City of Las Vegas

PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 28, 2002

CALL TO ORDER: COMMISSIONERS' BRIEFING, 5:30 P.M. in Council Chambers Conference Room of City Hall, 400 Stewart Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada

MINUTES:

PRESENT: VICE CHAIRMAN RICHARD TRUESDELL, COMMISSIONERS MICHAEL BUCKLEY, STEVEN EVANS, BYRON GOYNES AND LAURA MCSWAIN

EXCUSED: CHAIRMAN GALATI AND COMMISSIONER STEPHEN QUINN

ALSO PRESENT: DEPUTY DIRECTOR CHRIS KNIGHT, PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT - MANAGER JOHN KOSWAN, PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT - MANAGER MARGO WHEELER, PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT - SUPERVISOR CHRIS GLORE, PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT - SENIOR PLANNER JOEL MCCULLOCH, PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT - PLANNER II LAURA MARTIN, PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT - PROJECT ENGINEER DAPHNEE LEGARZA, PUBLIC WORKS, PROJECT ENGINEER RICK SCHRODER, PUBLIC WORKS - DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY BRYAN SCOTT, CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE - DEPUTY CITY CLERK DEENY ARAUJO, CITY CLERK'S OFFICE - DEPUTY CITY CLERK LINDA OWENS, CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

Items 7 [GPA-0045-00], 9 [Z-0011-02] and 10 [U-0010-02]:
JOEL McCULLOCH, Planning and Development, began the Briefing by saying that staff is requesting these items be held in abeyance until the 3/14/2002 meeting to properly notify the items with the correct map.

Items 11 [GPA-0047-01]:
MR. McCULLOCH requested this item be held in abeyance until the 3/14/2002 meeting to clarify several issues. Comprehensive Planning prefers to hear the entire package at one time.

Items 12 [GPA-0051-01], 13 [Z-0093-01] and 14 [Z-0093-01(1)]:
MR. McCULLOCH informed the Commissioners that staff is recommending denial based on incompatibility with the surrounding area and "spot" zoning. CHRIS GLORE added that self-service car washes are only located in C-1 zoning areas. In any other areas it would be disruptive. It could possibly be approved in a C-1 zoning district with a Special Use Permit, but would also require a Text Amendment.

BRIEFING - Continued:

Item 13 [Z-0093-01]:
MR. McCULLOCH pointed out that Condition 1 should state GC (General Commercial) instead of SC (Service Commercial).

Item 18 [Z-0024-99(37)]:
MR. McCULLOCH stated that the applicant has requested an abeyance in order to modify the application.

Item 19 [U-0147-01]:
MR. McCULLOCH advised that staff is recommending denial of this application based on saturation of the area with alcohol related uses.

Items 24 [Z-0097-01], 25 [V-0095-01] and 26 [Z-0097-01(1)]:
MR. McCULLOCH noted that staff would like to have these items held in abeyance inasmuch as staff did not receive the revised site plan until 5:00 P.M. on 2/27/2002 and has not had time to review the revisions. The applicant has agreed to have these items held to the 3/28/2002 meeting.

Items 27 [Z-0105-01(1)]:
MR. McCULLOCH advised that staff would like this item stricken from the agenda as it has been re-numbered on this agenda as Item 35.

Items 30 [U-0238-91(4)] and Item 34 [Z-0100-97(7)]:
MR. GLORE felt Condition 2 is not appropriate and should be stricken.

Item 36 [Z-0100-64(180)]:
MR. GLORE was uncertain as to whether the Office of Business Development and the developer have come to an agreement on off-street parking. Only a small number of parking spaces will be on site.

Item 39 [Z-0139-88(41)]:
MR. McCULLOCH said the applicant has requested this item be held to the 3/28/2002 meeting to modify the application.

BRIEFING - Continued:

Item 40 [DB-0002-02]:

MR. McCULLOCH stated that staff is recommending denial based on the Zoning Code requirements for Home Occupation businesses. MR. GLORE added that the applicant would be willing to accept all the conditions and possibly additional conditions.

General Business:

COMMISSIONER EVANS asked to be notified of any additional mailings. He would prefer the backup be numbered for each agenda item.

BRIEFING ADJOURNED AT 5:42 P.M.

City of Las Vegas

PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 28, 2002

ALL ITEMS ON THIS AGENDA ARE SCHEDULED FOR ACTION UNLESS SPECIFICALLY NOTED OTHERWISE.

THESE PROCEEDINGS ARE BEING PRESENTED LIVE ON KCLV, CABLE CHANNEL 2. THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING, AS WELL AS ALL OTHER KCLV PROGRAMMING, CAN BE VIEWED ON THE CITY'S WEBSITE AT www.ci.las-vegas.nv.us. THE PROCEEDINGS WILL BE REBROADCAST ON KCLV CHANNEL 2 AND THE WEB SATURDAY AT 10:00 AM, THE FOLLOWING TUESDAY AT MIDNIGHT AND 9:00 AM AND THURSDAY AT 6:00 PM.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE was led by VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL.

CALL TO ORDER: 6:00 P.M. in Council Chambers of City Hall, 400 Stewart Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada

ANNOUNCEMENT RE: COMPLIANCE WITH OPEN MEETING LAW

MINUTES:

PRESENT: VICE CHAIRMAN RICHARD TRUESDELL, COMMISSIONERS MICHAEL BUCKLEY, STEVEN EVANS, BYRON GOYNES AND LAURA MCSWAIN

EXCUSED: CHAIRMAN GALATI AND COMMISSIONER STEPHEN QUINN

ALSO PRESENT: DEPUTY DIRECTOR CHRIS KNIGHT, PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT - MANAGER JOHN KOSWAN, PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT - MANAGER MARGO WHEELER, PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT - SUPERVISOR CHRIS GLORE, PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT - SENIOR PLANNER JOEL MCCULLOCH, PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT - PLANNER II LAURA MARTIN, PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT - PROJECT ENGINEER DAPHNEE LEGARZA, PUBLIC WORKS, PROJECT ENGINEER RICK SCHRODER, PUBLIC WORKS - DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY BRYAN SCOTT, CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE - DEPUTY CITY CLERK DEENY ARAUJO, CITY CLERK'S OFFICE - DEPUTY CITY CLERK LINDA OWENS, CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL announced that Boy Scout Troop 912 was in attendance.

City of Las Vegas

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 28, 2002

SUBJECT:
Approval of the minutes of the January 24, 2002 Planning Commission Meeting

MOTION:
BUCKLEY - APPROVED AS AMENDED (ITEMS C-2 BUCKLEY DID NOT ABSTAIN AND B-60 BUCKLEY AND McSWAIN ABSTAINED BECAUSE OF STERLING S. DEVELOPMENT BEING A CLIENT OF THEIR FIRMS, NOT BECAUSE OF KB HOME) - UNANIMOUS with GALATI and QUINN excused

MINUTES:
There was no discussion.

(6:01 - 6:02)
1 - 43

City of Las Vegas

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 28, 2002

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL indicated the subdivision items could be appealed by the applicant or aggrieved person or a review requested by a member of the City Council.

ACTIONS:
ALL ACTIONS ON TENTATIVE AND FINAL SUBDIVISION MAPS ARE FINAL UNLESS AN APPEAL IS FILED BY THE APPLICANT OR AN AGGRIEVED PERSON, OR A REVIEW IS REQUESTED BY A MEMBER OF THE CITY COUNCIL WITHIN SEVEN DAYS OF THE DATE NOTICE IS SENT TO THE APPLICANT. IMITATIONS ARE MADE BY THE CITY COUNCIL.

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL read the statement on the order of the items and the time limitations on persons wishing to be heard on an item.

ANY ITEM LISTED IN THIS AGENDA MAY BE TAKEN OUT OF ORDER IF SO REQUESTED BY THE APPLICANT, STAFF, OR A MEMBER OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION. THE PLANNING COMMISSION MAY IMPOSE TIME LIMITATIONS, AS NECESSARY, ON THOSE PERSONS WISHING TO BE HEARD ON ANY AGENDAED ITEM.

City of Las Vegas

PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 28, 2002

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL noted the Rules of Conduct.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING RULES OF CONDUCT.

1. Staff will present each item to the Commission in order as shown on the agenda, along with a recommendation and suggested conditions of approval, if appropriate.

2. The applicant is asked to be at the public microphone during the staff presentation. When the staff presentation is complete, the applicant should state his name and address, and indicate whether or not he accepts staff's conditions of approval.

3. If areas of concern are known in advance, or if the applicant does not accept staff's conditions, the applicant or his representative is invited to make a brief presentation of his item with emphasis on any items of concern.

4. Persons other than the applicant who support the request are invited to make brief statements after the applicant. If more than one supporter is present, comments should not be repetitive. A representative is welcome to speak and indicate that he speaks for others in the audience who share his view.

5. Objectors to the item will be heard after the applicant and any other supporters. All who wish to speak will be heard, but in the interest of time it is suggested that representatives be selected who can summarize the views of any groups of interested parties.

6. After all objectors' input has been received, the applicant will be invited to respond to any new issues raised.

7. Following the applicant's response, the public hearing will be closed; Commissioners will discuss the item amongst themselves, ask any questions they feel are appropriate, and proceed to a motion and decision on the matter.

8. Letters, petitions, photographs and other submissions to the Commission will be retained for the record. Large maps, models and other materials may be displayed to the Commission from the microphone area, but need not be handed in for the record unless requested by the Commission.

As a courtesy, we would also ask those not speaking to be seated and not interrupt the speaker or the Commission. We appreciate your courtesy and hope you will help us make your visit with the Commission a good and fair experience.

City of Las Vegas

Agenda Item No.: 1

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 28, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER [X] **CONSENT** [ ] **DISCUSSION**

SUBJECT:

A-0002-02(A) - ANTONETTE AND WILLIAM SNYDER - Petition to annex 0.78 acres of land generally located adjacent to the northeast corner of Rainbow Boulevard and Atwood Avenue (APN: 138-11-401-006), Ward 6 (Mack).

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:		APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:	
Planning Commission Mtg.	0	Planning Commission Mtg.	0
City Council Meeting		City Council Meeting	

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application - Not Applicable
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

BUCKLEY - APPROVED Consent Items 1 through 6 - UNANIMOUS with GALATI and QUINN excused

To be forwarded to the City Council in Ordinance form.

MINUTES:

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL stated this is a Consent item.

There was no further discussion.

(6:13 - 6:15)

City of Las Vegas

Agenda Item No.: 2

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 28, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER [X] **CONSENT** [ ] **DISCUSSION**

SUBJECT:

A-0003-02(A) - KENNETH AND MYRNA CHRISTENSEN - Petition to annex 0.54 acres of land generally located adjacent to the west side of Jones Boulevard, approximately 1,300 feet north of Cheyenne Avenue (APN: 138-11-704-020), Ward 6 (Mack).

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:		APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:	
Planning Commission Mtg.	0	Planning Commission Mtg.	1
City Council Meeting		City Council Meeting	

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application - Not Applicable
3. Staff Report
4. Telephone List

MOTION:

BUCKLEY - APPROVED Consent Items 1 through 6 - UNANIMOUS with GALATI and QUINN excused

To be forwarded to the City Council in Ordinance form.

MINUTES:

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL stated this is a Consent item.

There was no further discussion.

(6:13 - 6:15)

City of Las Vegas

Agenda Item No.: 3

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 28, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER [X] **CONSENT** [ ] **DISCUSSION**

SUBJECT:

A-0004-02(A) - JOHN ROHAY - Petition to annex 0.58 acres of land generally located adjacent to the south side of Oakey Boulevard, approximately 600 feet east of Jones Boulevard (APN: 163-01-301-002), Ward 1 (M. McDonald).

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:		APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:	
Planning Commission Mtg.	0	Planning Commission Mtg.	0
City Council Meeting		City Council Meeting	

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application - Not Applicable
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

BUCKLEY - APPROVED Consent Items 1 through 6 - UNANIMOUS with GALATI and QUINN excused

To be forwarded to the City Council in Ordinance form.

MINUTES:

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL stated this is a Consent item.

There was no further discussion.

(6:13 - 6:15)

City of Las Vegas

Agenda Item No.: 4

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 28, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER [X] **CONSENT** [ ] **DISCUSSION**

SUBJECT:

A-0005-02(A) - DAVID AND COLLEEN KETZENBERGER - Petition to annex 0.57 acres of land generally located adjacent to the southeast corner of Cheyenne Avenue and Garehime Street (APN: 138-14-111-001), Ward 6 (Mack).

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:		APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:	
Planning Commission Mtg.	0	Planning Commission Mtg.	0
City Council Meeting		City Council Meeting	

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application - Not Applicable
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

BUCKLEY - APPROVED Consent Items 1 through 6 - UNANIMOUS with GALATI and QUINN excused

To be forwarded to the City Council in Ordinance form.

MINUTES:

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL stated this is a Consent item.

There was no further discussion.

(6:13 - 6:15)

City of Las Vegas

Agenda Item No.: 5

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 28, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER [X] **CONSENT** [ ] **DISCUSSION**

SUBJECT:

A-0006-02(A) - RALPH AND MARCELLA COOPER - Petition to annex 1.86 acres of land generally located adjacent to the northwest corner of Rainbow Boulevard and Farm Road (APN: 125-15-608-007), Ward 6 (Mack).

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:		APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:	
Planning Commission Mtg.	0	Planning Commission Mtg.	0
City Council Meeting		City Council Meeting	

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application - Not Applicable
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

TRUESDELL - APPROVED Consent Items 1 through 6 - UNANIMOUS with GALATI and QUINN excused

To be forwarded to the City Council in Ordinance form.

MINUTES:

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL stated this is a Consent item.

There was no further discussion.

(6:13 - 6:15)

City of Las Vegas

Agenda Item No.: 6

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 28, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER [X] **CONSENT** [ ] **DISCUSSION**

SUBJECT:

A-0007-02(A) - CHARLENE WILLIAMS, ET AL - Petition to annex 1.14 acres of land generally located adjacent to the southeast corner of O'Bannon Drive and Mohawk Street (APN: 163-01-802-002 and 004), Ward 1 (M. McDonald).

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:		APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:	
Planning Commission Mtg.	0	Planning Commission Mtg.	0
City Council Meeting		City Council Meeting	

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application - Not Applicable
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

BUCKLEY - APPROVED Consent Items 1 through 6 - UNANIMOUS with GALATI and QUINN excused

To be forwarded to the City Council in Ordinance form.

MINUTES:

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL stated this is a Consent item.

There was no further discussion.

(6:13 - 6:15)

City of Las Vegas

Agenda Item No.: 7

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 28, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER [ ] **CONSENT** [X] **DISCUSSION**

SUBJECT:

ABEYANCE - RENOTIFICATION - GPA-0045-00 - LAS VEGAS MASONIC TEMPLE ASSOCIATION - Request to Amend a portion of the southeast sector of the General Plan FROM: L (Low Density Residential) TO: SC (Service Commercial) and to PF (Public Facilities) on approximately 14.05 Acres located adjacent to the northeast corner of Rancho Drive and Mesquite Avenue (APN: 139-29-801-005), Ward 5 (Weekly).

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:		**APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:**	
Planning Commission Mtg.	**7**	**Planning Commission Mtg.**	**0**
City Council Meeting		**City Council Meeting**	

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends DENIAL of SC (Service Commercial) & APPROVAL of PF (Public Facility).

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application - Not Applicable
3. Staff Report
4. Telephone List
5. Letters In Opposition

MOTION:

McSWAIN – ABEYANCE - Item Nos. 7 [GPA-0045-00], 9 [Z-0011-02] and 10 [U-0010-02] to the 3/14/2002 Planning Commission Meeting with Renotification Radius increased - UNANIMOUS with GALATI and QUINN excused

MINUTES:

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing open.

