



Community Development

"Dedicated to Excellence in Public Service"

Adrian P. Freund, FAICP, Community Development Director
Nathan Edwards, Legal Counsel



Washoe County Planning Commission

Christy Magers, Chair
Dian A. VanderWell, Vice Chair
Neal Cobb

Roger M. Edwards
Roy H. Hibdon
Keith Lockard
William Weber

WASHOE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

April 7, 2009

The Washoe County Planning Commission met in regular session on Tuesday, April 7, 2009, in the Washoe County Commission Chambers, 1001 East Ninth Street, Reno, Nevada.

DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Chair Magers called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. The following Commissioners and staff were present:

Commissioners present: Christy Magers, Chair
Neal Cobb
Roger M. Edwards
Roy Hibdon
Keith Lockard
Dian A. VanderWell
William Weber

Commissioners absent: None

Staff present: Michael Harper, FAICP, Planning Manager, Community Development
Kimberly Robinson, Planning Manager, Community Development
Sandra Monsalve, Senior Planner, Community Development
Roger Pelham, Senior Planner, Community Development
Lisa Brosnan, Planner, Community Development
Donald Morehouse, Planner, Community Development
Eric Young, Ph.D., Planner, Community Development
Kimble Corbridge, P.E., CFM, Public Works
Nathan Edwards, Deputy District Attorney
Sara DeLozier, Recording Secretary, Community Development

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Commissioner Edwards led the pledge to the flag.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

In accordance with the Open Meeting Law, Commissioner Hibdon moved to approve the agenda for the April 7, 2009 meeting. Commissioner Weber seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Commissioner Edwards moved to approve the minutes of March 10, 2009 as written. Commissioner Hibdon seconded the motion which carried by a vote of six in favor, none opposed, one abstention (Commissioner VanderWell).

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There was no response to the call for public comment.

CONSENT ITEMS

TO CONSIDER AND ADOPT A RESOLUTION INITIATING AN AMENDMENT TO THE WASHOE COUNTY DEVELOPMENT CODE RELATING TO ARTICLE 416, FLOOD HAZARDS, IN ORDER TO INCLUDE GUIDELINES FOR FLOODPLAIN STORAGE MITIGATION IN CRITICAL FLOOD ZONE ONE.

Commissioner Weber moved to approve Consent Item A; Commissioner Cobb seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM 1

PUBLIC HEARING: ABANDONMENT CASE NO. AB09-002 (WASHOE COUNTY PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT) (Continued from March 10, 2009) - To abandon a roadway easement of ±1.24 acres, containing two closed bridges over railroad tracks, as authorized by Article 806 of the Washoe County Development Code. The project site is located near the intersection of South Verdi Road and Boomtown Road in Verdi. The ±30.0-acre parcel is designated Public Semi-Public Facilities (PSP) in the Verdi Area Plan, and is situated in a portion of Section 16, T19N, R18E, MDM, Washoe County, Nevada. The property is located in the Verdi Citizen Advisory Board boundary and Washoe County Commission District No. 5. (APN 038-430-38)

Chair Magers opened the public hearing.

Sandra Monsalve reviewed her updated staff report dated March 23, 2009. At the March 10, 2009 hearing, concerns of maintenance and deconstruction of the bridges and whether or not Washoe County had a responsibility to repair or make improvements prior to the abandonment were raised. The Deputy District Attorney representing the Public Works Department had reviewed the documents concerning the easement concluding those responsibilities are that of the property owner, Union Pacific Railroad. Both bridges are over a rail line.

As there was no one present to provide testimony, Chair Magers closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Cobb moved to conditionally approve Abandonment Case Number AB09-002. Commissioner Weber seconded the motion which carried with six Commissioners in favor, one opposed (Commissioner Hibdon). Commissioner Hibdon stated the county should ensure the bridges are removed if they are not going to be used to remove liability.

