

MINUTES

CITY OF NORTH LAS VEGAS

SPECIAL PLANNING COMMISSION STUDY SESSION

CALL TO ORDER: Tuesday, December 13, 2005 at 6:00 P.M.
North Las Vegas City Hall, City Manager's Conference Room
2200 Civic Center Drive, North Las Vegas, Nevada

ROLL CALL: Chairman Jay Aston - Present
Vice-Chairman Jo Cato - Present
Commissioner Dean Leavitt - Present
Commissioner Harry Shull - Absent
Commissioner Steve Brown - Absent
Commissioner Dilip Trivedi - Present
Commissioner Angelo Carvalho - Absent

STAFF PRESENT: Jory Stewart, Planning & Development Director
Misty Haehn, Principal Planner

VERIFICATION: Jo Ann Lawrence, Recording Secretary

BUSINESS:

1. **THE PLANNING COMMISSION WILL MEET WITH THE CONSULTANT FIRM OF MCBRIDE/DALE/CLARION TO DISCUSS THE UPDATE OF THE NORTH LAS VEGAS COMPREHENSIVE PLAN.**

Ben Herman with Clarion Associates, 5725 Dragon Way, suite 22, Cincinnati, OH stated he was there to present the first draft of the document that outlined the direction for the plan. They were still looking at three alternatives, the current trend scenario, a residential emphasis scenario, and a Vision 2025 scenario. In the course of undergoing the work on the scenarios, they realized the second scenario no longer made a lot of sense, as there was not as much land that had the potential for conversion or made sense to go from industrial to residential. After discussion with Staff, the second scenario was dropped. They were looking at continuing on the current path and what it would take to achieve Vision 2025 from a land use plan perspective. Mr. Herman explained Greg would explain the five planning areas the City was broken into and implementation and Amy would provide an overview of the plans. He stated they had met with the Focus Group to go over the same material. After each section, they would give the Commission the comments from the Focus Group.

Jory Stewart, Planning & Development Director asked Misty Haehn of Planning & Development to explain who was on the Stake Holders Group and what it was comprised of.

Misty Haehn, Principal Planner, of the Planning & Zoning Department explained there were approximately 12 people in the Focus Group, with Jay Aston, Planning Commission Chairman attending as the liaison from the Planning Commission to the Focus Group and there were a number of developers and commercial people, there were also residents and citizens and some individuals from the Vision 2025 Group and added there had been a lot of very good input from the group.

Greg Dale of Clarion & Associates presented two scenarios. The first scenario was essentially a continuation of the current trends, which was for the purpose of establishing the baseline. It was good to have the baseline for the purpose of measuring and comparing the alternative. The alternative scenario, which was called the Visioning 2025, was simply their best efforts to take the goals and policies that were previously presented, which, in turn, grew out of the visioning process that the community engaged in a couple of years ago. The exercise was a very deliberate effort to translate the policies into a future physical development plan and to take those ideas and try to put them into play in terms of what could potentially happen on the ground. The overall City, with the two alternatives, they tried to look at those scenarios in terms of a number of different variable or factors: The growth patterns, business and employment, housing and neighborhoods, transportation, etc. Generally, the major themes that run through the alternative scenario was more of a focus on mixed use development and a focus on trying to encourage more integrated and connected neighborhoods, more focus on clustering commercial in a more compact form rather than in the traditional strip form. They were trying to pick up on some of the transit themes, like the North 5th corridor, etc., but, pretty straight forward concepts. There should be no real surprises in terms of ideas that were shown. The challenge was to try to translate it into a physical development plan format. They have made an effort to take some of the other categories, mixed use neighborhoods, mixed use commercial and mixed use employment and flush those out even more because they are some of the newer ideas and were trying to provide more background in terms of what they mean. Mixed use neighborhoods are primarily residentially oriented residential neighborhoods with non-residential uses, commercial and institutional uses that are supportive of the residential uses as contracted with mixed use commercial, which may also have residential but the dominant use was the commercial use. The residential uses are more limited toward multi-family uses, either within or around the edges and the mixed use employment, which was exactly what it said. They were trying to encourage other compatible uses, such as retail and restaurant uses. It was basically residential, commercial, and employment mixed uses. Mr. Dale stated Amy would be explaining the five planning areas and then Mr. Herman will wrap up the presentation by talking about a couple of issues, one of which were preliminary numbers in terms of what the "yield" of the alternative plan would be, compared to the trend plan, in terms of dwelling units and in terms of square footage of non-residential. It is still a work in progress. There are a lot of assumptions that go into doing the calculations and they were not sure they had nailed down all the assumptions as much as they should be. The other issue Mr. Herman will be speaking about will be what they feel the critical issues were and that was the implementation issues. Ultimately, if the City is, in fact, going to embrace this kind of plan, one of the important things was for Clarion and Associates to give the Commission, was a good understanding of what it would take to make it happen.

