that are on the building located here. We said we will not have roll up doors out in this area. Because the game plan was to have the roll up doors to bring the – I'm gonna say materials, out in this area and have two shade areas, and have the students put the stuff together, whatever the materials are, to do their construction. So, what we did is we redesigned the plan for the footprint. And instead of having the roll up doors out here, we're gonna have roll up doors in the front of the school here a set of roll up doors, where we're able to move the heavy materials or big materials in and out of the building in this area. And what we agreed with the neighbors, is there was a concern with noise, we said we won't have any of that construction noise or putting the stuff together outside.

So we believe, in good faith, that we've done as much as we can to eliminate whatever you wanna eliminate on Bledsoe. Although... and there was one other thing we talked about. And I know Public Works is not in support of this, but we're always willing to put, "No parking," signs during school hours along Bledsoe. But if that is a - but that isn't in a condition that gets imposed. What we told the neighbors also, we will hire off-duty police officers to help patrol this area to ensure no one is parking on Bledsoe.

Then the last thing that we also mention is our handbook. As you know, when you come in the charter schools, you have more control over the student conduct and parent conduct. If anybody is caught parking along Bledsoe Lane, we can just eliminate, excuse me, we could just let them go from the school and move on from there. If there are infractions like that, we can control.

With respect to circulation, we have circulation on Owens. We have lots of engineering, our traffic engineer. We've been working with your staff. We have double queuing lines within the property itself. As we get bigger - I mean, as we increase in students - when we have juniors and seniors on the property, we're gonna have split bell times of dismissal. And that's usually - pick up is usually the more dense time, with respect to the impact of - on schools and streets. But by having split bell times here, we will have about, roughly, somewhere around one o'clock in the afternoon, the juniors and seniors would be leaving to go to Southern Nevada College, to jobs, to other things that they need to do to complete their education. And then the freshman and sophomores would be let out around three o'clock.

So, as - when the school gets bigger and we get fully - we have more people in the school, we'll be having those split bell times. The other thing that we're gonna do, that charter schools are starting to do, is - there is an app that you can have. It's - I believe it's Driveline. There is a process and procedure to help move the traffic in and out a lot quicker than having people just show up and wondering whether or not their rides are there.

GRONAUER

Addressing staff's comments on the additional conditions – the school is planning to open this August. This August, enrollment is expected and projected to be no more than 200 students. The year later, we're projecting an extra hundred students, and a year later, a hundred extra students. So, within the next couple of years, we feel for phase one, within - for the church purposes, we can fill up about 400 students. That's what we definitely need.

Thereafter, over the next couple of years, our plan is to add 50 students per year, until we get up to the cap of 600 students. So, staff's added conditions of allowing a 400 cap for now, is good for us, and that's what we need so we could finance the building, purchase the building and move on for the development on the property. Staff has mentioned a cap of 200. I think that gives a comfort to the neighbors that are out there. Because what you're saying is, although we have 400, the first year is only 200. That's what we've represented. So I think that makes sense for a condition. I think that's fair, so someone doesn't think we're gonna put 400 students in there tomorrow.

The other thing that I think is very important, and I think this is coming from Commissioner Segerblom and your staff, is a condition for a one-year review. We're totally fine with that, and that one-year review is to check out the circulation, checking out everything that we said we were going do. 'Cause if we don't do it, then we have issues. But we believe as you run these charter schools, if you do it the right way, after the first week or two when you open, you get everything organized and and hopefully have that well-oiled machine.

So, we're comfortable we can get there. We wanna have that opportunity, as Julia has mentioned, as there is a need in this area. You already have a use that already has preschool and church services and church activities during the day and evenings, and on the weekends. And so, we feel that we'd be a great supplement to the current use that's there. So that being said, I will answer any other questions off of rebuttal or the neighbors that come down and speak, but those were the highlights of the issues that were discussed over the voluntary neighborhood meetings.

GIBSON

Thank you. This is a public hearing which is now open. Anyone who has not yet already spoken is invited to come forward on Item 11.

GLENNA ANDERSON

I have some papers, may I..?

GIBSON

Yes, if you'll hand them to that lady right there.

G. ANDERSON

Thank you. My name is Glenna Anderson. A-N-D-E-R-S-O-N. My address is 1547 Bledsoe Lane. I am here, not to oppose the Trades High School, but to oppose the location at 1580 Bledsoe Lane. There are six main points for my opposition and before I go to those, may I just say, I have raised six children of my own over a period of 25 years. I took kids to school and picked them up, so I'm very familiar with what it's like around schools, unless they've really changed in the last few.

So, the six points. Number one, our relatively quiet, peaceful neighborhood will be disrupted drastically by the noise of constant construction projects, the

G. ANDERSON

deliveries, the hustle bustle of young people up and down our streets on foot and cars. Number two, this is a neighborhood with R-E zoning. This school would be sandwiched in between R-E lots. Number three, it brings the potential for increased risk of crime and danger for our older citizens. Number four, there is a probability of troublesome issues due to insufficient parking spaces, with the added dilemma of no parking ordinance along Owens, between Nellis and Christy. Five, Bledsoe Lane does not have provisions for foot traffic. The only sidewalk is directly in front of the school, and the dispersing of young people through the neighborhood day after day after day would be concerning. Number six, traffic on Owens and Christy and side streets would be impacted. It's of particular concern for me because I'm directly across the street and I expect there'll be dropping off, picking up, parking, turning around on Bledsoe directly in front of my home and the other homes on the street.

I'd like to speak for just a moment about the zoning matter. Our neighborhood is zoned as R-E, the definition on the North Las Vegas website for R-E, as you well know. The purpose of the district is to provide for the development of single family detached dwellings and directly related complimentary uses at a low density. The district is intended to be strictly residential in character with a minimum of disturbances due to traffic or overcrowding.

The N - Nevada Department of Education published an online report of the charter schools in Southern Nevada. Other than the schools in Henderson, this group of pages passed out shows the list of 49 schools, their location, number of students, and grades attending. And then thanks to Clark County Government Open Web and Google, I gathered the information concerning the zoning of each property, as well as the zoning and circumstances of adjacent properties. Those with R-E zonings are highlighted. And as you can see, none of those is entirely similar to our situation, but the three most comparable have adjacent R-E properties that are primarily undeveloped land. If they were to be developed into homes, the potential buyers would be able to choose whether or not they wanted to live next to or across from a school, and that's a very different situation than we have. Do we want to set this precedent? I am really afraid that our quality of life would be greatly diminished...

GIBSON

You can com - you can complete your comment.

G. ANDERSON

Thank you. We've lived in our home in this neighborhood that's - for 43 years, we want and need it to remain quiet and peaceful. That's why we moved there. My husband suffers from Alzheimer's disease. How I wish he were his old self today. He served on the Sunrise Manor Town Board for over 17 years and he would be able to speak effectively on our behalf and for the community he served, but I must be the one today.

I am very concerned about my husband's wellbeing if there were to be a high school directly across the street from us. Because of the disconnect in his brain, he would not understand at all. When he would hear a noise, he would need an explanation, not just once - not just once a day, but every few minutes until the noise would stop. I know because it happens now. He would be concerned with the people on the street, the traffic, the goings and comings. It would cause him more confusion and many, many more questions and answers. This would

G. ANDERSON

adversely affect his quality of life and mine. As his concerned and loving wife, and his caregiver, I am truly concerned that this would change our life in a drastic way. Thank you for giving me an opportunity to speak.

GIBSON

Thank you. Is there anyone else who wishes to speak on this item?

MIKE ANDERSON

I'm Mike Anderson. I live at 6001 Applegate Lane, 89110. And I just wanna read a couple of things from the details of this, that was published with the agenda. It starts, "A use permit is a discretionary land use application that is considered on a case-by-case basis, in consideration of Title 30 in the Master Plan. One of several criteria the applicant must establish is that the use is appropriate at the proposed location and demonstrate the use shall not result in a substantial or undue adverse effect on adjacent properties."

Staff's primary concern with schools and daycare facilities are to ensure compatibility with existing and planned surrounding land uses, and that there is adequate onsite parking. So, Glenna is my mom. I grew up in that house across the street from where they want to put the school. The neighborhood is - there's very few sidewalk or - sidewalks or curbs, it's all just gravel. It's horse property, so people ride their horses on the street.

Anyway, so we're talking about changing this neighborhood. Again, from the paper, it says... So, talking about parking, "A pattern has been established with vehicles entering from Owens Avenue, where a double line queue will extend through the parking lot with a queue length of 520 feet. This queue length will ensure that even at the full 600 student capacity, the drop offline will not back up into Owens Avenue." And, we were encouraged, when he said they changed that to 400, and then he took it away and said it's - they're gonna expand to 600 again. So, I'm not sure what that meant.

But, if you have 520 feet of queue, you've got about room for 52 cars. Um - if we have 170 people in the park- the cars in the parking lot, that's only 220 cars. So, that means we're expecting 378 people to walk. "The proposed school requires 208 parking spaces, where 170 parking spaces are required and assist any request to reduce onsite parking." So, for some reason they want to give this waiver so we don't have as much parking as the rule says we should have. And because of the neighborhood streets and the no parking on Owens, there's gonna be people parked all over the place where they shouldn't be.

Later down in the paper, it says, "Based upon discussions with similar charter schools within the area, it's been determined that a large portion of the student body will not drive to school, but rather be dropped off or walked to school." It talks about a... It mentioned having a system of parking permits to control that. That's not gonna change the number of students or how they're gonna get to school. Somebody's gonna have to drive them or they're gonna have to walk. So, we're gonna have that many people.

I don't know if you remember from the overhead...

GIBSON

Sorry, you can wrap it up.

M. ANDERSON

... there's about 300 feet between their driveway and the four-way stop at Christy and Owens. If people can only turn right out of the parking lot, that's only room for 30 cars. We've got 200 - and-whatever car - 220 cars that are gonna have to go through that intersection along with half the kids, 200 kids, that are gonna walk through that intersection also. So...

And then one last really quick thing. It was denied at the Town Board Meeting, and so I'm curious how it was on the consent agenda when the Town Board didn't approve it. So, thank you.

GIBSON

Thank you. So, we have a young lady that is walking down from the top and she's leaving someone, I think. So, why don't you come on down and you can go next.

CHRISTINA BAROCIO

I'm going to leave my cane back there. Well, my name is Christina Barocio, spelled B-A-R-O-C-I-O. I own the property on the corner there, in the way of everything. (laughs) So, my only concerns – um - like everyone says, maybe we're not gonna stop this from happening, and it's gonna be good or it's gonna be bad, whatever it leads to. My concerns are, my property doesn't have, like – um - privacy.

So, I temporarily moved a fence that was in my property to the Bledsoe side of the property. And if they have future plans, is - do they discuss that? Like, if I'm gonna be pretty much shoed out of the way, out of the corner, because my house is like, literally on the corner in the way of everything. I'm not sure if they discuss that afterwards? 'Cause I used to have a lot of traffic that I used to think that they were going to the church but they would go in my property and in through Bledsoe and go through the back, through... No. They would go in through Owens and then they would get out through Bledsoe. I haven't lived there a very long time, but I did move there because it was quiet and there was property and I can have animals, and I do have animals.

So, my concerns were, "Okay, they're gonna build a fence high enough to where my animals aren't gonna be disturbed, or I'm not gonna have kids loitering in my backyard. 'Cause there's a acre back there to loiter back in there, you get me? I've had it happen with just other people, not students and stuff. And I've had traffic going through my property which I tried avoiding by putting a little temporary gate, 'cause I haven't been able to block off that whole thing. So, I just wanna know if they will discuss that, if they're gonna have that many quantity of people. And like everybody said, there is no parking on our - Bledsoe Street because it's a 45-mile hour. I guess you can park after Christy Lane, but you can't park before Nellis or in between, like, that section. So, where do those people go? I mean, I know that maybe they might try to go in our property and go in to park there but, I mean, I'm sure there's something we could do about that, right?

GIBSON

So, exactly -

BAROCIO

Since it's like, an empty field. So, those are my questions.

GIBSON

Okay. Well, Commissioner Segerblom will be addressing that, and a bunch of other items, when we hear the - when he gets an opportunity to do that.

BAROCIO

Okay.

GIBSON

Thank you.

BAROCIO

Thank you.

CHERIE ANDERSON

I'm Cherie Anderson. A-N-D-E-R-S-O-N. And I don't know if you guys want this or not, but can I give this to you? We had friends sign a petition that are opposed to this. Again, we're not opposed to a trades school at all. We - I have six kids graduating the 5th this year, and so we're not opposed to a high school, we're just opposed to the location that they've chosen for a high school, right across the street from my mother-in-law.

I am against all having to do so many waivers when there's such a negative response from the neighbors. Like my husband said, the Town Board was against it. I'm opposed to bringing in modular classrooms to accommodate the 600 students. That's not what the area... Anyway, it wouldn't be good in the area.

I'm opposed- one of the things that they had suggested is that the principal would stand out and guide traffic every day after school and before school, and I think that's a terrible idea. There - anyway, she's gonna get hurt and there's gonna be accidents and issues.

Their end time is the same time as the elementary school gets out and so there's gonna be elementary kids trying to cross that street at the same time as the high schoolers. That's not gonna end well. And because it's a charter school, we won't have the school police. And so if there's a problem, we have to depend on Metro, who is already overtaxed. They have claimed that they're gonna hire an off-duty officer to be there, and they ensured us that they would be in uniform, but if there's another issue with Metro, they will be called in to Metro, not to stay at the school, and vice versa.

Anyway someone commented, I think it was the lady, commented that they believe that the high high unemployment for our neighborhood is why they chose our neighborhood, but it's not unemployment, it's retirement. Most of the people in our area are retired. And they've commented on having the two churches and so it's already established. But church attendance is with families typically, and high school is not - you don't get to take mom and dad with you to the high school so that you're on your best behavior, but you do at church. And that's all I wanna say. Thanks.

GIBSON

Thank you.

BRETT WILLIS

My name is Brett Willis, W-I-L-L-I-S at 620 Chervil Valley Drive. I am the Board Chair for the Southern Nevada Trades High School and as well, the President of Silver Lake Construction. In that capacity, I'm coming to speak today representing many of the trade contractors. If they'd raise their hand? Just that, for the need for such a school, we're grateful for the opportunity to come before you and talk about this. We've been working on something for years. We're excited we have a deficit of skilled employees out there who are able to come in and help us build the communities in which we all live. That's something that we're excited

WILLIS

about.

We do hire many people who come out of high school, who come out of college, and unfortunately, they're woefully underprepared. We do spend the time to train them, but it would be wonderful if they could come in and already have those skillsets, have their OSHA 10, have an understanding of safety and how to use the tools properly, and understand that. That would be of great benefit to us. And so, we're really excited for this school, and we're interested in making sure that we're good neighbors. Thank you.

GIBSON

Thank you. Is there anyone else who wishes to speak on this item?

CONNIE BAGLEY

Good morning. My name's Connie Bagley. I live on 5560 East Owens Avenue close to Christy. And, we are not opposed to having a trades school in this town. We are opposed to having it in a rural neighborhood. That's mostly what I wanted to say. Thank you.

GIBSON

Thank you.

JOHN MANIS

Good morning.

GIBSON

Morning.

MANIS

My name is John Manis. I live at 5418 East Monroe Avenue, Las Vegas. My family has lived on this block of Bledsoe since 1957. I was raised there. We moved there when I was five years old. I raised four children there myself at that address. And it's been, over these years, we've seen the neighborhood change, but the one thing that has always remained constant is that it is an R-E zoned neighborhood. And it's generally quiet with neighbors and residence, having lived there for many years, and it has its special purpose there for us to have a quiet neighborhood.

