

CITY OF ELKO
PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
6:30 P.M., P.D.S.T., TUESDAY, JULY 7, 2009
ELKO CITY HALL, 1751 COLLEGE AVENUE, ELKO, NEVADA

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Jeff Thompson.

ROLL CALL

Present: Jeff Thompson, Reece Keener,
Brent Elmore, Doug Owen,
Richard Perry, John Anderson

Absent: one vacancy

City Staff Present: Ed Wynes, City Planner
Curtis Calder, City Manager
Delmo Andreozzi, Assistant City Manager
Scott Wilkinson, Development Manager
Mike Hecht, Deputy Fire Chief/Fire Marshal
Kelly Watson, Planning Technician

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: June 2, 2009 – Regular Meeting

****Commissioner Owen moved to approve the minutes of June 2, 2009, in their entirety. Commissioner Perry seconded the motion and the motion passed with Commissioner Elmore and Commissioner Keener abstaining.**

I. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

This agenda item is to provide time for the general public to address the Planning Commission regarding items of concern not specifically listed on the agenda. Action cannot be taken at this time, but a matter can be set on the agenda for a future meeting, as appropriate.

There were no comments made at this time.

II. NEW BUSINESS

A. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Review and consideration of Conditional Use Permit No. 4-09 filed by Catherine Wines on behalf of Jose Romero to consider an extension, enlargement and/or change of a nonconforming use consisting of an existing carport, storage shed and covered porch in connection with a residential use in a GI (General Industrial) zoning district. **ACTION ITEM.**

The subject property is located generally on the north side of River Street, approximately 50 feet west of 12th Street (1137 River Street).

Catherine Wines, representing Jose Romero, 1250 Lamoille Highway Suite 519, indicated that the property is currently zoned General Industrial but there is an existing house that has been there for a long time. Most of the block is residential although it is zoned industrial. Mr. Romero has owned the house for about five years and built a carport, storage shed and a covered porch without a permit. We decided the best way to fix the situation was to apply for a Conditional Use Permit and then go about getting building permits for the structures. I am here to ask for a Conditional Use Permit because those three types of structures are not allowed in an industrial zone.

Mr. Wynes stated after looking at the particulars all we could say was go through the Conditional Use Permit application process which is the only way you are going to get to have an allowed any of these allowed activities on that property. The application was filed and we did review it. There is a lot of material that has been provided by the Building Inspector regarding actions he has taken in relation to this application reviewing it, looking it over, inspecting the property and everything else. His comments are included. After a lot of consideration and review and looking at all of the findings that are written I came to the recommendation that this application should be conditionally approved. Subject to the conditions contained in my Staff report.

Chairman Thompson asked when the property was zoned industrial.

Mr. Wynes stated it has historically been industrial.

Chairman Thompson asked if that was because of the railroad.

Mr. Wynes said it was adjacent to the railroad and like all of the other industrial property along Commercial and River and all that area down there it was zoned industrial to accommodate heavy industry that was to be adjacent to the railroad tracks.

Chairman Thompson asked if no one ever changed when they started building homes.

Mr. Wynes said some of it has been changed over time. Slowly pieces have been changed but there has never been any real mass rezoning of all of the properties.

Mr. Wilkinson referred to the memo dated June 29, 2009, to the City Planner indicating he had provided some background information. You have heard some discussion with regard to building permit, meeting setbacks, etc. Item 4 there is some information that I would like to make sure the applicant's representative is aware of some of the issues that would still be in front of them. It appears that the existing buildings regardless of what setbacks would apply and the Development Department is not clear if that would be R1 setbacks or General Industrial setbacks. If the GI zoning were applied there would be zero sideyard setbacks required unless it abuts a residential zone. Regardless of that the Building Code will require a three foot setback from the property line and I don't believe the carport can meet that at this point in time. They would need to be able to address that and seek a variance with the Planning Commission. Based on our preliminary review there doesn't appear to be special circumstances that would exist to grant that variance. That could be cited in the variance application. With all of that said we are recommending a conditional approval based on the applicant being able to provide evidence that no type of easement exists along the side lot lines of the property and that would enable them to

move forward and request a variance. If there are easements that exist they probably aren't being utilized and they would have to be vacated. He continued to cite the conditions contained in his memo of June 29, 2009.

