

**CITY OF NORTH LAS VEGAS
SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES**

September 21, 2005

CALL TO ORDER: 4:30 P.M.

ROLL CALL: **COUNCIL PRESENT:**

Mayor Michael L. Montandon
Mayor Pro Tempore William E. Robinson
Councilman Shari Buck
Councilman Robert L. Eliason

EXCUSED:

Councilwoman Stephanie S. Smith

STAFF PRESENT:

City Manager Gregory Rose
City Attorney Sean McGowan
City Clerk Karen L. Storms
Finance Director Phil Stoeckinger
Planning and Development Director Jory Stewart
Public Works Director Jim Bell
Deputy City Clerk Anita Sheldon

VERIFICATION: Karen L. Storms, CMC
City Clerk

BUSINESS:

1. **PROGRESS REPORT ON THE UPDATE TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN BY CLARION AND ASSOCIATES; DISCUSSION AND/OR DIRECTION ON FUTURE LAND USE SCENARIOS.**

Principal Planner Misty Haehn advised the update to the Comprehensive Plan was going well and offered to respond to questions. She introduced **Ben Herman, Clarion Associates, 5725 Dragon Way, Suite 220, Cincinnati, Ohio** who provided a slide presentation on the status of the update. Mr. Herman explained the first step in updating the Comprehensive Plan was to establish a planning framework of the City. It was decided to consider North Las Vegas as several different areas, those with common characteristics and others that were unique, rather than one large area. The next step was to identify future land uses the City might develop over the next 20-plus years. Three scenarios were identified which included:

1. Current Trends - projected future land use patterns under current policies and practices.
2. Residential Emphasis - illustrated a future land use pattern with an emphasis on

converting industrial land to residential land. This scenario would come into play if it were decided the City should lean more toward residential.

3. Vision 2025 - this scenario would follow the recommendations by the Visioning 2025 Committee.

For purposes of evaluating each scenario, Mr. Herman stated the following criteria would be utilized:

Economic: Included jobs and housing balance, economic impacts, impacts on pivotal centers.

Community: Involved transportation, diverse housing mix, etc.

Environment: The degree to which transit could be supported, open space, etc.

Mr. Herman asked Council for direction regarding the three scenarios or if another direction for the planning process should be explored. He also requested comments and/or input on the recommended evaluation criteria.

Mayor Pro Tempore Robinson expressed a desire to see a mixed use of residential and employment development. Mayor Montandon felt the only viable options would be Scenarios 1 and 3 and Scenario 2 should not be considered.

Mr. Herman explained as part of the comparison of the scenarios, economic and fiscal impacts on the City would be considered. The balance between housing and jobs would be examined to include what type of jobs might be created by the differences between the scenarios and how much revenue would be generated by the City. Mr. Herman explained the costs between the scenarios would not be reviewed because the tools for measuring costs were not available at the time.

Mayor Pro Tempore Robinson felt jobs other than gaming should be considered in the analysis of balancing residential with employment. Mr. Herman explained all jobs, including technical and retail, were being included in the analysis.

City Manager Rose explained a comprehensive study was performed approximately 18 months ago on the fiscal impact of the City based on land uses. Therefore, the fiscal impact would not be included in the current update of the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Herman stated the process of developing an implementation strategy would begin immediately and be completed in late spring of 2006. Mayor Montandon expressed concern about a possible misconception of mixed use zoning and residential properties being built on commercial land. He requested an analysis of the potential effects of

residential conversion as defined in Scenario 2.

ACTION: REPORT GIVEN

2. DISCUSSION AND/OR DIRECTION REGARDING THE PROPOSED MIXED USE ORDINANCE.

Planning and Development Director Jory Stewart introduced Planner Ned Thomas who made a presentation on the proposed Mixed Use Ordinance. Planner Thomas explained the proposed ordinance would be an interim ordinance due to the ongoing update of the Comprehensive Plan. He stated the purpose of a Mixed Use Ordinance was to mix uses on one site, create a reduction in dependency on automobiles, develop neighborhood centers, promote quality urban design and increase choices in housing and transportation. A major concern was the location of the mixed use. Planner Thomas explained there were six different residential and commercial designations within the current Comprehensive Plan that were applicable to mixed use. The residential designations consisted of medium density up to the highest density. Commercial designations consisted of neighborhood commercial, community commercial and regional commercial. He stated there were several criteria which would determine which locations within those sites were appropriate for mixed use. In an attempt to preserve a pedestrian environment, certain uses such as car sales, boat sales or large outdoor storage should not be permitted .

Planner Thomas emphasized the importance of the development standards (the quantitative standards) and the design guidelines (the qualitative standards). He stated the development community requested more flexibility in the City's codes, such as shared parking for visiting and commercial.

Planner Thomas explained the Planning Department was coordinating with the other reviewing departments in the City and were expected to present a draft ordinance at the end of October. After review of the draft by the Southern Nevada Homebuilders Association and the National Association of Industrial and Office Properties (NAIOP), a final draft of the ordinance would be presented to Council.

ACTION: REPORT GIVEN

3. DISCUSSION AND/OR DIRECTION REGARDING CONDITIONS FOR ZONING APPROVAL AND THE NEED FOR RIGHT-OF-WAY DEDICATIONS.

Assistant Public Works Director Kelly Chuma advised, due to a significant lack of right-of-way dedications in the rapidly-developing areas of the City, Staff was working with the Planning and Development Department and the City Attorney's office to revise the Municipal Code to require right-of-way dedications with zoning actions. A suggested

solution was to revise Chapter 17 of the Municipal Code similar to Clark County's conditions of approval for zone changes. The revisions were currently under review by the City Attorney's office and, if adopted, they would allow the City, as a prerequisite to approval, to impose conditions including dedication of right-of-way in order to mitigate potential adverse impacts of that zone change. A time limit of six months was proposed for the Resolution of Intent which would expire after that time if the conditions were not met. Assistant Director Chuma stated the proposed Resolution of Intent would be mapped and available for review by the public.

In response to a question by Mayor Pro Tempore Robinson, Assistant Director Chuma stated once the six-month time limit expired, no extension of time would be permitted.

Mayor Montandon advised he was not in favor of the Resolution of Intent and stated the time limit should be less than six months for the developer to bring the right-of-way dedication before Council. He suggested that Staff seek other alternatives, such as a modified Special Improvement District (SID) or Reimbursal District.

ACTION: STAFF DIRECTED TO PURSUE ALTERNATIVES FOR RIGHT-OF-WAY DEDICATIONS IN ADDITION TO LEGAL REVIEW OF SHORT-TERM RESOLUTIONS OF INTENT

PUBLIC FORUM

There was no public participation.

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: THE MEETING ADJOURNED AT 5:27 P.M.

MOTION: Mayor Pro Tempore Robinson

SECOND: Councilman Eliason

AYES: Mayor Montandon, Mayor Pro Tempore Robinson, Council Members Buck and Eliason

NAYS: None

ABSTAIN: None

APPROVED: November 16, 2005

Mayor Michael L. Montandon

ATTEST:

Karen L. Storms, CMC
City Clerk