We have had serious concerns about the proposal of the school, many of which have been addressed. I won't take a lot of that time. One of the things I did wanna address though is with the exception of the sidewalks and streetlights directly adjacent to that present building. The streets and the side streets of this neighborhood, especially like, along Monroe and Bledsoe, are unimproved, with no sidewalks, gutters, or streetlights. Then - and as they have talked today, they said this will be a - they would like to make it a neighborhood school which means there will be much more increased foot traffic through that neighborhood. The increased foot traffic would be a safety and security concern for us. There are - already are occasional issues from students and other individuals walking through the area, scaling our fences and with access to the private residences and opening private mailboxes. And, there are just a lot of issues that need to be thought about.

The traffic congestion, as we talked about, has also already been discussed, especially along Monroe Avenue to that four-way stop at Christy and Owens. There are - at the times when Mountain View School and El Dorado High School are opening and closing, that becomes a very congested area and it - this project would even add much more congestion. And I think one of the concerns that I

MANIS

would have also, is that there would be... The streets such as Christy Avenue - Christy Lane - Monroe Avenue and Washington Avenue drivers would be seeking alternative routes to get through that congestion, would be going through our neighborhood even more. The - our streets are barely maintained by the County as it is, and I think there would be a lot of more wear and tear to that - to the old asphalt on those streets.

Also a concern, which has been addressed of course, is the lack of sufficient parking. But be aware, we really are not opposed to this concept of a construction - construction trades school for the east side of Las Vegas. It is a declining area, as - which we've seen over the last few years. But putting the school in an unimproved, R-E zoned residential area would be a concern. I know that even driving in today, there are a lot of vacated buildings, such as the old Kmart building at Nellis Boulevard and Bonanza, also the old Walmart building at Craig and Nellis, which might be a much better consideration since those are already in a commercial area and there's - has much more access to public transportation and major traffic arteries.

I just wanted to give you that opportunity to hear what many of us, that have lived there for many, many years, think about this project.

GIBSON

Thank you. Is there anyone else who wishes to speak on this item? If so, please come forward. You've had your opportunity, Sir. Is there anyone else who hasn't yet spoken. Ma'am?

MARINA KANG

Hello. My name is Marina Kang. K-A-N-G. I live on 1457 Midnight Cowboy Court, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89110. I wanna thank the Board of Commissioners for this opportunity to speak. I have lived on the east side of town for about, nearly four decades. I went to Dell H. Robinson and graduated from El Dorado High School in 1988. And all of us have witnessed the development of Vegas over these past, you know, four decades, and it's grown exponentially. I sometimes visit certain sides of town and I'm - I wonder if I'm still in Vegas. (laughs) I have also worked for Clark County School District as a substitute teacher, and I've taught in different schools around town. And it was through that job that I learned that my side of town, east side of town, is considered at risk. I'm here today to remind everyone that it doesn't have to stay that way. I, as an educator myself, I believe that quality education can provide students, especially young, youth immigrant students, like myself at one time, with productive skills and knowledge that can change the trajectory of those lives.

And, I also believe that when lives are changed and invested in that way, that those students will develop a desire to want to come back and do something for their community. And so with that thought in mind, I know there's a lot of, you know, inconveniences with the whole - the logistics involved in this school coming to this property. But I, too, have lived on that property. That's why I attended El Dorado High School and Dell H. Robinson. But I had the chance to study. I had the chance to go away and gain education that has been very helpful to me, and I desire that for the other youth in that community.

And so, if we can set aside some of those immediate inconveniences and focus more on the greater whole, what's better for the greater whole I believe with the help of God, with the investment of this community, and with the awesome

KANG

education, I hope, from this school we will be able to change the east side of Vegas into a better community. Thank you so much for your time.

GIBSON

Thank you. Is there anyone else?

BAE KO

Hello. My name's Bae Ko 60599 Cromwell Court 89139. Please, pardon me, no – I - my English is not that great, but I'll explain myself. I'm from South Korea, 1987. I have been couple of times, you know, job training. One is, you know, (unintelligible) training. That's - you know, good for the, you know, (unintelligible), you know, American - you know, time.

Second is I've been taught by the - you know, just the high school, Desert Rose Adult High School. That makes my life, big change. After graduating high school, I just extend the - you know, go to the college for the - you know - pastor. So my second generation is there - you know, just to follow me to the - as the - became the pastor to serving town.

So you know, just my point of that, I wanted to say without learning (unintelligible), in my experience. You know – just that our church, surround our church live many migrants like me. So, this school will be - I believe - this will be hope of light, I believe. Thank you.

GIBSON

Thank you. Mister Gronauer?

GRONAUER

Thank you, Mister Chairman, Commissioners. I just have a few comments that were mentioned by the neighbors, 'cause I wanna make a couple clarifications. As I mentioned in my presentation, I wanna stress again from the lady – Miss Glenna – Miss Anderson, I believe who lives over on Bledsoe, on this side of – as I'm showing you on the overhead. Her concern was with noise. As I said, we are having all activities inside. Initially, we're gonna have activities outside as I was pointing out on the site plan, in here. So, to address her concerns, we also removed the two roll up doors that we were planning to have along the side of the building that's located here.

With respect to Bledsoe, today, and I wanna stress this today, today and every time I've come to this church for neighborhood meetings, Bledsoe is open. This is where traffic comes in. My understanding, and I could be corrected if I'm wrong, the only time the gate on Owens, as the church has been here, has been open on Sundays for church services, is my understanding.

And then, I also I know that because, from my personal experience, coming to neighborhood meetings at this church, I've always come down Owens and I thought I was making a right hand turn in, and then you gotta come back around and come down to Bledsoe. So what we're doing is, we're eliminating that traffic, that circulation coming out - in and out of this driveway, as I'm showing you here, that's there today. So, that should eliminate the - any type of concerns about the amount of traffic that's there.

With respect to parking... And I didn't do a good job, I guess, at the neighborhood meeting, and I didn't stress this in my initial presentation, but yes, we do have a parking waiver for reduction, but that doesn't apply to this first phase of what

GRONAUER

we're doing for construction. Okay? Because if this is approved today at 400, and just 200 for the year one, the parking reduction, the waiver, development standard, in that capacity, is not required. We need parking onsite. Even if we don't need parking onsite, if we didn't, as I already mentioned to you, we have control of passes and other means that we can control the parking on the property itself. We mentioned that we have off-duty officers that will be in the area, especially along Bledsoe, to ensure that nobody parks on - off property in these areas.

That being said, the other thing is, what is interesting, I spoke to the young lady after the neighborhood meeting last week. I believe her house is located here, the young lady I mentioned, on Owens and Bledsoe. I presume, and what she was explaining to me is, there was actually, at a time, there was cut-through traffic coming through her property. Not through the streets, that someone was coming off of Owens and Bledsoe, or Bledsoe to Owens, whatever it was, was cut through going through her property. I don't know if that was the church, if it's other residents, people in the area, whatever, that was coming through in this - in - in this area. The reason why I point this out is because that concern should not be an issue here because - for - as it regards to the school because, again, you're not gonna have the students driving in and out of this driveway that's located there, that's open today, so you will not be having people coming through.

And then in addition, she has fencing in the area here, along the side. As we mentioned to her, we're building a block wall in here, which is gonna be higher than her property so she's gonna have some more privacy in that area. So, I do wanna mention, if I understood, because we had that discussion last Thursday night after a neighborhood meeting, of her concerns with the cut through traffic in that area. Yep, and I think that's about it. Those are the things I wanted to hit on.

GIBSON

Okay. So we've closed the public hearing. Commissioner Segerblom.

TICK SEGERBLOM

Thank you, Mister Chair. Antonio, first, has the traffic study been done? Or will it be done after, if this is approved?

ANTONIO PAPAIZIAN

Thank you, Commissioner. The traffic study has been submitted. We have not reviewed it yet, but we will review it and they will have to address all the matters all the - the neighbors have not just adjacent to their property, the queuing analysis, how the stacking will be on site, and intersections around the school.

SEGERBLOM

Okay. So, Mister Gronauer, can you ... My understanding is you want to have 200 students starting in September?

GRONAUER

Yes, Sir. Yes.

SEGERBLOM

Okay. And then are you ... Is the plan to raise - raise that 100 students each of the next following years?

GRONAUER

Yeah. Year two and then year three would be 100 each year, maximum.

SEGERBLOM

Alright. And so you're asking for a total student population today of 400.

GRONAUER 400 today is that condition, yes.

SEGERBLOM Okay. Is the lady who spoke, who has the property on the corner, did she run off or is she ...

GIBSON She's up in the back.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER She's here.

SEGERBLOM Alright. And you've talked to her. I mean I understand her concern, at least as far as this wall you're gonna build. Is that wall high enough for you, that they're gonna build?

BAROCIO The property on that side is in fact higher. I wanna say -

GIBSON It's really difficult to get that on the record, so.

SEGERBLOM Okay.

GIBSON If -

GRONAUER Yeah, I believe what she's mentioning is our property's higher than her property. As we build our block wall, it'll be about two to three feet higher than her current existing block wall.

GIBSON Alright.

SEGERBLOM Alright.

GRONAUER Correct?

SEGERBLOM Wait, wait. I want you to, if this is approved, to work with her on this Bledsoe wall, because, obviously -

GRONAUER Mm-hmm.

SEGERBLOM - we don't people coming up Bledsoe, then cutting through her property. So -

GRONAUER Correct.

SEGERBLOM She needs - she needs some help there. I, this is the hardest thing I've done since I've been here. Because I understand you wanna keep the neighborhood. These neighborhoods are precious – horses are precious, and this is part of what Commissioner Kirkpatrick and I are trying to work on this to keep these older neighborhoods. Having said that, you know, Owens is not the street it was back when this house was built when you moved there. I mean, it's become a thoroughfare. So, honestly, one of my, things I need to do the next four years is to figure out how we can slow traffic down on Owens, make it a complete street, maybe we can put a divider in the middle of it.

There's lots of things we need to work on that this applications actually brought to

SEGERBLOM my attention. 'Cause the farther to the east, that's gonna keep developing. So, you're gonna have property going way back and forth. So, having said that I'm willing to approve this for 200 people with the condition that you come back sometime around, will be next, around this time next year to see if the conditions they're - they have promised have been met. To see what the impact is on the neighborhood, to see what the impact is on the house, of what the impact is on the traffic. If that - if this has gone south and none of these promises have been met, then it's over.

GRONAUER Yeah.

SEGERBLOM But if, you know, the, so far we're moving forward, then add another 100 students, let's come back a year from then. And then, if it's still going okay, come back a year from then - for that 100 students. But this is a really tight squeeze as far as what we're trying to do here. And we need to make sure that we don't destroy a neighborhood to save it, so ... But the flip side is, this project is something that is near and dear to me. There's nothing better than to create opportunities for kids that live in this neighborhood.

They can go out and there's, you know, construction's our number two industry. The fact that they can start here, go to the community college part time is just ... makes you wanna cry. So with that said, I move for approval. Did you have an issue?

GRONAUER Uh -

BAROCIO No, I mean, you discussed -

SEGERBLOM Oh -

BAROCIO - the concerns about the fencing and stuff.

SEGERBLOM Uh-huh.

BAROCIO I mean -

GIBSON Tell us your name.

BAROCIO Christina Barocio.

SEGERBLOM Tell us the baby's name.

AUDIENCE (laughs)

BAROCIO Camilla Barocio. (laughs) Tell them your name.

CAMILLA BAROCIO (unintelligible baby talk)

AUDIENCE (laughs)

SEGERBLOM Okay, but anyway, just -

BAROCIO She just turned one. Now, but -

SEGERBLOM Uh -

BAROCIO But my concerns were just, like - if this is gonna get approved my fencing is only this, yay high right now. It's chain link, 'cause that's all that was there. I do have a block, like, pallets of, full of blocked wide. But it is costly, so it's probably gonna be a process to do that as well -

SEGERBLOM Well, hopefully they're gonna teach brick layers at this school too.

BAROCIO Well, hopefully they build my fence. (laughs)

SEGERBLOM But anyway - but anyway, if you, when you come back a year from now, I want everybody to come back a year from now we'll have a neighborhood meeting again and we want Mister Gronauer to be able to say, "I worked with her to make sure that people are not cutting through her property," whatever that takes.

BAROCIO Okay.

SEGERBLOM So, thank you for coming forward.

BAROCIO Yeah.

SEGERBLOM But, I'm sorry, so, on time ... is there -

PAPAZIAN Commissioner, it sounds like they're opening up in August. I would just like to put on the record that if they've not ordered their flashers, the school flashers as of yet, they should probably get them ordered. They will not get C of O until they're installed.

SEGERBLOM Okay. Did everyone hear that? School flashers. Alright, but anyway, so, this area, we need to work on the traffic. Figure out how - how it's all gonna fit together. But we're gonna, with, if everybody votes with me, we're gonna go forward. Come back with, after, see how the 200 are working, and then hopefully everybody will be happy. But thank you so much for being involved. I appreciate what you've done. Jim and I both grew up in this town when you did. We appreciate how it was and how it ... but the fact is, this is not the Las Vegas that we grew up in. So, I would move for approval with those conditions.

GRONAUER One clarification, that's a cap of 400, right? That we -

SEGERBLOM Right - right.

GRONAUER Yeah? Okay. But -

SEGERBLOM But you - you're gonna come back in a year -

GRONAUER Yeah, yeah.

SEGERBLOM

- and if you have not met the conditions, it's over.

GRONAUER

Yep. Got it.

GIBSON

Okay, there's a motion for approval by Commissioner Segerblom. I wanna make a comment. One of the most difficult things that we do, we see these areas that are horse – zoned for animals. They're maybe - they're a rural neighborhood. And in many cases, they're undeveloped or somewhat developed. In this case we have a mature neighborhood where many people have worked hard over many years, to keep their neighborhood the way they wish for it to be. They can't control everyone that moves in. So, there is deterioration for sure, in most of the older and mature neighborhood. It's especially important that this neighborhood be protected to the extent that it's possible. And so, we're gonna be looking very, very carefully at everything that Commissioner Segerblom is moving to approve today. So, that we do not further degrade a neighborhood that is fighting for its life, that's really important. There's a motion, if there are no other comments, please cast your votes. The motion carries.

GRONAUER

Thank you for your consideration.

GIBSON

Thank you.

CARVER

Thank you.

ACTION:

It was moved by Commissioner Tick Segerblom, and carried by the following vote, that the application be approved subject to staff and additional conditions:

VOTING AYE:

Jim Gibson, Justin Jones, Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick, Ross Miller, Michael Naft, Tick Segerblom

VOTING NAY:

None

ABSENT:

William McCurdy II

ABSTAIN:

None

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL -

Current Planning

- 1 year to review as a public hearing;
- Per revised plans;
- Limitation of 200 students the first year for a total of 400 students thereafter;
- Post “right-turn only onto Owens Avenue during student drop-off and pick-up” sign;
- Certificate of Occupancy and/or business license shall not be issued without final zoning inspection.
- Applicant is advised that the installation and use of cooling systems that consumptively use water will be prohibited; the County is currently rewriting Title 30 and future land use applications, including applications for extensions of time, will be reviewed for conformance with the regulations in place at the time of application; a substantial change in circumstances or regulations may warrant denial or added conditions to an extension of time and application for review; the extension of time may be denied if the project has not commenced or there has been no substantial work towards completion within the time specified; and that this application must commence within 2 years of approval date or it will expire.

Public Works - Development Review

- Drainage study and compliance;

- Drainage study must demonstrate that the proposed grade elevation differences outside that allowed by Section 30.32.040(a)(9) are needed to mitigate drainage through the site;
- Traffic study and compliance;
- Reconstruct any unused driveways with full off-site improvements;
- All driveways to be ADA compliant.
- Applicant is advised that approval of this application will not prevent Public Works from requiring an alternate design to meet Clark County Code, Title 30, or previous land use approvals.

Fire Prevention Bureau

- Applicant is advised to submit plans for review and approval prior to installing any gates, speed humps (speed bumps not allowed), and any other Fire Apparatus Access Roadway obstructions.