Mr. Androzzzi pointed out that we are not clear as to what zoning district you would actually enforce regarding setbacks. The Planning Commission could add an additional condition that would require the structures meet the residential setbacks if you choose to do that.

Mr. Hecht stated the Development and Building Departments have addressed the concerns of the Fire Department.

Chairman Thompson said whether we use the Residential or the General Industrial setbacks the Building Code states that we have a three foot setback.

Mr. Wilkinson said that is more restrictive than the R1 setback but less restrictive than what would be applied under the GI zone to this piece of property.

Chairman Thompson asked if it would be the same setback for the Building Code even if it is GI.

Mr. Wilkinson said it is three foot, which is building code. Typically if you were to grant a variance on an R1 where you granted relief from five and one-half foot sideyard setback, the closest they could go to the property line is three foot under the Building Code unless they have provided for special construction. We have granted a variance on an existing garage where the owner purchased the property and constructed and met some fire wall criteria in order to get a variance for that particular situation.

Commissioner Perry asked if that was added as a condition the least restrictive would be the Building Code requirement or the R1.

Mr. Wilkinson said the least restrictive would be GI which has a zero sideyard setback and the next most restrictive would be the Building Code which is three feet and then R1 is five and one-half feet.

Commissioner Perry state this is three issues. The first is the Conditional Use Permit which is a step towards solving it because this is General Industrial and in the Zoning Ordinance anything that is within General Industrial requires a Conditional Use Permit if you are going to change a non-conforming use.

Mr. Wynes said if you make any modifications or expansions to a residence in the General or Light Industrial you need to get a Conditional Use Permit.

Commissioner Perry said the second issue is getting approval to build the structure that is already there including the setback issue. The third is whether or not a variance is required or that really isn't an issue I guess. There is only two.

Mr. Wynes said a building permit would not be issued unless a variance has been obtained.

Commissioner Perry said assuming this was a positive outcome for the applicant they would have to be back here requesting a variance.

Mr. Wynes said they would.

Commissioner Perry asked what kind of setback is there for the garage.

Catherine Wines said right now there is only twenty inches to the side and there is also only about 20 inches to the carport and the residence which is also not legal. Our plan right now is probably the carport is going to have to move. The porch and the storage shed will comply with just a building permit. I don't see any way that the carport is going to comply. I think the applicant is prepared to move it.

Chairman Thompson said the other question is do we look at this as R1 or General Industrial?

Mr. Wynes said you would look at it as General Industrial, which is the zoning of the property. The questions that we have regarding setbacks and other issues will be resolved with the building permit.

Commissioner Perry asked then you don't believe that should be part of a condition.

Mr. Wynes said no, if you want to make it a condition you will just have to make one that it meets all of the applicable or appropriate setbacks.

Chairman Thompson said they will need a variance either way on the storage shed.

Mr. Wynes said the storage shed is movable and they could probably slide the storage shed far enough away from the sideyard property line to make the clearance.

Catherine Wines indicated the storage shed has already been moved and complies right now.

Mr. Andreozzi said if we are applying the underlying zone of GI which requires a zero lot line setback and they go through the process to get a building permit then it is unclear to me whether they are required to get a variance.

Mr. Wynes said they may not be required that is something I will have to make a determination on and I am leaning towards that fact that if it is GI they don't have any setback requirements.

Mr. Andreozzi said to take that one step farther then if the Planning Commission wanted to preserve the integrity of the R1 setbacks again this being a Conditional Use Permit they could make that a condition if they chose to do so.

Mr. Wynes said they could. You have the option of conditioning it to say it must meet R1 setbacks or the condition that it meet appropriate setbacks for the industrial zoning.

Chairman Thompson said if it is industrial zoning would they have to have the firewall or a three foot setback?