In terms of implementation, Planners often tend to focus on things like design code updates and subdivision regulation amendments. They feel the implementation issues are much broader and deeper in a sense that there are probably going to be some fundamental changes in the way the City thinks about future growth and development and it was incumbent upon them to help identify what those are. Mr. Dale asked Amy to give her presentation.

Chairman Jay Aston asked if they were just looking at single-family residential categories on the Master Plan or if it was being broken up.

Mr. Herman responded they were looking at the current plan, it was very parcel specific with lots of chunky little pieces. Scenario No. 1 was a more generalized large picture of the current plan; so, one of the questions was, "What does the plan look like in the future, are there seven residential categories or are there three or four, one of which was mixed use, one which was master planned."

Chairman Aston stated the reason he felt that was critical was because, as you look at some of the roads they have, you would look at layers and what kind of density the layers would be. Mr. Herman stated the question would be to what extent those kinds of nuances got addressed in the Comprehensive Plan and to what extent to the Comprehensive Plan, the broad visionary document, with those kinds of questions were being worked out in the zoning land use regulation environment. He stated they had some ideas but did not have all the answers. One of their concerns was that with the Comprehensive Plan, it was so specific that it was like a shadow zoning ordinance and you were dealing with two sets of land use regulations, one that was in the Comprehensive Plan and one that was in the Zoning Ordinance. The question was, how close they should be and to what extent the Comprehensive Plan should operate as a broad visionary level and the zoning code be the day-to-day, month-to-month kind of implementation tool and how they interacted.

Planning & Zoning Director Jory Stewart introduced the new Assistant City Manager, Maryann Ustick, who joined the City from Las Cruces, New Mexico.

Amy Casala of Clarion and Associates stated in the downtown area, the key difference was how the land uses were being treated. Under Vision 2025 there were more mixed use categories. All three mixed use categories were mixed in, especially along the corridors. There were mixed use commercial activities, there was a station area along the North 5th Corridor and they were incorporating the transportation elements. The mixed use would be bringing higher density to the downtown area but also translated into how that area functioned. There would be pedestrian oriented design principles. How the mixed use areas would function in terms of daily interactivity, the overall mix in use and density would be there, but also how the buildings were scaled and oriented so there were store fronts that were more oriented to pedestrians, so you would not have to go through huge parking lots in order to access things. It would be easier to get from place to place with better

connectivity with sidewalks or open areas. The parking would not be up front, it may be on the side, on the street or structured parking. With the structured parking, you would want to have a pedestrian friendly first level. Other amenities and design, having pedestrian friendly elements such as safe crossings, maybe even out jutting, so it was easier to get across some of the major roadways, lighting, benches and other such items. There would also be open areas where people could gather or to act as transitions between different buildings or building areas. In the downtown area, there was a gateway concept which was part of the Visioning document. The downtown would be a major gateway off of I-15, in which public art, banners and landscaping would be used to establish the entry into the downtown area.