Clark County Water Reclamation District (CCWRD)

- Applicant is advised that a Point of Connection (POC) request has been completed for this project; to email sewerlocation@cleanwaterteam.com and reference POC Tracking #0013-2023 to obtain your POC exhibit; and that flow contributions exceeding CCWRD estimates may require another POC analysis.

ITEM NO. 12 UC-23-0007-USA:

USE PERMITS for the following: 1) public utility structures; 2) landscaping and screening; and 3) trash enclosure. DESIGN REVIEW for proposed public utility structures in conjunction with an existing electric generating station (solar photovoltaic facility) on a portion of 2,393.0 acres in an R-U (Rural Open Land) Zone. Generally located 2 miles north of the Nevada/California state line, 10,000 feet east of the Primm Boulevard terminus, 12,000 feet east of Interstate 15, and east of the Union Pacific Railroad within South County. MN/lm/syp (For possible action)

ACTION: Deleted from the agenda (held to March 22, 2023 per the applicant).

ITEM NO. 13 VS-22-0709-TZORTZIS SURVIVOR’S TRUST A, ET AL:

VACATE AND ABANDON easements of interest to Clark County located between Jonathan Drive and Bruner Avenue, and between Gabriel Street and Las Vegas Boulevard South; and a portion of right-of-way being Gabriel Street located between Jonathan Drive and Bruner Avenue within Enterprise (description on file). MN/gc/syp (For possible action)

ACTION: Deleted from the agenda (held to March 22, 2023 per the applicant).

ITEM NO. 14 WS-22-0708-TZORTZIS SURVIVOR’S TRUST A, ET AL:

WAIVERS OF DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS for the following: 1) allow non-standard improvements in the right-of-way; and 2) reduce throat depth. DESIGN REVIEWS for the following: 1) commercial center; 2) alternative parking lot landscaping; and 3) finished grade in conjunction with an existing tavern on 3.7 acres in a C-2 (General Commercial) Zone. Generally located on the west side of Las Vegas Boulevard South, 350 feet south of Jonathan Drive within Enterprise. MN/gc/syp (For possible action)

ACTION: Deleted from the agenda (held to March 22, 2023 per the applicant).

ITEM NO. 15 WS-22-0685-PROLOGIS LP:

HOLDOVER WAIVERS OF DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS for the following: 1) attached sidewalks; 2) street landscaping; and 3) throat depth. DESIGN REVIEWS for the following: 1) distribution center; and 2) finished grade on 80.0 acres in an M-1 (Light manufacturing) Zone in the Asian Design Overlay District. Generally located on the south side of Desert Inn Road, 280 feet west of Valley View Boulevard within Paradise. JJ/sd/ja (For possible action)

ACTION: It was moved by Commissioner Justin Jones, and carried by the following vote, that the application be approved subject to staff conditions.

VOTING AYE:

Jim Gibson, Justin Jones, Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick, Ross Miller, Michael Naft, Tick Segerblom

VOTING NAY:

None

ABSENT:

William McCurdy II

ABSTAIN:

None

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL -

Current Planning

- Certificate of Occupancy and/or business license shall not be issued without final zoning inspection.
- Applicant is advised that the installation and use of cooling systems that consumptively use water will be prohibited; the County is currently rewriting Title 30 and future land use applications, including applications for extensions of time, will be reviewed for conformance with the regulations in place at the time of application; a substantial change in circumstances or regulations may warrant denial or added conditions to an extension of time; the extension of time may be denied if the project has not commenced or there has been no substantial work towards completion within the time specified; and that this application must commence within 2 years of approval date or it will expire.

Public Works - Development Review

- Drainage study and compliance;
- Drainage study must demonstrate that the proposed grade elevation differences outside that allowed by Section 30.32.040(a)(9) are needed to mitigate drainage through the site;
- Traffic study and compliance;
- Full off-site improvements;
- Remove the western driveway on Pioneer Avenue or move the driveway to line up with, and prevent turn conflicts from, the proposed driveway on the south side of Pioneer Avenue on APN 162-18-506-001;
- Coordinate driveway locations with the owner/developer of the proposed project on the south side of Pioneer Avenue on APNs 162-18-506-001, 162-18-506-008, and 162-18-506-011.
- Applicant is advised that approval of this application will not prevent Public Works from requiring an alternate design to meet Clark County Code, Title 30, or previous land use approvals.

Clark County Water Reclamation District (CCWRD)

- Applicant is advised that a Point of Connection (POC) request has been completed for this project; to email sewerlocation@cleanwaterteam.com and reference POC Tracking #0013-2022 to obtain your POC exhibit; and that flow contributions exceeding CCWRD estimates may require another POC analysis.

ITEM NO. 16 ZC-23-0002-VWP VEGAS BLVD OWNER, LLC:

ZONE CHANGE to reclassify 12.5 acres from an H-2 (General Highway) Zone, C-2 (General Commercial) Zone, and an R-T (Manufactured Home Residential) Zone to an M-D (Design Manufacturing) (APZ-2) (AE-75) Zone.

WAIVER OF DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS for landscaping.

DESIGN REVIEWS for the following: 1) warehouse facility; and 2) finished grade. Generally located on the south side of Las Vegas Boulevard North and approximately 550 feet east of Walnut Road within Sunrise Manor (description on file). WM/sd/syp (For possible action)

ACTION:

It was moved by Commissioner Justin Jones, and carried by the following vote, that the application be approved subject to staff conditions and revised plans.

VOTING AYE:

Jim Gibson, Justin Jones, Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick, Ross Miller, Michael Naft, Tick Segerblom

VOTING NAY:	None
ABSENT:	William McCurdy II
ABSTAIN:	None

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL -
Current Planning

- No Resolution of Intent and staff to prepare an ordinance to adopt the zoning;
- Per revised plans;
- Certificate of Occupancy and/or business license shall not be issued without final zoning inspection.
- Applicant is advised that the installation and use of cooling systems that consumptively use water will be prohibited; the County is currently rewriting Title 30 and future land use applications, including applications for extensions of time, will be reviewed for conformance with the regulations in place at the time of application; a substantial change in circumstances or regulations may warrant denial or added conditions to an extension of time; the extension of time may be denied if the project has not commenced or there has been no substantial work towards completion within the time specified; and that the waiver of development standards and design reviews must commence within 2 years of approval date or they will expire.

Public Works - Development Review

- Drainage study and compliance;
- Drainage study must demonstrate that the proposed grade elevation differences outside that allowed by Section 30.32.040(a)(9) are needed to mitigate drainage through the site;
- Traffic study and compliance.
- Applicant is advised that approval of this application will not prevent Public Works from requiring an alternate design to meet Clark County Code, Title 30, or previous land use approvals; and that Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) permits may be required.

Fire Prevention Bureau

- Applicant is advised to submit plans for review and approval prior to installing any gates, speed humps (speed bumps not allowed), and any other Fire Apparatus Access Roadway obstructions.

Clark County Water Reclamation District (CCWRD)

- Applicant is advised that a Point of Connection (POC) request has been completed for this project; to email sewerlocation@cleanwaterteam.com and reference POC Tracking #0023-2023 to obtain your POC exhibit; and that flow contributions exceeding CCWRD estimates may require another POC analysis.

ITEM NO. 17 CP-23-900037: Conduct a public hearing, adopt the Flood Control Master Plan Amendment, and authorize the Chair to sign a Resolution amending the Plan. (For possible action)

ACTION: Deleted from the agenda (held to March 22, 2023 per staff).

ITEM NO. 18 ORD-22-900590: Conduct a public hearing on an ordinance to consider adoption of a Development Agreement with Signature Land Holdings LLC for a single family residential development (Chieftain & Serene) on 2.6 acres, generally located north of Serene Avenue and east of Chieftain Street within Enterprise. JJ/dd (For possible action)

ACTION: It was moved by Commissioner Justin Jones, and carried by the following vote, that the recommendation (including the adoption of Ordinance No. 5022) be approved.

VOTING AYE:	Jim Gibson, Justin Jones, Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick, Ross Miller, Michael Naft, Tick Segerblom
--------------------	---

VOTING NAY: None
ABSENT: William McCurdy II
ABSTAIN: None

ITEM NO. 19 ORD-23-900035: Conduct a public hearing on an ordinance to consider adoption of a Development Agreement with Alexander Mackovski for a hotel and a commercial building (Las Vegas & Cactus) on 2.8 acres, generally located east of Las Vegas Boulevard and south of Cactus Avenue within Enterprise. MN/dd (For possible action)

ACTION: It was moved by Commissioner Justin Jones, and carried by the following vote, that the recommendation (including the adoption of Ordinance No. 5023) be approved.

VOTING AYE: Jim Gibson, Justin Jones, Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick, Ross Miller, Michael Naft, Tick Segerblom
VOTING NAY: None
ABSENT: William McCurdy II
ABSTAIN: None

ITEM NO. 20 AG-23-900058: Receive a report on the Transform Clark County Development Code rewrite, and direct staff accordingly. (For possible action)

AMUNDSEN Next is Item 20, AG-23-900058. This is to receive a report of the Transform Clark County Development Code rewrite and direct staff accordingly. Commissioners, this is the consolidated draft. This is putting all of the portions that we had previously brought to you together and adding the administrative portions. So, we will be opening this draft up for comments. We'll be having our neighborhood or our stakeholder meetings tonight. We're even having a Town Board CAC meeting. So, this is the final step of the rewrite for Title 30.

GIBSON Good morning.

MATT GOEBEL Good morning, Commissioners, good to see you again. I'm Matt Goebel from Denver, Colorado. Looking for the Power Point. There we go. Happy to be here to update you on the progress of this project of – we've been on this road together for a while, we started back in 2020 with the development of the master plan. And we just wanted to carry forward this slide to show you that we've now moved to the far right of the slide. We're getting close to the final stages of this large project which is gonna involve the drafting of the development code.

So, this slide gives you a little bit more detail on the drafting calendar for the Title 30 rewrite. We really got started in earnest on this, in the middle of 2021, when we talked with a lot of you all, a lot of stakeholders about, you know, opportunities to improve the documents. We've summarized all that in a code assessment, which laid out a roadmap for moving forward. Then we started drafting the code. And we rolled that out in a couple of installments so far. We were here in the middle of last year on the zoning districts and land uses and then we rolled out the development standards. Things that affect quality development, like parking and landscaping at the end of 2022.

So, now we're moving into the next stage. And the document that is being published now for review is the consolidated draft, as Miss Amundsen said it includes revised versions of everything that you've seen so far. The districts and uses of the development standards, and also some new material, the administration. And that's what we'll spend the bulk of our presentation today talking about. We are asking for comments from the public to be due on March 23rd, that'll allow us to turn around a revised document and adoption draft in early May. And then ideally, moving forward into the adoption process with you all, in June of this year.

So, that's the schedule. And we'll talk more about the opportunities for commenting on that draft later in the presentation. So, I think that's a - that's an aggressive schedule, but it's very realistic, because we've had a lot of good feedback along the way, from you all, from a lotta stakeholders. We've had a lotta meetings with stakeholders submitting comments from groups like the Southern Nevada Home Builders, from individual property owners. We've had a lot of good feedback submitted.

As you heard, we're doing stakeholder meetings tonight. Meeting with a lot of the new folks on the TAB, CACs in person. And we have been putting the documents up online to get feedback. So, the process has been very robust, I think, in terms of getting public input. So, that's all I wanted to say about the structure of the project, the scope. We want to now talk about substance. And, just as a reminder, the assessment report for the code identified some big themes to work on for improving Title 30. The one we haven't talked about yet is the one in yellow there. Ensure consistent and efficient procedures.

And so, that's what we're gonna spend the first half of this presentation going forward with you on. If you recall, we've gotta reorganize code. That's summarized on the left-hand side of the slide. Basically just trying to make it a more rational structure. You know, grouping like material. We've gotten really good feedback on the structure from the stakeholders that have reviewed it. We'll be talking today about the ones that are highlighted. 30.01 and 30.05. I will say on this slide we were talking with staff and I think the current draft is about 175 pages shorter than you have in your current Title 30. And it's gonna get shorter still, 'cause we're gonna take out all the footnotes and all the commentary.

So one of your directions to us was a simpler, more streamlined document, more user friendly. And so, I think just the organization and the length is something that we've really worked hard to implement. So let's focus on the procedures. That's the new piece that the County has not seen yet in this draft. It's primarily two chapters. 30.01 is general provisions. I'm not gonna spend much time talking about that. It's the foundation stuff, you know, the general purpose statement, the overall statement of applicability. This is where enforcement lives in the code, those provisions. This is where the non-conformity stuff is.

We will spend the bulk of our time here talking about Chapter 30.05, which is the rewrite of all the procedures, for how you look at use permits, for how you look at rezonings. All the things that you've been talking about this morning. Our goals as we went through this and worked with staff were several. First of all, just clarify how projects moved through the process to try to improve transparency and

GOEBEL

efficiency. We heard from a lotta stakeholders early on that the process is little bit confusing to the mom and pops but also sophisticated developers, and also people that use the code as officials or staff.

So, I think just trying to codify exactly what you do now and try to clarify how applications move through was a big goal for the project. More administrative approvals for small deviations. So, you know, some of the small stuff. You know, maybe if somebody comes in with a small change to an approved sign permit. Can that be handled with staff to get it through faster as opposed to going back through the original process? That was a goal. And then, allowing more flexibility to reduce the need for waivers. We've talked about this throughout the project. We have tried to - the waiver process doesn't go away in this draft. It's still there, it still will be used.

But I think we've built in a lotta flexibility in a lotta different ways to try to eliminate the need for so many waivers on so many projects moving forward. So, that was the goal.

KIRKPATRICK

Mister Chairman, I just, I gotta get this off my chest before we go too much farther so I could have a clear way of seeing this. It's ironic to me, though, as we're talking about the process in the permitting, all of the home builders walked out on the item before. There's no architects, engineers in here, yet they're putting bills in that would gut this entire process. So, I don't understand why they're not here so that we know that they've been heard? Because what's gonna happen is, they're gonna say, "No one asked our opinion." I just am super frustrated that we're not pointing that out, because it bothers me that on one hand you take legislation to gut the process, talk about how we don't do enough.

And when even you, our consultant says, "People are confused on how the process works." Really? Wh - they have no problem coming and submitting half-assed work. So, I just am bothered before our staff. Because we work around the clock and yet every one of those people got up and walked out of this building. And there's no engineering firms, there's nobody here to hear this process. So, it just frost my, just frost me today.

GOEBEL

Alright. I'll just keep going on. (laughs)

AUDIENCE

(laughs)

GIBSON

It's a little hard to follow that, right?

GOEBEL

(laughs) I ... We'll just say, we - they've - we've got a broad invitation list to all these stakeholder meetings. They're still gonna continue. This is the one that we gear primarily to you all, but we have been having stakeholder meetings with other groups. And so, hopefully that's gonna be well attended. We have been getting good feedback in writing. And that has resulted in, I think, in some good constructive changes to the process. Understood that's just a small piece of the big picture that you're talking about.

So, let me talk about the structure of this chapter a little bit more it is anchored by common review procedures. These are, this is just the general flow of how most

GOEBEL stuff moves through most stages of the process. You've got a pre-submittal conference for some of the bigger things. You've got an application review after the application is submitted. You've got the review of the application by staff. You might have public meetings, and then a decision. And then you've got things that happen after the decision. We have worked really hard with your staff to scrub all this material, to simplify it, to make sure it's matching current practice, or the way that you would like practice to be.

By putting all this stuff together in one spot, we've actually reduced it down to about a dozen pages. It's repeated a lot in your current Title 30. And it's repeated in different ways, in different places. And so, you've got a cleaner, more consistent way of repeating a lot of this information.

NAFT C - ... Before we move on, Chairman, can I ask a question on that slide?

GIBSON Yes.