Mr. Wilkinson said that is health and safety. That is Building Code regardless of the zoning. That is the minimum distance under fire code for fire safety. If you do chose to apply the R1 setbacks, we will have to be able to track these types of decisions on these very types of issues going forward in the future. If we don't use the underlying zoning whether it is GI, LI or

Commercial but we start applying setbacks based on the use than every time this comes before you in order to be consistent we will have to be able to track what we have done in the past.

Mrs. Watson said in Commercial zoning you can have residences if they go by the R zoning setbacks. We already have something in the code that states you can do residential in different zoning but you have to meet the R zoning setbacks. I don't think it is out of the scope because it was looked at at some point and said if they are going to have a home in a commercial area they are going to have to go by the residential setbacks.

Mr. Andreozzi said in a commercial zone you are not required to go through a Conditional Use Permit process where for this you are so it opens the door to review whatever you feel warrants review and whatever you feel you would like to protect as far as setbacks are concerned if you chose to do so.

Commissioner Perry commented that is a good question because the entire block on the north side of 11th Street is homes. It is not interspersed commercial, it is solid homes from one end to the other and the majority of them are nice well kept homes. Across the street it is commercial.

****Commissioner Perry moved to conditionally approved CUP No. 4-09 subject to the following conditions:**

- 1. That the Conditional Use Permit No. 4-09 is only approved to permit the three buildings, the storage shed in the rear of the lot, the garage on the easterly side of the property, and the covered porch on the rear of the house to remain on the GI zoned property with the issuance of building permits for each in accordance with the submitted site plan labeled Exhibit "A".**
- 2. If the applicant seeks to make other additions or modifications to the buildings on the property in the future, he will have to seek a new Conditional Use Permit before any building permit will be issued**
- 3. This Conditional Use Permit will expire within one (1) year if no building permit is activated within that time period for the construction of the three buildings.**
- 4. The storage shed shall be required to meet all required side yard set backs prior to any building permit being issued.**
- 5. The covered porch shall only require a building permit to be considered a legal fixture on the property.**
- 6. The garage building shall be required to meet the required side yard set backs and the separation between building setbacks, prior to any building permit being issued.**
- 7. All structures meet applicable setbacks.**
- 8. Condition number 1 contained in the Memorandum from Scott A. Wilkinson, Development Manager, to Ed Wynes, City Planner dated June 29, 2009, stated as follows:**
 - 1) Provide evidence that no type of easement exists along the side lot lines of the property.**

Commissioner Perry's findings are that this Conditional Use Permit is consistent with the Land Use Component of the Elko City Master Plan, the Streets and Highways Component of the Elko City Master Plan, Section 3-2-3 of the City Zoning Ordinance, Section 3-2-4 of the City Zoning Ordinance, Section 3-2-12 GI (General Industrial) Zoning District, of the City Zoning Ordinance, Section 3-2-18 of the City Zoning

Ordinance – (Conditional Use Permit Procedures) and Section 3-2-19 of the City Zoning Ordinance – (Nonconforming Uses).

Commissioner Keener seconded the motion with similar findings.

The motion passed unanimously.

2. Review and consideration of Rezone No. 3-09, filed by Catalina Laughlin on behalf of Stephen E. Trettin and Pamela J. Trettin Family Trust and Nancy Starkey, Trustee of the Nancy Starkey Living Trust, to consider a change in zoning from C (General Commercial) to IC (Industrial Commercial) involving approximately 3.4 acres. **ACTION ITEM**

The subject property is located generally on the north side of Alta Vista Drive approximately 300 feet east of Jennings Way.

Catalina Laughlin, 1243 Rockland Drive, said right now this parcel is currently 5.85 acres and the applicants have a potential buyer for this portion of the property. It is surrounded by industrial uses including the adjacent parcel. Their intention is to take the 3.36 acres that we would like to get rezoned to IC for this potential buyer and leave the remaining portion of the parcel commercial.

Mr. Wynes said we have come up with a recommendation that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation of approval to the City Council for Rezone No. 3-09 based upon the facts and finding we presented.

Mr. Wilkinson said we are also in support of this proposed rezone. There is nothing in the code that prevents one piece of property from having different zones but you may consider as a condition that if you approve this zone that they submit a parcel map and create a parcel for that zone. The applicant's representative could give us an idea if they would be in favor of parceling that property. It is my understanding that the sale may not go through on this but that is something you may want to consider as a condition of the rezone.