Ben Herman stated the Focus Group commented that one of the opportunities that should be looked at in the downtown area was making it a cultural theme or opportunity. There have been a couple of places who have done this. Tucson, Arizona has begun to do it, along with numerous communities in California, whether it was new development or redevelopment. Mr. Herman asked if the discussion with the Focus Group was something the plan should mention and then the market would have to pick it up and run with it versus the role the City might take. The issue of the extent of which that should or should not get articulated in the Comprehensive Plan; how far the Comprehensive Plan went in identifying some of those kinds of opportunities was discussed but not resolved. Ms. Stewart stated maybe that was something that could be pointed out as a policy direction in the Master Plan but implemented through the Redevelopment Plan. Mr. Herman agreed.

Ms. Casala stated the second area being highlighted was the master planned communities, which was the northern area where you could anticipate master planned communities would dominate the development in the area as BLM land sales continue. They were looking at how that would play out, given the uses. They were illustrating more mixed use areas with employment and commercial integrated with mixed use residential in the neighborhoods surrounding that and then tapering off in density. You would also tie in the pedestrian oriented design into all mixed use developments so the concept would be carried through. There would also be other levels of connectivity such as trails and parks that would be related, not just within an individual master planned community but there would also be an emphasis on connectivity to other adjacent areas and other use areas, including the open space areas. There were four basic practices in master planned communities, which are: the mix of housing types and character. The mixed use would provide, not just single family, but a nice range of different housing types and densities with other uses integrated so that employment and commercial would bring jobs to the area. The mixed use centers concept would be a town center area for each different neighborhood or group of neighborhoods. Integrating the parks, open space and trails would go to the overall designs and also have overall connectivity to the regional trails network but localized trails so it would be easier for people to use bikes or walk rather than having to drive everywhere and then multi-modal would tie into it. The street design and circulation patterns don't just depend on automobiles.

Mr. Herman stated it was discussed with the Focus Group the kinds of projects they were pursuing for doing these type of things, and also about how prescriptive the plan should be and he got a sense that the plan set a basic direction but it was appropriate for the City's plan to say these are the kinds of things we want to see. The City should be proactive in asking for connective neighborhoods, an overall approach to the master plan, and mixed use centers, which was affirmed by the Focus Group.

Ms. Casala stated the third area was the North Fifth corridor. The basic idea was to have mixed uses around each station area with higher densities. The design and function would use the principals of transit oriented design, so those were structured to be focused on supporting the use of the stations and transit options. The principals of transit oriented design would have the economic sustainable mix of uses surrounding it and there were higher densities, commercial activities, residential activities with commercial, typically being phased in at a later stage when it could be supported by the other activities in the area, with a compact design, with attention paid to the first quarter mile surrounding the station area. Public spaces would be incorporated into the design similar to how it was described with the mixed use making it easier for people to walk to get to the stations, so they would be residing in the dense neighborhood areas. There would also be some civic spaces interspersed throughout the area, at least one central public plaza. The area would be oriented to pedestrians the way the store fronts and streets, sidewalks and distances of the blocks would all be oriented to try to make it easy and convenient to travel around. Building on existing features was an asset when you were designing and if there were dominant existing structures or natural features, they would be incorporated into the overall design.

Mr. Herman stated there was a lot of discussion with the Focus Group on this last item. There was a broad question of transportation, generally, whether the City was going to be able to keep up with the transportation. Some points made were that in order for North Fifth Street to work, there needed to be equal emphasis on east/west corridors. One being discussed, was Las Vegas was looking at Rancho Drive having the connection with North Fifth and there was also some discussion about whether it mattered what the mode of transit was. His understanding after talking with RTC, was they were looking at light rail and it may, in effect, more likely be bus rapid transit. There was also discussion about whether station locations were fixed and they were not; they were conceptual at this point.