The motion was based on the following findings:

1. Comprehensive Plan. That the abandonment or vacation is consistent with the policies, action

programs, standards and maps of the Comprehensive Plan and the Verdi Area Plan;

2. No Detriment. That the abandonment or vacation does not result in a material injury to the public;
3. Existing Easements. That existing public utility easements in the area shall remain and continue to provide needed service; and
4. Reasoned Consideration. That the Planning Commissioners gave reasoned consideration to the information contained within the staff report and information received during the meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 2

PUBLIC HEARING: COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT CASE NO. CP09-001 [PALOMINO VALLEY GENERAL IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT (PVGID)] - To consider a request to amend the Warm Springs Area Plan, being a part of the Washoe County Comprehensive Plan. The amendment request would redesignate Assessor's Parcel Number 076-251-07 (± 6.70 acres) from the land use designation of General Rural Residential (GRR) to Public and Semi-Public facilities (PSP). The property is located at the southeast corner of State Route 445 and Ironwood Road. The parcel is outside the Truckee Meadows Service Area, and within the area of interest of the City of Sparks, as identified by the 2007 Truckee Meadows Regional Plan. The parcel is located within Section 7, T22N, R21E, MDM, Washoe County, Nevada. The property is within the Washoe County Commission District No. 4 and within the Warm Springs Citizen Advisory Board boundary. To reflect changes requested within this application and to maintain currency of general area plan data, administrative changes to the area plan are proposed. These administrative changes include: a revised map series with updated parcel base and revised table of land uses.

Chair Magers opened the public hearing.

Roger Pelham reviewed his staff report dated February 17, 2009, providing the background of the Palomino Valley General Improvement District's request to change one parcel in the Warm Springs planning area from General Rural Residential (GRR) to Public Services and Facilities (PSP). A vicinity map was shown identifying the subject parcel and the surrounding parcels with General Rural and Public Services and Facilities land use designations.

The parcel does not meet the minimum lot size for the current designation of GRR; the current designation would allow for two dwelling units. A well has been drilled with the anticipation of a water truck fill station being constructed. This Utility Service use is not one allowed in General Rural Residential but would be allowed with a special use permit on a PSP-designated parcel. No negative impacts were identified; the change will bring the lot size and anticipated use into conformance with Development Code. The Air Quality Management Division had expressed support for the change and the anticipated use's positive impact on air quality; the Department of Public Works indicated there would be no impact to services. The parcel is within the Area of Interest for the City of Sparks and the proposed amendment was circulated to them in January 2009 with no response received. The item received a vote recommending approval from the Warm Springs Citizen Advisory Board.

Mr. Pelham provided the correct Development Code Section citation for the findings.

As there was no answer to the call for public testimony, Chair Magers closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Weber moved to adopt Comprehensive Plan Amendment Case No. CP09-001 [Palomino Valley General Improvement District (PVGID)]. Commissioner Lockard seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

The motion was based on the following findings:

1. The proposed amendment to the Warm Springs Area Plan is in substantial compliance with the policies and action programs of the Washoe County Comprehensive Plan.
2. The proposed amendment to the Warm Springs Area Plan will provide for land uses compatible with existing and planned adjacent land uses and will not adversely impact the public health, safety or welfare.
3. The proposed amendment to the Warm Springs Area Plan will not adversely affect the implementation of the policies and action programs of the Conservation Element, the Population Element and/or the Housing Element of the Washoe County Comprehensive Plan.
4. The proposed amendment to the Warm Springs Area Plan will promote the desired pattern for the physical growth of the County and guides development of the County based on the projected population growth with the least amount of natural resource impairment and the efficient expenditure of funds for public services.
5. The proposed amendment to the Warm Springs Area Plan is the first amendment to the Warm Springs Area Plan in 2009, and therefore does not exceed the three permitted amendments as specified in Section 110.820.15 of the Washoe County Development Code.

with one additional finding that states:

6. The Washoe County Planning Commission gave reasoned consideration to information contained within the staff report and information received during the public hearing.

