

CITY OF ELKO
PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
6:30 P.M., P.D.S.T., TUESDAY, OCTOBER 4, 2016
ELKO CITY HALL, COUNCIL CHAMBERS,
1751 COLLEGE AVENUE, ELKO, NEVADA

CALL TO ORDER

Aaron Martinez, Chairman, called the Elko Planning Commission meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Present: David Freistroffer,
Jose Negrete,
Aaron Martinez,
John Anderson,
Tera Hooiman,
Jeff Dalling.

Absent: Matt Haley.

City Staff: Cathy Laughlin, City Planner
Jeremy Draper, Development Manager
Bob Thibault, City Engineer
Scott Wilkinson, Assistant City Manager
Shelby Knopp, Planning Technician

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

COMMENTS BY THE GENERAL PUBLIC

There were no public comments made at this time.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

September 6, 2016 – Regular Meeting **FOR POSSIBLE ACTION**

*****Motion: Approve the minutes from September 6, 2016 as presented. Moved by Jose Negrete, Seconded by Tera Hooiman.**

**** Motion passed unanimously. (6-0)**

I. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS, PETITIONS, AND COMMUNICATIONS

1. Review, consideration, and possible action to initiate amendment to the City Zoning Ordinance, Ordinance No. 805, specifically Sections 3-2-2 Definitions, Section 3-2-3 General Provisions, 3-2-5 Residential Zoning Districts, 3-2-8 PQP Public, Quasi-Public District, 3-2-11 IBP, IC Industrial Districts, and 3-2-12 LI GI Districts and matters related thereto. **FOR POSSIBLE ACTION**

Cathy Laughlin, City Planner explained that we had to bring this item back as initiation because of the fact that we had to add some modifications to Section 3-2-8 PQP. We hadn't listed 3-2-8 in the previous initiation, so we are still the initiation process not the first reading. Ms. Laughlin then went through the changes to the Zoning Ordinance.

Jeremy Draper, Development Manager, had a question for Ms. Laughlin. We have our proposed Residential Business Zone and in the Residential District if they are abutting that zone, are they required to do a CUP? It would now be a Commercial District.

Ms. Laughlin said that is something she would have to think about. With the IC it is important to have that CUP if they are abutting a Residential Zone because they could be very industrial. Whereas the 5th Street has more of a Residential Commercial Transitional kind of feel. She doesn't feel it is as necessary to have that CUP requirement for the new 5th Street Zone.

Mr. Draper read the part in the code changes that he was referencing.

Ms. Laughlin asked for the current City Code to be brought up.

Scott Wilkinson, Assistant City Manager, said that they will have to give that some consideration as they consider the new zone for 5th Street. The real questions is do you want to have that requirement whether your developing commercial or residential on 5th Street. If you look at 5th Street it is mostly developed, so the likelihood of Residential development being subject to the CUP would be pretty low. But as things convert to Commercial they would be subject to that. Through that process you may or may not have any conditions to mitigate any issues. The one thing it does is it gives a residential neighbor the opportunity to comment on the proposed development. We should pay particular attention to that issue on 5th Street.

Aaron Martinez, Chairman, asked if staff recommended the Commission to initiate this item with the language how it is now. He then asked if there were to be unintended consequences if they will have to modify the amendment.

Mr. Wilkinson thought they wouldn't want to get rid of that requirement because of the rest of the community.

Chairman Martinez said he was looking at it as it is today. It sounds like this is a new thought to the process.

Mr. Wilkinson said if you look at North 5th Street and how it's developed, he doesn't see a block in on the side streets that you're going to see much in the way of redevelopment in that area. He didn't think there were many vacant lots and asked for that to be pulled up.

Mr. Draper said it was just a thought that he had and he might be jumping ahead. There are a few vacant lots. The intent of the new code is to reduce some of the CUPs and variances that we get.