Ms. Casala stated the fourth area was a grouping of two areas, the university district with a campus and the medical area with a new VA hospital. There would be two major sources of employment and those would be integrated with the uses next to them. There was less integration overall, basically continuing master planned communities up to the campus area. They were looking at Vision 2025 to have more mixed use focus and then have the station areas but the adjacent uses were supportive of those employment centers. There was a campus and proposed research facilities, so there was adjacent mixed use employment that could house other research facilities or offices but also some supportive residential and commercial uses. Likewise, with the hospital area, there would be adjacent

office but also mixed supportive uses, which embodied the whole activity center focus that was a strong theme in the pivotal centers of activity idea in the Visioning document, similar to how they were looking at the other areas with sustainable mix of uses, the concepts of pedestrian oriented design, incorporating civic spaces, and paying attention to how they were designed to make them easy to access and move around within; but also how to transition to the adjoining uses. They were getting away from having independent single use areas and having more fluidity as transition occurred.

Mr. Herman stated the discussion with the Focus Group was more about gaining an understanding of the university's time line and how the university's plans might fit together with the vision for the area. The university just finished the master planning process and was asked to provide information so people could look at it. There was a real clear vision for the area. The university was probably on a 10 to 15 year horizon but their time line, and what they were hoping to do with the legislature, was to have their first building funded and underway in three years.

Ms. Casala stated the fifth area, which was two separate areas, covered the Cheyenne Technology Corridor and the Craig Ranch area. They were looking at how the new regional park would function as far as the surrounding development would occur in relation to the park. With Vision 2025 they were trying to show more of a park oriented design. The park would be the stimulating factor for surrounding development and the development would be oriented and connected to the park in a number of ways. They were going with the mixed use with lots of pedestrian access into the park and it would also connect the neighborhoods in the southern portion. The Cheyenne Technology Corridor implied the mixed use category. There would be supportive retail including restaurants, some high density housing for people who work in the area and maybe some other commercial uses. The predominant use would be employment. There would also be more emphasis than any of the other mixed use categories on having a higher level of connectivity. If you went to one business, you could possibly walk to another business without having to use a vehicle.

Mr. Herman stated there was a lot of discussion by the Focus Group on this area. One was the attention of the role that Cheyenne plays as a major regional traffic corridor and on one hand there is opportunity to intensify activity along Cheyenne, more jobs and maybe some housing and services but the attention between the traffic capacity and the intensified uses and how that could be balanced and if the level of services should be decreased because there was more activity. There was discussion of how Cheyenne related to Fifth Street and the other north/south corridors and transit. There was also a comment made that they had not addressed the airport and its role in relationship to the activity along Cheyenne. The Focus Group liked the idea of the Cheyenne Corridor being more than a one dimensional corridor but the question was how to make it work.

Mr. Herman stated there was work being done to help quantify what was being looked at in terms of jobs, households, population, revenue and some of the things Council asked

them to look at with the scenarios. With that work still in progress, it will be presented before the January meetings. They wanted to take a look at how the scenarios compared to the goals of Vision 2025 so they took a set of the goals and turned them into evaluation criteria. The figures are still preliminary, as they are still being tweaked. They are very sensitive to densities and assumptions, because, when you are talking about 15,000 to 16,000 acres of residential land, if you change one number just a little, it changes the other number a lot. He emphasized, if you have a place you're headed, you need to figure what it would take to get there and whether or not it was achievable. There are a fairly significant amount of regulatory changes because one of the things discussed in the initial round of interviews, whether they were internal interviews with the City, or interviews with builders or developers, was that even some of the small steps that people are trying to make in the City, change patterns, which are currently not allowed by the regulations. The City is trying to get away from design guidelines and standards and use a more form based, to determine what the City wants the areas to look like, not how many units per acre it would be. The only way to achieve that, was through guideline standards. They are also looking at how you plan and zone for areas around transit, particularly, when it might be years away. Mr. Herman stated the City should be more proactive in the approach to the development of the recently auctioned BLM property. If you want to go from where you are, to where you think you want to be, you need to figure out what you need to do.

Mr. Dale opened the floor for discussion. Ms. Stewart also welcomed the Commission's input on the written materials that were handed out.