AGENDA ITEM 3

PUBLIC HEARING: COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT CASE NUMBER CP06-016 (CONSERVATION ELEMENT) – To amend the Washoe County Comprehensive Plan by replacing the existing Conservation Element with a new Conservation Element that facilitates the conservation, development, and utilization of natural resources, including, without limitation, water and its hydraulic force, underground water, water supply, forests, soils, rivers and other waters, harbors, fisheries, wildlife, minerals and other natural resources throughout the unincorporated portions of the County. The Conservation Element is a required element within the Washoe County Comprehensive Plan under Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) Chapter 278.160.

Chair Magers opened the public hearing.

Don Morehouse reviewed his staff report dated March 23, 2009, bringing forth an updated Conservation Element, one of three mandatory state required planning documents, last updated in 1991. The overarching goals and policies reflect the different development patterns that have emerged since the Element's last adoption and impact scenic, land, water and air quality resources. The updated Element includes guidance for the management, extraction and

development of renewable energy resources and Low Impact Development (LID) guidelines. It is easier to read and provides an updated map series depicting the most up to date spatial information available. The more progressive policies include those concerning renewable energy, wind energy and the site orientation for solar systems.

Staff stressed the map series is to be used for master planning purposes only with much more detailed studies and data required if and when an actual development process is initiated. The Builder's Association of Northern Nevada (BANN) had voiced concern with the accuracy of the data depicted on the maps and requested removal of the Geologic Hazards map in favor of reference to current U.S. Geologic Survey (USGS) data. Staff has ensured the maps include the most up to date data and notes have been added to each indicating their purpose. Staff did not oppose the removal of the Geologic Hazard map but stressed the importance of a complete master plan level map series.

Commissioner Edwards questioned the language addressing potential conflicts between overarching Element policy and Area Plan policy. Staff explained it is general planning practice that the more restrictive policy takes precedence should there be a conflict.

In response to concerns of wildlife habitats and determining critical and key wildlife and migratory paths, it was specified that the Nevada Department of Wildlife (NDOW) had been involved in the creation of the habitat maps and would be the ultimate entity determining critical and key paths. Commissioner Edwards indicated a preference to have NDOW specifically indicated in the text. He further requested the addition of composting materials to the use of mulch in Policy C.5.1(d) which staff had no objection to.

Discussion of the update and review process for policy documents ensued with mention of recent legislative changes which provide for a simplified amendment process for maps in order to assure that the most accurate data is reflected.

Commissioner Edwards voiced concern with the use of "encourage" in the policies addressing Air Resources.

Jess Traver, Builder's Association of Northern Nevada, stated appreciation for the Community Development staff meeting with BANN to address their concerns. He stated understanding that the general nature of the Geologic Hazards map but stated preference for the use of more specific data as housed by the University of Nevada. He stated concern with what the map represents and how it could be used and requested one more meeting with staff and local consultants to review it. He voiced further concern that the policies concerning air quality were outdated.

Chair Magers closed the public hearing.

In response to Commissioner VanderWell, Mr. Traver indicated the policies concerning regional stormwater, water conservation and the reuse of wastewater for irrigation were of concern and that the Builder's Association would like assurance that these policies comply with the most current code and policies of the District Health Department.

Commissioner Edwards voiced concern that an equal number of all community groups, CABs, individuals, development community members had not been received.

There was discussion of the ongoing community collaboration and the input sought in the update of the Conservation Element and all planning documents.

Chair Magers requested that all wildlife corridors, not just those deemed "critical," be considered, requesting that the word "critical" be eliminated from C.3.1(f) in order to broaden the scope.

Commissioner Cobb asked about the reviewing procedures and cooperation with the District Health Department.

Mr. Harper assured the Planning Commission that the Conservation Element was not written by the Builder's Association of Northern Nevada or any other interested party though their input was considered. The documents are circulated to reviewing agencies some of which typically provide comments and others of which rely on the strength of their own respective regulations which would of course override Conservation Element policy language.

Commissioner VanderWell asked that staff work with the University of Nevada to ensure the most up-to-date seismic data was being used.