JOEL McCULLOCH, Planning and Development, stated Items 7 [GPA-0045-00], 9 [Z-0011-02] and 10 [U-0010-02] are related. Staff requested these items be held to the 3/14/2002 Planning Commission meeting in order to properly notify them.

MINUTES - Continued:

GARY GRAY, 706 Bracken Avenue, appeared to represent the applicant. The abeyance will allow enough time for the neighbors to meet with the applicant.

DANIEL DEGAN, 1801 Granite Avenue, appeared to represent the neighbors. He requested the area of notification be extended. When COUNCILMAN LAWRENCE WEEKLY asked for this item to be removed from consideration last year, he assured the residents they would all be notified as he has a mailing list that was developed through community meetings. The residents have a fundamental agreement with the applicant. However, staff is requesting some changes, which the residents have not seen.

MR. GRAY agreed to extend the notification radius over what is required.

There was no further discussion.

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing closed.

NOTE: See related Items 9 [Z-0011-02] and 10 [U-0010-02].

(6:02 - 6:07)

City of Las Vegas

Agenda Item No.: 8

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 28, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER [ ] **CONSENT** [X] **DISCUSSION**

SUBJECT:

ABEYANCE - RENOTIFICATION - VAC-0045-01 - OVID A. AND EDNA E. MOORE - Petition to vacate Versi Mount Road generally located between Grand Teton Drive and Ackerman Avenue, Ward 6 (Mack).

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:		**APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:**	
Planning Commission Mtg.	**0**	**Planning Commission Mtg.**	**0**
City Council Meeting		**City Council Meeting**	

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

GOYNES - APPROVED subject to conditions – UNANIMOUS with GALATI and QUINN excused

To be heard by the City Council on 4/3/2002

MINUTES:

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing open.

LAURA MARTIN, Planning and Development, stated the applicant's justification letter states this Vacation is required in order to affect the development of the adjacent parcels. This Vacation will not eliminate public access to any abutting parcels and the right-of-way is deemed unnecessary by City staff. Staff recommended approval, subject to the conditions.

MINUTES - Continued:

BRENT WILSON, VTN Nevada, 2727 South Rainbow Boulevard, appeared to represent the applicant. He concurred with staff's conditions.

No one appeared in opposition.

There was no further discussion.

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing closed.

(7:43 - 8:10)

2-1500

CONDITIONS:

1. All public improvements, if any, adjacent to and in conflict with this vacation application are to be modified, as necessary, at the applicant's expense prior to the recordation of an Order of Vacation as required by the Department of Public Works.

2. Development of this site shall comply with all applicable conditions of approval for the Tentative Map for Spring Mountain Ranch – Unit 57, Zoning Reclassification Z-0071-01 and all other subsequent site-related actions.

3. All development shall be in conformance with code requirements and design standards of all City Departments.

4. Reservation of easements for the facilities of the various utility companies together with reasonable ingress thereto and egress therefrom shall be provided if required.

5. The Order of Vacation shall not be recorded until all of the above conditions have been met provided, however, that Condition #1 may be fulfilled for purposes of recordation by providing sufficient security for the performance thereof in accordance with the Subdivision Ordinance of the City of Las Vegas. City Staff is empowered to modify this application if necessary because of technical concerns or because of other related review actions as long as current City right-of-way requirements are still complied with and the intent of the vacation application is not changed. If applicable, a five-foot wide easement for public streetlight and fire hydrant purposes shall be retained on all vacation actions abutting public street corridors that will remain dedicated and available for public use. Also, if applicable and where needed, public easement corridors and sight visibility or other easements that would/should cross any right-of-way being vacated must be retained.

6. If the Order of Vacation is not recorded within one (1) year after approval by the City Council or an Extension of Time is not granted by the Planning Director, then approval will terminate and a new petition must be submitted.

City of Las Vegas

Agenda Item No.: 9

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 28, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER [ ] **CONSENT** [X] **DISCUSSION**

SUBJECT:

Z-0011-02 - LODGE MASONIC MEMORIAL TEMPLE ON BEHALF OF AD AMERICA - Request for a Rezoning FROM: R-1 (Single Family Residential) TO: C-1 (Limited Commercial) and C-V (Civic) on 14.05 Acres located adjacent to the northeast corner of Rancho Drive and Mesquite Avenue (APN: 139-29-801-005), Ward 5 (Weekly).

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:		APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:	
Planning Commission Mtg.	1	Planning Commission Mtg.	0
City Council Meeting		City Council Meeting	

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

McSWAIN – ABEYANCE - Item Nos. 7 [GPA-0045-00], 9 [Z-0011-02] and 10 [U-0010-02] to the 3/14/2002 Planning Commission Meeting with Renotification Radius increased - UNANIMOUS with GALATI and QUINN excused

MINUTES:

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing open.

JOEL McCULLOCH, Planning and Development, stated Items 7 [GPA-0045-00], 9 [Z-0011-02] and 10 [U-0010-02] are related. Staff requested these items be held to the 3/14/2002 Planning Commission meeting in order to properly notify the neighborhood.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 28, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 9 - Z-0011-02

MINUTES:

GARY GRAY, 706 Bracken Avenue, appeared to represent the applicant. The abeyance will allow enough time for the neighbors to meet with the applicant.

DANIEL DEGAN, 1801 Granite Avenue, appeared to represent the neighbors. He requested the area of notification be extended. When COUNCILMAN LAWRENCE WEEKLY asked for this item to be removed from consideration last year, he assured the residents they would all be notified as he has a mailing list that was developed through community meetings. The residents have a fundamental agreement with the applicant. However, staff is requesting some changes, which the residents have not seen. Staff has not had a chance to present them to the neighborhood.

MR. GRAY agreed to extend the notification radius over what is required.

There was no further discussion.

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing closed.

NOTE: See related Items 7 [GPA-0045-00] and 10 [U-0010-02].

(6:02 - 6:07)

City of Las Vegas

Agenda Item No.: 10

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 28, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER [ ] **CONSENT** [X] **DISCUSSION**

SUBJECT:

U-0010-02 - LODGE MASONIC MEMORIAL TEMPLE ON BEHALF OF AD AMERICA - Request for a Special Use Permit FOR A 55-FOOT HIGH, 14-FOOT X 48-FOOT OFF-PREMISE ADVERTISING (BILLBOARD) SIGN on 3.0 Acres located adjacent to the northeast corner of Rancho Drive and Mesquite Avenue (APN: 139-29-801-005), R-1 (Single Family Residential) Zone [PROPOSED: C-1 (Limited Commercial)], Ward 5 (Weekly).

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:		APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:	
Planning Commission Mtg.	2	Planning Commission Mtg.	0
City Council Meeting		City Council Meeting	

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

McSWAIN – ABEYANCE - Item Nos. 7 [GPA-0045-00], 9 [Z-0011-02] and 10 [U-0010-02] to the 3/14/2002 Planning Commission Meeting with Renotification Radius increased - UNANIMOUS with GALATI and QUINN excused

MINUTES:

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing open.

JOEL McCULLOCH, Planning and Development, stated Items 7 [GPA-0045-00], 9 [Z-0011-02] and 10 [U-0010-02] are related. Staff requested these items be held to the 3/14/2002 Planning Commission meeting in order to properly notify them.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 28, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 10 - U-0010-02

MINUTES:

GARY GRAY, 706 Bracken Avenue, appeared to represent the applicant. The abeyance will allow enough time for the neighbors to meet with the applicant.

DANIEL DEGAN, 1801 Granite Avenue, appeared to represent the neighbors. He requested the area of notification be extended. When COUNCILMAN LAWRENCE WEEKLY asked for this item to be removed from consideration last year, he assured the residents they would all be notified as he has a mailing list that was developed through community meetings. The residents have a fundamental agreement with the applicant. However, staff is requesting some changes, which the residents have not seen. Staff has not had a chance to present them to the neighborhood.

MR. GRAY agreed to extend the notification radius over what is required.

There was no further discussion.

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing closed.

NOTE: See related Items 7 [GPA-0045-00] and 9 [Z-0011-02].

(6:02 - 6:07)

City of Las Vegas

Agenda Item No.: 11

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 28, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER [ ] **CONSENT** [X] **DISCUSSION**

SUBJECT:

ABEYANCE - GPA-0047-01 - CITY OF LAS VEGAS - Request to amend portions of the Southeast Sector map of the General Plan in the general vicinity of the Charleston Boulevard/Rancho Drive intersection FROM: SC (Service Commercial) TO: O (Office); FROM: R (Rural Density Residential) TO: DR (Desert Rural Density Residential); FROM: O (Office) TO: DR (Desert Rural Density Residential) and; FROM: L (Low Density Residential) TO: DR (Desert Rural Density Residential) in accordance with the recommendations of the Rancho Charleston Land Use Study and Strategic Plan, APN: multiple, Ward 1 (M. McDonald).

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:		APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:	
Planning Commission Mtg.	1	Planning Commission Mtg.	1
City Council Meeting		City Council Meeting	

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application - Not Applicable
3. Staff Report
4. Letter in Opposition
5. Letter in Approval

MOTION:

BUCKLEY - ABEYANCE to 3/14/2002 Planning Commission Meeting - UNANIMOUS with GALATI and QUINN excused

NOTE: VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL announced that he has abstained previously on this item because his architectural firm has clients that have property within the area. However, that would not affect his ability to vote on an abeyance. COMMISSIONER BUCKLEY announced that he has also abstained previously on this item because he lives in the area, but that would not affect his ability to vote on an abeyance.

CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF FEBRUARY 28, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 11- VAC-0045-01

MINUTES:

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing open.

JOEL McCULLOCH, Planning and Development, stated staff would like to have this request held in abeyance until the 3/14/2002 Planning Commission meeting to clarify several issues in regard to the land use plan.

No one appeared in opposition.

There was no further discussion.

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing closed.

(6:07 - 6:08)

1-245

City of Las Vegas

Agenda Item No.: 12

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 28, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER [ ] **CONSENT** [X] **DISCUSSION**

SUBJECT:

ABEYANCE - GPA-0051-01 - SMOKE RANCH JONES PARTNERSHIP - Request to Amend a portion of the Southwest Sector Plan FROM: SC (Service Commercial) TO: GC (General Commercial) on 0.53 acres north of Smoke Ranch Road approximately 150 feet west of Jones Boulevard (APN: 138-14-802-009), Ward 6 (Mack).

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:		APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:	
Planning Commission Mtg.	0	Planning Commission Mtg.	0
City Council Meeting		City Council Meeting	

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends DENIAL.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application - Not Applicable
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

BUCKLEY - DENIED - UNANIMOUS with GALATI and QUINN excused

To be heard by the City Council on 4/3/2002.

MINUTES:

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing open.

CHRIS KNIGHT, Planning and Development, stated that the applicant has justified this request due to the location of this property near an auto parts store and an existing convenience store which they want to expand. To the north and east of this property is SC (Service Commercial), to the west is PF (Public Facility), and to the south is high density residential. This is an area in a pocket of commercial within a neighborhood. There is a church within a few hundred feet to the

MINUTES - Continued:

north. Introducing GC (General Commercial) into this area sets a difficult precedent because it is a stabilized residential area with neighborhood serving commercial in it. This will result in a destabilization of the corner. From a land use planning standpoint, the planning has been done and the area is as it should be. The C-2 (General Commercial) zoning that would be allowed is not compatible as it is not intended to be located near residential areas, just a buffer between commercial and industrial areas. Staff recommended denial.

RUPEC CHIME, Smoke Ranch Enterprises, 2400 North Jones Boulevard, appeared to represent the application. He owns the AM/PM store next door. It has been in the family for twelve years, but he has only owned and operated it for the last three years. He felt this is the best use of this half acre. There will be an automated drive-through car wash and four self-serve bays. The issue revolves around the self-serve bays where people come in to wash their own cars.

No one appeared in opposition.

COMMISSIONER GOYNES felt there are enough car washes located within a mile and a half.

COMMISSIONER BUCKLEY thought this would set a precedent. Perhaps the code should be changed.

COMMISSIONER EVANS noted that this does not meet the GPA qualifications.

COMMISSIONER McSWAIN wondered about the C-2 zoning request. CHRIS GLORE responded that the reason that C-2 zoning was considered appropriate for a self-service car wash is because they are a 24-hour operation and there is no way to monitor activities at those car washes in terms of excessive noise. They are incompatible with adjacent residential uses. C-1 zoning tends to be more neighborhood oriented and usually located next to residential. C-2 is more often found in a regional setting area such as Rancho Drive. COMMISSIONER McSWAIN wondered if the hours of operation could be regulated. MR. GLORE thought that would necessitate a Text Amendment.

MINUTES - Continued:

MR. CHIME added that his convenience store next door is a 24-hour operation. In addition, they have a good surveillance system inside the convenience store, which they plan to use at the car wash. They held a neighborhood meeting where four persons attended who did not have a problem with this request. Next door is a school, behind is commercial, and in front are apartments.

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL thought the avenue for a car wash on this property would be through a Text Amendment.

COMMISSIONER BUCKLEY added that it might be possible for a self-service car wash that would not be open 24 hours a day or perhaps C-1 with limited conditions and a Special Use Permit.

There was no further discussion.

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing closed.

NOTE: See Items 13 [Z-0093-01]and 14 [Z-0093-01(1)] for related discussion.

(6:17 - 6:31)

1-560

City of Las Vegas

Agenda Item No.: 13

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 28, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER [ ] **CONSENT** [X] **DISCUSSION**

SUBJECT:

ABEYANCE - Z-0093-01 - SMOKE RANCH JONES PARTNERSHIP - Request for a Rezoning FROM: U (Undeveloped) [SC (Service Commercial) General Plan Designation] TO: C-2 (General Commercial) Zone, on 0.53 acres located north of Smoke Ranch Road approximately 150 feet west of Jones Boulevard (APN: 138-14-802-009), PROPOSED USE: FULL AND SELF SERVICE CAR WASH, Ward 6 (Mack).

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:		**APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:**	
Planning Commission Mtg.	**0**	**Planning Commission Mtg.**	**0**
City Council Meeting		**City Council Meeting**	

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends DENIAL.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

BUCKLEY - DENIED - UNANIMOUS with GALATI and QUINN excused

To be heard by the City Council on 4/3/2002.

MINUTES:

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing open.

JOEL McCULLOCH, Planning and Development, stated the current zoning and land use designations do not allow a self-service car wash on the site, but would allow a full-service car wash if the property were rezoned to C-1 (Limited Commercial) with an approved Special Use Permit. The General Plan Amendment has been requested to allow this rezoning application. This request is incompatible with the surrounding zoning districts and future land use designations. Staff recommended denial.

MINUTES - Continued:

No one appeared in opposition.

RUPEC CHIME, Smoke Ranch Enterprises, 2400 North Jones Boulevard, appeared to represent the application. He owns the AM/PM store next door. It has been in the family for twelve years, but he has only owned and operated it for the last three years. He felt this is the best use of this half acre. There will be an automated drive-through car wash and four self-serve bays. The issue revolves around the self-serve bays where people come in to wash their own cars.

No one appeared in opposition.

COMMISSIONER GOYNES felt there are enough car washes located within a mile and a half.

COMMISSIONER BUCKLEY thought this would set a precedent. Perhaps the code should be changed.

COMMISSIONER EVANS noted that this does not meet the GPA qualifications.

COMMISSIONER McSWAIN wondered about the C-2 zoning request. CHRIS GLORE responded that the reason that C-2 zoning was considered appropriate for a self-service car wash is because they are 24 hour operations and there is no way to monitor activities at those car washes in terms of excessive noise. They are incompatible with adjacent residential uses. C-1 zoning tends to be more neighborhood oriented and usually located next to residential. C-2 is more often found in a regional setting area such as Rancho Drive. COMMISSIONER McSWAIN wondered if the hours of operation could be limited. MR. GLORE thought that would necessitate a Text Amendment.