Chairman Jay Aston asked how the mixed use ordinance was coming along. Ms. Stewart responded it was coming along great. Chairman Aston asked if it was broken up in the same way as the Comprehensive Plan was presented with neighborhoods, commercial and employment. Ms. Stewart responded there was a draft that was being applied in principle, though it had not been adopted and had not been through the process before the Commission or City Council. They were applying it in concept to a planned unit development process that was already on the books to see if the ordinance, and the way the guidelines had been outlined, worked in the real world. As applicants came forward, the mixed use draft was being used, in concept, on their development proposals to see how it worked in reality and it seemed to be working quite well. The mixed use ordinance should be ready in January. Chairman Aston asked if that ordinance would do away with the PUD's. Ms. Stewart responded it would not; it would enhance the PUD process because they had started using the PUD process to try to accommodate vertical and horizontal mixed uses. A mixed use district augments the City's ability to consider the out-of-the-box design issues. Chairman Aston stated Area Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 4 are all keyed into the biggest changes in the master plan around mixed use and in relating that to the downtown area, when looking at the downtown map, there was mixed use commercial on Las Vegas Boulevard, mixed use neighborhoods in the middle and then a little bit of mixed use employment and there were two directions he was thinking of. One was the master plan should be done at the same time, but asked if there was a priority schedule for different

areas. As mentioned, some master planned communities were ready to be released and the Commission was getting a lot of applicants who really had some need for seeing what the intent was along North Fifth Street. He felt some areas were more in priority to establish the finality in the master plan than some other areas. Ms. Stewart stated they were getting pressure from all areas and it was critical they move forward as rapidly as possible. The current master plan was devised in 1998 and things had drastically changed since that time. Chairman Aston stated when looking at bringing mixed use to the downtown areas, he liked what was presented and felt it was a good next step; but, as stated, now is the time to start figuring out how the plan could be implemented. He thought the downtown employment mixed use, as shown, was the best location and the mixed use commercial along Las Vegas Boulevard was good. When looking at the downtown area in Scenario No. 2 and Scenario No. 1, particularly with the mixed use neighborhoods, in Scenarios No. 1 there was still a lot of residential. The key to making the plan happen was the commercial and employment because then the neighborhoods would move out and become condominiums. But, if the area was planned for that, when the property sold, that would be the zoning. Ms. Stewart stated while working with Mike Majewski of Economic Development and Larry Bender of the Redevelopment Agency, on Economic and Redevelopment issues for the downtown area, what they were trying to emphasize, was the symbiotic relationship that needed to happen between residential development but also the employment base and expansion of the downtown area. One cannot really be achieved successfully without the other. In traditional development, you would see rooftops first, retail second and then expansion. In a downtown area where there were in-fill challenges because of blighted situations that had to be remedied, part of the revitalization of the area needed to come from employment coming back to the downtown and creating a draw, with people wanting to live close to where they work and that would bring the rooftops, which would bring the retail. Ms. Stewart found the mixed use gave the scale and the flexibility to work in the incubation sites to get the employment base established and begin to develop the site with residential to complement the employment base and the retail would follow to support the whole mixed use concept. The key was to have the flexibility in the zoning document to be able to facilitate that happening. Chairman Aston asked if once the City came to a point where Council, the Commission, the Community, and the Focus Group felt good about the Master Plan, if amendments would be put on hold to see how the potential of the plan was working. Ms. Stewart gave some history of some of the recent changes to the Master Plan in the North Las Vegas area. There has been transition from the industrial master planned areas to residential and that was a big change from where the City was with the Master Plan and to how it evolved and not really comprehensively assessing how that might impact where the City was going. Now the impact was recognized because that area had transitioned; now roads, schools, and parks were needed to support residential rather than industrial. The City needed to recognize State law that was in place now thanks to the 2003 Legislative Session, which gave the ability for local government to regulate the amendment process to the Master Plan and they could actually batch requested amendments to a quarterly process and only consider them once per quarter so they could more comprehensively assess those proposed amendments.