Mr. Morehouse reiterated that the entire map series reflects the most up-to-date data available; with the data for the Geologic Hazards map reflecting USGS data. He also directed attention to Goal Ten of the Element which identifies what seismic data will be necessary once an actual development is being considered.

Commissioner Weber moved to adopt Comprehensive Plan Amendment Case No. CP06-016 (Conservation Element) with the following two modifications: 1) eliminate the word "critical" with regard to wildlife and, 2) on page four, "shall maintain adequate consultation with other agencies." Commissioner Hibdon seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

[The below reconsideration took place at the conclusion of Agenda Item Four.]

Deputy District Attorney Edwards recommended the Planning Commission reconsider its action in order to clarify the findings for Item Three. Commissioner Edwards moved to reconsider the item; Commissioner Lockard seconded the motion which carried unanimously. Deputy District Attorney Edwards explained the Development Code language more concisely refers to land use changes, explaining additional findings were applicable for an Element amendment. Commissioner Weber moved to amend his earlier amendment to include the findings stated in Section 110.820.15(f), 1-6, to the extent they are applicable. Commissioner Cobb seconded the amended motion. Upon vote, the motion carried unanimously.

The motion was based on the following findings:

1. The revised Conservation Element will not adversely impact the public health, safety or welfare.
2. The revised Conservation Element responds to the need to have an adopted plan to conserve resources while developing future infrastructure needs within Washoe County, and the revised Conservation Element represents the needs and desires of the community.

3. The revised Conservation Element will not adversely affect the implementation of the policies and action programs of any other Elements contained within the Washoe County Comprehensive Plan.
4. The revised Conservation Element is the first amendment to this Element of the Comprehensive Plan in 2009, and therefore does not exceed the four permitted amendments as specified in Section 110.820.05 of the Washoe County Development Code.
5. The Washoe County Planning Commission public hearing, prior to action on the revised Conservation Element, and the related changes to the text and graphics of the plan, has been properly noticed in a newspaper of general circulation in the County as prescribed under NRS 266.210(1).
6. The Washoe County Planning Commission gave reasoned consideration to information contained within the staff report and information received during the public hearing.

and

7. The proposed amendment is in substantial compliance with the policies and action programs of the Comprehensive Plan.
8. The proposed amendment will provide for land uses compatible with (existing or planned) adjacent land uses and will not adversely impact the public health, safety or welfare.
9. The proposed amendment responds to changed conditions or further studies that have occurred since the plan was adopted by the Board of County Commissioners, and the requested amendment represents a more desirable utilization of land.
10. The proposed amendment will not adversely affect the implementation of the policies and action programs of the Conservation Element or the Population Element of the Washoe County Comprehensive Plan.
11. The proposed amendment will promote the desired pattern for the orderly physical growth of the County and guides development of the County based on the projected population growth with the least amount of natural resource impairment and the efficient expenditure of funds for public services.
12. The proposed amendment will not affect the location, purpose and mission of the military installation.

AGENDA ITEM 4

PUBLIC HEARING: DEVELOPMENT CODE AMENDMENT CASE NUMBER DCA07-007 (DENSITY BONUS) – An amendment to the Washoe County Code, Chapter 110, Development Code, Article 402: Density/Intensity Standards and Article 902: Definitions, to offer an increase in intensity of land use (density bonus) to developers who commit to providing social and/or environmental enhancements such as affordable and workforce housing, LEED-certified green development, and dedication of land for public use; and other matters relating thereto; as authorized in Article 818, Amendment of Development Code, of the Washoe County Development Code.

Chair Magers opened the public hearing.

Lisa Brosnan reviewed her staff report dated March 19, 2009, and the proposed amendments to the Washoe County Development Code intended to provide developers a voluntary program providing an opportunity for increased density in exchange for certain functions the county determines to be socially or environmentally desirable, notably affordable housing, green building and the donation of land to the County.