MR. CHIME added that his convenience store next door is a 24-hour operation. In addition, they have a good surveillance system inside the convenience store, which they plan to use at the car wash. They held a neighborhood meeting where four persons attended who did not have a problem with this request. Next door is a school, behind is commercial, and in front is apartments.

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL thought the avenue for a car wash on this property would be through a Text Amendment.

MINUTES - Continued:

COMMISSIONER BUCKLEY added that it might be possible for a self-service car wash that would not be open 24 hours a day or perhaps C-1 with limited conditions and a Special Use Permit.

There was no further discussion.

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing closed.

NOTE: See Items 12 [GPA-0051-01] and 14 [Z-0093-01(1)] for related discussion.

(6:17 - 6:31)

1-560

City of Las Vegas

Agenda Item No.: 14

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 28, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER [ ] **CONSENT** [X] **DISCUSSION**

SUBJECT:

ABEYANCE - Z-0093-01(1) - SMOKE RANCH JONES PARTNERSHIP - Request for a Site Development Plan Review FOR A PROPOSED FULL AND SELF-SERVICE CAR WASH on 0.53 acres located north of Smoke Ranch Road approximately 150 feet west of Jones Boulevard (APN: 138-14-802-009), U (Undeveloped) Zone [SC (Service Commercial) General Plan Designation] [PROPOSED: C-2 (General Commercial)], Ward 6 (Mack).

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:		APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:	
Planning Commission Mtg.	0	Planning Commission Mtg.	0
City Council Meeting		City Council Meeting	

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends DENIAL.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

BUCKLEY - DENIED - UNANIMOUS with GALATI and QUINN excused

To be heard by the City Council on 4/3/2002.

MINUTES:

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing open.

JOEL McCULLOCH, Planning and Development, stated this request is for a single-stall full-service and four-stall self-service car wash. The current zoning and land use for this site does not allow a self-service car wash and the General Plan Amendment has been requested to allow this use. The submitted site plan provides sufficient circulation and elevations. The elevations depict a typical stucco finish with stalls facing Smoke Ranch Road. This use is incompatible with the surrounding zoning districts and future land use designations. The reduction in perimeter landscaping is unwarranted as minor changes to the site plan would allow for the provision of the required landscape planters.

MINUTES - Continued:

If this item is approved, there is a condition recommending full perimeter landscaping in accordance with the Urban Design Guidelines and Standards and elimination of the access aisle along the north property line. There is appropriate siting of the trash enclosure on the property adjacent to the east and provision of one van accessible parking space. Staff recommended denial.

RUPEC CHIME, Smoke Ranch Enterprises, 2400 North Jones Boulevard, appeared to represent the application. He owns the AM/PM store next door. It has been in the family for twelve years, but he has only owned and operated it for the last three years. He felt this is the best use of this half acre. There will be an automated drive-through car wash and four self-serve bays. The issue revolves around the self-serve bays where people come in to wash their own cars.

No one appeared in opposition.

COMMISSIONER GOYNES felt there are enough car washes located within a mile and a half.

COMMISSIONER BUCKLEY thought this would set a precedent. Perhaps the code should be changed.

COMMISSIONER EVANS noted that this does not meet the GPA qualifications.

COMMISSIONER McSWAIN wondered about the C-2 zoning request. CHRIS GLORE responded that the reason that C-2 zoning was considered appropriate for a self-service car wash is because they are 24 hour operations and there is no way to monitor activities at those car washes in terms of excessive noise. They are incompatible with adjacent residential uses. C-1 zoning tends to be more neighborhood oriented and usually located next to residential. C-2 is more often found in a regional setting area such as Rancho Drive. COMMISSIONER McSWAIN wondered if the hours of operation could be limited. MR. GLORE thought that would necessitate a Text Amendment.

MINUTES - Continued:

MR. CHIME added that his convenience store next door is a 24-hour operation. In addition, they have a good surveillance system inside the convenience store, which they plan to use at the car wash. They held a neighborhood meeting where four persons attended who did not have a problem with this request. Next door is a school, behind is commercial, and in front is apartments.

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL thought the avenue for a car wash on this property would be through a Text Amendment.

COMMISSIONER BUCKLEY added that it might be possible for a self-service car wash that would not be open 24 hours a day or perhaps C-1 with limited conditions and a Special Use Permit.

No one appeared in opposition.

There was no further discussion.

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing closed.

NOT: See Items 12 [GPA-0051-01] and 13 [Z-0093-01] for related discussion.

(6:17 - 6:31)

1-560

City of Las Vegas

Agenda Item No.: 15

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 28, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER [ ] **CONSENT** [X] **DISCUSSION**

SUBJECT:

ABEYANCE - RENOTIFICATION - GPA-0056-01 - CAPITAN REAL ESTATE TRUST ON BEHALF OF REALTY MANAGEMENT, INC. - Request to Amend a portion of the Town Center Master Plan FROM: ML-TC (Medium Low - Town Center) TO: SX-TC (Suburban Mixed Use) on 5.04 located adjacent to the west side of El Capitan Way approximately 660 feet south of Elkhorn Road (APN: 125-20-201-006), Ward 6 (Mack).

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:		APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:	
Planning Commission Mtg.	0	Planning Commission Mtg.	0
City Council Meeting		City Council Meeting	

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends DENIAL.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

EVANS – DENIED - Motion for approval did not carry due to lack of a super majority, which is tantamount to a denial, with EVANS and GOYNES voting YES and BUCKLEY, McSWAIN and TRUESDELL abstaining as this involves a client of their firms.

To be heard by the City Council on 4/3/2002.

MINUTES:

COMMISSIONER GOYNES declared the Public Hearing open.

MARGO WHEELER, Planning and Development, stated that staff is recommending denial of the SX-TC and approval of the UC-TC. The reason for that is because the Urban Center allows for the density that staff believes appropriate to this mixed-use project and that was the density and configuration that the neighborhoods felt were appropriate for this site. Dorrell Lane will go through to El Capitan. There is a Rezoning and Site Plan Review on this agenda for this project, but the Development Agreement is not fully prepared, so that portion of the project is being recommended for abeyance.

MINUTES - Continued:

ATTORNEY BOB GRONAUER, Kummer Kaempfer Bonner & Renshaw, 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 7th Floor, appeared to represent the applicant. Ten of the 15 acres is planned for Urban Commercial Town Center use. The General Plan Amendment is adding a five- acre piece of property, so there will be a consistent 15-acre piece. Staff is recommending approval of the UC-TC [Urban Center-Town Center] designation. Originally they applied for SX-TC (Suburban Mixed Use), but after meeting with staff and the neighbors, it was decided to change the request to UC-TC [Urban Center-Town Center].

No one appeared in opposition.

There was no further discussion.

COMMISSIONER GOYNES declared the Public Hearing closed.

NOTE: See Items 16 [Z-0099-01] and 17 [Z-0099-01)(1)] for related discussion.

(6:31 - 6:50)

1-1050

City of Las Vegas

Agenda Item No.: 16

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 28, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER [ ] **CONSENT** [X] **DISCUSSION**

SUBJECT:

ABEYANCE - RENOTIFICATION - Z-0099-01 - CAPITAN REAL ESTATE TRUST ON BEHALF OF REALTY MANAGEMENT, INC. - Request for a Rezoning FROM: U (Undeveloped) [TC (Town Center) General Plan Designation] TO: TC (Town Center) Zone on 15.16 acres located adjacent to the west side of El Capitan Way approximately 660 feet south of Elkhorn Road (APN: 125-20-201-006, 007, and 008), PROPOSED USES: MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL AND COMMERCIAL, Ward 6 (Mack).

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:		APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:	
Planning Commission Mtg.	0	Planning Commission Mtg.	0
City Council Meeting		City Council Meeting	

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

EVANS - APPROVED subject to conditions - UNANIMOUS with EVANS and GOYNES voting YES and BUCKLEY, McSWAIN and TRUESDELL abstaining as this involves a client of their firms.

To be heard by the City Council on 4/3/2002.

MINUTES:

COMMISSIONER GOYNES declared the Public Hearing open.

MINUTES - Continued:

JOEL McCULLOCH, Planning and Development, stated this request to TC [Town Center] will be consistent with the surrounding area. Staff recommended approval, subject to the conditions.

ATTORNEY BOB GRONAUER, Kummer Kaempfer Bonner & Renshaw, 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 7th Floor, appeared to represent the applicant. This is a zone change for a multi-family project along with commercial.

No one appeared in opposition.

There was no further discussion.

COMMISSIONER GOYNES declared the Public Hearing closed.

NOTE: See Items 15 [GPA-0056-01] and 17 [Z-0099-01(1)] for related discussion.

(6:31 - 6:50)

1-1050

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 28, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 16 - Z-0099-01

CONDITIONS:

Planning and Development

1. A Resolution of Intent with a two-year time limit.

2. A Site Development Plan Review application shall be approved by the Planning Commission or City Council prior to approval of a Tentative Map, issuance of any permits, any site grading, and all development activity for the site.

Public Works

3. Coordinate with the City Surveyor to determine if a Parcel Map is necessary prior to the issuance of any permits for this site. If so, such Parcel Map shall record prior to the issuance of any permits for this site.

4. Dedicate 40 feet of right-of-way adjacent to this site for Dorrell Lane, 30 feet for Jeanette Street, a 54 foot radius on the southwest corner of El Capitan Way and Dorrell Lane and a 25 foot radius on the northwest corner of El Capitan Way and Jeanette Street. Also, dedicate appropriate cul-de-sac radii for the terminations of Jeanette Street and the approved stub streets at the southwest corner of this development prior to the issuance of any permits.

5. Any proposed site plan for this development shall reflect either the continuation or acceptable termination of the approved stub streets on the south and west edges of this development in accordance with the adopted Town Center Development Standards.

6. Construct half-street improvements including appropriate overpaving, if legally able, on El Capitan Way, Dorrell Lane, Jeanette Street, the cul-de-sac terminations of Jeanette Street and the approved stub streets at the southwest corner of this development adjacent to this site concurrent with development of this site and in accordance with Town Center Development Standards. Install all appurtenant underground facilities, if any, adjacent to this site needed for the future traffic signal system concurrent with development of this site.

7. Provide a minimum of two lanes of paved, legal access to this site prior to occupancy of any units within this development.

CONDITIONS - Continued:

8. Coordinate with the Collection Systems Planning Section of the Department of Public Works to extend oversized public sewer in El Capitan Way to the north edge of this site to a location and depth acceptable to the City Engineer. Extend public sewer in the Dorrell alignment from El Capitan to the west edge of this site. All required public sewer easements, if any, necessary to connect this site to the existing public sewer system shall be provided to the City prior to City approval of sewer construction plans, or the issuance of any offsite permits. Provide public sewer easements for all public sewers not located within existing public street right-of-way prior to the issuance of any permits.

9. A Traffic Impact Analysis must be submitted to and approved by the Department of Public Works prior to the issuance of any building or grading permits or submittal of any construction drawings, whichever may occur first. Comply with the recommendations of the approved Traffic Impact Analysis prior to occupancy of the site. The City shall determine traffic signal contribution requirements based upon information provided in the approved Traffic Impact Analysis; such monies shall be contributed prior to the issuance of any permits for this site. The Traffic Impact Analysis shall also include a section addressing Standard Drawings #234.1 and #234.2 to determine additional right-of-way requirements adjacent to this site, if any; dedicate all areas recommended by the approved Traffic Impact Analysis. All additional rights-of-way required by Standard Drawing #201.1 shall be dedicated prior to or concurrent with the commencement of on-site development activities unless specifically noted as not required in the approved Traffic Impact Analysis. Phased compliance will be allowed if recommended by the approved Traffic Impact Analysis. No recommendation of the approved Traffic Impact Analysis, nor compliance therewith, shall be deemed to modify or eliminate any condition of approval imposed by the Planning Commission or the City Council on the development of this site.

10. A Drainage Plan and Technical Drainage Study must be submitted to and approved by the Department of Public Works prior to the issuance of any building or grading permits or submittal of any construction drawings or the recordation of a map further subdividing this site, whichever may occur first. Provide and improve all drainageways recommended in the approved drainage plan/study. The developer of this site shall be responsible to construct such neighborhood or local drainage facility improvements as are recommended by the approved Drainage Plan/Study concurrent with development of this site. In lieu of constructing improvements, in whole or in part, the developer may agree to contribute monies for the construction of neighborhood or local drainage improvements, the amount of such monies shall be determined by the approved Drainage Plan/Study and shall be contributed prior to the issuance of any building or grading permits or the recordation of a map further subdividing this site, if allowed by the City Engineer.

City of Las Vegas

Agenda Item No.: 17

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 28, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER [ ] **CONSENT** [X] **DISCUSSION**

SUBJECT:

ABEYANCE - RENOTIFICATION - Z-0099-01(1) - CAPITAN REAL ESTATE TRUST ON BEHALF OF REALTY MANAGEMENT, INC. - Request for a Site Development Plan Review FOR A PROPOSED 274-UNIT MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT AND 16,000 SQUARE FOOT OF COMMERCIAL SPACE on 15.16 acres located adjacent to the west side of El Capitan Way approximately 660 feet south of Elkhorn Road (APN: 125-20-201-006, 007, and 008), U (Undeveloped) Zone [TC (Town Center) General Plan Designation] [PROPOSED: TC (Town Center)], Ward 6 (Mack).

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:		**APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:**	
Planning Commission Mtg.	**0**	**Planning Commission Mtg.**	**0**
City Council Meeting		**City Council Meeting**	

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

EVANS - ABEYANCE to the 3/28/2002 Planning Commission meeting - UNANIMOUS with EVANS and GOYNES voting YES and BUCKLEY, McSWAIN and TRUESDELL abstaining as this involves a client of their firms

MINUTES:

COMMISSIONER GOYNES declared the Public Hearing open.

MINUTES - Continued:

CHRIS KNIGHT, Planning and Development, stated that the difficulty with the UC-TC designation is that under the Urban Center classification of Town Center all developments must have a Development Agreement. However, there is no Development Agreement for this request. The Site Development Plan would need to be approved by the requirements of that agreement. He recommended that the Site Development Plan Review be held in abeyance for 30 days, which would provide time for staff to work with the applicant to complete a Development Agreement. If the Site Development Plan is approved without a Development Agreement, they would not be going to the City Council concurrently.

ATTORNEY BOB GRONAUER, Kummer Kaempfer Bonner & Renshaw, 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 7th Floor, appeared to represent the applicant. There has been some confusion as to when the Development Agreement needed to be submitted to staff. Rather than hold this in abeyance he preferred to have a condition placed on this Site Plan Review that a Development Agreement needs to be approved before the Site Plan Review is heard by the City Council. Their escrow stipulates that they need to close the purchase on a certain date.

CHRIS GLORE, Planning and Development, objected to moving this item forward prior to receiving a Development Agreement. The Town Center standards by regulation require Development Agreements for developments in the UC-TC designation. If the Planning Commission had chosen to approve the SX-TC, that land use district does not have the Development Agreement requirement. To condition this application as suggested by ATTORNEY GRONAUER would be in violation of the ordinance.

No one appeared in opposition.

There was no further discussion.

COMMISSIONER GOYNES declared the Public Hearing closed.

NOTE: See Items 15 [GPA-0056-01] and 16 [Z-0099-01] for related discussion.

(6:31 - 6:50)

City of Las Vegas

Agenda Item No.: 18

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 28, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER [ ] **CONSENT** [X] **DISCUSSION**

SUBJECT:

ABEYANCE - Z-0024-99(37) - SOUTHWEST DESERT EQUITIES, LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY - Request for a Major Modification to the Lone Mountain West Master Plan to modify the land use designations FROM: VC (Village Commercial), NC (Neighborhood Commercial), and L (Low Density Residential) TO: Multi-Family Medium on approximately 22.5 acres; AND TO ADD APPROXIMATELY 20 ACRES INTO THE PLAN, located on the south side of Gowan Road, between Cliff Shadows Parkway and the beltway alignment, Ward 4 (Brown).