NAFT Could - if you could go back one.

GOEBEL Sure.

NAFT Could you go into greater detail, number one, the pre-submittal conference, I know we've had lots of discussion around this. You just said on bigger projects are where it's warranted. Could you dig a little deeper into that?

GOEBEL I can.

NAFT Sir? (laughs)

GOEBEL And I'll -

NAFT And then I'm sure Nancy will wanna add to it.

AMUNDSEN Can I real quick ... two different things. I think you're talking about the pre-application process. They're talking the pre-submittal for the big hips and those sort of things, so -

NAFT Well, either way -

AMUNDSEN Yes.

NAFT I guess is m - ... Well, sorta that's my question, what are you indicating that would trigger that? What are the triggers for a pre-submittal conference?

GOEBEL I'm gonna jump ahead of this slide here -

NAFT Okay.

GOEBEL - because this is the summary table of procedures Commissioner. And if you could see that text – the third column in is the pre-submittal conference. And so, this is the table that organizes all the different procedure types. You've got

GOEBEL

different categories, you know, plan and ordinance amendments, application types. And the, you can see that the rezoning would trigger the pre-submittal conference, the PUD, as drafted the special use permit. But there's a footnote there. And the footnote actually indicates that the pre-submittal is just required for certain types of applications, like, if there's hazardous waste involved that would trigger things.

So, it's a fairly limited list of when that formal pre-submittal conference is actually triggered. But we included it in the overall steps, just because it is one of the formal steps of the process. And this is - this slide is just more detail on each of those five steps.

SAMI REAL

Commissioner, if you wanted to make a note, it's page 284 of the document. It's 20.295 of the staff report, that says when the pre-submittal is required. So, we model what we require today. So, if they're a high impact project, even though we're getting rid of a definition of high impact project, we're still requiring those projects that meet the thresholds of what is today a high impact project, to require pre-submittal. We have our projects of regional significance and of -

NAFT

So, in other words, it's not really expanding what warrants a pre-submittal conference.

REAL

No, that ... Yeah.

NAFT

Okay.

REAL

Not expanding it.

NAFT

Thank you.

GOEBEL

So, this slide is just more detail on the prior slide, which was the steps one through five. It just gives you a sense of some of the specific components here. We've gone through all these, again, with your staff, just to try to clarify, simplify, streamline. You know, someone submits an application, you know, what bodies can't submit an application? That's the initiating authority. Application content. It's important to note that we're taking up a lot of the detail submittal requirements from the current code in the appendices. They're gonna be maintained outside the code, as part of the user's guide or something, where they can be updated without having to go through code amendments.

So, that's actually, you know making a briefer document there. Application analysis, that's the stuff where the staff is doing a lotta the internal work to evaluate compliance with the criteria for the particular type of application. You know, is there a timeline that's imposed by NRS there? What are the standards for approval generally for all types of projects? Then we move on into the, if a public meeting is required, and who makes the decision. A lotta work here. This is where notice would be specified. This is where we talk about the different types of notice, you know? Is it in the newspaper? Is it mailed? Is it published?

There's a lotta cleanup here. It's just, it's cleanup of things like terminology that was inconsistent in the current code. Also, we tried to simplify the process. So,

GOEBEL

now, on mailed notice, for example, you've got a different radius required for different application types. You know, for some it's 500 feet, for some it's 2,500. And this draft, for simplification, is proposing a standard 1,500-foot radius notice. Unless a larger notice is required by State law. So, there's only a couple places where 2,500 is required by NRS. But for the most part, the default proposed here is 1,500. That would be consistent with the notice radius for plan amendments, say. And so, you wouldn't have this confusing situation where you got different notice radiuses for different parts of the same associated applications. So, that's an example of how we've tried to clean that up. I won't go through all those details, but this is where we all specify, the general rules that apply to how the hearing would be conducted, the general rules that apply to the types of conditions that could be put on a project, et cetera. Post decision, you know, the general rules that apply to changes to approve plans, for example.

This is the foundation. And then everything subsequent in this chapter just builds on the common procedures. And it says the common procedures apply, or they apply with these modifications, or with these exceptions. And so, this is the table that I showed you here. And this is how the chapter is organized. And each one of these procedures has its own section. And I just, it builds on that common framework that I just outlined. And basically it says, you know, again, what modifications apply to that common framework.

So, it's organized into types of procedures. So, first of all you've got plan and ordinance amendments. You know, amendment to the master plan, or amendment to the text of Title 30, or rezoning. You've got the general application types there, you know, design review, special use permit, et cetera. Flexibility and relief, that's the - that's where you might get a minor deviation, an extension of time. This is just the first half of this table, it continues onto the next page. But the other categories are sign review, which is pulled out as its own review type. There's a whole set of subdivision and Public Works procedures –tentative maps, et cetera. And then other procedures. You know, things like street naming and annexation. Stuff like that, that's not used as often. But for each of these, it's intended to help be a clear visual summary of, you know, type of notice required and who makes the decision.

So we're not gonna bore you with all those in detail, in one of those procedures, but just wanted to hit a few of the high points on these next couple of slides. Some of the major revisions that we think you might wanna be aware of we said that we would look for opportunities for more staff decisions on very small stuff. And some examples are on this slide. Administrative Design Review. Right now you've got a long list of stuff that goes to the design review process heard by the Commission, sometimes by the Board. Some of those are very minor. Like, you know, a change in the number of visitor parking spaces. And so, we pulled out some of those very minor things, and are proposing that those could be handled at Administrative Design Review. I mentioned that there's a new sign review -

KIRKPATRICK

Mister Chairman? So, can ask this question? 'Cause this ain't my first rodeo going down to the request of the home builders. And I am probably pretty jaded and shouldn't be - even be listening to this presentation at this point this morning.

GOEBEL

(laughs)

KIRKPATRICK

But so, we went down this road. And this was when Chairman Sisolak was here. We went down this road, we had a list of 50 things, and then we narrowed it down to things that we can do. So, where are all these requests coming from? 'Cause I'd like to see that list myself, to compare it to the list of the 50 things that we got rid of last time. So, if the list is, "We can never get rid of enough things," then I'd like to know that, 'cause I also wanna see the emails where they say this is such a great process. So, I would like to see the list of where some of these ideas came up, because we've been down that list more than once. This is - when I first got here - this was 2005 -

GOEBEL

Mm-hmm.

KIRKPATRICK

We continued to whittle away our process, but no one else in the Valley is asked to do that. So, I wanna see the list on where this stuff came from, because I don't remember giving you that list. So, I'd like to see the list.

REAL

Commissioner Kirkpatrick, can I ... for what you're looking at here, the ... I understand what you're asking for in general. But specifically as it relates to minor deviations, one of the things that we did, our code allows for minor deviations now, but if you go to the section that talks about minor deviations, it just says you could have a minor deviation. You have to literally read through all the sections of code to find out where you can, or what rules you can apply for a minor deviation. So, what we've done is we've taken all those various sections that are in current code, and lumped it into a table that says, "These are all the areas where you can do minor deviations." So, some of what you're seeing is a cleanup from what we have today, and then some of it is putting into practice what we do today. And then some of it is a request of either what we've seen as trends or as you said, some request from industries.

KIRKPATRICK

But well, and I get that. But I'd like to see the list of what people are asking for because this Board, when I first came on, they decided things that they would like to see, because again, it goes back to, if everything goes administrative, then we sometimes could see things that are happening after the fact, when we can't fix it. And that was the whole discussion on that. There's a, somewhat of a history. So, at some point, I'd like to see the list of what we're seeing we could do, or what the list of the requests are. Because we've been down this road before.

GOEBEL

Mm-hmm.

KIRKPATRICK

And it started at 150. And now we, each time we give them 50, at what point do I have the ability to work with my constituents to make sure we're getting what's needed in the neighborhood? So -

AMUNDSEN

And - and- an -

KIRKPATRICK

I just - And I'm probably just mad about this whole thing. And I have 50 questions on some of this stuff that I feel that got taken out. And you're going out to the public. And so, I should just let you get through your presentation, maybe go have a breathing treatment and come back or something, I don't know.

AMUNDSEN

One point I'd like to make is the administrative applications all go to the Commissioner for the district, no matter what. We haven't changed that. And the other thing that I'd like to point out is, we have in our code, for instance, today, on a five-acre site, if someone comes in and doesn't ask for waivers or modifications or anything, they can come in and go do that for, an administrative application. Do you know that we've had no one that has come in for an - and we're not changing that. We're gonna allow them to still do that. And again, it goes to the Commissioner for that district. But we're not taking away, if they're coming in for waivers, they're coming in for waivers and they're gonna go through the public hearing process.

We're just trying to consolidate what we have and make it easier for the public to see and for you to see. But I don't know, we don't have, we haven't had those requests. The requests that we've had from industry is, "We don't wanna be subject to that," and "We don't wanna be subject to this." And we're not taking away their being subject to -

KIRKPATRICK

I just think, in all fairness, it's fair to us as a Board to see what that list is. Because I'll just tell you, I sat on some of the transition teams, and they had a list a mile long to get rid of Town Boards, to get rid of all these other things. And then there's legislation. So, I wanna see the list. I'm asking for the list. I think I'm entitled to that.

AMUNDSEN

And we don't have a list because they haven't given us that list.

KIRKPATRICK

Well, the consultant said he has a list, so, I want his list.

GOEBEL

Well, we talked to stakeholders and we heard I wanna be clear, I ... We, you know, we always hear from the industry that they wanna simplify the process. And they wanna have things go through as fast as possible. And that's just a given in projects like this, when we talk with them. And, you know, we always try to listen and we always try to step back and think about it with a - take it with a grain of salt. I think we heard very strongly, from you all, that there was not that much interest in further limiting your ability to hear things, and further giving things to staff. From my perspective, honestly, this is a very modest slide, for projects like this.

We typically would see many more things. You know - especially in a community this size, go down to the staff level. I think, you know, this reflects the feedback that we got that we need to be very careful in this area in terms of giving more things to staff. And so, as you heard, it's clarifying what you've already done. There's some very modest you know, things, like changing visitor parking spaces, again, it's a small list though. There's really not a lot of movement in that direction.

So, in terms of the, you know, the written feedback we've gotten has been more on other sections of the code. It's been more on the design review options. You know, "Can you add some more options for us in terms of how many things we can ... " I don't know that we've gotten any feedback on this stuff yet, because it's just going out for public review. So during the assessment stage, they didn't tell us anything specific on what they wanted to have addressed at staff level.

GIBSON So, have you, Commissioner Kirkpatrick, do you feel like you -

KIRKPATRICK I'm not reasonable today honestly.

GIBSON Well, that's fine, c -

KIRKPATRICK So, I'm gonna ... So, like, he could keep going. I'm gonna step out for a few minutes.

NAFT Chairman, just to chime in, you can, all of the comments are available to us. We, you would make them all available to us from industry -

GOEBEL Sure.

NAFT - from other. Frankly, I would like to know a lot more about what other departments have asked for. Because this is, while you are all are the lead, there are, well, are 39 other departments. A lot of them have to deal with this code as well. So, I'd like to delve into that. I think it's sorta the same question just to ... so we can have a better understanding of what everybody's asking for, both externally and, in my case, internally. But I don't think that's unreasonable we should have -

GIBSON No, I -

NAFT I think we do have access to that information. I think we should have very clear access to it.

GOEBEL We - well, and just to be clear about the feedback we've gotten so far, I think it's been pretty general. You know, at the assessment report stage, we talked about trying to make the process more efficient. Not a lotta people bit on that topic, we didn't get a lotta feedback on that yet. The feedback we've gotten so far has been about the detailed code that we've put out. So, site and building design standards, that's where we've gotten good feedback. I think in the next couple of weeks, when this material is now gonna be live, and we get the opportunity to get feedback in writing, you're gonna start to see more comments and say, "Maybe, can we put more things in the staff?" And then the conversation can continue about should that be pursued. But - the ... - I said we've gotten a lotta feedback, it's not been very deep, so.

GIBSON Well – uh – uh - here's what I think makes sense. I think that we, if - if there is no list, then, let's make available to us the feedback that you've received.

GOEBEL Sure.

GIBSON And we can take it from there. If it turns out that there are things that are of concern that come up as a result, then maybe there were some decisions made, based upon input then we'll be able to see that too. And we'll be able to attribute it where it oughta be attributed.

GOEBEL Okay. Happy to do that. I think this is the final slide on procedures. We rewrote

GOEBEL

the Planned Unit Development tool, which is not used very often. You know, plant unit developments are intended an opportunity for a developer to get a little bit more flexibility to be more innovative, in exchange for public benefits. You know, more high-quality design or more open space, say. And that's the way this has been rewritten. Right now, they get a lotta waivers accompanying that, and it's intended to just be a better tool more consistent with other communities do that. I mentioned sign review, right now sign review is lumped in with all the land use permitting review.

And this code is trying to clean up the system by clearly making it separate. If you're just doing a sign proposal for something that's gonna comply with the code and it's allowed in the district, you're probably just gonna go straight for a building permit. But this procedure is for waivers of more than 10%, or a sign type that's not allowed in the district. Staff has proposed to be able to do sign waivers up to 10%, consistent with that minor deviation you already have. Anything over 10% would go through this process. It's generally gonna be a Commission decision, the way it's drafted.

However, we have carried forward the concept of Comprehensive Sign Plans. Which is for maybe a – it's listed for resort hotels. So, you're doing a big, unusual site that's gonna have a lot of you know signage, a lot of bells and whistles. That tool is allowed is intended to give them even more flexibility on that site to arrange how the spacing and the lightness is arranged. So, that's the sign review, that's the new piece. And it's just flagged here because it's pulled out from your land use permitting piece, where it's integrated there now.

This is the point in the presentation where we're gonna shift over from procedures, into just a recap of the other installments and tell you what's new. Last night with the Planning Commission, we stopped here and they had a lotta questions about procedures, and that worked well. But I can continue on or we can stop here for more procedures questions, if you would like.

GIBSON

Are there other procedure questions before we move on? Let's move on.

GOEBEL

Okay. I'll just – this is gonna be a real quick recap, because you've seen a lot of this before. The zone districts, you know, a lot of people are new to this process, so we reminded them about the alignment of the zone districts with the categories from the master plan. We've gone through this with you before. We introduced some new districts some of have been retained as is. Some of the districts that are not being used are not being carried forward. We've gone through those lists. As an example, you know, you've got a mixed-use overlay district now that's not really being used. And so some new mixed use districts have been suggested.

There's a lot of the user-friendly enhancements we talked about in this part of the code with those illustrations like you see in the bottom right of - for all the different districts. Provides a good visual of what the County wants to see. Right now you've got a kind of a text heavy document that says what you don't want to see, but the code is starting to move in a direction of showing what types of development you want to see with mixed use.

SEGERBLOM

Could I ask you about the mixed use?

GOEBEL Sure.

SEGERBLOM So that's something I've been talking about, but you're saying we actually don't use the current mixed-use zoning?

GOEBEL Correct. Yeah, and we've proposed a couple of new flavors of mixed-use districts that I think are intended to have better standards and be more likely to create the type of mixed use you want to see. Maybe on major corridors, or places where you've identified that in the plan.

SEGERBLOM Is this something like Denver, you looked at other cities where they do this? Because -

GOEBEL We've done mixed use districts a lot in different codes. And I think one of the... There's a lot of different lessons we've learned. Yeah. And you can't have one flavor of mixed use like you have now. And so one of the things we've done in this new code is suggest a range of mixed use districts. So you've got a neighborhood mixed use that allows the corner store, you know, in a residential area on a corner. But you might have a larger scale mixed use, you know, on a couple of major collectors or so. There's different flavors of mixed use. The standards have been improved. It's intended to encourage that in places where you want to see it.

SEGERBLOM Great. Thank you. That's good, right?