The use of density bonus is allowed and defined in NRS.278.250 and it is Washoe County's intention to encourage developers to build affordable housing, and quality sustainable projects. A great deal of research into best practices and various systems for green building practices was done in order to ensure the right balance of exchange. Many communities of varied size and location were examined with particular focus on similarly sized counties. Input was gathered from staff planners and county professional staff, the development and consultant community, and the Citizen Advisory Boards.

The incentives for affordable housing are intended to implement the goals and policies of the Land Use and Transportation Element, the Housing Element and the Regional Plan and would be applicable to residential construction projects containing 20-25 percent affordable housing. The award of one market rate unit per affordable housing unit, not to exceed 25 percent of the total development, would be considered in conjunction with applicable codes and plans and the site's ability to accommodate additional density. Additionally, an Affordable Housing Development Plan and a Development Agreement would be required to ensure blending of the units, that the affordable units are maintained for a period of thirty years, and are only rented or sold to eligible households.

Incentives for use of green building technologies provide an opportunity for an increased supply of water and energy efficient development, will take into consideration master plan goals and policies, and site compatibility. Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) has emerged as the preferred system due to ongoing review and continuous update and as such a 10-30 percent density award would be determined in accordance with the level of (LEED) certification attained. Developers would be required to hire a LEED certified inspector.

Incentives are also proposed for those developments which dedicate a minimum of 10 percent suitable land to Washoe County for the preservation of open space or other public facilities, such as school sites. A minimum 10 percent dedication would render a 15 percent increase in density with an additional one percent award for each percentage of land donated up to a maximum of 30 percent additional density. Acceptance of land would be to the discretion of the Board of County Commissioners with a recommendation from the Planning Commission.

Incentives could be combined for a sum bonus density not to exceed 50 percent. Amendments to Article 902, Definitions, were also proposed to clarify existing terms and add new ones pertinent to the Article 402 amendments.

The amendments were constructed with county staff time and expense in mind. Procedural changes would be required but no additional staff or expertise. It is anticipated that, as has occurred in other communities, there will be a gradual increase in use of incentives as developers gain comfort with and realize the financial incentives associated with the program. Revisions will likely be necessary in the future.

Ms. Brosnan noted staff would not oppose the continuance of this item.

Commissioner Edwards voiced strong concern that the level of Planning Commission review might be minimized or removed, that the incentives undermine the Area Plans, and inquired as to the level of participation of community members not associated with development and BANN. Additional concern was expressed with having affordable housing located away from transportation corridors.

Staff advised there would be no change in the way projects were brought before the Planning Commission due to the proposed Development Code amendments and that all interested community members were invited to review the draft incentives. Once drafted by staff and as with all Comprehensive Plan and Development Code amendments, these were distributed to members of the Development Services Advisory Committee (DSAC), all the Citizen Advisory Boards (CABs), and any others who have requested such correspondence; additionally the information was made available on the county website and a legal ad was published prior to the public hearing. Comments received from all parties are reviewed and considered on their own merit and with consideration of existing Washoe County goals and policies.

Commissioner Weber commented that it seemed appropriate to have received input from the development community and BANN.

[A recess was called at 7:49 p.m.; the meeting resumed at 7:56 p.m.]

Jess Traver, Builder's Association of Northern Nevada, expressed overall support for the program but had issue with the exclusion of the Sierra Green program as a qualifying green building program. He spoke to the merits of the National Green Building Standards and the Sierra Green program adopted by BANN, stating it to be compatible with the county's existing building and energy codes. He requested that the National Green Building Standards be included as an incentive qualifying program.

Jeff Codega, Jeff Codega Planning and Design, spoke in favor of the proposed amendments as a good starting point anticipating further refinement would probably be necessary moving forward due to the dynamic nature of the field. He spoke about the required density and increased cost to construct LEED certified housing.

Bob Sader, 8600 Technology Way, stated general support for the incentive programs, preferring incentives over regulations but voiced concern with the provisions for the donation of land, its applicability and the procedures that would be required. He asked that the procedure and review process be clarified and that the parameters of dedication be expanded to include donation of land for community services not run by Washoe County such as schools, fire stations and water tanks.