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:		APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:	
Planning Commission Mtg.	0	Planning Commission Mtg.	0
City Council Meeting		City Council Meeting	

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends ABEYANCE to the March 28, 2002 Planning Commission meeting.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

BUCKLEY - ABEYANCE TO 3/28/2002 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING - UNANIMOUS with GALATI and QUINN excused

NOTE: VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL and COMMISSIONER BUCKLEY announced they have previously abstained on items in regard to this property owner, but felt that would not affect their ability to vote for an abeyance.

MINUTES:

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing open.

MINUTES - Continued:

JOEL McCULLOCH, Planning and Development, stated the applicant would like to have this item held in abeyance to the 3/28/2002 Planning Commission meeting in order to modify the application.

ATTORNEY BOB GRONAUER, Kummer Kaempfer Bonner & Renshaw, 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 7th Floor, appeared to represent the applicant. He concurred that the applicant would like to have this item held in abeyance.

No one appeared in opposition.

There was no further discussion.

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing closed.

(6:08 - 6:10)

1 - 290

City of Las Vegas

Agenda Item No.: 19

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 28, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER [ ] **CONSENT** [X] **DISCUSSION**

SUBJECT:

ABEYANCE - U-0147-01 - SMK, INC. ON BEHALF OF MNSNV LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY - Request for a Special Use Permit FOR THE SALE OF PACKAGED LIQUOR FOR OFF-PREMISE CONSUMPTION IN CONJUNCTION WITH A CONVENIENCE STORE (ABC STORE) at 23 Fremont Street (APN: 139-34-111-037), C-2 (General Commercial) Zone, Ward 3 (Reese).

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:		APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:	
Planning Commission Mtg.	6	Planning Commission Mtg.	1
City Council Meeting		City Council Meeting	

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends DENIAL.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report
4. Letters In Opposition
5. Letter In Approval

MOTION:

EVANS - APPROVED subject to conditions and additional condition of a six month review and location of sales space for the beer and wine only - UNANIMOUS with TRUESDELL abstaining as he has business involvement with the applicant and GALATI and QUINN excused

To be heard by the City Council on 4/3/2002.

MINUTES:

COMMISSIONER BUCKLEY declared the Public Hearing open.

JOEL McCULLOCH, Planning and Development, stated this request is located within the Downtown Redevelopment area. Redevelopment efforts are not limited to physical improvements of property, but can also encompass the evaluation of existing and proposed uses to ensure compatibility with redevelopment efforts. Further, staff finds this proposal is in conflict with Goal DS1d of the Downtown Centennial Plan, which encourages diversity of uses to achieve long-term vitality and economic growth. Staff recommended denial.

MINUTES - Continued:

ATTORNEY BOB GRONAUER, Kummer Kaempfer Bonner & Renshaw, 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, 7th Floor, appeared to represent ABC Store. In November of 2000, his client purchased this piece of property. Since that time they have invested over $3.3 million on Fremont Street. The store opened in November of 2001. It is not a typical convenience store as this is over 6,000 square feet of sales space. The items they sell are food, drinks, clothing, gifts, jewelry, etc. This store is not open 24 hours. This request has been reduced from packaged liquor to strictly beer and wine. Also, they have agreed not to sell single cans of beer or screw cap wines. In other words, the alcohol would be sold as it is brought into the store in its regular packages. There is a condition requiring this application to come back for a review. He indicated on the monitor how the store would be laid out.

TODD FARLOW, 240 North 19th Street, appeared as a concerned citizen to ask if the condition that staff often imposes on these types of applications would also include Fremont Street whereby a sign is posted indicating no consumption within a certain number of feet of the premises.

ATTORNEY BRYAN SCOTT, City Attorney's Office, said that distance condition is not imposed on Fremont Street.

COMMISSIONER McSWAIN felt this is an issue of competition. Saturation is often used to support a denial of this type of request. She noted that when persons are gambling they get alcohol for free. This applicant has done a nice job with this store.

COMMISSIONER EVANS did not think Fremont Street has a saturation of beer and wine outlets. He liked the creativity, cleanliness and architectural features of this store.

There was no further discussion.

COMMISSIONER BUCKLEY declared the Public Hearing closed.

(6:50 - 7:03)

1-1772

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF February 28, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 19 - U-0147-01

CONDITIONS:

Planning and Development

1. Conformance to all Minimum Requirements under Title 19A.04.050 for the sale of package for off-premise consumption.

2. This Special Use Permit shall expire one year from the date of final approval, unless it is exercised or an Extension of Time is granted by the City Council.

3. All City Code requirements and design standards of all City departments must be satisfied.

4. Approval of this Special Use Permit does not constitute approval of a liquor license.

5. The sale of alcoholic beverages shall be limited to the sale of beer and wine only.

6. The sale of individual containers of any size of beer, wine coolers or screw cap wine is prohibited. All such products shall remain in their original configurations as shipped by the manufacturer. Further, no repackaging of containers into groups smaller than the original shipping container size shall be permitted.

7. This business shall operate in conformance to Chapter 6.50 of the City of Las Vegas Municipal Code.

City of Las Vegas

Agenda Item No.: 20

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 28, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER [ ] **CONSENT** [X] **DISCUSSION**

SUBJECT:

ABEYANCE - Z-0100-01 - RL HOMES, LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY - Request for a Rezoning FROM: R-E (Residence Estates) TO: R-PD6 (Residential Planned Development - 6 Units Per Acre) on 4.48 acres adjacent to the southwest corner of El Capitan Way and Brent Lane (APN: 125-08-203-005), PROPOSED USE: 23-LOT SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION, Ward 6 (Mack).

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:		APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:	
Planning Commission Mtg.	15	Planning Commission Mtg.	4
City Council Meeting		City Council Meeting	

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report
4. Telephone List
5. Letter In Opposition
6. Residents List of Conditions

MOTION:

BUCKLEY - APPROVED subject to conditions with application amended to R-PD5 - UNANIMOUS with GALATI and QUINN excused

To be heard by the City Council on 4/3/2002.

MINUTES:

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing open.

JOEL McCULLOCH, Planning and Development, stated this request is for a 21-lot single-family residential subdivision. Since the last Planning Commission meeting, the applicant has held a neighborhood meeting and as a result has submitted revised site plans. R-PD6 would allow a maximum of 6.49 units per acre, which is allowed in the current PCD (Planned Community

MINUTES - Continued:

Development) General Plan designation. A Rural Preservation Neighborhood exists to the southeast of the site and submitted site plans depict conformance with the intent of SB391. This request is compatible with the surrounding zoning and land uses, provided conformance to SB391 is maintained.

KATHRYN GRIDER, WRG Design, 2260 Corporate Circle, #430, Henderson, Nevada, appeared to represent the applicant. A recent meeting with the neighbors proved to be very fruitful. After the January 29, 2002 meeting, they took some of the concerns of the neighbors and redesigned their site. Some of the concerns were that they keep a buffer of the Rural Estates. Another concern was that the lots throughout the south portion were too small. To the west those neighbors also wanted to see larger lots. There was a confusion as to the actual size of the homes. The developer plans to construct 1,400 to 2,200 square foot homes. The neighbors were also concerned over this being a part of Spring Mountain Ranch, the fencing, lighting, etc. She showed the new design on the monitor. They have larger lots on the east side, centralized the open space and the space that was gained was redistributed throughout the lots to the south and west. As far as matching the fencing along Spring Mountain Ranch, there will be landscaping and low lighting.

TODD FARLOW, 240 North 19th Street, appeared in approval. He wondered if the open space still meets the requirements. Secondly, he objected to the corner lots where all that will be seen is a garage door.

MICHELLE DEMAIO, 8708 Grazing Hill Court, appeared in approval. Last week they met with the developer's representatives. There was a problem with notification to the residents, so only about five persons attended that meeting. They will have gas lamps, continue the horse trail, and have a white slump wall. Her only concern was that there are a couple of lots under 6,000 square feet. All the other developments that abut Desert Rural have been R-PD3. The neighbors suggested incorporating this into Spring Mountain Ranch because of the open space.

LOUISE RUSKAMP, 8500 Log Cabin Way, appeared in approval. At the neighborhood meeting the applicant's representatives said they would be asking for abeyance at this meeting, which is the reason there are less residents here. She submitted a list of conditions requesting that the overall density be 3.5 units per acre. All along El Capitan where there is Desert Rural the density has not exceeded 3.5 units per acre. In one area where there is 6.0 units per acre there is a park to buffer the Desert Rural. On the east side of El Capitan there are homes at 1.74 acres

MINUTES - Continued:

per home. The smallest lot adjacent to this project is 69,069 square feet. On the south end there should be one less lot so those lots will be wider. The Rural properties would like the 600-foot buffer applied. The developer has agreed to the gaslights, matching the wall, matching the landscaping and trail. They want the final grade to be comparable to neighboring home sites. There is a problem with trash on this property.

BRUCE HAMILTON, President of Tule Springs Community Association, 8524 Maggie Avenue, appeared in approval. The overall density is higher than the surrounding properties. Staff is interpreting Nevada Revised Statute 278 that the only properties concerned in an RPN are occupied properties. If there is a vacant property, the buffer is not considered. The intent of that legislation is to preserve the rural nature of existing rural development and not find ways to increase the density in vacant parcels and decrease the density in occupied properties. That would discourage future rural developments.

DONNA MILLER, 8620 North El Capitan Way, appeared in protest. She wants to see 3.0 to 3.5 units per acre, multi-use trail, continuation of white fencing, and just being compatible with Spring Mountain Ranch.

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL asked staff to clarify Nevada Revised Statute 278. CHRIS KNIGHT, Planning & Development, explained that in the State Statutes for Rural Preservation Neighborhoods the definition of an RPN is that there has to be ten or more residentially developed lots that are at a density of 2.0 units per acre or less; vacant lots are not counted. It includes the outer boundary lots that have residential development. That definition is met where there is a cluster of ten or more lots that meet within 330 feet of each other.

COMMISSIONER BUCKLEY asked if there are less than ten homes on the east side of this project. MR. KNIGHT responded that there is an RPN across the street with ten or more homes. There is a vacant lot on the exterior.

COMMISSIONER BUCKLEY asked the applicant's representative whether the ten conditions submitted by the residents are acceptable. MS. GRIDER said she has not seen those conditions. VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL announced this item would be trailed to later in the meeting in order to allow time for the applicant to review those ten conditions.

******

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL recalled this item after Item 34 was heard.

MINUTES - Continued:

MS. GRIDER felt they could abide by all the residents' conditions except 1, 2 and 10. CHRIS GLORE, Planning and Development, concurred with eliminating Conditions 1, 2 and 10. COMMISSIONER BUCKLEY wondered why the applicant would not want to join the Spring Mountain Ranch Homeowner's Association as noted under Condition 10 submitted by the residents. MS. GRIDER explained that they do not want that to be a condition even though they are not completely opposed to being in that homeowner's association. There are issues that need to be resolved prior to joining that association.

DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY BRYAN SCOTT noted that the condition only indicates that the applicant should petition the Spring Mountain Ranch Homeowner's Association. MR. GLORE preferred the developer work with the Spring Mountain Ranch Homeowner's Association and perhaps come to an agreement to join in the future, but it is premature to have a condition whereby they should join at this time.

MR. McCULLOCH requested that this application be amended to R-PD5. MS. GRIDER concurred with that request.

DAPHNEE LEGARZA, Public Works, requested on Item 21 [Z-0100-01(1)] that Condition 4 be amended as follows: If allowed by the approved drainage study, the final grade of the project shall remain comparable to neighboring home sites and shall not exceed that of adjacent properties to the south and, insofar as possible, shall rise above those to the East only to the extent necessary to preserve natural grade. MS. GRIDER concurred with that amended condition.

There was no further discussion.

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing closed.

NOTE: See Item 21 [Z-0100-01(1)] for related discussion.

(7:03 - 7:31/7:54 - 8:01)

1-2310/2-840

CONDITIONS:

Planning and Development

1. A Resolution of Intent with a two-year time limit.

CONDITIONS - Continued:

2. A Site Development Plan Review application shall be approved by the Planning Commission or City Council prior to issuance of any permits, any site grading, and all development activity for the site.
3. Any portion of this rezoning within a 330-foot radius from APN 125-08-601-005 shall be limited to a maximum density of 3 dwelling units per acre as required by Senate Bill 391.

Public Works

4. Construct all incomplete half-street improvements (sidewalk) on Brent Lane adjacent to this site concurrent with development of this site.

5. Remove all substandard public street improvements, if any, adjacent to this site and replace with new improvements meeting current City Standards concurrent with on-site development activities.

6. A Traffic Impact Analysis must be submitted to and approved by the Department of Public Works prior to the issuance of any building or grading permits, submittal of any construction drawings or the recordation of a Final Map for this site. Comply with the recommendations of the approved Traffic Impact Analysis prior to occupancy of the site. The City shall determine area traffic mitigation contribution requirements based upon information provided in the approved Traffic Impact Analysis; such monies shall be contributed prior to the issuance of any permits or the recordation of a Final Map for this site. The Traffic Impact Analysis shall also include a section addressing Standard Drawings #234.1 #234.2 and #234.3 to determine additional right-of-way requirements for bus turnouts adjacent to this site, if any; dedicate all areas recommended by the approved Traffic Impact Analysis. All additional rights-of-way required by Standard Drawing #201.1 for exclusive right turn lanes and dual left turn lanes shall be dedicated prior to or concurrent with the commencement of on-site development activities unless specifically noted as not required in the approved Traffic Impact Analysis. Phased compliance will be allowed if recommended by the approved Traffic Impact Analysis. No recommendation of the approved Traffic Impact Analysis, nor compliance therewith, shall be deemed to modify or eliminate any condition of approval imposed by the Planning Commission or the City Council on the development of this site.

CONDITIONS - Continued:

Alternatively, in lieu of a Traffic Impact Analysis, the applicant may participate in a reasonable alternative mutually acceptable to the applicant and the Department of Public Works.

7. A Drainage Plan and Technical Drainage Study must be submitted to and approved by the Department of Public Works prior to the issuance of any building or grading permits, submittal of any construction drawings or the recordation of a Final Map for this site, whichever may occur first. Provide and improve all drainageways recommended in the approved drainage plan/study. The developer of this site shall be responsible to construct such neighborhood or local drainage facility improvements as are recommended by the approved Drainage Plan/Study concurrent with development of this site. In lieu of constructing improvements, in whole or in part, the developer may agree to contribute monies for the construction of neighborhood or local drainage improvements, the amount of such monies shall be determined by the approved Drainage Plan/Study and shall be contributed prior to the issuance of any building or grading permits, or the recordation of a Final Map, whichever may occur first, if allowed by the City Engineer.

City of Las Vegas

Agenda Item No.: 21

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 28, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER [ ] **CONSENT** [X] **DISCUSSION**

SUBJECT:

ABEYANCE - Z-0100-01(1) - RL HOMES, LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY - Request for a Site Development Plan Review FOR A 23-LOT SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION on 4.48 acres adjacent to the southwest corner of El Capitan Way and Brent Lane (APN: 125-08-203-005), R-E (Residence Estates) Zone [PROPOSED: R-PD6 (Residential Planned Development - 6 Units Per Acre)], Ward 6 (Mack).

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:		APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:	
Planning Commission Mtg.	2	Planning Commission Mtg.	4
City Council Meeting		City Council Meeting	

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report
4. Residents List Of Conditions

MOTION:

BUCKLEY - APPROVED subject to conditions with Condition 4 as amended by Public Works and Residents' conditions as follows:

2. Per the Centennial Hills Sector Plan 2.8, Program B1.2, and 2.5 within the area 600 feet west of El Capitan Way the density shall be no greater than 2.0 dwelling units per acre.