Chairman Aston stated in one of the documents presented, an annual review of the overall Master Plan was recommended and he was in favor of the quarterly master plan application because in the long run it would protect the investments of the developers. Mr. Herman stated the other issue raised by the discussion was the fundamental question that was on the table, "what kind of plan should it be." If you took the labels off the zoning and land use plan maps, you would not be able to tell which was which. They were basically doing the same thing. They were parcel based with lots of gradations and lots of detail. If you could get away from that level of detail and go to broader concepts as discussed, you would not have to amend the land use plan as frequently. Ms. Stewart added you would just have to determine the proposal was consistent with the Master Plan. Mr. Herman stated you would have to get away from the plan as being a regulating document. The Comprehensive Plan was not a regulating document; it was a map and was treated as a regulatory process and there was no direction. The verbiage outlined in the Master Plan was the meat of the Master Plan, not the colors on the map.

Commissioner Dilip Trivedi asked if mixed use was being treated as an independent zone or an overlay district. Ms. Stewart responded it was more of an overlay district but at this point they were talking about it as land use concept, not to be confused with the actual ordinance that was being developed which would facilitate the use of a mixed use land use designation, which was a zoning overlay.

Mr. Herman moved the discussion to the master planned communities. Chairman Jay Aston asked if any of that was in the current master planned community that was being submitted. Misty Haehn, Principal Planner with the Planning & Development Department stated she did not know, as she had not seen the land use plan. It may be submitted next week. Mr. Herman asked to what extent the applicant had been advised that the City wanted to see certain things in the master planned community. Ms. Haehn stated she gave a list of things, such as diversity in housing, connectivity, etc. but it was handed to the applicant's designers and stated the discussion of the map would come up and she did not know if it would be status quo or a mixture of status quo and something else. Mr. Herman stated in the future, while you don't want to be prescriptive and say "here's our design for you," do you want to be in a position of saying this is not just a check list from the Planning Department, this is public policy as embodied in the plan that you need to meet. In achieving the balance, they were giving enough guidance to be able to believe the City was being proactive in determining what they want to see but not so prescriptive that they were scaring people away or were getting to a level of detail that was not realistic.

Chairman Aston stated if an applicant was turning something in within a week, they were not ready. Ms. Haehn stated the proposed project was on the fast track but it was 2600 acres so there was still plenty of acreage to work with. Even if the project was more status quo, the big thing would be when development was adjacent to the university district, going to the north. Chairman Aston felt going forward, they needed to look more at the guidelines. Mr. Herman stated one other factor that would cause the change to happen a

little more quickly was the cost of land. When Misty talked about status quo, you would think Aliante or Anthem, four units per acre typical stuff that has been happening forever; but, you will see six, eight or more units per acre and you cannot do status quo at eight units per acre; it will not work. It won't work on the lot scale or the circulation scale. There will be changes from status quo because things have changed. Ms. Haehn stated the price of land at the last BLM Auction was 1,000 times more than the Aliante purchase. Aliante paid \$35,000 per acre and this last purchase was \$300,000 per acre. Mr. Herman asked the Commission if they felt the Comprehensive Plan was going in the right direction or if they felt something was not being addressed.

Commissioner Dean Leavitt had some reservations on his interpretation of the term "status quo." He felt status quo was not acceptable. Mr. Herman responded the plan agreed with him, with the way it was structured.

Mr. Dale moved the discussion to North Fifth Corridor. Ms. Haehn stated North Fifth would probably be coming before the Commission in February. Mr. Dale stated they had tried to take North Fifth and capture it at a comprehensive plan scale and context.

Commissioner Dilip Trivedi asked if there was going to be growth limits such as what was on the Cheyenne east/west corridor. Mr. Herman responded a lot of the residential that was shown reflected what was already existing.

Chairman Aston asked if the view of the North Fifth Corridor was without the mixed use employment. Mr. Herman responded it would probably be conventional. Ms. Haehn stated there was a slight amount of mixed used employment shown. Ms. Stewart stated characteristics in mixed use neighborhoods still have a component of some offices such as tax consultants, real estate, etc. Mr. Herman stated those uses could be appropriate uses in all of the categories.