Catalina Laughlin indicated a parcel map has been generated and would be filed for approval upon the negotiations being complete. There is an agreement on the purchase of the property. They will have something in writing and agreed upon before this would go to the City Council on the 28th. They would file the parcel map at that time if not before that.

Mr. Wilkinson said it would be a lot cleaner if there was a condition that this be parceled for the rezone if you would consider that. They are going to have to have a legal description submitted to us for the zone and maybe to go ahead and have it parceled off would be cleaner from our perspective if they could do that.

Commissioner Perry asked Mr. Wynes what the difference between IC and Commercial.

Mr. Wynes said basically IC is a light commercial or industrial. He then read the intent of the IC zoning district out of the City Zoning Ordinance and the allowed uses.

Commissioner Perry asked then versus Commercial what does it allow and not allow.

Mr. Wynes said anything you would find downtown.

Commissioner Perry said as I recall the parcel to the northwest we sent a recommendation of IC for Milex.

Mr. Wynes said they are building or assembling strobe lights for the mining industry. Those are the kinds of things that it does allow. It talks about small scale industrial uses. I could see that property being something like Milex maybe it could be a gas station, it could be some other use that would be similar to what is across the street. There are several different things that zoning would allow in that area.

Commissioner Perry asked if I & E Electric is Light Industrial.

Mr. Wynes said correct.

Commissioner Perry said from that standpoint there really aren't any neighbors that would have any issues with this.

Mr. Wynes said the only neighbor would be up Ruby Vista to the northeast of that property a little ways.

Commissioner Perry said after we did Industrial Commercial on the Cummins there was someone who came in with a comment.

Mr. Wynes said Sam Billings.

Commissioner Perry asked do you remember what his issue was with IC versus C.

Mr. Wynes said that was not a zone change you gave them a Site Plan approval of that project.

Chairman Thompson said IC is a transitional zone between commercial and industrial.

Mr. Wynes said it allows both of them and it also allows residential so I can see it as transitional. This is the third time we have done this in the last couple of years. It was done recently with Mr. Johnson out on Mountain City Highway to put his storage units in and it was done for the Milex property and now it could be done for this property.

Commissioner Keener asked if Mr. Wilkinson could reiterate his concerns with the parcel map as it relates to the zoning designation.

Mr. Wilkinson said I think it would be a little clearer going forward if we had entire parcels with the same zoning. Here you would have one parcel with two different zones on it. I am thinking it might be appropriate for the Planning Commission to condition this with a parcel map being properly recorded along with the rezone or that in your recommendation to the City Council. If you go forward in time say this doesn't develop and you have other people looking at it and you have two different zones on the property. It is a bit confusing going forward. If the owner didn't object to the parceling of the property and if they wanted to rezone it they are probably going to sell that entire piece off with that zoning. I think it is appropriate that we have a parcel map recorded with the same legal description as the zone change.

Mrs. Watson indicated the owner called and wanted to know if they did not complete their agreement with the buyer if the rezone would go through and I let them know they had until it went to City Council before it would actually be rezoned. He asked if they could pull the request all of the way up until the date and I told him yes. It sounds like to me he doesn't want it rezoned until they have that done anyway.

Commissioner Perry said I have a question because now I am confused. I am looking at a map that was included that indicates Parcel No. 1, 3.365 acres and it is covered in yellow and that is what I thought we were talking about here and then there is a parcel number 2. What are we talking about?

Mr. Wilkinson said you are looking at a proposed parcel map that was included with this application.

Commissioner Perry said right now this is all one parcel.

Mr. Wilkinson said this map has not been recorded and my preference would be to see this map that was included in the application actually recorded along with approval of the rezone. There is nothing in our code that I am aware of that I could condition that or recommend a condition. I think the Planning Commission can do that. I think it is the appropriate way to go. I think it keeps things a little bit more organized for the City going forward.

Commissioner Perry said that makes sense to me, I have never seen multiple zoning on one parcel.