3. Lots with a minimum of 20,000 square feet (net) shall be implemented along El Capitan Way. These homes shall be single story homes to prevent loss of line of sight and shall be developed to minimum R-E setbacks for side and rear yards.

4. If approved by the City, the final grade of the project shall remain comparable to neighboring home sites and shall not exceed that of adjacent properties to the south and, insofar as possible, shall rise above those to the East only to the extent necessary to preserve natural grade.

5. Along private streets minimal lighting such as 6 foot lamplight or lighting from the exterior of the homes so that there is no spillover to adjacent properties. Electric lights are permissible.

Motion - Continued:

6. **Construct exterior perimeter chain link fencing, of an adequate height, prior to issuance of building permits for individual homes to prevent trash from spreading onto adjacent properties.**
7. **The applicant shall submit any changes to the site plan for review by the Planning Commission at a public hearing.**
8. **All required perimeter landscaping and trails adjacent to El Capitan shall be installed concurrently with the construction of the block wall. Exterior walls of white slump design and perimeter landscaping shall be consistent with those of the Spring Mountain Ranch Community.**
9. **The 30 foot multi-use trail and related landscaping shall be consistent with that of the constructed one in the Spring Mountain Ranch Community and utility boxes shall be placed outside of its designated pathways. - UNANIMOUS with GALATI and QUINN excused**

To be heard by the City Council on 4/3/2002.

MINUTES:

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing open.

JOEL McCULLOCH, Planning and Development, stated the applicant has submitted a revised site plan that depicts a 21-lot residential development with typical lot sizes of 5,000 square feet. Access to this site will be via one entrance off Brent Lane with a recommendation that a pedestrian access be added at the east side of the site to allow access from the community open space to the multi-use trail along El Capitan Way. A Rural Preservation neighborhood exists to the southeast of this site and a portion of the site is within the 300-foot buffer area required by Senate Bill 391. The revised site plan depicts development in conformance with the intent of Senate Bill 391. The open space provided is acceptable in size and location. Due to the larger lot sizes required by the RPD buffer, the rear setbacks for lots over 7,500 square feet should be increased to maintain a consistent development pattern throughout the site. Staff recommended approval, subject to the conditions.

CHRIS GLORE, Planning and Development, pointed out that the actual site plan being proposed is the one in the Commissioners' backup information.

MINUTES - Continued:

KATHRYN GRIDER, WRG Design, 2260 Corporate Circle, #430, Henderson, Nevada, appeared to represent the applicant. A recent meeting with the neighbors proved to be very fruitful. After the January 29, 2002 meeting, they took some of the concerns of the neighbors and redesigned their site. Some of the concerns were that they keep a buffer of the Rural Estates. Another concern was that the lots throughout the south portion were too small. To the west those neighbors also wanted to see larger lots. There was a confusion as to the actual size of the homes. The developer plans to construct 1,400 to 2,200 square foot homes. The neighbors were also concerned over this being a part of Spring Mountain Ranch, the fencing, lighting, etc. She showed the new design on the monitor. They have larger lots on the east side, centralized the open space and the space that was gained was redistributed throughout the lots to the south and west. As far as matching the fencing along Spring Mountain Ranch, there will be landscaping and low lighting.

TODD FARLOW, 240 North 19th Street, appeared in approval. He wondered if the open space still meets the requirements. Secondly, he objected to the corner lots where all that will be seen is a garage door.

MICHELLE DEMAIO, 8708 Grazing Hill Court, appeared in approval. Last week they met with the developer's representatives. There was a problem with notification to the residents, so only about five persons attended that meeting. They will have gas lamps, continue the horse trail, and have a white slump wall. Her only concern was that there are a couple of lots under 6,000 square feet. All the other developments that abut Desert Rural have been R-PD3. The neighbors suggested incorporating this into Spring Mountain Ranch because of the open space.

LOUISE RUSKAMP, 8500 Log Cabin Way, appeared in approval. At the neighborhood meeting the applicant's representatives said they would be asking for abeyance at this meeting, which is the reason there are less residents here. She submitted a list of conditions requesting that the overall density be 3.5 units per acre. All along El Capitan where there is Desert Rural the density has not exceeded 3.5 units per acre. In one area where there is 6.0 units per acre there is a park to buffer the Desert Rural. On the east side of El Capitan there are homes at 1.74 acres per home. The smallest lot adjacent to this project is 69,069 square feet. On the south end there should be one less lot so those lots will be wider. The Rural properties would like the 600-foot buffer applied. The developer has agreed to the gaslights, matching the wall, matching the landscaping and trail. They want the final grade to be comparable to neighboring home sites. There is a problem with trash on this property.

MINUTES - Continued:

BRUCE HAMILTON, President of Tule Springs Community Association, 8524 Maggie Avenue, appeared to support the application. The overall density is higher than the surrounding properties. Staff is interpreting Nevada Revised Statute 278 that the only properties concerned in an RPN are occupied properties. If there is a vacant property the buffer is not considered. The intent of that legislation is to preserve the rural nature of existing rural development and not find ways to increase the density in vacant parcels and decrease the density in occupied properties. That would discourage future rural developments.

DONNA MILLER, 8620 North El Capitan Way, appeared in protest. She wants to see 3.0 to 3.5 units per acre, multi-use trail, continuation of white fencing, and just being compatible with Spring Mountain Ranch.

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL asked staff to clarify Nevada Revised Statute 278. CHRIS KNIGHT, Planning & Development, explained that in the State Statutes for Rural Preservation Neighborhoods the definition of an RPN is that there has to be ten or more residentially developed lots that are at a density of 2.0 units per acre or less; vacant lots are not counted. It includes the outer boundary lots that have residential development. That definition is met where there is a cluster of ten or more lots that meet within 330 feet of each other.

COMMISSIONER BUCKLEY asked if there are less than ten homes on the east side of this project. MR. KNIGHT responded that there is an RPN across the street with ten or more homes. There is a vacant lot on the exterior.

COMMISSIONER BUCKLEY asked the applicant's representative whether the ten conditions submitted by the residents are acceptable. MS. GRIDER said she has not seen those conditions. VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL announced this item would be trailed to later in the meeting in order to allow time for the applicant to review those ten conditions.

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL recalled this item after Item 34 was heard.

MS. GRIDER felt they could abide by all the residents' conditions except 1, 2 and 10. CHRIS GLORE, Planning and Development, concurred with eliminating Conditions 1, 2 and 10. COMMISSIONER BUCKLEY wondered why the applicant would not want to join the Spring Mountain Ranch Homeowner's Association as noted under Condition 10 submitted by the residents. MS. GRIDER explained that they do not want that to be a condition even though they are not completely opposed to being in that homeowner's association. There are issues that need to be resolved prior to joining that association.

MINUTES - Continued:

DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY BRYAN SCOTT noted that the condition only indicates that the applicant should petition the Spring Mountain Ranch Homeowner's Association. MR. GLORE preferred the developer work with the Spring Mountain Ranch Homeowner's Association and perhaps come to an agreement to join in the future, but it is premature to have a condition whereby they should join at this time.

MR. McCULLOCH requested that this application be amended to R-PD5. MS. GRIDER concurred with that request.

DAPHNEE LEGARZA, Public Works, requested on Item 21 [Z-0100-01(1)] that Condition 4 be amended as follows: If allowed by the approved drainage study, the final grade of the project shall remain comparable to neighboring home sites and shall not exceed that of adjacent properties to the south and, insofar as possible, shall rise above those to the East only to the extent necessary to preserve natural grade. MS. GRIDER concurred with that amended condition.

There was no further discussion.

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing closed.

NOTE: See Item 20 [Z-0100-01] for related discussion.

(7:03 - 7:31/7:54 - 8:01)

1-2310/2-840

CONDITIONS:

Planning and Development

1. The City Council shall approve a Rezoning (Z-0100-01) to an R-PD6 (Residential Planned Development – 6 Units Per Acre) Zoning District.

2. This Site Development Plan Review shall expire two years from date of final approval unless it is exercised or an Extension of Time is granted by the City Council.

3. All development shall be in conformance with the site plan and building elevations, except as amended by conditions herein.

CONDITIONS - Continued:

4. The setbacks for all lots equal to or less than 7,500 square feet in lot size shall be a minimum of 20 feet to the front of the house, 20 feet to the front of the garage as measured from back of sidewalk or from back of curb if no sidewalk is provided, 5 feet on the side, 10 feet on the corner side, and 15 feet in the rear.

5. The setbacks for all lots greater than 7,500 square feet in lot size shall be a minimum of 20 feet to the front of the house, 20 feet to the front of the garage as measured from back of sidewalk or from back of curb if no sidewalk is provided, 5 feet on the side, 10 feet on the corner side, and 25 feet in the rear.

6. A landscaping plan must be submitted prior to or at the same time application is made for a building permit.

7. Air conditioning units shall not be mounted on rooftops.

8. All utility boxes exceeding 27 cubic feet in size shall meet the standards of Municipal Code Section 19A.12.050.

9. The applicant shall have constructed a six-foot high decorative block wall, with at least 20 percent contrasting materials, along the side and rear property lines. Fence heights shall be measured from the side of the fence with the least vertical exposure above the finished grade, unless otherwise stipulated.

10. A fully operational fire protection system, including fire apparatus roads, fire hydrants and water supply, shall be installed and shall be functioning prior to construction of any combustible structures.

11. All City Code requirements and design standards of all City departments must be satisfied.

12. The standards for this development shall include the following: minimum lot size of 5,000 square feet, maximum density of 6.49 Dwelling Units per Gross Acre, minimum distance between buildings of 10 feet, lot coverage shall not exceed 50%, and building height shall not exceed two stories or 35 feet, whichever is less.

CONDITIONS - Continued:

13. The applicant shall provide a pedestrian access to connect the interior open space of the subdivision to the multi-use equestrian trail along El Capitan.

Public Works

14. Meet with the Traffic Engineering Representative in Land Development for assistance in the possible redesign of the proposed driveway access, on site circulation and parking lot layout prior to the submittal of any construction plans or the issuance of any permits, whichever may occur first. The private entry drive as proposed may not be gated, now or in the future, unless additional roadway width is provided in conjunction with any such proposal in conformance with Standard Drawing #222a.

15. The design and layout of all onsite private circulation and access drives shall meet the approval of the Department of Fire Services prior to the issuance of any permits.

16. A Homeowner's Association shall be established to maintain all perimeter walls, private roadways, landscaping and common areas created with this development. All landscaping shall be situated and maintained so as to not create sight visibility obstructions for vehicular traffic at all development access drives and abutting street intersections. The CC&R's for the Homeowner's Association shall be submitted to and approved by the City Attorney's Office.

17. Site development to comply with all applicable conditions of approval for Zoning Reclassification Z-100-01, on this same agenda, and all other subsequent site-related actions.

18. The final layout of the subdivision shall be determined at the time of approval of the Tentative Map.

City of Las Vegas

Agenda Item No.: 22

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 28, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER [ ] **CONSENT** [X] **DISCUSSION**

SUBJECT:

ABEYANCE - Z-0101-01 - ESHANOLLAH AND JANET KASHANI, ET AL ON BEHALF OF RL HOMES, LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY - Request for a Rezoning FROM: R-E (Residence Estates) Zone TO: R-PD6 (Residential Planned Development - 6 Units Per Acre) on 12.26 acres generally located adjacent to the southeast corner of Thom Boulevard and Severance Lane (APN: 125-13-803-001, 002 and 003), PROPOSED USE: SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION, Ward 6 (Mack).

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:		APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:	
Planning Commission Mtg.	2	Planning Commission Mtg.	2
City Council Meeting		City Council Meeting	

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report
4. Telephone List

MOTION:

BUCKLEY - APPROVED subject to conditions - UNANIMOUS with GALATI and QUINN excused

To be heard by the City Council on 4/3/2002.

MINUTES:

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing open.

JOEL McCULLOCH, Planning and Development, stated this rezoning request would be in conformance with the General Plan designation of ML (Medium Low Density Residential), which allows up to 8.49 units per acre. The accompanying proposal for a Site Development Plan Review depicts a density of 5.2 units per acre, which would be allowed in the zoning designation of R-PD5; therefore, this request should be amended to R-PD5. Staff recommended approval, subject to the conditions.

MINUTES - Continued:

KATHY GRIDER, WRG Design, 2260 Corporate Circle, appeared to represent the applicant. They have met with the neighbors and their primary concern is the adjacent large lots along the south property line. They have shorted up some of the larger corner lots and moved the drainage and utility easements.

TODD FARLOW, 240 North 19th Street, appeared in protest. He objected to having the garage door in the front of the houses.

TONY FARROW, 5000 Elkhorn Road, appeared in approval. He met with the applicant. He wanted to make sure there will be single story houses on the south end of this project. He suggested a requirement that the south wall be constructed as soon as possible for sound and safety.

PATRICIA DAVIS, 5050 Elkhorn Road, appeared in approval. She met with the developer's representatives. The density is too high as she would like to preserve the rural density and property values. This property creates trash for the entire area. RL Homes has various size homes that they build. She does not want them to construct their smallest home.

MS. GRIDER said the developer would be willing to limit the lots along the south property line to single story homes and build the fence as soon as possible. The homes will be between 1,400 and 2,200 square feet.

COMMISSIONER McSWAIN asked if this new site plan meets R-PD5 zoning in terms of the number of lots. MS. GRIDER responded that they did not gain lots, just widened some of them. They will still be over the requirement for open space.

There was no further discussion.

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing closed.

NOTE: See Item 23 [Z-0101-01(1)] for related discussion.

(7:31 - 7:45)

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 28, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 22 - Z-0101-01

CONDITIONS:

Planning and Development

1. This application shall be amended to R-PD5 (Residential Planned Development - 5 Units Per Acre).

2. A Resolution of Intent with a two-year time limit.

3. A Site Development Plan Review application shall be approved by the Planning Commission or City Council prior to issuance of any permits, any site grading, and all development activity for the site.

Public Works

4. Submit a Petition of Vacation for the existing strip of right-of-way located near the southeast corner of this site or dedicate appropriate right-of-way and construct appropriate improvements to terminate the public right-of-way in a cul-de-sac meeting current City Standards. Such vacation shall have been acted upon by the City Council prior to the submittal of a Final Map Technical Review for this site. The Order of Vacation shall record prior to the recordation of a Final Map adjacent to the area to be vacated.

5. Dedicate a 15 foot radius on the southeast corner of Severance Lane and Thom Boulevard.

6. Construct half-street improvements including appropriate overpaving on Severance Lane and Thom Boulevard adjacent to this site concurrent with development of this site. Install all appurtenant underground facilities, if any, adjacent to this site needed for the future traffic signal system concurrent with development of this site. Also, if the existing strip of right-of-way near the southeast corner of this site is not vacated, construct appropriate improvements to terminate such right-of-way in a cul-de-sac meeting current City standards.

7. Coordinate with the Collection Systems Planning Section of the Department of Public Works to connect public sanitary sewer in Elkhorn Road to a location and depth acceptable to the City Engineer. Provide public sewer easements for all public sewers not located within existing public street right-of-way prior to the issuance of any permits as required by the Department of Public Works. Improvement Drawings submitted to the City for review shall not be approved for construction until all required public sewer easements necessary to connect this site to the existing public sewer system have been granted to the City.

CONDITIONS - Continued:

8. A Master Streetlight Plan for the overall subdivision shall be approved prior to the submittal of any construction drawings for this site.