Mr. Wilkinson said that there could be an exception, in the Code, for that district, but we would need to have that district in place before we could finish passing that section of the code. The intent was to have 5th Street more Commercialized. If we don't arrive at a good conclusion tonight, we could always table the initiation and staff could spend a little more time going through this. In the RO District if you have a principal use as residential you don't have to have a CUP, but for every other use a CUP is required. That's because it is a transitional area. Over the time that district has been in place we have probably processed four or five CUPs over fifteen years. It's nice when there is a transitional use to allow the neighbors to comment on it. Mr. Wilkinson asked if in the CT District if a CUP was required.

Mr. Draper pointed out a Residential lot located next to a Commercial lot that would require a CUP under the code revision if that lot was ever developed.

Mr. Wilkinson explained that they may be faced with a \$750 application and we may not identify any conditions that need to be mitigated. Typically, if residential is going in first there are really no issues to mitigate. But if Commercial comes in after that then Commercial is the development that needs to mitigate the issues.

Ms. Laughlin pointed out that in the CT District there is no CUP requirement for abutting residential.

Mr. Wilkinson said there is probably a good reason why we don't have that then. But there are some pretty onerous development standards.

Chairman Martinez asked if the intent for the new 5th Street District was to alleviate some of the CUPs and variances. What is the expected impact of the new district? If we could get that answered then, we would all feel comfortable with the initiation. We don't want to take away ten CUPs and give back five.

Mr. Wilkinson said he thought the intent was to have a district similar to CT. Relax the standards and try to bring most of the non-conforming properties into conformance. We could go back and put an exception under the Residential District, so that they aren't required to have a CUP on CT Districts or the CN, if that's what we decide to call it.

Chairman Martinez thought that it was important that the residents be able to speak towards that potential Commercial use going next door.

Mr. Wilkinson said we could but an exception in the Residential District but require the CN to have a CUP. That way if you want to convert a property to a Commercial use it places the burden on the Commercial Development and not the Residential Development.

Chairman Martinez thought that sounded more fitting and appropriate. He asked if it would still require the CUP process.

Mr. Wilkinson clarified that you would only need a CUP if you were developing a Commercial property next to a Residential property.

Chairman Martinez asked if they went that route if the amendment would need to be modified.

Mr. Wilkinson answered that the Planning Commission could consider what we just discussed and we could work through those issues and try to get a CN District in place.

Ms. Laughlin wondered if they couldn't add it into the CT District itself. We have in all the other Districts where the CUPs are required. If we put into the new CN District the exceptions.

Mr. Wilkinson said we probably could.

Ms. Laughlin said that way we could continue on with Ordinance 805, get that through, and continue with the process for the 5th Street District.

Mr. Wilkinson thought if they changed the language, in the R Zone, to require the CUP, except for exceptions identified in other sections of the code.

Mr. Draper said his concern was with the language in which it was written. He wondered if they needed to change it from saying "lot or parcel", if it's more of a subdivision.

Mr. Wilkinson said it is very rare, and it might be worth considering eliminating that out of the R District. Then we could just require it under the Commercial Districts and Industrial Districts.

Ms. Laughlin stated that staff would support that.

Mr. Wilkinson said each time you're looking at development of a Commercial District, we would always be looking at if they would be subject to it. Regardless we would be looking at the Zoning of the surrounding properties, and require a screen wall in anticipation for future development.

Chairman Martinez asked if there was a clear recommendation from staff.

Mr. Wilkinson recommend that they remove the requirement for a CUP out of the Residential District for lots or parcels abutting Commercial or Industrial Districts.

Chairman Martinez asked if that modification would take place in this amendment so they could then initiate the amendment.

Mr. Wilkinson explained if they take action to make that change it would show up in the first reading.

Ms. Laughlin added as well as any other changes that the Commission wants to make.

Mr. Wilkinson explained that if you got to first reading and had significant changes then it would go to first reading again.

Mr. Draper read what the current code is today. The proposed language from the City Attorney changed that to be more of a definite thing. It went from a “may” to “requires” and that’s where the problem is. It’s going to be too much of a burden for a single lot.