Mr. Wilkinson said we did it with the Cotoko annexation. That was 232 acres and had four different zones on it. I think that makes sense at an early planning stage like that where you are breaking out bigger pieces of acreage but I think in this circumstance it really doesn't make sense to keep two different zones on one parcel.

Catalina Laughlin said we did provide you the legal description in the application and it was based on the parcel map that we will be submitting to the City for approval. With the attorneys trying to come to an agreement upon the purchase of the property, I didn't feel like I should submit the parcel map for approval and then have to pull that if it didn't work out. According to the e-mail today they are nearing an agreement and I can submit the parcel map prior to the City Council meeting for approval.

Chairman Thompson said if we put it as a condition then it is not a problem because it is a recommendation to the City Council anyway. That should be fine I would think.

Commissioner Perry asked if the parcel map would have to be submitted and filed before or could it be contingent upon or with the City Council's final approval of the rezone. It makes a difference in the motion I think.

Mr. Wilkinson said preferably that you would have a recorded parcel before the rezone is approved. If a rezone is approved and then they don't submit and record the map, I am not sure what our recourse would be to try and undo the rezone. That would be fairly complicated I would think. I would think that your motion could state that a parcel map is submitted to the City and property recorded before the City Council hears the rezone.

Chairman Thompson said or just before approval by the City Council.

Mrs. Watson said the applicant needs to know that when they submit a parcel map, as long as there is not any dedications, Staff can take up to 45 days so the rezone may not be looked at by City Council on the 28th as expected before and that any conditions on a rezone have to be accepted by the applicant.

Commissioner Perry said what if the City Council denies it and they have a parcel map that is filed.

Mr. Wilkinson said they could always merge the parcels back into one if they so choose to do that. It would cost some additional money for them to get another surveying company to go back and merge those parcels. There is some risk that they would have to take.

Mr. Andreozzi said one suggestion to handle it would be that it is approved not conditionally but contingently on something. In other words if it doesn't get approved by City Council or there is not a parcel map than it is contingent on those things taking place as opposed to conditionally.

Mr. Wynes said if they were to file the parcel map, we already have a document in the file with the legal description that if it meets the legal description of the parcel map when the documents are signed by the City they are sent over to the drafts person to draw up during that course of time that parcel map is in review and in process. We could make sure that the two descriptions are the same so when the parcel map is approved the legal description is what is going to be the zoned parcel if it is approved by the Council. If this whole thing is turned down by the Council for some strange reason the application for parcel map can be withdrawn.

Mr. Wilkinson said you still don't have a recorded document at that time or a legal parcel that is recorded so it would be contingent upon them submitting a parcel map for review and approval.

Chairman Thompson asked if contingent would be a better way to go.

Mr. Wilkinson said you could do that and if the rezone is approved and they don't follow through with the recordation of the parcel map we really wouldn't have any recourse to undo the rezone that would be worth our time. Worse case scenario is you have a parcel with two zones on it. It is a little bit complicated. I don't know that it is that big of a deal to try and get it recorded before hand. If you have it recorded, it exists and the zone is based on that. I think either way you choose to go on it would be appropriate and it sounds like if they don't have a sales agreement they are probably going to pull the rezone and wouldn't submit a parcel map anyway.

****Commissioner Perry moved to forward a recommendation of approval to the City Council for Rezone No. 3-09 with the following condition:**

- 1. The parcel map is submitted to the City of Elko and properly recorded prior to the final rezoning.**

Commissioner Perry's findings are that the rezone is consistent with the Land Use Component of the Elko City Master Plan, Streets and Highways Component of the Elko City Master Plan, Section 3-2-10 General Commercial Districts, Section 3-2-11 Industrial Commercial Districts and Section 3-2-21 which is Amendments.

Commissioner Owen seconded the motion with the same conditions and findings.

The motion passed unanimously.

B. MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS, PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATION

1. Review a draft Statement of Qualifications to select a qualified consultant team to provide a comprehensive update for the Land Use, Streets and Highways, and Parks, Recreation, Open Space Plan components of the City of Elko Master Plan inclusive of the development of a Public Arts and Cultural component, together with a Redevelopment element. **DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEM. ACTION TO BE IN THE FORM OF A RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL.**

Mr. Andreozzi stated the City Council through our budget process has budgeted \$160,000 for a Master Plan update. \$10,000 of that is specifically for an Arts and Culture plan as part of the Master Plan. Pursuant to NRS and City Code the Planning Commission really is the driver of that process. This process needs to be brought through the Planning Commission and where we are at currently since the Planning Commission can't encumber City resources, the City Council is the only one that can do that. We have a draft Statement of Qualifications that we have provided. What we would do based on your recommendation either modify it, tweak it or whatever we needed to do at some point get that before the City Council so they can authorize us to solicit these Statement of Qualifications. The other component of this also is a selection committee. City Staff has a couple of recommendations on what we would like to see as far as a selection committee but the one thing you pointed out when you introduced this topic there is a lot of components in addition to the updates to the Land Use Component, Streets and Highways Component, Open Space and Recreation, we talked about making sure our Master Plan has the appropriate correlation between it and our newly adopted Redevelopment Plan and this Arts and Culture Plan that we are trying to develop as well. In addition to the Planning Commission we have three advisory committees that work on these various areas. We have the RDA and the RDA Advisory Committee, we have the Arts and Culture Committee and we also have a Parks and Recreation Committee as well. The next process after you review this we would then try to come up with that selection committee and maybe one way would be to work up some recommendations bring it back to the Planning Commission and then have you forward that recommendation to the City Council or we could take that directly to City Council. At a minimum we would see me, Mr. Wynes, and Eric Howes from City Staff being a part of that selection committee. We think it is entirely appropriate to have a member of the Planning Commission, a member of the City Council and perhaps a member from each of those advisory boards that I had mentioned. This SOQ is essentially generic. We are painting a scene for what we are trying to find and accomplish. We go through what is called a structured interview process and with the selection committee we would force rank all of these qualified consultants and possibly conduct an interview with the top candidates. Ultimately we would make a selection and at that point we would negotiate costs as well as further define a scope of work. We have painted an outline and these guys are experts in this and we would expect them to help us develop that scope of work that we are trying to achieve. The one thing that needs to be pointed out since it is a structured interview we should take a little bit of time to review the bullet points that they will be evaluated on. He cited the required information that the SOQ would be evaluated on. That is something we should focus on and make sure that is good criteria to judge

all of the applicants. This is going to be a time consuming process and we want to find the highest qualified firm to do this work for the City of Elko.

Chairman Thompson asked what is the time frame required?

Mr. Andreozzi said depending on how many applications we get that is what is going to take time. Actually going through the applications force ranking them based on the criteria, more than likely having a follow up oral interview and then forwarding those recommendations to City Council. It certainly could be several hours of time but it would be spread out over time.

Chairman Thompson said one of the requirements is their ability to meet the time frame required to complete the plan does it state anywhere what that time frame is?

Mr. Andreozzi said not at this time. What their time frame would actually be when we develop that scope. We will have a better idea of what is realistic. We definitely want to have something done this fiscal year so we don't want this thing to lament.

Chairman Thompson said you basically want to know how often they would come in under the time frame given their other projects.

Mr. Andreozzi said that would certainly help us. One of the things we are asking them to consider since they are the experts is how the community envisions the City and that is going to involve the Planning Commission being the driving force of the Master Plan. We might have a public meeting or two but that is at the time that we actually have a consultant on board. It is a pretty lengthy process from start to finish.

Chairman Thompson said that is going to change as time goes by depending on our ability and the City's ability to meet certain requirements.

Mr. Andreozzi said it could take several months to get through this whole thing.

Commissioner Perry said the final product requires the Planning Commission have public hearings before it is approved. I would like to make a request that we have that part of the budget in our packets that enabled this so we know what they are thinking.

Mr. Andreozzi said it was just part of the budget. We had anticipated \$100,000 set aside for the land use and transportation component updates. Parks and Recreation has \$50,000 committed for the Parks and Open Space Component and then there is \$10,000 set aside to develop the plan for the Arts & Culture.