9. A Traffic Impact Analysis must be submitted to and approved by the Department of Public Works prior to the issuance of any building or grading permits, submittal of any construction drawings or the recordation of a Final Map for this site. Comply with the recommendations of the approved Traffic Impact Analysis prior to occupancy of the site. The City shall determine traffic signal contribution requirements based upon information provided in the approved Traffic Impact Analysis; such monies shall be contributed prior to the issuance of any permits or the recordation of a Final Map for this site. The Traffic Impact Analysis shall also include a section addressing Standard Drawings #234.1 and #234.2 to determine additional right-of-way requirements adjacent to this site, if any; dedicate all areas recommended by the approved Traffic Impact Analysis. All additional rights-of-way required by Standard Drawing #201.1 shall be dedicated prior to or concurrent with the commencement of on-site development activities unless specifically noted as not required in the approved Traffic Impact Analysis. Phased compliance will be allowed if recommended by the approved Traffic Impact Analysis. No recommendation of the approved Traffic Impact Analysis, nor compliance therewith, shall be deemed to modify or eliminate any condition of approval imposed by the Planning Commission or the City Council on the development of this site.

   Alternatively, in lieu of a Traffic Impact Analysis, the applicant may participate in a reasonable alternative mutually acceptable to the applicant and the Department of Public Works.

10. A Drainage Plan and Technical Drainage Study must be submitted to and approved by the Department of Public Works prior to the issuance of any building or grading permits, submittal of any construction drawings or the recordation of a Final Map for this site, whichever may occur first. Provide and improve all drainageways recommended in the approved drainage plan/study. The developer of this site shall be responsible to construct such neighborhood or local drainage facility improvements as are recommended by the approved Drainage Plan/Study concurrent with development of this site. In lieu of constructing improvements, in whole or in part, the developer may agree to contribute monies for the construction of neighborhood or local drainage improvements, the amount of such monies shall be determined by the approved Drainage Plan/Study and shall be contributed prior to the issuance of any building or grading permits, or the recordation of a Final Map, whichever may occur first, if allowed by the City Engineer.

City of Las Vegas

Agenda Item No.: 23

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 28, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER [ ] **CONSENT** [X] **DISCUSSION**

SUBJECT:

ABEYANCE _ Z-0101-01(1) - ESHANOLLAH AND JANET KASHANI, ET AL ON BEHALF OF RL HOMES, LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY - Request for a Site Development Plan Review FOR A 69-LOT SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION on 12.26 acres generally located adjacent to the southeast corner of Thom Boulevard and Severance Lane (APN: 125-13-803-001, 002 and 003) R-E (Residence Estates) Zone [PROPOSED: R-PD6 (Residential Planned Development - 6 Units Per Acre)], Ward 6 (Mack).

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:		**APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:**	
Planning Commission Mtg.	2	**Planning Commission Mtg.**	2
City Council Meeting		**City Council Meeting**	

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report
4. Telephone List

MOTION:

BUCKLEY - APPROVED subject to conditions with the additional conditions as follows: that the houses on south end of the property be limited to single story, houses no less than 1,400 square feet, south wall constructed as soon as possible, and amending Condition 12 changing Ledesma Key Avenue to Jelson Falls Way - UNANIMOUS with GALATI and QUINN excused

To be heard by the City Council on 4/3/2002.

MINUTES:

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing open.

JOEL McCULLOCH, Planning and Development, stated this site plan depicts an orderly layout of lots, open space and internal roadways. Further, staff finds that the density of the project will be compatible with existing surrounding land uses and future land uses as proposed by the General Plan. Staff recommended approval, subject to the conditions.

MINUTES - Continued:

KATHY GRIDER, WRG Design, 2260 Corporate Circle, appeared to represent the applicant. They have met with the neighbors and their primary concern is the adjacent large lots along the south property line. They have shorted up some of the larger corner lots and moved the drainage and utility easements.

TODD FARLOW, 240 North 19th Street, appeared in protest. He objected to having the garage door in the front of the houses.

TONY FARROW, 5000 Elkhorn Road, appeared in approval. He met with the applicant. He wanted to make sure there will be single story houses on the south end of this project. There should be a requirement that the south wall be constructed as soon as possible for sound and safety.

PATRICIA DAVIS, 5050 Elkhorn Road, appeared in approval. She met with the developer's representatives. The density is too high as she would like to preserve the rural density and property values. This property creates trash for the entire area. RL Homes has various size homes that they build. She does not want them to construct their smallest home.

MS. GRIDER said the developer would be willing to limit the lots along the south property line to single story homes and build the fence as soon as possible. Those homes will be between 1,400 and 2,200 square feet.

COMMISSIONER McSWAIN asked if this new site plan meets R-PD5 zoning in terms of the number of lots. MS. GRIDER responded that they did not gain lots, just widened some of them. They will still be over the requirement for open space.

DAPHNEE LEGARZA, Public Works, requested Condition 12 be amended to change the street name of Ledesma Key Avenue to Jelson Falls Way.

There was no further discussion.

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing closed.

NOTE: See Item 22 [Z-0101-01] for related discussion.

(7:31 - 7:45)

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 28, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 23 - Z-0101-01(1)

CONDITIONS:

Planning and Development

1. The City Council shall approve a Rezoning (Z-0101-01) to an R-PD5 (Residential Planned Development - 5 Units Per Acre) Zoning District.

2. This Site Development Plan Review shall expire two years from date of final approval unless it is exercised or an Extension of Time is granted by the City Council.

3. The site plan shall be revised to provide a minimum of 30 feet of street frontage for the two lots located on the knuckle in the southwest corner of the site .

4. One Hundred percent of open space/common space shall be installed at the time 75% of the houses are built.

5. All development shall be in conformance with the site plan and building elevations, except as amended by conditions herein.

6. The setbacks for this development shall be as follows: minimum of 20 feet to the front of the garage/house, minimum 18 feet to the front of the garage/house if located on a knuckle, as measured from the back of curb or sidewalk, 5 feet on the side, 10 feet on the corner side, and 15 feet in the rear.

7. Air conditioning units shall not be mounted on rooftops.

8. All utility boxes exceeding 27 cubic feet in size shall meet the standards of Municipal Code Section 19A.12.050.

9. The applicant shall have constructed a six-foot high decorative block wall, with at least 20 percent contrasting materials, along the street frontages. Fence heights shall be measured from the side of the fence with the least vertical exposure above the finished grade, unless otherwise stipulated.

10. A fully operational fire protection system, including fire apparatus roads, fire hydrants and water supply, shall be installed and shall be functioning prior to construction of any combustible structures.

11. All City Code requirements and design standards of all City departments must be satisfied.

CONDITIONS - Continued:

Public Works

12. Meet with the Traffic Engineering Representative in Land Development for assistance in the possible redesign of the proposed access drives and on site circulation prior to the submittal of any construction plans or the issuance of any permits, whichever may occur first. All active gated access drives shall be designed, located and constructed in accordance with Standard Drawing #222a. Proposed street intersection (Ledesma Key Avenue and Diamond Stream Avenue) shall be offset by no more than 10 feet (centerline to centerline) from an opposing intersection, or no less than 220 feet, unless otherwise allowed by the City Traffic Engineer.

13. The design and layout of all onsite private circulation and access drives shall meet the approval of the Department of Fire Services prior to the issuance of any permits.

14. A Homeowner's Association shall be established to maintain all perimeter walls, private roadways, landscaping and common areas created with this development. All landscaping shall be situated and maintained so as to not create sight visibility obstructions for vehicular traffic at all development access drives and abutting street intersections. The CC&R's for the Homeowner's Association shall be submitted to and approved by the City Attorney's Office.

15. The final layout of the subdivision shall be determined at the time of approval of the Tentative Map.

16. Site development to comply with all applicable conditions of approval for Z-101-01, on this same agenda, and any other site-related actions.

City of Las Vegas

Agenda Item No.: 24

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 28, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER [ ] **CONSENT** [X] **DISCUSSION**

SUBJECT:

ABEYANCE - Z-0097-01 - NEVADA HOMES GROUP, INC. - Request for a Rezoning FROM: U (Undeveloped) [L (Low Density Residential) General Plan Designation] TO: R-PD5 (Residential Planned Development - 5 Units Per Acre) on 7.5 acres located adjacent to the northwest corner of Buffalo Drive and Gowan Road (APN: 138-09-601-013 and 018), PROPOSED: 41-LOT SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION, Ward 4 (Brown).

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:		APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:	
Planning Commission Mtg.	3	Planning Commission Mtg.	2
City Council Meeting		City Council Meeting	

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application -
3. Staff Report
4. Telephone List
5. Letter In Opposition

MOTION:

BUCKLEY - ABEYANCE of Item Nos 24 [Z-0097-01], 25 [V-0095-01] and 26 [Z-0097-01(1)] to 3/28/2002 Planning Commission Meeting - UNANIMOUS with GALATI and QUINN excused

MINUTES:

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing open.

JOEL McCULLOCH, Planning and Development, stated staff would like to have Items 24 [Z-0097-01], 25 [V-0095-01] and 26 [Z-0097-01(1)] held in abeyance to the 3/28/2002 meeting. Staff did not receive the revised site plan until 5:00 P.M. on 2/27/2002 and has not had time to go over the revisions. Late today the applicant agreed to having this item held in abeyance to the 3/28/2002 meeting.

JENNIFER LAZOVICH, 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, appeared on behalf of the applicant and preferred a two-week abeyance, but agreed to a 30-day abeyance.

MINUTES - Continued:

No one appeared in opposition.

There was no further discussion.

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing closed.

NOTE: See related Items 25 [V-0095-01] and 26 [Z-0097-01(1)].

(6:10 - 6:11)

1-320

City of Las Vegas

Agenda Item No.: 25

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 28, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER [ ] **CONSENT** [X] **DISCUSSION**

SUBJECT:

ABEYANCE - V-0095-01 - NEVADA HOMES GROUP, INC. - Request for a Variance TO ALLOW ZERO SQUARE FEET OF OPEN SPACE WHERE 29,185 SQUARE FEET OF OPEN SPACE IS THE MINIMUM REQUIRED FOR A PROPOSED 41-LOT SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION on 7.5 acres located adjacent to the northwest corner of Buffalo Drive and Gowan Road (APN: 138-09-601-013 and 018), U (Undeveloped) Zone [L (Low Density Residential) General Plan Designation], [PROPOSED: R-PD5 (Residential Planned Development - 5 Units Per Acre)], Ward 4 (Brown).

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:		APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:	
Planning Commission Mtg.	3	Planning Commission Mtg.	1
City Council Meeting		City Council Meeting	

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends DENIAL.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report
4. Telephone List
5. Letter In Opposition

MOTION:

BUCKLEY - ABEYANCE of Item Nos. 24 [Z-0097-01], 25 [V-0095-01] and 26 [Z-0097-01(1)] to 3/28/2002 Planning Commission Meeting - UNANIMOUS with GALATI and QUINN excused

MINUTES:

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing open.

JOEL McCULLOCH, Planning and Development, stated staff would like to have Items 24 [Z-0097-01], 25 [V-0095-01] and 26 [Z-0097-01(1)] held in abeyance to the 3/28/2002 meeting. Staff did not receive the revised site plan until 5:00 P.M. on 2/27/2002 and has not had time to go over the revisions. Late today the applicant agreed to having this item held in abeyance to the 3/28/2002 meeting.

MINUTES - Continued:

JENNIFER LAZOVICH, 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, appeared on behalf of the applicant and preferred a two-week abeyance, but agreed to a 30-day abeyance.

No one appeared in opposition.

There was no further discussion.

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing closed.

NOTE: See related Items 24 [A-0097-01] and 26 [Z-0097-01(1)].

(6:10 - 6:11)

1-320

City of Las Vegas

Agenda Item No.: 26

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 28, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER [ ] **CONSENT** [X] **DISCUSSION**

SUBJECT:

ABEYANCE - RENOTIFICATION - Z-0097-01(1) - NEVADA HOMES GROUP, INC. - Request for a Site Development Plan Review FOR A 41-LOT SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION and for a Waiver of the Perimeter Landscape Requirement on Ahey Road on 7.5 acres located adjacent to the northwest corner of Buffalo Drive and Gowan Road (APN: 138-09-601-013 and 018), U (Undeveloped) Zone [L (Low Density Residential) General Plan Designation] [PROPOSED: R-PD5 (Residential Planned Development - 5 Units Per Acre)], Ward 4 (Brown).

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:		APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:	
Planning Commission Mtg.	3	Planning Commission Mtg.	2
City Council Meeting		City Council Meeting	

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends DENIAL.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

BUCKLEY - ABEYANCE of Item Nos. 24 [Z-0097-01], 25 [V-0095-01] and 26 [Z-0097-01(1)] to 3/28/2002 Planning Commission Meeting - UNANIMOUS with GALATI and QUINN excused

MINUTES:

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing open.

JOEL McCULLOCH, Planning and Development, stated staff would like to have Items 24, [Z-0097-01], 25 [V-0095-01] and 26 [Z-0097-01(1)] held in abeyance to the 3/28/2002 meeting. Staff did not receive the revised site plan until 5:00 P.M. on 2/27/2002 and has not had time to go over the revisions. Late today the applicant agreed to having this item held in abeyance to the 3/28/2002 meeting.

JENNIFER LAZOVICH, 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, appeared on behalf of the applicant and preferred a two-week abeyance, but agreed to a 30-day abeyance.

MINUTES - Continued:

No one appeared in opposition.

There was no further discussion.

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing closed.

NOTE: See related Items 24 [Z-0097-01] and 25 [V-0095-01].

(6:10 - 6:11)

1-320

City of Las Vegas

Agenda Item No.: 27

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 28, 2002

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER [ ] **CONSENT** [X] **DISCUSSION**

SUBJECT:

ABEYANCE - Z-0105-01(1) - CARINA CORPORATION - Request for a Site Development Plan FOR A PROPOSED 57-LOT SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT on 10.39 acres on the east side of Cimarron Road approximately 950 feet south of Grand Teton Drive (APN: 125-16-501-002), U(Undeveloped) Zone [PCD (Planned Community Development) General Plan Designation] [PROPOSED: R-PD5 (Residential Planned Development - 5 Units Per Acre)], Ward 6 (Mack).

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:		**APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:**	
Planning Commission Mtg.	**0**	**Planning Commission Mtg.**	**0**
City Council Meeting		**City Council Meeting**	

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends this item be STRICKEN from the agenda.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application - Not Applicable
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

McSWAIN - STRICKEN – UNANIMOUS with GALATI and QUINN excused

MINUTES:

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing open.

JOEL McCULLOCH, Planning and Development, stated this item should be stricken as it is a duplicate of Item 35 [Z-0096-98(3)].

There was no further discussion.

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing closed.

(6:11 - 6:12)

1 - 380

City of Las Vegas

Agenda Item No.: 28

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 28, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER [ ] **CONSENT** [X] **DISCUSSION**

SUBJECT:

ABEYANCE - V-0046-92(4) - CITY PARKWAY IV A, INC. ON BEHALF OF VIACOM OUTDOOR (INFINITY) - Required One Year Review of an approved Variance which allowed a 14 foot x 48 foot off-premise advertising (billboard) sign 690 feet from an existing off-premise advertising (billboard) sign where 750 feet is the minimum distance separation allowed on the north side of the Oran K. Gragson Highway (U.S. 95), between Bonanza Road and Grand Central Parkway, 150 feet west of the centerline of the Union Pacific Railroad tracks (APN: 139-27-401-031), M (Industrial) Zone, Ward 5 (Weekly).

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:		APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:	
Planning Commission Mtg.	0	Planning Commission Mtg.	0
City Council Meeting		City Council Meeting	

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

BUCKLEY - APPROVED subject to conditions - UNANIMOUS with GALATI and QUINN excused

To be heard by the City Council on 4/3/2002.

MINUTES:

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing open.

MINUTES - Continued:

LAURA MARTIN, Planning and Development, stated that this existing 672-square foot off-premise (billboard) sign encroaches into the distance separation requirement by 60 feet. The sign is located north of US95 approximately 150 feet west of the Union Pacific Railroad. It is situated on the southern portion of the property and oriented toward the east and westbound traffic along the freeway. A recent inspection of the sign revealed that it is in compliance with the approved plans and conditions of approval. The use continues to be compatible with the character of the surrounding neighborhood, which is predominantly industrial. Staff recommended approval, subject to the conditions.