Commissioner David Freistroffer asked for clarification on the wording of the motion.

Mr. Wilkinson said that entire provision will be struck from the code.

*****Motion: Initiate an amendment to the City Zoning Ordinance, specifically 3-2-2 Definitions, 3-2-3 General Provisions, 3-2-5 Residential Zoning Districts, 3-2-8 PQP Public Quasi Public District, 3-2-11 IBP, IC Industrial Districts, and 3-2-12 LI GI Districts, striking from 3-2-5(E)(3) the provision at the end of (E)(3) that references Residential development abutting Commercial or Industrial Zones needing a Conditional Use Permit, and direct staff to bring the item back as a public hearing. Moved by David Freistroffer, Seconded by Jose Negrete.**

****Motion passed unanimously. (6-0)*

II. NEW BUSINESS

A. MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS, PETITIONS, AND COMMUNICATIONS

1. Review, consideration, and possible initiation to amend Title 3, Chapter 2, of the Elko City Code entitled “General Zoning Ordinance”, with the addition of a new zoning district, and matters related thereto. **FOR POSSIBLE ACTION**

Ms. Laughlin wanted to go through with the thought process that staff had when they were establishing this district. Planning Commission will need to decide whether they want to call it “Commercial Neighborhood District” or “Residential Business District”. Ms. Laughlin explained that after doing some research on other, larger, places that have done this same thing and talking with the City Attorney, they came to the conclusion that a new district is the best choice, rather than doing an overlay. She then read the intent of the district and described the boundary of the zone. Staff felt that the zone should be set by a boundary, but this is up for discussion. All properties within the boundary would be rezoned into this new district. The reason staff is recommending a set boundary for this district is because staff doesn’t feel that there is any other location within the City, with the exception of Court Street, that could fit into this district. We could expand the boundary at a later date if needed.

Commissioner Jose Negrete asked if some of the homes on 12th Street would fit into this district.

Ms. Laughlin said 12th could be an example and College Avenue. There are a few other areas but we need to be cautious with that. Maybe we start out with the boundary and expand upon that at a later date. Ms. Laughlin then continued explaining the District guidelines. After long discussions, between staff, about the front setbacks, staff felt that going down to a 0 foot setback would work, because of the 15 foot right-of-way at the front of every lot. We would have to look at a possible exception in the code stating that vacation of the right-of-way would not be permitted. One of the things about setbacks in this area is out of the 45 parcels 32 of them don’t meet the front setback, 16 don’t meet the rear setback, 27 don’t meet the interior side setback,

and 40 don't meet the exterior side setback. That's not including any of the accessory structures. What we're trying to eliminate by doing this district is Variance and CUP applications. They would be legal non-conforming uses now, but if they ever wanted to expand upon their property then they would need to get a variance if there was a setback requirement. Staff would recommend a 0 setback requirement on all four sides and allow the right-of-way to determine the distance from the curb. We could possibly add into the landscape requirements that the right-of-way is required to be part of their landscaping and they are required to maintain that as well. The Building and Fire Rating Code would determine a lot of the setback requirements.

Mr. Wilkinson said one other consideration is, if there are any easements along the lot lines you can't encroach into the easements. That also limits how close you can get to the lot line.

Ms. Laughlin finished explaining the District requirements.

Mr. Wilkinson commented that we shouldn't have the 10ft front yard setback, and that signage should be limited to monument type signs.

Commissioner Negrete asked Mr. Wilkinson for clarification on whether the front yard setback should remain at 10ft.

Mr. Wilkinson thought if they put that setback requirement on that it would be crippling to the transformation of the use along this street. A lot of that is going to be self-governing. If we're going to consider that then, maybe we add some language that would encourage the use of the excess right-of-way, to be used to meet the landscape requirements.

Commissioner Jeff Dalling asked for an explanation of the off-street parking requirements.