Commissioner Perry said so it was just line item and that was approved. If we could have that page of the line items if that is o.k.

Mr. Calder said the goal is to have City Council maybe not at the next meeting but certainly by the end of July to take action to authorize Staff to solicit these SOQs and get it out on the street. This would actually be envisioned to go out prior to the next Planning Commission meeting and start the process because we will give the consultants a couple of weeks to respond and through that process at some point the City Council needs to appoint the selection committee to go through the documents, force rank them and then meet and possibly invite the top consultants for interviews. It is a very lengthy process. We want to get it on the street as soon as possible.

Commissioner Perry said I am not trying to slow it down; I would just like to see that at some point in time; what the components of it are as we go through this.

Chairman Thompson said if we could get that e-mailed out to us. This is probably driven because it has been quite a while since we have looked at it and due to time constraints it is hard for us to do anything of this magnitude. We need some guidance from a consultant.

Mr. Andreozzi said some of the actions that we have been through have made it clear that the Land Use Component needs a good thorough update and projection into the future.

Chairman Thompson said the Master Plan also over the last couple of years we have had few discussions about that.

Mr. Calder said the Plan is over ten years and it is probably overdue for an update. This does not revise every single component but it revises the components with the highest priority right now. As Mr. Andreozzi mentioned we are looking for some sort of integration between a revised Master Plan and the current RDA Plan. We are not looking at a consultant to come in and revise the RDA Plan but somehow link it to our Master Plan so our Master Plan is out ahead of the RDA Plan as well as the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan, Streets and Highways, etc. We have outgrown our Master Plan and we need to push it out in advance of us. We do need that specialized assistance and of course Planning Staff and other departments will help that consultant in their duties as well as the Planning Commission by code takes an active role in the revision and ultimate implementation of the Master Plan. After the selection process and we know who the consultant is the Planning Commission will be taking a lead role with Staff in working with the consultant and shepherding it through the process which will probably include meetings that will invite citizen comment and input on some of the areas if not all of the areas.

Commissioner Perry said there does need to be integration between the Master Plan and RDA. I think it will be a great thing for the Planning Commission because it gives us the opportunity to be part of what Elko is going to look like in the future.

Commissioner Keener said I noticed under the publication there are four newspapers listed on there and this seems rather specialized to me. Would there be any benefit in advertising this in a planning industry type publication?

Mr. Andreozzi said certainly there is and the bigger pool we can get would provide more opportunities. One thing we need to think about in regionalization we are going to require some face time and I think the only disadvantage when we think about what type of region we want to advertise with is the cost of that fact time. We only have \$160,000 so if we had someone from the Midwest or the East that is going to be very expensive for that individual to help us through this process. You can look at the intermountain west region and expand it from what this is because obviously the more people that see this the better chance we have of getting the most qualified person in the region.

Mr. Wynes said regarding some of the specialized planning publications there is also a publication lead time and how it fits in with our deadline and how long somebody would have a chance to see the material, get a hold of it and actually get a response back.

Mr. Andreozzi said we would have it on our website as well. It is pretty interesting when we have bids where we get bids from. The power of the web is a pretty good tool.

****Commissioner Keener moved to forward the Statement of Qualifications as presented to the City Council for consideration**

Commissioner Owen seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

III. REPORTS

A. Summary of City Council Actions.

Mr. Wynes said at the last City Council meeting Doug Owen was reappointed for another term on the Planning Commission and part of John Rice's motion for approval he wanted to comment the Planning Commission members for their dedication and work as volunteers knowing at times this is a very tireless and heartless job that has to be done.

B. Summary of Redevelopment Agency Actions.

We reviewed the SOQ. We also spent a large amount of time discussing the differential between the Master Plan and the Redevelopment Plan and have developed some processes that will initiate that moving forward a little bit more expediently.

C. Professional articles, publications, etc.

1. Zoning Bulletin
2. Zoning Practice

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.

G. Staff.

NOTE: The Chairman or Vice Chairman reserves the right to change the order of the agenda and if the agenda is not completed, to recess the meeting and continue on another specified date and time.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Jeff Thompson, Chairperson

Reece Keener, Secretary

