

KCCIA 1131114 - Clark County, Nevada  
CCID-BOCC, Oriako, Schroeder  
Dear Councilors

May 31, 2010  
For the Public Record

Clark County has had a long history of Comprehensive Plan dating back to 1960. Community Framework Plans were common. The county did not just discover them in 1993. They were an integral part of the Plan the citizens accepted, prior to 1993 and the adoption of the 1994 Comprehensive plan and subsequent Plans thereafter. A common theme in all of them is to recognize the existing rural character and parcel sizes that were already in existence. In doing so, the intent was to accord them the zone size consistent with the existing lot size. Therefore, when the 1988 - 1990 Plans were adopted, there was acceptance by the people for the zones that were designated. In comparison, the 1994 Plan, and subsequent Plans are greatly differ from what is actually on the ground and what makes logical sense

CLARK COUNTY COMPRENENSIVE PLAN GOALS AND GUIDELINES - DECEMBER 29, 1976 - Page 2 - Rural Lands - Those lands not within urban service guideline areas 1 and 2 that are suitable for sparse settlement. Small farms and acreage home sites are the predominant land use. These acres are not suitable necessary, nor intended for urban uses. Page 5 - Goals - 1. To provide relatively low densities perimeters around more densely settled communities, thus enhancing a sense of identity. 3. To encourage the maintenance of small farms or acreage home sites on lands suitable for sparse settlement.

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACE STAEMNET - FRAMEWORK PLAN - August 1977

A - Natural Resources - Agriculture - Forest Page 4 - Clark County's agricultural employment represents only .03 or 1 percent of the national agricultural employment - economically speaking less than enough to supply local demand. Page 5 - The Framework Plan and the proposed cluster concept would permit a higher proportion of the agricultural and timberland in the county to be less affected by suburban residential development. B. Housing - The basic intent of the housing goals is to strive for the highest quality of living environments for all residents, while enabling each to choose a home among a variety of housing types and residential areas.

CLARK COUNTY COMPREENEISIVE PLAN - VOLUME I - REVISED; JANUARY 1988

Page 16 - As noted earlier, single family homes make up 80% of all housing in unincorporated Clark County. The predominant housing density is one single family home on a lot which is 5,500 to 43,559 square feet in size. Inside the urban service areas, this category represents almost 70% of all housing density categories and in the unincorporated County, it is 54% percent of the total. The next most common housing density is one single family home on lots one 1 to 4.99 acres in size.

Page 19 - RURAL RESIDENTIAL - Rural Residential categories re widely distributed throughout the County outside of urban growth areas. It should be understood that existing residential property or lots smaller than the recommended sizes will not be affected by the Plan recommendations.

The rural densities recognized on the plan are: Suburban - 1 to 2.5 acres Rural Residential - 2.5 to 5 acres Rural Estate - 5 to 10 acres Farm Residential over 10 acres

CLARK COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN - VOL. III - SEPT. 1990 COMMUNITY FRAMEWORK PLAN -

The Hometown Community Framework Plan - The framework policies to implement this Community Framework Plan are discussed in the next section. ....The policies are intended to provide a framework within which the county can bridge the plan to the 20 year growth management plan...

1.1 County wide Planning Policies 3.2 Framework Plan Policies - 3.2.3 - Agricultural land on small parcels 10 acres or more in size currently used or designate for agricultural use shall be afforded special protection.

3.2.4 - Forest land on small parcels 10 acres or more in size currently used for designated for forest shall be afforded special protection Encourage the conservation of large parcels 10 to 20 acres or more which have prime agricultural soils for agricultural use and afford these parcels special protection.

The citizens did not accept such a Plan then, in 1994 and continues to reject it in the 2016 Plan. Perhaps the best idea, is to simply go back to the 1993 Plan and return to the people, what the county took away from the citizens and taxpayers of Clark County.

Sincerely,

Carl Lewner, C.C.C.U., Inc.