Jennifer Lazovich of Kummer, Kaempfer, Bonner & Renshaw and Ferrario asked with the North Fifth Corridor coming to the Planning Commission in February, which plan would take precedent or if both plans were meant to be the same. Ms. Haehn responded they would be the same. Ms. Stewart stated the North Fifth Corridor would actually go into a higher level of detail.

Chairman Jay Aston asked what it would take to implement the TODD Standards and if it was currently being done and if it included places for people to park. Ms. Haehn responded that was being done and did include parking. Ms. Stewart stated they were recognizing there was a transition period before mass transit could be relied on. Chairman Aston asked if that would be reliant on developers. Mr. Herman stated there were two different things being talked about. Typically, in this type of location, there would not be transit parking, park and ride, this was a more urban setting for transit. Transit parking would tend to be in a more peripheral location. Parking would be to serve the development and when transit

kicked in, some of the requirements would be reduced. Chairman Aston stated he envisioned some people in North Las Vegas would drive to one of the nodes, park and ride from node to node on the transit system. Mr. Herman responded the economics would preclude it, and the cost of a parking space would be too expensive. Chairman Aston stated that was why he came back to the private sector. On the corner of North Fifth and Deer Springs, there was currently an application that had all kinds of parking because there was shopping there, a big box store. Commissioner Leavitt stated when he met with the developer on that application, he asked if he would be willing to identify some areas in the existing parking that, in the future, there could be a ghost building so that as the requirement for parking diminished, there was already some sense of what would take place. Ms. Stewart stated when you looked at areas who had gone through the process of developing transit, where transit didn't exist before, such as Portland. They came in and did a transit line between Gresham and the City west of Portland and, at first, you saw a resistance to transit; in fact, Gresham did not want transit, so they did not locate it near downtown. Then the transit came in and Gresham realized they made a major mistake, so they moved the downtown so they could tap into the economic spin-off associated with the transit corridor. Then they built a park and ride garage and the garage was there so people could drive into the area, park the car for the day and ride the transit into Portland to get to their jobs and now the parking garage has become a business enterprise. It was originally built on the City's dollar and now it has become an income maker because the transit was self-sufficient, they have the rider ship and the lower floors have been converted to retail and the area around it is beginning to develop. Ms. Stewart also stated she could see that happening in North Las Vegas.

Mr. Herman stated they were doing a lot of work with the transitioning corridors and the way commercial development has historically been done, ownership patterns and restrictive covenants, etc. become major barriers for that. Commercial developments coming in with a 10 year life, there are things that could be done to make it easier for the transitions to occur in the future. Historically, it was about protecting the departments, if you look at the platting pattern of a shopping center, it was a mess and you do not want that, if you want to have people try to redevelop shopping centers.

Mr. Dale moved the discussion to the northern development area.

Chairman Aston stated when the City finds out what UNLV was proposing, he would like to review it. Mr. Herman responded, the Master Plan was already adopted by the Board of Regents and maybe they should ask if they could give the Planning Commission a presentation. Ms. Stewart asked Ms. Haehn if it would be possible to have Jack Kelso give a presentation to the Planning Commission on the Master Plan for the new University. Chairman Aston asked if that covered the whole site. Mr. Herman responded it covered their portion. The challenge for the City was that they would get the pressures before the critical mass of the University. Ms. Haehn stated they could get someone from the University to give a presentation on the University's Master Plan.

Mr. Dale moved the discussion to the Cheyenne Technology Corridor. Chairman Aston stated the biggest discussion for that was Craig Ranch and the only area around there that was not planned, was north of Craig Road and the Robinson's property. Mr. Herman stated some of it was pushing the City because, parks designers are really good at designing parks, but they tend to think of it as a premier urban park but the City needs to look beyond the number of ball fields and soccer fields, they need to look at what would bring people to the park.

Ms. Stewart stated the winning candidate from the presentations made to City Council by the Park Planners would be asked to meet the Planning Commission and talk about their plan. They were talking about making sure the park would drive the whole community process. Commission Trivedi asked who the winning Park Planner was. Ms. Haehn responded it was MIG out of Irvine, CA and they were very creative.