TOM SKANCKE appeared to represent the applicant. He concurred with staff's conditions and urged approval of this application.

No one appeared in opposition.

There was no further discussion.

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing closed.

(7:45 - 7:49)

2-530

CONDITIONS:

Planning and Development

1. The Variance shall be reviewed in one (1) year at which time the City Council may require the off-premise sign to be removed. The applicant shall be responsible for notification costs of the review. Failure to pay the City for these costs may result in a requirement that the off-premise advertising sign (billboard) be removed.

2. The off-premise advertising sign (billboard) and its supporting structure shall be properly maintained and kept free of graffiti at all times. Failure to perform the required maintenance may result in fines and/or removal of the off-premise advertising sign (billboard).

City of Las Vegas

Agenda Item No.: 29

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 28, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER [ ] **CONSENT** [X] **DISCUSSION**

SUBJECT:

ABEYANCE - V-0003-02 - JON G. GRIFFIN - Request for a Variance TO ALLOW A SIX FOOT TALL SOLID BLOCK WALL IN A PORTION OF THE FRONT YARD WHERE A TWO FOOT TALL SOLID WALL IS PERMITTED; AND TO ALLOW FOUR FEET OF GREEN NETTING ON TOP OF AN EXISTING FOUR FOOT TALL WALL WHERE A SIX FOOT WALL IS PERMITTED on property located at 8010 Maverick Street (APN: 125-11-806-010), R-E (Residence Estates) Zone, Ward 6 (Mack).

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:		APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:	
Planning Commission Mtg.	0	Planning Commission Mtg.	1
City Council Meeting		City Council Meeting	

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

BUCKLEY - ABEYANCE to the 3/14/2002 Planning Commission meeting - UNANIMOUS with GALATI and QUINN excused

MINUTES:

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing open.

LAURA MARTIN, Planning and Development, stated that the first part of the Variance request concerns the front yard. The applicant plans to construct several wall segments, which do not require a Variance; however, the applicant is proposing to erect a six-foot high solid wall on the southwest portion of the front yard with a gate for vehicle access to Grand Teton Drive, which does require a Variance. The portion of fencing requiring the Variance is limited and will screen the corral area from traffic and property along Grand Teton Drive. This proposal meets the intent of the Residential Estates district.

MINUTES - Continued:

The second part of the Variance request concerns the rear yard. The applicant proposes to install four feet of green tennis court netting that would be placed on top of a four-foot high wall that surrounds an equestrian arena for a total of eight feet. That exceeds the code maximum of six feet for walls on the side and rear yards. The applicant has stated to staff that such a screening would reduce the incidence of dust drifting onto adjacent properties. The strict interpretation of the Zoning Code would unnecessarily burden the applicant's enjoyment of this property and that such screening is permitted for other sport recreational uses.

Staff recommended approval, subject to the conditions.

JON G. GRIFFIN, 8010 Maverick Street, appeared to represent the application. He concurred with staff's conditions, except Condition 2. They plan to begin with the screening and lighting on the arena, but would have to work out a mutual agreement on the 20-foot easement. That easement comprises 6,000 square feet of his property. COMMISSIONER BUCKLEY noted that the condition states the applicant shall work with staff to establish a trail width that is mutually acceptable and does not indicate 20 feet. VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL added that there is a commitment for a trail easement in this area. It is important to continue the trail as planned.

TODD FARLOW, 240 North 19th Street, appeared in approval. There are commitments in the older areas of town to put in the trails, even though the funds may not be available at this time.

COMMISSIONER McSWAIN felt that all the properties should be dealt with at the same time. CHRIS GLORE, Planning and Development, stated that this is the first property along Grand Teton Drive that has requested a Variance, which is a privilege. As part of that privilege, the City is legally entitled to impose certain standards that are reasonable. The height of the fence is the problem, not the material. JOEL McCULLOCH, Planning and Development, added that the portion of the fence that is in the rear and side yards could be eight feet in height. The real issue is the front yard.

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL suggested the applicant withdraw the application or it could be held in abeyance.

There was no further discussion.

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing closed.

(8:01 - 8:14)

City of Las Vegas

Agenda Item No.: 30

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 28, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER [ ] **CONSENT** [X] **DISCUSSION**

SUBJECT:

U-0238-91(4) - CITY PARKWAY IV A, INC. ON BEHALF OF LAMAR OUTDOOR ADVERTISING COMPANY - Required One Year Review on an approved Special Use Permit which allowed a 14 foot x 48 foot off-premise advertising (billboard) sign on the south side of Oran K. Gragson Highway (U.S. 95) between "F" Street and Main Street (APN: 139-27-401-031), M (Industrial) Zone, Ward 5 (Weekly).

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:		**APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:**	
Planning Commission Mtg.	**0**	**Planning Commission Mtg.**	**0**
City Council Meeting		**City Council Meeting**	

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

GOYNES - APPROVED subject to conditions with Condition 2 deleted - UNANIMOUS with GALATI and QUINN excused

To be heard by the City Council on 4/3/2002.

MINUTES:

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing open.

LAURA MARTIN, Planning and Development, explained that the Las Vegas Municipal Code allows for the removal of an off-premise sign if conditions in the surrounding area have changed such that the off-premise sign no longer meets the standards for approval of a Special Use Permit. The continued off-premise advertising sign use on this site is appropriate and the vicinity has not changed substantially in the past year. Due to the potential for new development on that adjacent site, staff has a condition requiring the billboard use be reviewed in one year. Staff recommended approval, subject to the conditions with Condition 2 deleted.

KELLEEN COTA, Lamar Outdoor Advertising Company, 1863 Helm Drive, appeared to represent the application.

MINUTES - Continued:

No one appeared in opposition.

There was no further discussion.

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing closed.

(8:14 - 8:17/RECESS)

2-1560

CONDITIONS:

Planning and Development

1. The Special Use Permit shall be reviewed in one year at which time the City Council may require the off-premise sign to be removed. The applicant shall be responsible for notification costs of the review. Failure to pay the City for these costs may result in a requirement that the off-premise advertising (billboard) sign is removed.

2. A one-time relocation of the off-premise advertising (billboard) sign shall be allowed, at no cost to the City of Las Vegas or to the developer, to accommodate redevelopment of the site.

3. The off-premise advertising (billboard) sign and its supporting structure shall be properly maintained and kept free of graffiti at all times. Failure to perform the required maintenance may result in fines and/or removal of the off-premise advertising (billboard) sign.

4. If the existing off-premise advertising sign structure is removed, this Special Use Permit shall be expunged and a new off-premise advertising sign structure shall not be erected in the same location unless: (1) a new Special Use Permit is approved for the new structure by the City Council, or (2) the location is in compliance with all applicable standards of Title 19A including, but not limited to, distance separation requirements, or (3) a Variance to the applicable standards of Title 19A has been approved for the new structure by the City Council.

City of Las Vegas

Agenda Item No.: 31

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 28, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER [ ] **CONSENT** [X] **DISCUSSION**

SUBJECT:

U-0262-94(2) - CHARWEST, INC. ON BEHALF OF LAMAR OUTDOOR ADVERTISING - Required Two Year Review on an approved Special Use Permit which allowed a 14 foot x 48 foot off-premise advertising (billboard) sign at 4820 West Charleston Boulevard (APN: 138-36-804-008), C-2 (General Commercial) Zone, Ward 1 (M. McDonald).

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:		APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:	
Planning Commission Mtg.	0	Planning Commission Mtg.	0
City Council Meeting		City Council Meeting	

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

BUCKLEY - APPROVED subject to conditions - UNANIMOUS with GALATI and QUINN excused

To be heard by the City Council on 4/3/2002.

MINUTES:

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing open.

LAURA MARTIN, Planning and Development, stated that the continued use of this off-premise sign is appropriate for this site as the vicinity has not changed substantially in the past two years. Staff recommended approval, subject to the conditions.

KELLEEN COTA, Lamar Outdoor Advertising, 1863 Helm Drive, said she concurred with staff's conditions.

MINUTES - Continued:

No one appeared in opposition.

There was no further discussion.

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing closed.

(8:30 - 8:33)

2-1656

CONDITIONS:

1. This Special Use Permit shall be reviewed in two (2) years at which time the City Council may require the off-premise advertising (billboard) sign be removed. The applicant shall be responsible for notification costs of the review. Failure to pay the City for these costs may result in a requirement that the off-premise advertising (billboard) sign is removed.

2. If the existing off-premise advertising sign structure is removed, this Special Use Permit shall be expunged and a new off-premise advertising sign structure shall not be erected in the same location unless: (1) a new Special Use Permit is approved for the new structure by the City Council, or (2) the location is in compliance with all applicable standards of Title 19A including, but not limited to, distance separation requirements, or (3) a Variance to the applicable standards of Title 19A has been approved for the new structure by the City Council.

3. The off-premise advertising (billboard) sign and its supporting structure shall be properly maintained and kept free of graffiti at all times. Failure to perform the required maintenance may result in fines and/or removal of the off-premise advertising (billboard) sign.

City of Las Vegas

Agenda Item No.: 32

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 28, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER [ ] **CONSENT** [X] **DISCUSSION**

SUBJECT:

U-0265-94(2) - URBAN LAND NEVADA ON BEHALF OF LAMAR OUTDOOR ADVERTISING - Required Two Year Review on an approved Special Use Permit which allowed a 55 foot high, 14 foot x 48 foot off-premise advertising (billboard) sign at 2550 Highland Drive (APN: 162-09-110-019), M (Industrial) Zone, Ward 3 (Reese).

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:		**APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:**	
Planning Commission Mtg.	**0**	**Planning Commission Mtg.**	**0**
City Council Meeting		**City Council Meeting**	

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

GOYNES - APPROVED subject to conditions - UNANIMOUS with GALATI and QUINN excused

To be heard by the City Council on 4/3/2002.

MINUTES:

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing open.

LAURA MARTIN, Planning and Development, stated that the continued use of this off-premise advertising sign is appropriate. This vicinity has not changed substantially in the past two years. There is a condition to review the billboard in two years. Staff recommended approval, subject to the conditions.

KELLEEN COTA, Lamar Outdoor Advertising, 1863 Helm Drive, said she concurred with staff's conditions.

MINUTES - Continued:

No one appeared in opposition.

There was no further discussion.

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing closed.

(8:33 - 8:34)

2-1750

CONDITIONS:

1. This Special Use Permit shall be reviewed in two (2) years at which time the City Council may require the off-premise advertising (billboard) sign be removed. The applicant shall be responsible for notification costs of the review. Failure to pay the City for these costs may result in a requirement that the off-premise advertising (billboard) sign is removed.

2. If the existing off-premise advertising sign structure is removed, this Special Use Permit shall be expunged and a new off-premise advertising sign structure shall not be erected in the same location unless: (1) a new Special Use Permit is approved for the new structure by the City Council, or (2) the location is in compliance with all applicable standards of Title 19A including, but not limited to, distance separation requirements, or (3) a Variance to the applicable standards of Title 19A has been approved for the new structure by the City Council.

3. The off-premise advertising (billboard) sign and its supporting structure shall be properly maintained and kept free of graffiti at all times. Failure to perform the required maintenance may result in fines and/or removal of the off-premise advertising (billboard) sign.

City of Las Vegas

Agenda Item No.: 33

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 28, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER [ ] **CONSENT** [X] **DISCUSSION**

SUBJECT:

U-0127-99(1) - SAHARA WEST PLAZA, LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY ON BEHALF OF NISSAN WEST - Required Two Year Review on an approved Special Use Permit which allowed a minor auto repair garage at 4601 West Sahara Avenue (APN: 162-07-101-004), C-1 (Limited Commercial) Zone, Ward 1 (M. McDonald).

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:		APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:	
Planning Commission Mtg.	0	Planning Commission Mtg.	0
City Council Meeting		City Council Meeting	

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

GOYNES - APPROVED subject to condition - UNANIMOUS with GALATI and QUINN excused

To be heard by the City Council on 4/3/2002.

MINUTES:

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing open.

LAURA MARTIN, Planning and Development, stated that this minor auto repair business is limited to auto window tinting and the installation of stereos, alarms and minor accessories. One of the original conditions of approval is to obtain a Variance for parking as it is deficient by seven spaces. This use has met the conditions of approval for the Special Use Permit, so the continued minor auto repair garage use is appropriate, subject to no further reviews. Staff recommended approval, subject to the condition.

JEFF BENDAVID, Moran & Associates, 630 South 4th Street, appeared on behalf of the applicant. He urged approval of this application.

MINUTES - Continued:

No one appeared in opposition.

There was no further discussion.

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing closed.

(8:34 - 8:36)

2 - 1800

CONDITION:

1. Conformance to the Conditions of Approval for Special Use Permit (U-0127-99) and all other subsequent site-related actions.

City of Las Vegas

Agenda Item No.: 34

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 28, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER [ ] **CONSENT** [X] **DISCUSSION**

SUBJECT:

Z-0100-97(7) - UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD COMPANY, ET AL ON BEHALF OF ELLER OUTDOOR ADVERTISING COMPANY AND VIACOM OUTDOOR ADVERTISING - Required One Year Review for 12 existing off-premise advertising (billboard) signs on property bounded by U.S.-95, I-15 and Grand Central Parkway (APN: 139-33-710-001, 139-33-610-004, 139-33-511-003, 004, 139-27-410-002 and 005) PD (Planned Development) Zone, Ward 5 (Weekly).

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:		**APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:**	
Planning Commission Mtg.	**0**	**Planning Commission Mtg.**	**0**
City Council Meeting		**City Council Meeting**	

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

BUCKLEY - APPROVED subject to conditions with CONDITION 2 STRICKEN - UNANIMOUS with GALATI and QUINN excused

To be heard by the City Council on 4/3/2002.

MINUTES:

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL recalled this item after Item 28 [V-0046-92(4)] and declared the Public Hearing open.

LAURA MARTIN, Planning and Development, stated that the conditions of approval of the rezoning state that no off-premise advertising signs are allowed. However, the existing off-premise advertising signs are allowed to remain, subject to a review. The area immediately surrounding this site has not changed substantially in the last year. Developments that have been recently approved for the subject parcels may render the off-premise advertising sign inappropriate. Staff recommended approval, subject to the conditions with Condition 2 stricken.

MINUTES - Continued:

TOM SKANCKE appeared on behalf of Viacom Outdoor Advertising.

R. VAN NOSTRAND appeared on behalf of Clear Channel Outdoor Advertising Company. Clear Channel has Condition 2 in their lease agreement on nine other locations. The City has inherited his lease with the railroad. In the Viacom leases that condition does not exist.

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL said the lease agreement is not what the Planning Commission should consider with this application. CHRIS KNIGHT, Planning & Development, said that that condition violates the 750-foot space requirement under the Zoning Code. Also, there may have been some variances granted. The lease does not negate the Zoning Code provisions. MR. VAN NOSTRAND thought Condition 2 should be deleted.

No one appeared in opposition.

COMMISSIONER BUCKLEY commented that these signs are all at the appropriate height.

There was no further discussion.

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing closed.

(7:49 - 7:54)

2-660

CONDITIONS:

Planning and Development

1. This Use shall be reviewed in one (1) year at which time the City Council may require the off-premise advertising (billboard) signs be removed. The applicant shall be responsible for notification costs of the review. Failure to pay the City for these costs may result in a requirement that the off-premise advertising (billboard) signs be removed.

2. A one-time relocation of the off-premise advertising (billboard) sign shall be allowed, at no cost to the City of Las Vegas or to the developer, to accommodate redevelopment of the site.

3. The off-premise advertising (billboard) signs and its supporting structure shall be properly maintained and kept free of graffiti at all times. Failure to perform the required maintenance may result in fines and/or removal of the off-premise advertising (billboard) sign.

