



City of Las Vegas

Agenda Item No.: 4.

**AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
PLANNING COMMISSION WORKSHOP MEETING OF: JULY 30, 2009**

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
DIRECTOR: M. MARGO WHEELER

☐ Consent ☒ Discussion

SUBJECT: Discussion and Possible Action regarding the content and organization of the Planning Commission Staff Reports.

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

City Council Meeting

RECOMMENDATION:

NONE

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

NONE

Minutes:

Planning Manager Doug Rankin began the meeting discussing the staff report contents and the redundancy of materials. He held up a staff report packet for four related cases that was quite large. He then held up a packet with the redundant materials deleted. For a project that includes several case types we continue to have large staff report packets due to the backup containing the same information for each case type. The solution is to remove all the redundant information. We would still have individual line items on the agenda, however, we would just have one packet of backup information.

The Planning Commissioners are concerned that they would not be able to conduct their field checks if they do not have pertinent information in their draft materials. They were assured that the only information removed from the staff report would be the redundant materials and that each different case type would still have the necessary materials that they would need.

The Planning Commission agenda would still look the same its just the back-up that would be changing. Asst. City Attorney Scott mentioned that if there are four related items and there is a situation with just one of the items that would require an abeyance, all four items would need to be held.

The Planning Commissioners were in favor of this new procedure.

Commissioner Evans asked if the draft packet could look the same as the final packet. This means could the Agenda Summary Pages be colored as they are in the final. Director Wheeler answered that if they would like that to happen then we could do that for them.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: JULY 30, 2009

Mr. Rankin then went over the new Planning Commission Report Format by section. He gave copies of the Standard Conditions for each case type to the Commission for their feedback at a later date on those conditions. No changes were made to the conditions section.

The next section is the Project Description. The Commissioners asked that the order of the project description change to have what they are asking for before what is legal and staff recommendation before ramifications of denial. They would also like to see a new recommendation from staff shown in the staff report. The recommendations they suggested were: Denial, Approval and Approval with conditions.

Under the Background Information section Commissioner Ellsworth asked if we could include the notes from the neighborhood meetings. Staff stated that we currently included them as long as they were available prior to the printing of the final packets. It was also discussed that meeting notes be included on the abeyance items if they are held for the purpose of a neighborhood meeting. The Commission also asked if there were a way to include in the background section the history from the last time the property came before them and what their vote was at that time. Asst City Attorney Scott mentioned that it wasn't a good idea to do that so that their views on the current project were not biased. If parcel ownership transfer information is important to have in the history section.

Under the Tables Section the Commission stated that they liked the tables and the information provided in them. Their only concern was when the table was split between pages. If it was necessary to split the tables could staff please carry the headings of the table forward to the next page.

The Analysis section was the next discussed. The Commissioners discussed that sometimes they had to read between the lines for staffs recommendation or objections. Further discussion was held pertaining to the specific information that is included in this section of the staff report. It was discussed that staff should refer to the land use impact when analyzing the project. Also, the Commissioner asked if there were a way to include in the analysis information relevant to berms with rocks, specifically showing how the rocks would be retained.

The Commission asked if a 3D presentation could be made for projects. Staff answered that it would be up to the applicant to present in 3D if that was their preference to do so.

Discussion was held regarding projects that had protected uses in the neighboring areas. Staff stated uses with no business license or any other permit cannot be ascertained. County projects are not in staffs database.

Another topic that was brought up by staff was for the Commissioners to let us know if they had concerns that would be pertinent to a specific application so that staff could do research. Sometimes meetings are held and staff is not included in the invitations for such meetings, so if anyone heard of an upcoming event that might be beneficial to the commission or staff, let the Planning Dept know.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: JULY 30, 2009

The Commission had some questions about projects that had revised plans turned in at the meeting. It was discussed that sometimes it is difficult for staff to do a full analysis of those revised plans at the meeting and that they were crafting conditions without seeing the revisions. If an applicant turns in revised plans the day of the meeting and staff has not had sufficient time to review the plans then those applications should be held in abeyance so that reviews may be made and new conditions imposed. The Planning Commissioners were receptive of this idea and made mention that this was something that they would keep in mind for future meetings.

Lastly staff asked the commission if there were anything further they would like to see included in the backup of the agenda items. It was discussed that they would like to see the application so that they would have that information.

Ms. Wheeler introduced the discussion of Justification Letters, showing an issues list and asking for input as staff is working on an outline or template to assist applicants in preparing such letters. The Commission generally concurred with the contents and concept of enhanced guidelines for justification letters.

The commissioners asked about the maps that were referred to in the staff report. Currently the public hearing notice which is included on the map. Staff stated that they could pull back on the maps to give the section lines and also major cross streets on the maps for the commissioner reference on an additional map. This concluded the discussion on the staff report formats.