Bob Ackerman, 25 Golden Current Circle, suggested that bonuses be granted based on completing approved development on schedule and actual performance; density incentives are not the vehicle by which public benefits should be achieved.

Gary Houk, 1345 Guffey Drive, stated agreement with the previous speaker and voiced opposition to incentives being offered in the rural parts of Washoe County.

Randy Walter, Places Consulting Services, spoke to the complexity of preparing the right balance of what will surely be a dynamic program. He suggested the Sierra Green program is more tailored to the area and that incentive opportunities should be provided for it in addition to the LEED program.

Dan Herman, 11275 Campo Rico, suggested it was a "crazy idea" to allow up to a fifty percent density bonus to a developer, stated agreement with the concerns stated by Commissioner Edwards. The market should dictate the development and developers shouldn't be provided incentives to do what they should be doing already or provided any retroactive benefits.

Chair Magers closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Weber voiced concerns with the amendments; he questioned how the below market rate occupancy would be enforced asking for more specifics. He suggested more meetings were necessary to review the incentives and review the National Green Standards program.

Commissioner VanderWell noted an ANSI for residential green building had been released January 2009. She suggested an educational presentation be provided similar to the one done for wind energy. She spoke to the need for affordable housing in Washoe County.

Commissioner Cobb agreed that more time to review the incentive program and the Sierra Green program was necessary. He was not in favor of any retroactive benefit and inquired as to the need/requirement for a certified inspector for Sierra Green projects similar to that required for the LEED program.

Commissioner Lockard asked if the proposed incentives were consistent with those existing or proposed in neighboring jurisdictions and if a standard development agreement would achieve the desired results.

Mr. Harper indicated that while the state law clearly anticipates jurisdictions will offer development potential over and above zoning classifications in order to provide a public benefit, Washoe County was the first in the state to bring forward such a program. He reiterated that the incentives were not designed or intended to be a gift to the development community as was insinuated earlier in the discussion.

If the Planning Commission were to continue the matter, staff could setup educational and input gathering workshops. Staff stressed the importance of having all the Commissioners involved.

Commissioner Weber moved to continue indefinitely Development Code Amendment Case No. DCA07-007 (Density Bonus); Commissioner Cobb seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

AGENDA ITEM 5

REPORT, DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE DIRECTION: SPANISH SPRINGS AREA PLAN UPDATE – Staff request for direction regarding the continuing implementation of the Spanish Springs Area Plan.

Dr. Young reviewed his staff report dated March 23, 2009, presenting three areas of concern identified by staff: 1) The relevancy of Vision, Character Statement and Policies as they relate to the marketplace and demands in the Spanish Springs area; 2) The serial nature of Area Plan amendments being submitted by landowners; and, 3) How to reconcile the existing Area Plan with the updated Land Use and Transportation Element.

Significant changes to the landscape of the Spanish Springs planning area have occurred since the adoption of the original Area Plan in 2004. The 2007 update of the Regional Plan impacted the City of Sparks Sphere of Influence (SOI) and the Truckee Meadows Service Area (TMSA) providing the opportunity for more intensive development than had originally been identified. An initiative to create a town center was begun in 2007 but for many reasons lost momentum and was not carried to completion.

The serial nature of requests to change the non-residential land use cap has brought forth concerns about its applicability and necessity and while the number once had a rational nexus, it becomes more arbitrary with each amendment. Language in the Character Statement limits increasing density beyond three units per acre which is conflict with the current Regional Plan provision allowing up to five units per acre detached and unlimited for other housing types. The three unit provision also conflicts with the Land Use and Transportation and Housing Elements policies encouraging a diversity of housing types.

Direction concerning the processing of the existing amendments and the continuing implementation of the Area Plan was being sought with three possible options provided.