GOEBEL Overlay districts similarly we went through the whole list. We tried to review to maintain what works. And a lot of that stuff is on the left-hand side here. Airport environs, airport overs-, or airspace. We got a lot of feedback from the department of aviation on some cleanup for those sections, but generally they're retained as is. As are those other districts down the left-hand side.

But sometimes we've been able to improve them. The Maryland Parkway, for example, has some complex standards about the sidewalks. And we've got better, new general standards for the mixed-use districts. And so we were able to replace the ones in Maryland Parkway with those new standards. Retained with edits, historic designation, those have been consolidated and beefed up. Neighborhood protection, we've talked about this before. That's that new framework for the RNP where the RNP is going to be one of the first neighborhood protection overlays. And that's a key part of how we're carrying forward that protection for the RNPs.

KIRKPATRICK So can you tell me where in this document that is, because I'm looking for it, quite frankly.

GOEBEL It's in the overlay section. My hard copy's over there.

KIRKPATRICK Because I see the residential component in the 80,000 for agriculture, then the 20,000 with 18,000 net for, which I think all of those are on page 38. But where is it? I thought that we were talking about the characteristics, and I don't see any of the characteristics that resemble what we promised the rural community.

GOEBEL 72, page 72 is where the neighborhood protection overlay starts. And that's a general framework. So you could protect a variety of different types of neighborhoods. And then the first specific one under that umbrella is the - is on page 74, the rural neighborhood preservation overlay.

KIRKPATRICK So would we... I'm asking, because I, you know, still have a lot of rural folks, do we not want to put a reference, though on the - where the page is that says that talks about what you can have as a rural. I think it's page 38. You mean - I mean...

GOBEL Page 38.

KIRKPATRICK No, wait. I have a list of questions, so. Let me try and get my bearings here. So when you go page 16 through 18, it talks about the rural with the agriculture. And then it talks about the R-E district, which is ranch. But I mean, wouldn't you want... I just think, I'll just tell you. The rural folks are hard in, as Commissioner Jones and Miller said yesterday. Some people that speak rural. And you really got to speak rural. So it just seems that there should be something under their thing to send them to the standard -

GOEBEL Mm-hmm

KIRKPATRICK - that talks about the overlay position. Because if they see this, they'll be like me, and go, "Well, where the heck is all the characteristics that we talked about. And where is all the protections."

GOEBEL Mm-hmm

KIRKPATRICK So I just think that you would do all of us a big favor if you kind of drove them to wherever that neighborhood protection is for the rural components.

GOEBEL That's an excellent suggestion, Commissioner. And we can do that. Now that we've got the whole draft consolidated, we can add in more cross references in those district tables to other parts of the code that are important. RNP, that's a really important one, and we should add those. I - in some of the commercial and industrial districts, we need to add cross references to the residential adjacency standards that we drafted. So that's another good example. But I appreciate that. That's a good point. But - but -

SEGERBLOM Could I also ask, we have like little Ethiopia by the (unintelligible). Is - was that would be historic, is that neighborhood, what is, what would that... Is that part of this code?

AMUNDSEN No, that is an overlay that's designated. It goes through the -

REAL The Department of Administrative Services -

AMUNDSEN Yeah.

REAL - established the process to establish cultural districts. And so they're the ones who are currently right now working on establishing the cultural district for little Ethiopia, I think is what it might be called. And then other cultural districts. And

REAL that was pursuant to a Board policy that was adopted by the Board, or approved by the Board.

KIRKPATRICK So I guess to his point, though, is it much like Chinatown, Red Rock? Is it - will it have its own designation somewhere within this document if it were ever to be approved?

REAL So - so right now, I guess, the easiest way to explain it. So right now, these are what we call overlays. So they are a layer that is supplemental map to our zoning book, and it covers a certain area. We, in terms of, let's say, in the zoning districts themselves I don't know which zoning districts that would all apply to, let's say, the Red Rock overlay. I'm, we can think about how to better cross reference zoning districts with the overlays. It's, for what you're asking for the RNP, I think that's easily done. We can make a reference for the purpose of the RS-80, the 40, and the 20 about that there are some RNP areas that we're still calling, and we could definitely reference those. The other ones might be a little bit more difficult to have a one... Not a one to one, but a cross reference where we could say go here for this. What we tried to do is in the zoning district tables, we said we have a column on the right where it says you might want to go to these other sections of the code, development standards, I think there's one that says overlays. But there isn't one that just says, you know, for gaming go here. So.

JONES Mister Chair.

GIBSON Yes.

JONES Quick question with regards to the RNP or whatever we're calling it now, RNPNPO. There's a reference in there to density, maximum density, two dwelling units per acre. Except minor subdivisions proposing four or fewer lots may exceed the density of a lot if the lot area requirements of the underlying district are met. So I know that on more than one occasion we've had circumstances in, particularly, in Mister Miller's district and in my mine, where we have proposals that don't meet the existing R-E designation, but are exactly the thing that we want for lots on roughly 2.5 acres. Are we accounting for that, because I don't ever want to see one again. Period.

REAL So that is, that is to address that issue. So what that would allow is in the RNP areas when we have four lot subdivisions, but they would be allowed to subdivide. They wouldn't be limited by the density of a master plan. They would go by the minimum lot size of the zoning district. Those projects that we've seen that have been processing waivers or trying to get some other creative way to get a four lot when everybody else has four lots, this addresses that issue. They weren't having lot size issues, they were having density issues.

JONES Okay. So on the RS-20 residential single family, 20 standards for lot area minimums of 20,000 square feet. It's because we no longer count to the middle of the roadways. They're at 19,950 square feet even though it's still a four-lot cul-de-sac. We're not going to see those, right?

REAL So for the examples that we've seen, for most part, it's again the density issue not the lot size issue. I can't guarantee we're never going to see a waiver to lot sizes,

REAL

because we've had some situations in, for instance, the Northwest where there's large gas lines going through or next to a street where they've had to reduce the lot size minimums as a result of that. But again, most of the situations, I think, that we've seen as a result of the change of how to calculate density has just affected density, not the minimum lot size.

JONES

Okay.

GOEBEL

Moving on. So land uses within the districts. You may recall we introduced this new use table summaries - summarizing all the different land uses allowed in the districts. It's got a crosswalk at the top that shows you existing districts versus proposed districts. Will be the last draft that that's included in. As we move forward into more adoption drafts, it'll just say the district allowed. But for now, in the review process, this is really helpful to let people see how the current district plan up compares to the new. A lot of things we talked about in prior meetings, we've got a much better reorganization of the uses. So we've got general categories, we've got subcategories within those. We've integrated the accessory and temporary uses into the tables. Done a complete line by line review of, you know, where uses are allowed. An important part of this was defining all the uses, as well, which is not included in the current code, which led to a lot of needs for interpretation. You know, the use categories weren't defined, and so, you know, how do yo - how do you deal with new uses that came in, you know, via the, you know, an ax throwing, or something like that. You know, does it fit within one of the categories that you have, or does it need to have its own use. We got a lot of good cleanup on things like that.

That's a master table that introduces the chapter. But then each individual use has its own table. This is something that is similar to the way Henderson has their code organized. And each individual use, like light manufacturing here, has its own table. Again, you've got that crosswalk of existing versus proposed districts at the top of the table. All the specific standards that would apply to light manufacturing are listed here in one spot.

Staff went through here, and these were extensively reviewed, and cleaned up. A lot of things that you are currently are requiring waivers to now sometimes were removed if they were unnecessary or they were revised to try to provide more flexibility. Or they were maintained if they were providing important protections. So a lot of review in this code in this draft. And again, those will cleaned up in the final version moving forward.

So we did the zoning districts and the land uses, that was the first installment. Then we had the whole discussion about development standards, all the different quality issues on landscaping and parking, et cetera. This is where we've probably gotten the most feedback online from the people that have reviewed the drafts. And just want to remind some of these key things - key features, and then we'll show you what some of the changes were.

In landscaping, recall that we reoriented the landscaping requirements to focus more on landscaping bit. Requirements that could be enforced and where the landscaping actually would help provide value like on street frontages and in parking lots, were you can minimize that heat island effect. Better alignment the

GOEBEL

regional water plant list, low water plants, et cetera.

This is - establishes tree fund. Recall that we tried to build in flexibility into the landscaping. One of the goals was to minimize the need for waivers long term. And so we said you can do alternative landscaping standards. And if you still through those, despite those alternative options, can't meet the requirements, you can pay into this tree fund, you can pay a fee in lieu. And that money, this is a new fund that you would authorize that would provide money for the County tree fund that would you know, make plantings where they would be most beneficial.

Lot of screening and buffering on the simplified more flexibility and wall requirements. We didn't get a public comments on this piece. I think there was a lot of support for the changes there. Parking. We did get more comments on this.

GIBSON

Commissioner Jones has a question.

JONES

Yeah, just real quick. To be clear the - we're establishing this tree fund not so that residential developments, traditional single family residential developments can avoid putting in landscaping. This is narrowly tailored for the parking lot type areas, or industrial type areas where we decide that that's perhaps not the best use of money.

GOEBEL

That is very much the intent, and that's the way it's drafted now. But I will say this is one of the things to watch, you know, in the first couple of years as the code rolls out to make sure that people are not trying to use this as loophole, and not trying to evade that. And so, we always talk about codes as a living document, you know. And as you introduce new things like that, it's just important to watch how they're rolled out. So I think the intent is not that people can just say, "I'm going to write a check," instead of providing landscaping. It's going to be you have to show some site specific constraint, or something unusual about your site that's keeping you from meeting your requirements. And only in those limited circumstances can you write that check.

NAFT

So, Chairman?

GIBSON

Yes.

NAFT

So knowing that people will request through residential, can we not write an exemption for residential? Or would we not, is there a reason we wouldn't want to do that? Rather than dealing with the problem when it comes knowing that it will come?

AMUNDSEN

Do you mean making it so that it's only for non-residential properties? We can do that, yes.

NAFT

Okay. Thank you.

SEGERBLOM

And can I ask is this a staff decision on the waiver, or the - to put money in the tree fund? Or does that come to us?

AMUNDSEN

No, that's coming to you.

GOEBEL And you as the Board would set the amount of the fee in lieu. And that's on page 193, just FYI.

GIBSON Nancy.

AMUNDSEN And we would not put the fee in lieu amount in the code, but it would be a policy established. We could provide you with the information on how much it would, how much installing trees would cost with irrigation. That sort of thing.

GIBSON So there's guidance.

AMUNDSEN There, so you would give, you would create the policy document, and that would, what, is what we would point to when you approved a fee in lieu.

GIBSON Okay. Any more questions?

GOEBEL Parking. All the parking requirements were reviewed. In some cases the minimums were – were lowered based on - you had a lot of good parking studies that had already been done that I identified a lot of over parking requirements that you had. We did roll out that new maximum parking requirement. Which was limited parking at 115% of the minimum to prevent those seas of parking that are unused. But you could go beyond that in certain circumstances.

One thing that's new in the draft, now, on parking that you haven't seen is required spaces for electric vehicles. This has been done in coordination with the All In Clark County. And they've been looking at model codes. And they've been, you know, thinking about what was appropriate here. And so, now for certain developments that meet certain thresholds, you'd have to, they would have to provide a certain number of spaces for EVs. And the way those are described is sometimes you have to actually put in the full infrastructure for the charging station and actually make it an operable site. And that's an EV installed space. Sometimes, you just have to lay the conduit, and you have to make space for the wiring, but you don't have to actually put the full mechanism in place, and that's called EV capable. And the way this is drafted, it requires a certain percentage of each for larger projects. And that's on page 221.

JONES Mister Chair?

GIBSON Yes?

JONES The trend in many cities is to go away, to entirely eliminate minimum parking standards. I don't know if I'm there. I don't know if my Board is either. But are we (laughs), is there an option, is there flexibility in the code, the proposed code, that will allow us to go further down that direction if we so chose?

GOEBEL Sure. I – You know, we started to have those conversations at the very beginning of the project, and we floated those examples. And we tried to get a sense of would that fly here. And our sense was a few people were really intrigued. Generally, people thought this is Nevada, we're not there yet. So we didn't propose anything that aggressive. We certainly have in other places. We've

GOEBEL

worked in a lot of communities where they just eliminate parking requirements in the downtown. Or Buffalo, you know, eliminated them all together citywide, and other places are doing that.

You've got the foundation to do that here. You could look at certain areas, like the mixed-use districts, and you could have blanket parking reductions there, because people are hopefully not going to be driving as much. Reno has adopted a new code where they have a couple of tiers of parking requirements. And in more urban areas, they've got substantially lower requirements than in more suburban areas. And that could be a next direction to go to, as well.

But you certainly have the foundation. I think, and I think we've done a lot just by reducing the minimums here to start with.

JONES

I would say I sort of like that idea with, with Reno. I don't know which areas it would necessarily apply to down here. In downtown Las Vegas, obviously, they – uh - waived or substantially reduced their parking requirements, because the city itself is providing a lot of that parking. But I think we should consider that in the code if it's appropriate in certain areas.

AMUNDSEN

And I think our first good step is the maximum parking.

JONES

Sure.

AMUNDSEN

Because that - that helps us eliminate the seas of parking that we see that are not used except on Black Friday or the traditional Black Friday.

SEGERBLOM

Could I -

GIBSON

I think that's a big concern. I mean, I think we've all experienced the concern. We all have areas that are, where they're essentially just a waste of asphalt (unintelligible). It's hot. So I think we need to be willing, we really need to be willing to risk it in some cases. This is probably another one of those times when we need to be able to be... We need not to be in a place where we're critical of ourselves as opposed to - and fighting with people who have a better idea, another idea. It's got to be easy to do. Commissioner Segerblom.

SEGERBLOM

Yup. Could I just raise an issue that's come to me and see if you've experienced this other places. There's, we have a strip mall, or a shopping center requirement, and there's a formula for so many spaces for that much space. But we have one in my district where it's all restaurants. And so, especially at night the parking is just way over, the need is way over what's required. Is there anywhere where you've seen where they have additional parking based upon the use as opposed to the square footage?

GOEBEL

Yeah. I mean, we tried to introduce more alternatives for parking in this draft. So, we, you've got the minimum requirements that are by use, but there's a lot of situations where like if you have restaurants and they might be near churches, or something, maybe you can do a shared parking situation. So they can enter an agreement, and you know, the church has the parking during the day, and the restaurant has the parking at night.

GOEBEL So I, we definitely have seen ways to introduce some just creativity and flexibility, you know, based on use. If that answers your question.

SEGERBLOM It does. Is there a way to at least discuss that, Nancy, going forward? That we could require that, or at least require that the developer look at that issue depending on what the ultimate use of a shopping center is going to be?

AMUNDSEN Absolutely.

KIRKPATRICK But what I was going to say, this slide in particular, too, Commissioner Jones, is conversation. I mean, any of the shopping malls, unless it's a holiday season or whatever, they don't have it, and... But I also remember being in those meetings with NAIOP and they, how they were super opposed to any of the parking at that time. But this particular one, this particular tables specifically is more about housing. Not really about commercial. So I'm assuming within the commercial, the mixed use, the – that – I-H zone, that there's some options to kind of go down that direction if we won't.

GOEBEL Down that direction - sorry.

AMUNDSEN Of reducing requirements -

KIRKPATRICK Mm-hmm

AMUNDSEN - or being flexibility - flexible in the requirements in certain areas. And I think we have looked at that and reduced parking requirements in those areas. We - what is up is just the off-street parking, or, yeah, the off street requirements for residential.

KIRKPATRICK Right.

AMUNDSEN But we have everything else in the code, as well.

KIRKPATRICK Right, so that - so individual Commissioners could look at different options. I mean -

AMUNDSEN Yes.