Mr. Dale stated one of the comments from the Focus Group was they felt Cheyenne and Craig Ranch was an awkward fit and that it was put together but felt it was more appropriate to combine it with the North 5th Corridor as it related more to that than to Cheyenne. Ms. Haehn stated they would probably combine the Craig Ranch Park with North 5th.

Chairman Aston stated on the Cheyenne Technology Corridor, higher density residences were incorporated; but, he felt if there was higher density residences along Cheyenne, it would bring more employment along Cheyenne, but asked how that could be layered and still keep the neighborhoods. Ms. Stewart stated they also had to be sensitive to the airport. Chairman Aston asked if, in order to make it a stronger corridor, they needed to increase the density. Ms. Stewart stated there were already residences on Cheyenne but on some of the in-fill sites, more residential could be added. Chairman Aston asked if they were looking more toward industrial, restaurants, a technology corridor rather than a place to live. It was more of a strip and to go high density, they would need to look at layers and that window was already closed unless they were going to the south. Mr. Herman stated that was a good comment and he felt the idea of the high density residential was to create integration with the employment center. They were also looking at the fact that the current Cheyenne model was older, with fairly low density and land had gotten more valuable and combined with economic development, they were no longer chasing after the in-fill pieces as the employment market had changed and was smaller and more specialized and did not lend itself to the 100,000 square foot single use building anymore. In many places the employment growth has gone from the high tech to the smaller service professional jobs. Ms. Stewart stated there were also incubator opportunities, the live/work, small industrial complex with the residential units above. Chairman Aston asked if the Airport flight paths had to be taken into consideration. Ms. Stewart responded they had to be sensitive to the flight patterns of the airport, especially with the residential.

Ms. Stewart asked if, when they were talking about the military component, it was in the sense that it needed to support Nellis Air Force Base in terms of land uses. Mr. Herman responded that question came up in the Focus Group. Ms. Haehn stated maybe in ten or fifteen years, the military might change but there was no indication that the Base should be flagged. Mr. Dale stated the Focus Group also questioned whether the stable areas got any attention in the plan and Clarion agreed they needed to be addressed but the presumption was they were a stable neighborhood and should be kept stable. There would be a section of the plan devoted to stable neighborhoods.

Mr. Dale stated they would be back January 9 and 10, 2006. Ms. Haehn stated there would be an open house for the public from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. at North Las Vegas City Hall. There will also be a joint meeting with City Council and the Planning Commission on January 10, 2006 at 6:00 p.m. in the North Las Vegas Library.

Mr. Herman stated the meeting was intended to let City Council know the work the Focus Group has been doing and they want to start shifting the focus to implementation. They were looking for City Council to let them know if they were headed in the right direction, as they do not want to go further to flush out the detail and work out the implementation, to discover there were fundamental issues associated with the basic concept. Chairman Aston felt City Council would be pleased with the proposed plan. Ms. Stewart stated it was consistent with the Vision 2025 and Council had reiterated their support for 2025 vision and this was the reality check, because this plan was showing what the Vision 2025 said and this was the translation and what it would look like.

Mr. Dale stated they were still talking about the logistics of handling the meeting. Their thinking was that they would provide the Planning Commission and City Council with a one or two page executive summary they could look at in advance. He also stated the Focus Group had until the end of the year to send their comments on the plan and asked if the Commission would like to do the same. Chairman Aston responded he felt they were ready for the next meeting. Mr. Dale stated they would like to work out any bugs before the plan was presented to City Council, so if the Commission noticed anything that was inaccurate or needed to be reworded, they would like to know.

PUBLIC FORUM:

There was no public participation.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting adjourned at 7:23 p.m.

APPROVED: January 11, 2006

/s/ Jay Aston
Jay Aston, Chairman

/s/ Jo Ann Lawrence
Jo Ann Lawrence, Recording Secretary