Mr. Draper explained that under No. 1, that's how they determine how many spaces are to be provided, and No. 2 says the on-street parking, on 5th Street and the adjacent side streets, would count as long as it's abutting the frontage. We may want to consider limiting that to the Commercial Uses and having Residential still provide off-street parking. By allowing that, it promotes better yard space used for landscaping. On 5th Street there is action taken by Council that allows for on-street parking to be used in that manner.

Bob Thibault, City Engineer Commercial commented that there is nothing that addressed a lot abutting another lot.

Ms. Laughlin explained that at this point, because there was so much discussion just amongst staff, they wanted to bring the discussion to the Planning Commission and have them give their input on the setbacks.

Chairman Martinez said the Planning Commission is not qualified to be bringing those types of comments to the Commission. That should be laid out and directed to the Commission, because how do they know that a setback is required. He thought this was going to be brought forth as a big Planning Initiative. He felt that this was going to be a greater opportunity, from a planning perspective, to warp the 5th Street Corridor into something that could be better than it is today. It is not seen, nor are there any planning initiatives, in this document, outside the implications of the items that are listed, that have a planning effect. Outside of evaluating the properties and

conforming them to meet in a certain box, there are no planning initiatives in this at all. He thought the initiative was to alleviate the variances, if possible, and eliminate some of the CUPs, but at the end have a district that was going to be better focused and pointed in a better direction.

Commissioner Freistroffer said allowing for small setbacks and allowing on-street parking were the only two things he saw that would make it easier for Commercial Development to come in on these small lots. He agreed with Chairman Martinez but said that he wouldn't know how, other than to relax the standards, to accomplish a better district.

Chairman Martinez said further specifying something that would drive a particular type of development. These standards are extremely vague. There's not much to go off of. Code could drive development towards specific standards, which would help spur the development to look a specific way. He thought this could be a time for the 5th Street Corridor to really be unified and for the City to have segregated districts that have different look and feel. 5th Street is a prime example, compared to Cedar Street, to be very specific and it could be driven to a warmer residential feel with a commercial lift.

Commissioner Freistroffer said he was trying to understand Chairman Martinez's thinking. For example, requiring certain front yard features and a certain amount of landscaping for all front yards, no matter the development, so that you get a look.

Chairman Martinez said you can start to drive some of that look and feel by integrating a percentage of windows you would like to see on the front face of the building. If you have a 0 setback on a Commercial structure up against a traffic right-of-way there could potentially be very specific things associated with that. Mr. Martinez has a ton of questions from just looking at the vague standards. We could start to look at that future development of those commercial lots and start to better specify the types of feels that we want to see. There are certain code enforcements that do further spur a larger investment on a commercial basis, so we have to take that into consideration. There are some minor things we can do to make the city look better.

Mr. Wilkinson thought this code allowed for repurposing of existing buildings. Basically you're talking about design standards for the buildings. We could go down that direction if the Commission directs us to do that. The City Council might not accept that. That same group chose not to accept those type of restrictions for Redevelopment, because they believe it's just going too far in requiring people to conform. If you start getting into development standards for the structure, a lot of the existing structures probably won't be repurposed for business uses. But it could encourage for some of the existing structures to come down, redevelop, and reconstruction could start occurring. Redevelopment occurs is when the market provides for that opportunity.

Chairman Martinez said that the project he was referring to had highly restrictive standards and that's not what he was thinking for this district. There is a comprehensive approach that can better district, especially going through all the work that we're doing here.

Mr. Wilkinson said if you look at the principal uses under Commercial. That is going to drive a lot of what you're talking about. The neighborhood could better utilize the uses that are listed. The type of uses is an area we should focus on and design standards for the structures. We could talk about the setbacks a little more and define the front, rear, interior, and exterior setbacks.