KIRKPATRICK - here's what I would tell you, with all the manufacturing, warehousing things. I wish there was no parking, so then they could do a drop off shuttle. Everybody go park and ride kind of deal. It would solve a lot of traffic trying to get down Craig Road or different places. But at least from what I read in the code, there seems to be some flexibility -

AMUNDSEN There is -

KIRKPATRICK - as long as they have, meet the DOJ with the handicap and those things. There seems to be some flexibility, at least under the I-H code and the – uh - municipal code to do that.

AMUNDSEN That's correct. And we have looked at and reduced some of the - like the

AMUNDSEN

warehousing parking is ridiculous. They don't need that much. We have done, reevaluated that. We may get push back from NAIOP again, but we did reduce the required parking.

KIRKPATRICK

And I would like them to put more truck parking than anything.

GOEBEL

Warehouse was reduced 1.5 per thousand square feet to 1 per thousand square feet. And there is a whole section on parking alternatives. That's on page 214, but that's – there - there's a lot of flexibility built in here. So you've got that baseline requirement. But if you're close to a transit stop, or if you're just submit a parking study, you know, you can reduce that requirement by up to 20% is the way this is drafted.

GIBSON

Alright.

GOEBEL

Site and building design. If you recall we talked about how the new code has specific standards for, you know, non-residential, multi-family, et cetera. Trying to get at some of the biggest you know, problem areas in terms of building design. This is not an architectural style guide, but it's trying to say you've got to have four-sided architecture for important buildings. You've got to have entries that face the street, you've got to have varied roof lines. Building massing is addressed.

There's a lot of options in those standards. And this is where I was indicating earlier that we did get some good feedback from home builders and others, saying maybe you could add some more options of things that would comply with the - with these standards just to give us a bigger menu of tools. And I think we and the staff, we didn't accept all those suggestions, but we took some of them and we did extend the menus. So I thought that was helpful feedback.

There are more detailed common open space requirements in this draft. That's what the graphic is here. That's just an example of some of the different ways that you could pro - you could meet your new common open space requirement. By an active recreational area, by a garden. But if you're doing a big multi-family, say, you're going to have to provide some common open space on that site. You've got some flexibility in how you do it, but you've got to provide something for the benefit of the people that live there.

Next slide. Sustainability is brand new in this draft. We heard this was a big issue of importance for the County. It's a point-based system. You have to meet a certain number of points if you're a certain type of development. So if you're multi-family, you're going to have to come in and achieve at least five points. And there's a lot of categories that you can chose from, and there's points you could earn in renewable energy, there's points you could earn in native water efficient landscaping. You've got to meet that minimum number of points.

If you go above those points, there's some incentives available, and you might get some additional building height, say, if you provide even more points. But the point was, so to speak, the point was to build in sustainability as a requirement now, part of the baseline moving forward. Not just an afterthought. I think this is a really good foundation that you'll be able to build on. Henderson has now had a

GOEBEL system like this in place for over a decade. They just did a big code update. They maintained this as part of their update. They refine it over time. This is the kind of thing that you have to look at and monitor how well it's working, make sure the points are well calibrated. But I think it's a really good foundation.

There was a change here based on the feedback that we got. And this is no longer proposed to apply to single family. It's - it applies to multi-family and to non-residential. I think we're getting at a lot of the design related sustainability issues for single family in the design standards separately. But this - this particular point system, right now, is focused on multi-family and non-residential.

JONES Mister Chair.

GIBSON Yes.

JONES Understanding and I have had these discussions both with - with Planning and with home builders, on this idea. Looking to other jurisdictions where sustainability is incorporated, though -

GOEBEL Mm-hmm

JONES - do they still maintain single family residential in the sustainability requirements? I don't want to just eliminate it all together if there's something other than they're going to have to do as a result of other provisions of the code -

GOEBEL Mm-hmm

JONES - and IECC update, and all that type of stuff.

GOEBEL I think there's a lot of experimentation with this in different places. A lot of communities are trying to figure out how they can move the ball forward in a way that doesn't discourage development but still makes a difference. You know, some places look at building code changes. And they really are trying to get at single family issues through the building code.

JONES Okay.

GOEBEL I think one of the issues here was that the way the points were drafted, they really applied on a larger scale than just an individual single-family home. And there wasn't a clear way to apply them to a large subdivision without really revamping the system. And so I think it's a starting point. It made sense to just limit it to non-residential and multi-family.

You could add single family in the future. But I think communities tread carefully, I would say, in that. When they're all experimenting with how to introduce this into their codes, and they don't want to experiment with the mom-and-pop homes. And so that's something they've been cautious on, if that helps.

JONES Yeah. And maybe, again, it gets back to the concepts that we get back to with major projects -

GOEBEL

when we talked to their staff, there's - they've got pro -

KIRKPATRICK

Well, let me give you an example. So I represent an older, poor neighborhood. And I would tell you what, I'd give them a density bonus if they went into the Lake Mead Nellis area, and they tore down that dilapidated building, and they put in some cool pavement, and made a nice little canopy so kids could play. Because if they change it, they can't have any lands -, they can't have any parks. There's no parks. So I'm just asking for those of us that don't have brand new areas, that what are some other options, because I don't want to... unlikely to keep the yards that they have because there's nowhere for them to play. They don't have a lot of parks over there. So that's my point, but we should not be here today.

GOEBEL

I think that's a great point. And I think, you know, we should be looking at this in a lens of redevelopment and not just new development. I think a lot of these standards would apply in a redevelopment situation, but we'll take another look at that, and just make sure that there are options for those, as well.

Right. Last topic, signs. We talked about this just a few months ago. Fairly significant rewrite of the sign ordinance. One of the main goals was to comply with Federal law to make it content neutral. There's just a better reorganization and a lot of housekeeping here to define the different types of signs to distinguish permanent signs like wall signs like you see here, versus specialty signs like an A-frame sign on the sidewalk. There's generally, like we said earlier, there's a little bit more flexibility and higher allowances for the resort properties where you were seeking a lot waivers. And there's individual sign tables like the one you see here for all the different sign types. And I think that's all I had to say about that. A - again now I think the format of this, we've - we've gotten some good feedback so far on people. They ... It's definitely easier to understand than - than the current ordinance and it's ... The sign review as I said earlier has been pulled out and it's - it's gonna be a separate thing from land use permit review, which I think is gonna be a lot cleaner system. That's my last substantive slide.

KIRKPATRICK

Can I ask some, like, page specific questions at this point and it has something ... I mean, I feel like the last meeting that we had we gave you kind of some tasks to come back and get our input on, and I don't ever remember getting that input, so ... or giving that input on, like, the sidewalks, right. So when I looked in the code there really is not anything that I agreed to or had a piece of. So I just ... Before you go to next steps, I'm trying to clean up -

GOEBEL

Sure.

KIRKPATRICK

- the steps from the last time. So let's go to ... I am curious as to where our zoning is for rescues, for kennels, for breeders, where that is. I can't seem to find that in here. Page 29, I curious as to the neighborhood commercial. So will this stop people from taking a 20 acre parcel and leaving the little three acres for a convenience store to come later, which tends to be a bait and switch for folks? Would that ... Will this stop that? Because that's not how I read it. And I'm happy to go over this with staff, but I feel like we didn't complete the task from last time.

GIBSON

What number -

KIRKPATRICK Uh ... So page -

GIBSON - are you looking at?

KIRKPATRICK - 29 underneath -

GIBSON Are you looking at this?

KIRKPATRICK - neighborhood commercial.

GIBSON Are you looking at that number?

KIRKPATRICK Uh-huh, yeah.

GIBSON (unintelligible)

KIRKPATRICK No, the ... There's a page number right above the code number.

GIBSON Right, yeah.

KIRKPATRICK So then on page 38 the industrial heavy. So I just wanna understand. It doesn't really talk about outdoor storage, so what does that mean? That is a big problem. It doesn't really talk about parking for trucks, so ... Which are some of the uses that we let people know. So I just am trying to understand if we're gonna push people to the pretty picture and what we think it should be, I wanna be on the same page. Then on page 43 there - So one of the ... And I think that you're trying to answer it, but I just would tell you from a rural perspective who represents a lot of rural areas, and I mean, rural half acre, third acre or more, it, it says in small print that, you know, animals are allowed.

But I'm telling you in the world that will happen, HOAs will say, "No, they're not." So we gotta put something in there to make that that's the rural characteristic. I thought we were ... I - it says, "Allowable uses," which I get that. But it doesn't say a characteristic and that is a characteristic, right? So where do we put The Farm? Where do we put the Gilcrease? Just, you know, the things that we have that pop up. So I know that I'm being a thorn in everybody's side, but I read this thing from front to back, and I'm confused. The one that I'm really a little bit nervous about is page 139 when it talks about vehicle repair. And based on the map, it says (laughs) that it's a residential home business, that it's allowed, allowable use, is the way I read it. So that's never happening in my district, so I hope that I read it wrong. So it's vehicle repaired equipment. Number 11 says it's permitted with conditions. That is not what I want in my district. Sorry. But I have a whole list, which I'm -

REAL Okay, fine.

KIRKPATRICK - happy to go with -

REAL We can ... We can go back and forth. I can keep collecting, and we can talk. I'm just wondering when you want me to (laughs). (unintelligible)

KIRKPATRICK (unintelligible) I'm just saying, and I feel like -

REAL (laughs)

KIRKPATRICK - where is the conversation about the sidewalks?

AMUNDSEN And, and just to step back, I did ask Cindy to set up individual meetings for Sami and I to come to all the Commissioners to go over what the concerns are, so that we could gather them while we're going through the final draft process and getting comments from the public as well. So I don't know whether you want to talk about this now, or you want to ... when, when we can get it -

KIRKPATRICK I just wanna talk about it.

AMUNDSEN Yeah.

KIRKPATRICK Because I said ... 'Cause if you go, and you read the sidewalk stuff, it talks about six feet, which is one foot more than what we had, but we never talked about the width of sidewalks and it was always, we're gonna come back. And the consultant is basically saying, "Okay, here's the ... Here's kind of we're, what we're gonna send out to people." Well, I ain't happy, so I'm not sending this to my constituents. So I do want a briefing, and look, staff has done yeoman's work on this, but we ... I don't wanna get a lot of calls on things that I, I can't even back you up on, is my whole thing. So I have about 30 questions, and I'm happy to go over it with them, but I just ... I feel like I was waiting on the sidewalk conversation. Listen, no one loves Antonio more than I do on most days. However, where's my sidewalk conversation? I ... And you're basically saying, "We're ready to go to talk." I want the ... I want to ... This is our document.

GOEBEL Commissioner, just -

KIRKPATRICK And I want the list of what people have been asking for.

GIBSON So I'm thinking that one of the things that we need to do is make sure that in these individual briefings we are all hearing about these concerns. While they're being raised by one or another of the members, we gotta all hear them. I mean -I've got a ... I didn't come prepared to talk about everything I've circled, but I've got a number of concerns that I hope we address. Alright. So if there's nothing more right this moment, proceed forward, and we're gonna ... We're going to expect that we're gonna have that one-on-one opportunity to go through each of the 30 questions or however many there are.

KIRKPATRICK Might be 100 by the time I'm done.

GOEBEL I did wanna flag the sidewalks for mixed uses 'cause mixed use development, we had talked about that. That was where those - page 242. That's where the additional sidewalk stuff might be one place to start looking. This is recapping some of the things I said at the beginning. Online comments were asking for people to submit them by the 23rd. That would allow us to continue on the schedule that we have of getting you a revised draft in early May with then - hearings in early June. Current schedule but that's what's been publicized now.

GOEBEL And we're using this online commenting tool again. This is a link for the public. But they'll be able to comment directly on the draft. And this ... We didn't get a lot of comments here, but it lets people really zero in and say, you know, something about particular, you know, words on page 10. And they can comment on other people's comments, and so this is a helpful way of really getting into the details for people. It's up now. I think we have an internal version of this as well where you all can comment and staff can comment separately from the general public version. And the general website. That's an easier URL for people to remember. This is part of the public presentation, but this is how we've been using the web to keep people up to date on everything that's been going on. So I think that's the presentation.

GIBSON Alright. Are there any other questions? So I think we've given some clear direction about how to bring us up to speed and respond to some of the concerns that we have. I ... The only thing I'm a little concerned about is the timing. We've got really hard and fixed dates that we're working toward.

AMUNDSEN And they can be flexible.

GIBSON Yeah.

AMUNDSEN So -

GIBSON It's just that if we get to a point where there are some things within any of the chapters that are significantly of concern to members of the Board, we need to make sure that we have opportunity for input from the public on those things. All right. Thank you very much.

GOEBEL Thank you.

AMUNDSEN And we will provide you with ... We do get a list of all the comments. In fact, we haven't gotten a whole lot from the last installments, but we will provide those to you as well as the version that the home builders forwarded with all of their rewrites we don't wanna be subject to, and I ... We will get that to you, and I will have Cindy set up meetings with every one of you.

GIBSON Alright, good. Thank you.

ACTION: No action was taken by the Board.

ITEM NO. 21 NZC-22-0653-ROOHANI KHUSROW FAMILY TRUST:
HOLDOVER ZONE CHANGE to reclassify 7.3 acres from an R-E (Rural Estates Residential) Zone and a C-1 (Local Business) Zone to an RUD (Residential Urban Density) Zone.
WAIVERS OF DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS for the following: 1) increase wall height; 2) reduce setback; and 3) waive detached sidewalks.
DESIGN REVIEWS for the following: 1) single family residential development; and 2) finished grade. Generally located on the south side of Warm Springs Road and the east side of Montessouri Street within Enterprise (description on file).
MN/rk/syp (For possible action) PC Action - Approved

AMUNDSEN Next are Items 21, 22 and 23, which can be heard together.

AMUNDSEN

Item 21, NZC-22-0653, holdover zone change to reclassify 7.38 acres from an R-E (Rural Estates Residential) Zone and a C-1 (Local Business) Zone to an RUD (Residential Urban Density) Zone. Waivers of development standards for the following: increased wall height, reduced setback, wave detached sidewalks. Design reviews for the following, a single-family residential development, finished grade. Generally located on the south side of Warm Springs Road and the east side of Montessori Street within Enterprise.

Item 22, VS-22-0654, holdover vacate and abandon easements of interest to Clark County located between Warm Springs Road and Martin Avenue, and between Montessori Street and Rainbow Boulevard within Enterprise.

And Item 23, TM-22-500217, holdover tentative map consisting of single - 60 single family residential lots and common lots on 7.3 acres in an RUD (Residential Urban Density) Zone.

GIBSON

Good morning.

DIONICIO GORDILLO

Mister Chair and Commissioners, Dionicio Gordillo, 204 Bell Isle Court, Henderson, Nevada 89012. Here on behalf of the applicant and the property owner as well. As was just read into the record, there are three items on ... companion items on the agenda, the non-conforming zone change and the vacation abandonment, which is for right of way for the detached sidewalks, and of course the tentative map. Thank you for your consideration this afternoon, I guess, this afternoon and this morning on this item.

What we have before you basically is a single family, 60 lot, detached residential development at the southeast corner of Montessori and Warm Springs. We started this project about a year ago. I'd like to personally thank Commissioner Naft and his office for (laughs) their direction on this project. It's a long time ... Again we've come full circle. Oh I'm ... I'm not gonna go into the history, but this property has a lot of history behind it in terms of proposed developments and proposed requests. We believe that we've come forward with something that works for the area. Again, this is entry level, attainable, single-family housing.

With that, I'm gonna keep my comments very brief. We accept all of staff if approved conditions and of course we thank the Planning Commission ... We work tirelessly with Commissioner Lee and Commissioner Kilarski. And we also agree with their conditions of approval as well. So with that, I would request your approval as well.

GIBSON

Thank you. This is a public hearing as to Items 21, 22 and 23. Is there anyone here who wishes to comment on them? There being no one, Commissioner.

NAFT

Thank you, Mister Chairman. Dionicio has been working on this for a year. I think Tiffany and some of you here have been working on this for six years.