Garrett Gordan, 50 West Liberty Street, #410, representing Village at the Peak; Donald Reese, 220 Bret Harte Avenue; asked that the Commissions recommendation not prevent projects already underway from continuing concurrently with any update to the Area Plan. Concern was noted with the limitations presented by the non-residential cap and the three dwelling unit per acre provision. Mr. Gordan expressed appreciation for the proactive nature of the discussion and indicated a desire to be involved in any update process. Mr. Reese spoke to the tax benefit of allowing more non-residential uses in the county.

Dan Herman, 11275 Campo Rico, spoke to his involvement in past Spanish Springs update projects, voiced strong concern with the non-residential cap, his ability to realize his land potential, and maintaining the rural nature of the community. He suggested allowing the market to dictate the use types.

Chair Magers, having been involved in the original update process, noted she did not believe the Spanish Springs Area Plan was intended to be a static document but one that would be revisited and reevaluated with future conditions.

Commissioner Weber spoke to the importance of seeking diversity in housing, reverse commute and a jobs-housing balance. He suggested that when the plan was originally adopted, the Planning Commission yielded to the minority of people who didn't want development and that the update process has since evolved.

Commissioner Cobb suggested the cap was hindering appropriate growth in the community and that the cap should be eliminated.

Commissioner Edwards voiced support for a diversity of housing. He suggested possibly including all the pending amendments into one Area Plan update and discussing the matter with the Board of County Commissioners.

Commissioner Weber suggested it would be appropriate for the Planning Commission to provide the direction sought by staff. He expressed support for Option Two with emphasis on attainable housing, allowable densities, and the cap.

Commissioner Lockard voiced support for a focused review process for the plan. He voiced concern with the potential disservice to both residents and property owners should the update take longer than a reasonable period of time and that those with changes should not be "held hostage" by to a comprehensive update when that's seen as a method to keep those changes from occurring.

Commissioner Hibdon voiced support for Option Three, keeping active amendments moving forward and continuing to accept additional amendments while working on a comprehensive update.

Chair Magers expressed concern with a limited review process.

Dr. Young addressed the initial desire to create more stable Area Plans when the updating began and speculated that separating the policy and the land use change amendments may prevent what has been experienced with the South Valleys Area Plan and, to some extent, the Forest Area Plan.

Mr. Harper expressed the need for a consistent response to proposed land use changes in the planning area. In response to questions of timing and with consideration of anticipated staffing reductions, a five- to six- month timeline could be anticipated. Public forums would be held as with any update process.

Commissioner Weber moved to provide staff with the direction provided in Option Three providing for an update to the Area Plan that attempts to address the comprehensive set of issues discussed, namely, affordable housing, diversity in housing, the cap on non-residential uses and achieving jobs-housing balance, while allowing amendments already initiated to continue. Commissioner Cobb seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

OTHER ITEMS

None

CHAIR AND COMMISSION ITEMS

- a. Report on Previous Planning Commission Items

None

- b. Rules, Policies and Procedures

Mr. Harper reviewed the draft Rules, Policies and Procedures drafted pursuant to the workshop help by the Planning Commission. He noted counsel had reviewed and provided his

suggested changes particularly those to reflect substantive changes particular to the voting procedure resulting from a vacancy, an that an abstention is a vote in favor rather than against. He asked that the Commissioners review the draft and provide staff their comments.

Chair Magers asked about submitting agenda items for the joint meeting scheduled with the Board of County Commissioners.

Commissioner Hibdon noted the president of NV Energy would be speaking on alternative energy at the Atlantis May 15.

Chair Magers note Commissioner Lockard had asked for a report on the Regional Transportation Plan update.

DIRECTOR'S ITEMS

Mr. Harper announced that after more than 29 years of County service, he would be retiring in May.

ADJOURNMENT

Since there was no further business to come before the Planning Commission, the meeting adjourned at 9:33 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sara DeLozier, Recording Secretary

Approved by Commission in session on May 5, 2009.

Adrian P. Freund, FAICP
Secretary to the Planning Commission