Chairman Martinez said the sign, for instance, “A freestanding sign, to be limited to a maximum of 6ft tall.” Does it have to be on 5th Street? Does it have to be mounted to their structure? Can it go anywhere on the lot, since there are no setbacks? There’s a ton of ambiguity to what that looks like. If everyone is picking up their own signs and doing anything they want to we will never have that continuity feel. There are serious basic items that could be added to drive the development a certain way.

Ms. Laughlin said look at the development of what we provide you, in the list of principal permitted uses for commercial uses, Ms. Laughlin took out uses that were listed in the Master Plan and looked at other communities that have done this same thing. It was a collaboration of avenues of information that were put into the Commercial Permitted Uses. The majority was from the Master Plan. On the Signage, we allow wall signs on buildings and we currently don’t limit them in our sign code. When Ms. Laughlin and Mr. Draper discussed the signs, they felt that they didn’t want a freestanding, pylon sign that could be 20 feet tall. We can put in some design standards, but the focus that we focused on was that there are 45 parcels that would be rezoned, out of those 45 there are 3 vacant parcels. So we’re looking at three possibilities of new construction, unless someone bought an existing house and demolished it. We are in somewhat of a conformance to what’s already built. That area has a variety of different styles and setbacks.

Mr. Wilkinson explained that they are open to suggestions. He has been involved in a lot of discussion with proposed use changes on Court Street, where they were taking a residential house and convert it to a commercial use. The cost alone, under the Building and Fire Code Requirements, typically to change uses kills most of the plans. We need to be cautious with adding requirements for cosmetic changes. Signs can’t be in the right-of-way without a revocable permit. A lot of this is going to be self-governing. If you wanted to tie the neighborhood together, the only thing that’s going to do it would be streetscape.

Chairman Martinez explained that his comments were more towards the commercial uses that are already in place. As they redevelop their own properties. There could be a different narrative of what the Commissioners would like to see.

Mr. Wilkinson suggested that the Commissioners take action and let staff work it out.

Chairman Martinez said that signage would be a good start and it would make it seem like they were doing more than just trying to eliminate the variances and CUPs.

Mr. Wilkinson thought they should entertain a motion to have additional sign standards and design standards for the structure. Then give staff a chance to put that together.

Ms. Laughlin said she would like to see some discussion about the selection of the name of the district as well as having a set boundary or open it up to other areas of the community.

Commissioner Dalling said he would like to see a boundary and would like the name to be Residential Business District.

Commissioner Negrete agreed with Commissioner Dalling about both subjects.

Commissioner Freistroffer liked the idea of a boundary. This is a unique district that requires a boundary, it's not something that is supposed to be rezoned in bits over the City. There is a bit of a transitional feel to "Residential Business", though we might want to go to more of a Commercial direction and "Commercial Neighborhood" would work better in that situation.

Commissioner Dalling added that you still get the commercial feel with Residential Business.

Commissioner Tera Hooiman asked what the majority of the uses in that area are.

Ms. Laughlin said that it is more residential. There are about 13 lots that are commercial uses.

Commissioner Freistroffer asked for clarification on whether the laundry or dry cleaning pick-up outlet would be pick-up only and not the actual cleaning. (Yes)

Chairman Martinez asked if everyone agreed on the name "Residential Business District". (Yes) He then asked for legal ramifications on district verses overlays.

Ms. Laughlin clarified that they were proposing this as a district. What we're asking you if you want to limit the district with a boundary or rezone the properties and allow for rezones to this district throughout the City.

Chairman Martinez asked if they limited this district with a boundary if they would have to create a whole new district for another similar area.

Ms. Laughlin explained that they could add onto the boundary if they wanted to have all the same standard for that areas as well. Or they could have an RB1 and an RB2, with RB2 having a little bit different standards.

Commissioner Negrete liked the flexibility of that idea.

Commissioner Dalling thought they were going to include Court Street with this District.

Ms. Laughlin said she was just focusing on 5th Street, because that's what was brought to the Commission back in March to initiate.

Commissioner Negrete liked the idea of focusing on 5th Street. So we can get it how we want it and then move on.