GORDILLO

(laughs)

NAFT

This has been a long time coming, but Antonio, were there a couple items you wanted to add or speak to?

PAPAZIAN Thank you, Commissioner. I'd just like to speak to the driveways, drive aisles off of Martin Avenue. I think we have a -

NAFT Couple.

PAPAZIAN - couple things working in our favor. Martin Avenue ends to the west in a cul-de-sac. Let me take a step back. Our initial analysis was because of the conflicting left-hand turns -

NAFT This is an explanation of why this is so unusual that we would be comfortable with this.

PAPAZIAN Correct. Dionicio if you can just - can just slide your -

GORDILLO Yeah.

PAPAZIAN - just a little bit?

GORDILLO (unintelligible)

PAPAZIAN Higher, so we can see the park -

GORDILLO Yeah.

PAPAZIAN - to the south.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER I don't -

PAPAZIAN Yep, right there.

GORDILLO Oh.

PAPAZIAN So initially we had problems with the driveways because of the park across the street. We have conflicting left-hand turn movements. So the reason why we're a little more comfortable with this one is because Martin Avenue ends to the west, so traffic volumes in this area will be quite a bit less than any other area that the street doesn't end. The parking on the park side is limited. So again, the volume of traffic coming out of the park side for that conflicting left is just not there because of the traffic volumes. I would believe most people are gonna be taking a right-hand turn from Martin, to Montessori, to Warm Springs, so that they have a signalized intersection to make a left-hand turn onto Rainbow. Because if you were to head east on Martin, you cannot take a left-hand turn or head north on Rainbow. So the only way to the beltway or 215 would be via Warm Springs and a signalized intersection.

NAFT Thank you. That'll help us sleep better at night. There's also, Dionicio, the condition of the crosswalk that you'll be putting in on both sides.

GORDILLO Exactly, both here kind - north-south, and then east-west right at the intersection of Martin and Montessori, if you will.

NAFT And then remind me since this has gone back and forth over the years, the applicant is comfortable with view fencing along the whatever we're calling that open space, the green strip.

GORDILLO Yeah. We've been on record saying that ... Of course, we worked with Metro early on on how we could crime prevention through environmental design, (unintelligible) as they call it on how we could ensure that that is, you know, obviously a sale that is getting used by the residents. So we are at the Talent Board and at the Planning Commission, we said that we're doing half and half, half solid, half wrought iron for all the lots that back up to that sale, to that open space area.

NAFT Thank you. And then you've incorporated this in your comments already, but all of the conditions that were added by Planning Commission are acceptable to the applicant.

GORDILLO We are in full agreement with those, yes.

NAFT Alright, thank you. And that being the case, I move for approval of Items 21, 22 and 23 per Planning Commission.

GIBSON There's a motion for approval of these items by Commission Naft. Any discussion on the motion? Please cast your votes. Anyone having difficulty voting? We all voted? (laughs) The motion carries. Thank you very much.

GORDILLO Thank you, Commissioners. I appreciate it. Good afternoon.

ACTION: It was moved by Commissioner Michael Naft, and carried by the following vote, that the applications for Item Nos. 21, 22, and 23 be approved subject to staff conditions and per the Planning Commission.

VOTING AYE:	Jim Gibson, Justin Jones, Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick, Ross Miller, Michael Naft, Tick Segerblom
VOTING NAY:	None
ABSENT:	William McCurdy II
ABSTAIN:	None

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL -
Current Planning

- Resolution of Intent to complete in 4 years;
- Enter into a standard development agreement prior to any permits or subdivision mapping in order to provide fair-share contribution toward public infrastructure necessary to provide service because of the lack of necessary public services in the area.
- Applicant is advised that the County is currently rewriting Title 30 and future land use applications, including applications for extensions of time, will be reviewed for conformance with the regulations in place at the time of application; a new application for a Master Plan amendment and a zone boundary amendment may be required in the event the building program and/or conditions of the subject application are proposed to be modified in the future; a substantial change in circumstances or regulations may warrant denial or added conditions to an extension of time; and that the extension of time may be denied if the project has not commenced or there has

been no substantial work towards completion within the time specified.

Public Works - Development Review

- Provide an emergency access only gate where Street B terminates onto Montessori Street;
- Install “No Parking” signage on the north side of Mardon Avenue;
- Install crosswalks at the intersection of Montessori Street and Mardon Avenue going north to south and east to west;
- Drainage study and compliance;
- Drainage study must demonstrate that the proposed grade elevation differences outside that allowed by Section 30.32.040(a)(9) are needed to mitigate drainage through the site;
- Traffic study and compliance;
- Full off-site improvements;
- Right-of-way dedication to include 30 feet for Mardon Avenue, 25 feet to the back of curb for Montessori Street, 45 feet to the back of curb for Warm Springs Road, and associated spandrels;
- If required by the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC), dedicate and construct right-of-way for a bus turnout on Warm Springs Road, east of Montessori Street, including passenger loading/shelter pad in accordance with RTC standards.
- Applicant is advised that approval of this application will not prevent Public Works from requiring an alternate design to meet Clark County Code, Title 30, or previous land use approvals; and that the installation of detached sidewalks will require dedication to back of curb and granting necessary easements for utilities, pedestrian access, streetlights, and traffic control.

Department of Aviation

- Applicant is advised that issuing a stand-alone noise disclosure statement to the purchaser or renter of each residential unit in the proposed development and to forward the completed and recorded noise disclosure statements to the Department of Aviation's Noise Office is strongly encouraged; that the Federal Aviation Administration will no longer approve remedial noise mitigation measures for incompatible development impacted by aircraft operations which was constructed after October 1, 1998; and that funds will not be available in the future should the residents wish to have their buildings purchased or soundproofed.

Clark County Water Reclamation District (CCWRD)

- Applicant is advised that a Point of Connection (POC) request has been completed for this project; to email sewerlocation@cleanwaterteam.com and reference POC Tracking #0008-2023 to obtain your POC exhibit; and that flow contributions exceeding CCWRD estimates may require another POC analysis.

ITEM NO. 22 VS-22-0654-ROOHANI KHUSROW FAMILY TRUST:

HOLDOVER VACATE AND ABANDON easements of interest to Clark County located between Warm Springs Road and Mardon Avenue, and between Montessori Street and Rainbow Boulevard within Enterprise (description on file). MN/rk/syp (For possible action) PC Action - Approved

ACTION: It was moved by Commissioner Michael Naft, and carried by the following vote, that the applications for Item Nos. 21, 22, and 23 be approved subject to staff conditions and per the Planning Commission.

VOTING AYE:	Jim Gibson, Justin Jones, Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick, Ross Miller, Michael Naft, Tick Segerblom
VOTING NAY:	None
ABSENT:	William McCurdy II
ABSTAIN:	None

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL -

Current Planning

- Satisfy utility companies’ requirements.
- Applicant is advised that the County is currently rewriting Title 30 and future land use applications, including applications for extensions of time, will be reviewed for conformance with the regulations in place at the time of application; a substantial change in circumstances or regulations may warrant denial or added conditions to an extension of time; the extension of time may be denied if the project has not commenced or there has been no substantial work towards completion within the time specified; and that the recording of the order of vacation in the Office of the County Recorder must be completed within 2 years of the approval date or the application will expire.

Public Works - Development Review

- Right-of-way dedication to include 30 feet for Mardon Avenue, 25 feet to the back of curb for Montessori Street, 45 feet to the back of curb for Warm Springs Road, and associated spandrels;
- If required by the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC), dedicate and construct right-of-way for a bus turnout on Warm Springs Road, east of Montessori Street, including passenger loading/shelter pad in accordance with RTC standards;
- Vacation to be recordable prior to building permit issuance or applicable map submittal;
- Revise legal description, if necessary, prior to recording.
- Applicant is advised that the installation of detached sidewalks will require the recordation of this vacation and granting necessary easements for utilities, pedestrian access, streetlights, and traffic control.

ITEM NO. 23 TM-22-500217-ROOHANI KHUSROW FAMILY TRUST:

HOLDOVER TENTATIVE MAP consisting of 60 single family residential lots and common lots on 7.3 acres in an RUD (Residential Urban Density) Zone. Generally located on the south side of Warm Springs Road and the east side of Montessori Street within Enterprise. MN/rk/syp (For possible action) PC Action - Approved

ACTION:

It was moved by Commissioner Michael Naft, and carried by the following vote, that the applications for Item Nos. 21, 22, and 23 be approved subject to staff conditions and per the Planning Commission.

VOTING AYE:

Jim Gibson, Justin Jones, Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick, Ross Miller, Michael Naft, Tick Segerblom

VOTING NAY:

None

ABSENT:

William McCurdy II

ABSTAIN:

None

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL -

Current Planning

- Applicant is advised that the County is currently rewriting Title 30 and future land use applications, including applications for extensions of time, will be reviewed for conformance with the regulations in place at the time of application; a substantial change in circumstances or regulations may warrant denial or added conditions to an extension of time; the extension of time may be denied if the project has not commenced or there has been no substantial work towards completion within the time specified; and that a final map for all, or a portion, of the property included under this application must be recorded within 4 years or it will expire.

Public Works - Development Review

- Provide an emergency access only gate where Street B terminates onto Montessori Street;
- Install “No Parking” signage on the north side of Mardon Avenue;
- Install crosswalks at the intersection of Montessori Street and Mardon Avenue going north to south and east to

west;

- Drainage study and compliance;
- Drainage study must demonstrate that the proposed grade elevation differences outside that allowed by Section 30.32.040(a)(9) are needed to mitigate drainage through the site;
- Traffic study and compliance;
- Full off-site improvements;
- Right-of-way dedication to include 30 feet for Mardon Avenue, 25 feet to the back of curb for Montessori Street, 45 feet to the back of curb for Warm Springs Road, and associated spandrels;
- If required by the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC), dedicate and construct right-of-way for a bus turnout on Warm Springs Road, east of Montessori Street, including passenger loading/shelter pad in accordance with RTC standards.
- Applicant is advised that approval of this application will not prevent Public Works from requiring an alternate design to meet Clark County Code, Title 30, or previous land use approvals; and that the installation of detached sidewalks will require dedication to back of curb and granting necessary easements for utilities, pedestrian access, streetlights, and traffic control.

Department of Aviation

- Applicant is advised that issuing a stand-alone noise disclosure statement to the purchaser or renter of each residential unit in the proposed development and to forward the completed and recorded noise disclosure statements to the Department of Aviation's Noise Office is strongly encouraged; that the Federal Aviation Administration will no longer approve remedial noise mitigation measures for incompatible development impacted by aircraft operations which was constructed after October 1, 1998; and that funds will not be available in the future should the residents wish to have their buildings purchased or soundproofed.

Clark County Water Reclamation District (CCWRD)

- Applicant is advised that a Point of Connection (POC) request has been completed for this project; to email sewerlocation@cleanwaterteam.com and reference POC Tracking #0008-2023 to obtain your POC exhibit; and that flow contributions exceeding CCWRD estimates may require another POC analysis.

ITEM NO. 24 NZC-22-0676-COUNTY OF CLARK (AVIATION):

AMENDED ZONE CHANGE to reclassify 12.0 acres (previously notified as 12.3 acres) from an R-E (Rural Estates Residential) Zone to an R-2 (Medium Density Residential) Zone.

WAIVERS OF DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS for the following: 1) increase wall height; 2) street intersection off-set; and 3) street dedication.

DESIGN REVIEWS for the following: 1) single family residential development; and 2) finished grade in the CMA Design Overlay District. Generally located on the south side of Russell Road and the east side of Buffalo Drive within Spring Valley (description on file). MN/gc/ja (For possible action) PC Action - Approved

AMUNDSEN

Next are Items 23, 24 and 25, which - I'm sorry. 24, 25 and 26, which can be heard together.

Item 24, NZC-22-0676. Amended zone change to reclassify 12 acres from an R-E (Rural Estates Residential) Zone to an R-2 (Medium Density Residential) Zone. Waivers of development standards to the following: increase wall heights, street intersection offsite, set street dedication. Design reviews to the following: single family residential development, finished grade in the CMA design overlay district. Generally located on the south side of Russell Road and the east side of Buffalo Drive within Spring Valley.

Item 25, VS-22-0677. Vacate and abandon easements of interest to Clark County located between Russell Road and Oquendo Road in between Buffalo Drive and

AMUNDSEN

Tioga Way alignment, a portion of a right-of-way being Buffalo Drive located between Russell Road and Oquendo Road, and a portion of a right-of-way being Russell Road located between Buffalo Drive and Tioga Way, and a portion of a right-of-way being Tioga Way located between Russell Road and Oquendo Road within Spring Valley.

And Item 26, TM-22-500223, tentative map consisting of 80 single family residential lots and common lots on 12 acres in an R-2 (Medium Density Residential) Zone.

GIBSON

Mister Celeste.

TONY CELESTE

Good morning, Mister Chairman, Commissioners. My name is Tony Celeste, address 1980 Festival Plaza Drive here on behalf of the applicant, Pulte Homes. As you can see from the overhead, the site is highlighted here in yellow located on the southeast corner of Russell and Buffalo. It is about 12 acres. We are proposing an 80 lot subdivision of single family detached homes. Basically two major components to this, a zone change and design review. We have favorable recommendations from staff, Town Board and Planning Commission. So I will be brief in my comments here. But the first part is the non-conforming zone change. You can see in our master plan here. Let me see if I can ... they can zoom out a little bit.

You can see on the bottom map here about 3/4 of the site is planned neighborhood commercial. 1/4 of it the mid-neighborhood suburban, which would allow the R-2 zoning. But I think what is more instructive is at the top corner of my board here, is the zoning map. You can see everything around this is zone R-2, which is the R zoning, zone change request. So we think that that is compatible with the surroundings, and we appreciate staff's recommendation of approval on that. With respect to the design review, as I mentioned, we have a 80 lot subdivision taking access off Tioga Way.

As part of our application, we are requesting to vacate and abandon 12 feet of Tioga Way. We are gonna have our homes fronting Tioga Way in this portion that matched across on the other side of the development that ... with their homes fronting it. Three cul-de-sacs internally. There is a staff condition requiring us to provide pedestrian access, which ... to Buffalo, which we accept. This is a one-and two-story home product, and we agree with all the staff conditions and are more than happy to answer any questions you may have.

GIBSON

Thank you. This is a public hearing. Is there anyone here who wishes to speak on this I - on these items? There being no one, the public hearing is closed. Commissioner Naft.

NAFT

Thank you, Chairman. The only condition I would add is on that stub off Buffalo, could ... I know there's a pedestrian access already. Could you just add a crash gate for it, continue to allow for the pedestrian access?

CELESTE

We can accommodate that and agree to that condition, yes.

NAFT

Okay. And then if you could in the booth maybe show the upper left picture, the

NAFT satellite aerial.

CELESTE Oh, the aerial. Sorry.

NAFT Thank you. I can't miss the opportunity just to point out and for the record this has nothing to do with the application. But if you look at ... If you could zoom out, Victor, a little bit more, this entire area, all of these rooftops that we have, that's a 30-acre site of Clark County's and all we could get is a dinky little four and a half acre park. So you'll be hearing more about that later, but there are thousands of rooftops within walking distance here in this ... sad. Anyway sorry, Mister Celeste.

CELESTE (laughs) That's ... Thank you.

NAFT I had to since you showed it. I move for approval of Items 24, 25 and 26 with the additional condition of a crash gate with pedestrian access against Buffalo.

GIBSON There's a motion for approval by Commissioner Naft of these items. Any discussion on the motion? Please cast your votes. Motion carried.

CELESTE Thank you.

GIBSON Thank you.

ACTION: It was moved by Commissioner Michael Naft, and carried by the following vote, that the applications for Item Nos. 24, 25, and 26 be approved subject to staff and additional conditions.

VOTING AYE:	Jim Gibson, Justin Jones, Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick, Ross Miller, Michael Naft, Tick Segerblom
VOTING NAY:	None
ABSENT:	William McCurdy II
ABSTAIN:	None

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL -

Current Planning

- Resolution of Intent to complete in 4 years;
- Provide direct pedestrian access and crash gate from the subdivision to Buffalo Drive;
- Certificate of Occupancy and/or business license shall not be issued without final zoning inspection.
- Applicant is advised that the County is currently rewriting Title 30 and future land use applications, including applications for extensions of time, will be reviewed for conformance with the regulations in place at the time of application; a new application for a Master Plan amendment and a zone boundary amendment may be required in the event the building program and/or conditions of the subject application are proposed to be modified in the future; a substantial change in circumstances or regulations may warrant denial or added conditions to an extension of time; and that the extension of time may be denied if the project has not commenced or there has been no substantial work towards completion within the time specified.

Public Works - Development Review

- Drainage study and compliance;
- Drainage study must demonstrate that the proposed grade elevation differences outside that allowed by Section

- 30.32.040(a)(9) are needed to mitigate drainage through the site;
- Traffic study and compliance;
- Full off-site improvements;
- The installation of detached sidewalks will require the vacation of excess right-of-way together with a subdivision map granting necessary easements for utilities, pedestrian access, streetlights, and traffic control or the execution of a License and Maintenance Agreement for non-standard improvements in the right-of-way.
- Applicant is advised that approval of this application will not prevent Public Works from requiring an alternate design to meet Clark County Code, Title 30, or previous land use approvals.

Department of Aviation

- Applicant is advised that issuing a stand-alone noise disclosure statement to the purchaser or renter of each residential unit in the proposed development and to forward the completed and recorded noise disclosure statements to the Department of Aviation's Noise Office is strongly encouraged; that the Federal Aviation Administration will no longer approve remedial noise mitigation measures for incompatible development impacted by aircraft operations which was constructed after October 1, 1998; and that funds will not be available in the future should the residents wish to have their buildings purchased or soundproofed.

Clark County Water Reclamation District (CCWRD)

- Applicant is advised that a Point of Connection (POC) request has been completed for this project; to email sewerlocation@cleanwaterteam.com and reference POC Tracking #0448-2022 to obtain your POC exhibit; and that flow contributions exceeding CCWRD estimates may require another POC analysis.

ITEM NO. 25 VS-22-0677-COUNTY OF CLARK (AVIATION):

VACATE AND ABANDON easements of interest to Clark County located between Russell Road and Oquendo Road, and between Buffalo Drive and Tioga Way (alignment); a portion of a right-of-way being Buffalo Drive located between Russell Road and Oquendo Road; a portion of a right-of-way being Russell Road located between Buffalo Drive and Tioga Way; and a portion of a right-of-way being Tioga Way located between Russell Road and Oquendo Road within Spring Valley (description on file). MN/gc/ja (For possible action) PC Action - Approved

ACTION:

It was moved by Commissioner Michael Naft, and carried by the following vote, that the applications for Item Nos. 24, 25, and 26 be approved subject to staff and additional conditions.

VOTING AYE:

Jim Gibson, Justin Jones, Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick, Ross Miller, Michael Naft, Tick Segerblom

VOTING NAY:

None

ABSENT:

William McCurdy II

ABSTAIN:

None

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL -

Current Planning

- Satisfy utility companies' requirements.
- Applicant is advised that the County is currently rewriting Title 30 and future land use applications, including applications for extensions of time, will be reviewed for conformance with the regulations in place at the time of application; a substantial change in circumstances or regulations may warrant denial or added conditions to an extension of time; the extension of time may be denied if the project has not commenced or there has been no substantial work towards completion within the time specified; and that the recording of the order of vacation in the Office of the County Recorder must be completed within 2 years of the approval date or the application will expire.

Public Works - Development Review

- Drainage study and compliance;
- All parcel owners affected by this vacation to grant necessary access easements;
- Return streetlights to Public Works or replace streetlight inventory and convert existing streetlights to private power source;
- The installation of detached sidewalks will require the recordation of this vacation of excess right-of-way together with a subdivision map granting necessary easements for utilities, pedestrian access, streetlights, and traffic control;
- Vacation to be recordable prior to building permit issuance or applicable map submittal;
- Revise legal description, if necessary, prior to recording.

Clark County Water Reclamation District (CCWRD)

- The Clark County Water Reclamation District (CCWRD) has existing or proposed assets within the area proposed to be vacated per VS-22-0677; CCWRD has no objection to the request for vacation as presented; however, CCWRD requests all existing rights granted to us within the rights-of-way are reserved; it is understood that this vacation shall not reduce our rights to operate and maintain our facilities; CCWRD also requests that drivable access be able to handle H-20 loading and is maintained by fee owner; and that the CCWRD requests no gates or fences are allowed to be installed across the subject parcel as a condition of the rights granted to the CCWRD.

ITEM NO. 26 TM-22-500223-COUNTY OF CLARK (AVIATION):

TENTATIVE MAP consisting of 80 single family residential lots and common lots on 12.0 acres in an R-2 (Medium Density Residential) Zone in the CMA Design Overlay District. Generally located on the south side of Russell Road and the east side of Buffalo Drive within Spring Valley. MN/gc/ja (For possible action) PC Action - Approved

ACTION:

It was moved by Commissioner Michael Naft, and carried by the following vote, that the applications for Item Nos. 24, 25, and 26 be approved subject to staff and additional conditions.

VOTING AYE:

Jim Gibson, Justin Jones, Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick, Ross Miller, Michael Naft, Tick Segerblom

VOTING NAY:

None

ABSENT:

William McCurdy II

ABSTAIN:

None

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL -

Current Planning

- Applicant is advised that the County is currently rewriting Title 30 and future land use applications, including applications for extensions of time, will be reviewed for conformance with the regulations in place at the time of application; a substantial change in circumstances or regulations may warrant denial or added conditions to an extension of time; the extension of time may be denied if the project has not commenced or there has been no substantial work towards completion within the time specified; and that a final map for all, or a portion, of the property included under this application must be recorded within 4 years or it will expire.

Public Works - Development Review

- Drainage study and compliance;
- Drainage study must demonstrate that the proposed grade elevation differences outside that allowed by Section 30.32.040(a)(9) are needed to mitigate drainage through the site;
- Traffic study and compliance;
- Full off-site improvements;

MARGARET ANN COLEMAN Did you say (unintelligible) Manor?

KIRKPATRICK 27.

MISOGI (unintelligible)

GIBSON Item 27. Is there anyone who wishes to speak on this item?

COLEMAN Did you say (unintelligible) Manor?

KIRKPATRICK No.

GIBSON I didn't hear -

MISOGI No. It's Pueblo, between Pueblo and Nellis.

GIBSON Oh, okay.

AMUNDSEN No.

GIBSON Okay, so there being no one, the public hearing is closed. Commissioner Kirkpatrick.

KIRKPATRICK Thank you, and I just wanna ... And thank you for working with us. I just wanna put a little more on the record just in the event that I'm not here and things change. But Lamont to Pueblo there's a wash in between, and there's all kinds of other infrastructure. So it makes sense. It already stops on Alexander, so it makes sense cleaning up the map. So I support it and with that, I have a motion for approval.

GIBSON That's motion for approval by Commissioner Kirkpatrick on Item 27. Any discussion on her motion? Please cast your votes. Has everyone voted? The motion carries.

MISOGI Okay, I appreciate it. Thank you (unintelligible). Bye.

GIBSON Thank you very much.

MISOGI Have a good day.

ACTION: It was moved by Commissioner Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick, and carried by the following vote, that the application be approved subject to staff conditions.

VOTING AYE: Jim Gibson, Justin Jones, Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick, Ross Miller, Tick Segerblom

VOTING NAY: None

ABSENT: William McCurdy II, Michael Naft

ABSTAIN: None

ITEM NO. 28 AG-23-900053: Consider an appeal of the Zoning Administrator's decision to not accept and process an

Administrative Design Review at 16382 Red Rock Springs Circle. JJ/sr (For possible action)

AMUNDSEN

Next is Item 28, which is an appeal, AG-23-900053. It's for the Board to consider an appeal of the zoning administrative decision to not accept and process an Administrative Design Review at 16382 Red Rock Spring Circle.

GIBSON

Mister Gronauer.

GRONAUER

Thank you, Mister Chairman and Commissioners. My name is Bob Gronauer. I'm here representing Mister Joel Laub and Randall Jones in this matter. As you're very familiar with the property as known as Bonnie Springs a few years ago it came through with the residential subdivision for an approval for a residential development up there. The - what we did prior to that, we came in with an Administrative Design Review to move the existing commercial uses down further east on the property. And in doing so we were approved with an Administrative Design Review that allowed us to commence construction by 20 - I think it was December of 2020.

Since that period of time, and I'm just gonna go fairly quickly we pulled the demolition permits and those demolition permits, we spent over \$1 million and removing all the old hotel, the buildings, old - the old town and all that that was located up there. And then what we ended up doing is we moved along, and we did an agreement with the County and the BLM where I'll show you where we made an improvement on the road area. I'll show you some of the fencing we've done. Some of the continued construction and the money that we spent is in excess over \$20 million. So as you can see, a fire hydrant - you'll see other fire hydrants on the property itself. We did some rough grading on the property as we're moving along here. I'll just go through fairly quickly, so you can see some of the progress that we've been doing over the last few years.

And while we been doing this construction here, we've been working with NDEP, the health district. As you know, we've been working on some water issues up here to ensure that we have our co-op water system on the property. We were in the last legislation session in 2021 and this legislation session and trying to get some State law resolved, so we can move forward with some of the water rights that we have. In addition ... So this is the roadway that we've also paved. These are the fences that are being constructed and in this area here. I'll show you next. You can see. This is gonna be where you're gonna have an archway in this area that's gonna be for the reserve and for Bonnie Springs. That should be coming up in the next few weeks with construction. As you can see, this is a more fanned out picture here as we fan out. You can see the area here that's under construction or has been under construction in this area as you enter in.

And then, we have some of the infrastructure already in. Some of our water infrastructure we've been putting in. Today as I'm talking, I think this week where it's already started. Construction for utilities for NV Energy, we're putting the power poles underground. And there's some other water things that we're still doing. We upgraded the well for the property for the commercial and residential property. So we'd ask you to allow us to continue with our construction and allow us to move forward with this middle of our amended Administrative Design Review.

GIBSON Thank you. And this is a public hearing, which is now open. Is there anyone who wishes to comment? Are you coming down to comment, Ma'am?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER (unintelligible)

GIBSON No. There being no one, the public hearing is closed. Commissioner.

JONES Thank you, Mister Chair and thank you, Mister Gronauer for your presentation. I've been working with the applicant for quite some time. There's been some serious challenge that were unanticipated when it comes to water infrastructure, NDEP, water district, et cetera. And it's my understanding based on the presentation that the applicant has made substantial progress as much as they've been allowed to do in terms of moving forward, and so my motion would be to grant the appeal and allow the Administrative Design Review to be submitted to the Zoning Administrator.

AMUNDSEN Actually, if you feel that they have worked ... been working continuously, they don't need an ADR. They do not -

JONES Okay.

AMUNDSEN - need an Administrative Design Review.

JONES That is my ... my motion is that the applicant has been working diligently, and so does not need to move forward with an ADR.

GIBSON There's a motion. Any discussion on the motion? Please cast your votes on Item 28. Motion carries.

GRONAUER Thank you, Commissioners. I wanna thank your staff for working with us also.

JONES Thank you.

GIBSON Thank you.

GRONAUER Have a good day.

GIBSON Bye.

ACTION: It was moved by Commissioner Justin Jones, and carried by the following vote, that the appeal be approved.

VOTING AYE:	Jim Gibson, Justin Jones, Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick, Ross Miller, Michael Naft, Tick Segerblom
VOTING NAY:	None
ABSENT:	William McCurdy II
ABSTAIN:	None

ITEM NO. 29 ORD-22-900756: Introduce an ordinance to consider adoption of a Development Agreement with

Lexiland LLC for a multiple family residential development (Rainbow & Warm Springs) on 13.7 acres, generally located north of Warm Springs Road and east of Rainbow Boulevard within Enterprise. MN/dd (For possible action)

AMUNDSEN

Next, we have two items for introduction, Item 29. Ordinance 22-900756 is a recommendation that you introduce an ordinance to consider adoption of a Development Agreement with Lexiland LLC for a multiple family residential development (Rainbow and Warm Springs). We request this be set for public hearing for March 22, 2023 at 9:00 a.m.

GIBSON

I'll introduce the ordinance and set the public hearing for March 22, 2023, at 9:00 a.m.

ACTION:

There being no objections, Chair Gibson set the matter for public hearing on March 22, 2023, at 9:00 a.m.

ITEM NO. 30 ORD-23-900055: Introduce an ordinance to consider adoption of a Development Agreement with Majestic EJM Arroyo LLC for a distribution center (Warm Springs & Buffalo) on 41.5 acres, generally located north of Warm Springs Road and east of Buffalo Drive within Spring Valley. MN/dd (For possible action)

AMUNDSEN

Item 30, Ordinance 23-900055 is a recommendation that you introduce an ordinance to consider adoption of a Development Agreement with Majestic EJM Arroyo LLC for a distribution center (Warm Springs and Buffalo). We request this be set for public hearing for March 22, 2023 at 9:00 a.m.

GIBSON

I'll introduce the ordinance and set the public hearing for March 22, 2023 at 9:00 a.m.

ACTION:

There being no objections, Chair Gibson set the matter for public hearing on March 22, 2023, at 9:00 a.m.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

GIBSON

That concludes the posted agenda. The next and final item is public comment.

MARGARET ANN COLEMAN

Yes, good morning. My name is ... I mean, good afternoon. My name is Margaret Ann Coleman, and I'm here due to the fact ... I've been placed up on the fence due to the fact ... I'm been placed into a imposter's scam and overthrown concerning my cot - court order. And I gave the lady copies concerning 1316 Wizard that need to be filled out by the responsible party have overtaken my living arrangements, and I've been trying to tell you I need to get indoors. Now I spoke to you about this PA Paga – Pagay funding. That means as far as P means fund. It's just a bunch of letters. P means people population public association group, accepting your agency foundation first to fund under the nation - national wide disease society.

That meaning that that PAGA that has been thought up by the people that stole my property at 1316 Wizard, leaving me thinking that because it is associated with the foundation that I was gonna open up the arsenic lead poison, that it associated with my money that was collected over the time in other years of me placing over my phone the sent donations. Now Mister Kevin Shizler had something to do with this, also the DVAs have something to do with with this,

COLEMAN

and also, the Board of Commissioners. Now that paper I needed to be filled out by Kirkpatrick due to she's a power of attorney. She kicked me out of 13 - 3630, putting Barbara Antelo in control over my property with Bruce Goodman, a.k.a. Bruce – Bru – Bruno. And that leaves me back outside. I was arrested there and they -

GIBSON

(unintelligible)

COLEMAN

- and I was released to go back in and break in, I mean remove the locks by the police department at that time. And due to Kirkpatrick approving someone from Reno, the – whatever their name is of the network, the, Akilla to take over my home, and then from then on been (unintelligible) ever since all the way up to be State Treasurer. So these papers, I would like you to fill out, so I can turn them in because I gave you some paperwork concerning 1316 Wizard of my ownership that I should have been approved and respected by you to return back and remove those people out of there. Now I put in a 24 notice for them to be rom - removed, but due to this falsified and forging act by the accessories office, I'm thrown back into the streets.

GIBSON

Thank you. Is there anyone else who wishes to speak during the public comment period? Then this meeting is adjourned.

There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, at the hour of 11:52 a.m., the meeting was adjourned.

APPROVED:

/s/ James B. Gibson
JAMES B. GIBSON, CHAIR

ATTEST:

/s/ Lynn Marie Goya
LYNN MARIE GOYA, COUNTY CLERK