Chairman Martinez asked if they had to identify the boundary in the motion.

Ms. Laughlin explained the boundaries that she put in and why and explained that they could modify those boundaries.

Commissioner Negrete suggested that they expand the boundary to south of Willow Street.

Mr. Thibault suggested they go to Willow Street on the southwest side and Walnut Street on the northeast side so you can leave out the church.

Ms. Laughlin asked the Commission if there were any additional principal permitted uses or conditional uses that they would like to see added to the list.

Commissioner Freistroffer asked if the Conditional uses were five or more in multifamily. (Yes)

Mr. Draper asked if they wanted to limit the accessory uses permitted to residential only.

Commissioner Dalling asked if they wanted to have storage parking for either use.

Mr. Draper said it would be appropriate for a residential use.

Ms. Laughlin said that out of the 45 lots 29 of them are currently residential and they all currently have accessory buildings. Some of the buildings that were converted to commercial also had accessory buildings, but in order to provide parking in the rear they tore down the accessory building. We can easily change this.

Chairman Martinez pointed out that some of these places already have storage units in place and they are needed. He asked if they could put out a survey, as they come up with ideas, for the business on 5th Street.

Ms. Laughlin added that they should take into consideration that when the Redevelopment Agency was looking at the Urban Design Overlay, which was design standards for the Redevelopment Area, every permit that would go through the Building Department that was in the Redevelopment Area had to go through the Redevelopment Agency to be approved. So if you're going to put strict requirement upon this district for the buildings themselves those will have to be caught in the review process of building permits.

Mr. Wilkinson thought that since it would be under the Zoning Ordinance it would be fine.

Chairman Martinez reiterated that no one was proposing stricter standards than what's currently in place today. They may be looking at trying to create a better narrative for that neighborhood, that those commercial property owners, and residential, could have an opportunity to voice their opinion at some of the ideas that staff and Planning Commission puts forward, and maybe we can come up with something that's pretty basic and generic but points developers in a direction.

Commissioner Hooiman asked if, with the proposed changes, a Rainbow House would be allowed in this district.

Ms. Laughlin said that it wasn't listed under the permitted uses, so it could not go in this district.

Mr. Wilkinson said if they were a social or service club then it would be allowed.

Commissioner Freistroffer said they would have to meet parking standards for how many people were coming to meetings and things.

Commissioner Negrete asked if the setbacks would be 0, except for the right-of-way. (Yes)

Mr. Wilkinson said these standards need to be flexible enough to utilize an existing buildings or apply to a new building. We need to try to figure out what works for the built environment.

Mr. Wilkinson thought that they could make a motion to table the item and direct staff to do a little more work and bring it back.

*****Motion: Table the initiation to amend Title 3, Chapter 2 of the Elko City Code, direct staff to name the district Residential Business, the bounds shall be southeast of Willow Street, north of Pine Street, southwest of Walnut Street, and one property line east and west of 5th Street, direct staff to look into signage standards and property development standards for principal commercial buildings, also direct staff to finalize setbacks for the front, rear, interior, and exterior, and direct staff to create a survey of existing businesses, to be ready for the next Planning Commission meeting.**

Moved by Jeff Dalling, Seconded by Jose Negrete.

*****Motion passed unanimously. (6-0)**

2. Review, consideration, and possible action to change the time of the regular Planning Commission Meetings, and matters related thereto. **FOR POSSIBLE ACTION**

Commissioner Freistroffer said that 5:30p.m. would work for his schedule.

*****Motion: Instruct staff to change any future Planning Commission meeting times to 5:30pm.**

Moved by Jose Negrete, Seconded by Tera Hooiman.

*****Motion passed unanimously. (6-0)**

III. REPORTS

A. Summary of City Council Actions.

Ms. Laughlin explained that City Council, last week, approved the rezone for Southwest Gas and they tabled the Big Foot Holdings car wash rezone.

B. Summary of Redevelopment Agency Actions.

Ms. Laughlin said there was a RAC meeting last month to talk about the Phase 1 of Corridor Project as well as an item to discuss bonding. They determined that bonding was not in the best interest of the RDA. There was an RDA meeting to discuss the unfinished business of the Pescio Building. They have directed staff to get written estimates for the demolition of the building and reach out to the adjoining property owners and talk about an entire block end redevelopment opportunity. We will report back to the RDA the first part of November with our findings and they can make a decision at that point.

Chairman Martinez asked Commissioner Dalling if he would like to update the Commission on anything he has learned from attending the RDA and RAC meetings.

Commissioner Dalling said that they were trying to get the 30% drawing done and approved and their top three of what they want to see done first. It sounds like the Centennial Plaza was the top priority.

Ms. Laughlin said they asked for all block ends from 4th to 6th as part of the Centennial Plaza.

Commissioner Dalling said it was good that they got some unity there. The big deal was the Pescio Building. It is \$250,000 for the City to take that on and then give it back to a developer.

Chairman Martinez said what he took away from that was that that building could change the whole perspective of downtown.

Ms. Laughlin explained that the building was going to come down no matter what. Either the RDA does it, after accepting the donation or the Pescio's do it. If the Pescio's tear it down and it becomes a lot, they are going to want to sell that lot and recoup some of their costs. They don't have any control over the outcome of what gets developed there. Whereas, if the Redevelopment Agency accepts that building, demolishes it, and can prove that they can, in a redevelopment of that parcel, would get the money back that they spent on the demolition in tax increment. Then they can offer that property to a developer but also control the outcome of that property.

Chairman Martinez asked if it would be a 20 year endeavor to recoup the demolition cost.

Ms. Laughlin said it would be, but you also have to look at what that would do for the surrounding area.

Mr. Wilkinson explained that addressing blight is the primary function of a Redevelopment Agency.

Commissioner Dalling thought that if the building was going to come down any way, why we should pay to demo the building just so we have control over what goes on that lot. He wondered if we were short sighted and all we care about is tearing down old buildings to get a new building and a big tax increment.

Mr. Wilkinson explained that the long term plan, in the RDA Plan, is to create enough tax increment to address a blighted corridor.

Commissioner Dalling said were not Reno and we don't have that kind of pull and that kind of cash to go put in a ballpark.

Mr. Wilkinson explained that we do analysis and projections that show that we could. We're presenting all of that to the RDA, which show all the impacts to the projected revenues and cumulative impacts of past decisions. If you look in our plan these are things that the RDA may or may not do. Ms. Laughlin has done very detailed analysis that show that ground up development is what provides the most increment, so that we can accomplish the end goal.

Chairman Martinez said that there is not a narrative, even in the downtown corridor, that can alleviate your concern of controlling the outcome of that building. If there was a more narrative towards those development standards, and the way those buildings should look, it would help steer that development into alleviating some of those concerns.

Mr. Wilkinson said if you want to do development standards for principal buildings those have to be put into code. Code is force of law. The Agency has its Plan. The City Council and the Agency are required under NRS to work together. We cannot go in and enforce Agency design guidelines on developers, unless the Agency is participating in the project in some manner.

C. Professional articles, publications, etc.

1. Zoning Bulletin

D. Preliminary agendas for Planning Commission meetings.

E. Elko County Agendas and Minutes.

F. Planning Commission evaluation. General discussion pertaining to motions, findings, and other items related to meeting procedures.

Ms. Laughlin explained that the action sheets have been changed just to be more consistent with all the other meeting action sheets and they will be easier and simpler for new Commissioners to structure motions.

G. Staff.


Ms. Laughlin wanted to inform the Commission about the resignation of Commissioner Matt Haley. We will be asking City Council, on Tuesday, to accept the resignation and start the advertising process.

COMMENTS BY THE GENERAL PUBLIC

There were no public comments made at this time.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.



Aaron Martinez, Chairman



Jose Negrete, Secretary