4. If any of the existing off-premise advertising sign structures are removed, this Special Use Permit shall be expunged for that particular off-premise advertising sign structure and a new off-premise advertising sign structure shall not be erected in the same location unless: (1) a new Special Use Permit is approved for the new structure by the City Council, or (2) the location is in compliance with all applicable standards of Title 19A including, but not limited to, distance separation requirements, or (3) a Variance to the applicable standards of Title 19A has been approved for the new structure by the City Council.

City of Las Vegas

Agenda Item No.: 35

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 28, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER [ ] **CONSENT** [X] **DISCUSSION**

SUBJECT:

Z-0096-98(3) - CARINA CORPORATION - Request for a Site Development Plan Review FOR A 57-LOT ADDITION TO AN APPROVED SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION on 10.39 acres located adjacent to the east side of Cimmaron Road, approximately 1,300 feet north of Farm Road (APN: 125-16-501-002), U (Undeveloped) Zone [PCD (Planned Community Development) General Plan Designation] [PROPOSED: R-PD5 (Residential Planned Development - 5 Units Per Acre)], Ward 6 (Mack).

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:		APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:	
Planning Commission Mtg.	0	Planning Commission Mtg.	0
City Council Meeting		City Council Meeting	

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

GOYNES - APPROVED subject to conditions with Condition 9 being amended as follows:

> **Any *perimeter* property line wall shall be a decorative block wall, with at least 20 percent contrasting materials. Wall heights shall be measured from the side of the fence with the least vertical exposure above the finished grade, unless otherwise stipulated.**

– UNANIMOUS with GALATI and QUINN excused

To be heard by the City Council on 4/3/2002.

MINUTES:

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing open.

LAURA MARTIN, Planning and Development, stated that this is a request to redesign the northern boundary of the previously approved Lamplight Village Estates in the Centennial Springs subdivision in order to add this property to the subdivision. The Planning Commission recommended approval of the rezoning to R-PD5 at their January 24, 2002 meeting. The entire subdivision will be developed with 285 lots with typical lot sizes of 4,250 square feet. The overall density of 5.4 units per acre conforms to the PCD General Plan designation and the existing development of the area.

MINUTES - Continued:

Access to this site will be via one gated entrance off of Cimarron Road and throughout the subdivision via 38-foot private streets. The submitted landscape plan depicts the required amount of open space for the entire subdivision and is consistent with the Urban Design guidelines and standards

Staff recommended approval, subject to the conditions.

ED TANEY, Taney Engineering, 4445 South Jones Boulevard, appeared on behalf of the applicant. He clarified that the wall referred to in Condition 9 is intended to be only on the perimeter. In addition, the Staff Report indicates there would be a 12-foot landscape buffer along Cimarron Road and he requested the six-foot landscape buffer along Palm Grove Lane be continued. JOEL McCULLOCH, Planning and Development, said any perimeter property line wall could be inserted into Condition 9. The 12-foot landscape buffer was inadvertently written in the Staff Report as 12 feet, but is indicated on the site plan as six feet.

MR. TANEY said they are adding ten acres onto an existing subdivision on the northern end.

COMMISSIONER McSWAIN asked if there are other ways to get in and out of this project besides Cimarron Road. MR. TANEY replied that the primary entrance is off of Farm Road (with a secondary egress on Cimarron Road, and third ingress/egress as noted on the monitor.)

No one appeared in opposition.

There was no further discussion.

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing closed.

(8:36 - 8:40)

2-1869

CONDITIONS:

Planning and Development

1. The City Council shall approve a Rezoning (Z-0105-01) to a R-PD5 (Residential Planned Development – 5 Units Per Acre) Zoning District.

CONDITIONS - Continued:

2. This Site Development Plan Review shall expire two years from date of final approval unless it is exercised or an Extension of Time is granted by the City Council.

3. All development shall be in conformance with the site plan and building elevations, except as amended by conditions herein.

4. The standards for this development shall include the following: minimum lot size of 3,500 square feet, maximum density of 5.49 Dwelling Units per Gross Acre, minimum distance between buildings of 10 feet, lot coverage shall not exceed 50%, and building height shall not exceed two stories or 35 feet, whichever is less.

5. The setbacks for this development shall be a minimum of 15 feet to the front of the house, 18 feet to the front of the garage as measured from back of sidewalk or from back of curb if no sidewalk is provided, 5 feet on the side, 10 feet on the corner side, and 15 feet in the rear.

6. A landscaping plan must be submitted prior to or at the same time application is made for a building permit.

7. Air conditioning units shall not be mounted on rooftops.

8. All utility boxes exceeding 27 cubic feet in size shall meet the standards of Municipal Code Section 19A.12.050.

9. Any property line wall shall be a decorative block wall, with at least 20 percent contrasting materials. Wall heights shall be measured from the side of the fence with the least vertical exposure above the finished grade, unless otherwise stipulated.

10. A fully operational fire protection system, including fire apparatus roads, fire hydrants and water supply, shall be installed and shall be functioning prior to construction of any combustible structures.

11. All City Code requirements and design standards of all City departments must be satisfied.

Public Works

12. Dedicate 40 feet of right-of-way adjacent to this site for Cimarron Road and 30 feet for Palm Grove Lane.

CONDITIONS - Continued:

13. Construct half-street improvements including appropriate overpaving (if legally able) on Cimarron Road and Palm Grove Lane adjacent to this site concurrent with development of this site. Install all appurtenant underground facilities, if any, adjacent to this site needed for the future traffic signal system concurrent with development of this site. All existing paving damaged or removed by this development shall be restored at its original location and to its original width concurrent with development of this site.

14. Meet with the Traffic Engineering Representative in Land Development for assistance in the possible redesign of the proposed driveway access, on site circulation and parking lot layout prior to the submittal of any construction plans or the issuance of any permits, whichever may occur first. Driveways shall be designed, located and constructed in accordance with Standard Drawing #222a.

15. An update to the approved Traffic Impact Analysis must be submitted to and approved by the Department of Public Works prior to the issuance of any building or grading permits, submittal of any construction drawings or the recordation of a Final Map for this site, whichever may occur first. Comply with the recommendations of the approved Traffic Impact Analysis prior to occupancy of the site. Phased compliance will be allowed if recommended by the approved Traffic Impact Analysis. No recommendation of the approved Traffic Impact Analysis, nor compliance therewith, shall be deemed to modify or eliminate any condition of approval imposed by the Planning Commission or the City Council on the development of this site.

16. A Master Streetlight Plan for the overall subdivision shall be approved prior to the submittal of any construction drawings for this site.

17. The design and layout of all onsite private circulation and access drives shall meet the approval of the Department of Fire Services prior to the issuance of any permits.

18. A Homeowner's Association shall be established to maintain all perimeter walls, private roadways, landscaping and common areas created with this development. All landscaping shall be situated and maintained so as to not create sight visibility obstructions for vehicular traffic at all development access drives and abutting street intersections. The CC&R's for the Homeowner's Association shall be submitted to and approved by the City Attorney's Office.

19. The final layout of the subdivision shall be determined at the time of approval of the Tentative Map.

CONDITIONS - Continued:

20. The submitted Drainage Study must be accepted by the Department of Public Works prior to recordation of a Final Map.

21. Site development to comply with all applicable conditions of approval for Z-0105-01, Z-0096-98, VAC-0054-99, and all other site-related actions.

City of Las Vegas

Agenda Item No.: 36

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 28, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER [ ] **CONSENT** [X] **DISCUSSION**

SUBJECT:

Z-0100-64(180) - CITY OF LAS VEGAS REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY ON BEHALF OF PIONEER ENDEAVORS - Request for a Site Development Plan Review FOR A PROPOSED 72,178 SQUARE FOOT FOUR-STORY RETAIL/OFFICE BUILDING, FOR A WAIVER OF THE DOWNTOWN CENTENNIAL PLAN LANDSCAPE REQUIREMENT, AND FOR A WAIVER OF THE OFF-STREET PARKING REQUIREMENTS on 0.56 acres adjacent to the southeast corner of Fourth Street and Clark Avenue (APN: 139-34-303-002), C-1 (Limited Commercial) Zone under Resolution of Intent to C-2 (General Commercial), Ward 3 (Reese).

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:		**APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:**	
Planning Commission Mtg.	**0**	**Planning Commission Mtg.**	**0**
City Council Meeting		**City Council Meeting**	

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

GOYNES - ABEYANCE to 3/28/2002 Planning Commission meeting - Motion carried with BUCKLEY abstaining as the applicant is a client of his law firm and GALATI and QUINN excused

MINUTES:

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing open.

JOEL McCULLOCH, Planning and Development, stated that this office building is allowed within a C-2 zoning district. With the conditions regarding screening of the service boxes, relocation or burial of the overhead transmission lines, irrigated ground landscape, façade improvements and redesign of the handicapped parking, this request meets the standards as set forth in the Downtown Centennial Plan. Staff recommended approval, subject to the conditions.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 28, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 36 - Z-0100-64(180)

MINUTES - Continued:

MARK SCHIEFF, 7471 Darby Avenue, represented the applicant. There are still a number of conditions they would like to review with staff. He requested this item be held in abeyance to the next meeting.

No one appeared in opposition.

CHRIS GLORE, Planning and Development, felt that since this project is more complex than others, he requested this item be held to the 3/28/2002 Planning Commission meeting.

There was no further discussion.

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing closed.

(8:40 - 8:43)

2-2058

City of Las Vegas

Agenda Item No.: 37

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 28, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER [ ] **CONSENT** [X] **DISCUSSION**

SUBJECT:

DB-0020-01 - CITY OF LAS VEGAS - Discussion and Possible action on the West Las Vegas Neighborhood Plan.

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:		APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:	
Planning Commission Mtg.	1	Planning Commission Mtg.	0
City Council Meeting		City Council Meeting	

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report
4. Follow-up to the West Las Vegas Neighborhood Plan Briefing

MOTION:

GOYNES - APPROVED subject to condition - UNANIMOUS with GALATI and QUINN excused

To be forwarded to the City Council in Ordinance form.

MINUTES:

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing open.

MARGO WHEELER, Planning and Development, stated this item was before the Planning Commission on 1/24/2002 for a preliminary review of the Neighborhood Plan prepared by the Department of Neighborhood Services. There were several issues such as job creation, incentives, live/work opportunities, and Revolving Loan Program language. The Planning and Development staff members and concerned citizens worked on this project and reviewed those comments.

The Planning team from the Department of Neighborhood Services has requested alternative language to read: To support adherence to existing commercial and residential development standards, including the prohibition of billboards in residential areas. That concurs with Planning and Development staff's concerns.

MINUTES - Continued:
Staff recommended approval.

PASTOR JOSEPH SAYLES, 1313 West Van Buren Avenue, said the Plan has been reduced. He thanked everyone who has worked on this Plan.

KEN EVANS, 830 North Sloan, #201, urged approval so they could move forward with the project. They will amend the billboard language as requested. If there are requests for waivers of landscaping, parking, etc. the standards need to be adhered to so that this can be developed in the same manner as other areas of the valley. Participants in the planning process were developers, business owners, faith-based institutions, non-profit service providers, Clark County School District, Regional Transportation Commission, medical professionals, NAACP, and residents of the area that are familiar with economic and commercial development. They will be submitting a list of the backgrounds of the members of the planning team. The community wants development to benefit everyone. There is a market for small businesses.

The creation of standards and strategies represents the next level of action. When developers come before the Planning Commission they need to adhere to the standards.

In the area of economic development, they want to see jobs, businesses, and vacant areas developed.

There are a significant number of churches in the area.

PASTOR SAYLES added that many churches are challenged by circumstances such as the sale of alcohol and the issuance of gaming licenses. Those situations should not overshadow the benefits and values that churches provide. PASTOR SAYLE declared that a number of churches are positive assets, rather than liabilities. Churches are interested in providing jobs and services currently being provided by social service agencies.

MR. EVANS added that this plan contains socio-economic and demographic data. However, they would like to wait until the income data is available and proceed with obtaining additional demographic data. That will allow them to make evaluations in respect to commercial, economic and housing development. The action plan portion is the focal point of the plan. The committee will document all recommendations, keep track of the primary contacts, estimates of completion dates and actual completion dates, as well as ongoing status reports and related comments. It is hoped that this plan does not just end up being put on a shelf. The committee welcomes any future comments. He thanked everyone involved.

MINUTES - Continued:

TODD FARLOW, 240 North 19th Street, appeared in protest. This is a plan for tax money for businesses and investments. They are advocating churches which go off the tax rolls.

ROSETTA JORDAN, Executive Director West Side New Pioneers, Planning Team Member, clarified that they are not asking for the City to give any special assistance. They are attempting to make their community comparable to others in the valley.

COMMISSIONER McSWAIN asked if there are existing billboards in the area that they would like to have removed. MR. EVANS responded that there are a few billboards that exist on some islands within the West Las Vegas area.

COMMISSIONER McSWAIN asked if they plan to be a watch group. MR. EVANS explained that there is the West Las Vegas Executive Board and now the West Las Vegas Planning Team, who hope to be consulted prior to any development within the area. CITY COUNCILMAN LAWRENCE WEEKLY requested any applications in his ward go before a community forum prior to the Planning Commission. PASTOR SAYLES said he serves as Chair of the West Las Vegas Executive Board and they try to disseminate information throughout the community so they can get community input. They want the highest and best use for the property. COMMISSIONER McSWAIN thought this group should take a firm stand on certain issues. MR. EVANS said they recognize the number of churches in that area is a challenge. They hope to work with the churches to get them involved in that process. He gave an example of a church in Atlanta, Georgia which acquired land in the immediate proximity of the church and slowly a laundromat, school, strip mall and small housing development were developed.

COMMISSIONER EVANS wondered if there has been any thought given to having a core in West Las Vegas. MR. EVANS said there is a core area. The West Las Vegas area is comprised of Lake Mead Boulevard on the north, Bonanza Road on the southern boundary, I-15 on the eastern boundary, and Rancho Drive on the western boundary. Within the core is Martin L. King, Owens, Nucleus Plaza, and Vons. In addition, there is a historical trail that is being developed throughout Clark County.

COMMISSIONER GOYNES said he has asked to be included in meetings pertaining to the Plan.

There was no further discussion.

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing closed.

(8:43 - 9:11)

2-2193

CONDITION:

1. Amend language of Recommendation 2.1.2 to reflect current code.

City of Las Vegas

Agenda Item No.: 38

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 28, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER [ ] **CONSENT** [X] **DISCUSSION**

SUBJECT:

ABEYANCE - SD-0080-01 - MIGUEL FAMILY TRUST ON BEHALF OF ROBERT A. CAVANAUGH - Request for a Site Development Plan Review FOR AN EXPANSION OF AN EXISTING RETAIL CENTER AND A REDUCTION IN REQUIRED PARKING LOT AND PERIMETER LANDSCAPING on 10 acres generally located on the east side of Eastern Avenue approximately 205 feet south of Owens Avenue (APN: 139-25-101-006), C-1 (Limited Commercial) and C-2 (General Commercial) Zones, Ward 5 (Weekly).

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:		APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:	
Planning Commission Mtg.	0	Planning Commission Mtg.	0
City Council Meeting		City Council Meeting	

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

McSWAIN - APPROVED subject to conditions with Condition 13 deleted - UNANIMOUS with GALATI and QUINN excused

This is final action.

MINUTES:

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing open.

LAURA MARTIN, Planning and Development, stated that access to this site is from two existing driveways onto Owens Avenue and three existing driveways onto Eastern Avenue. The revised site plan indicates 35,254 square feet of additional retail space in the Eastern/Owens Center. The Staff Report reflects the square footage of the original site plan. The addition will be located at the south end of the site perpendicular to the existing retail to the east.

MINUTES - Continued:

The building elevations depict architecture to match the existing retail center. The landscape plan meets the intent of the Urban Design Standards and Guidelines by reducing unsightly views and contributing to the overall attractiveness of the City. The applicant has requested a reduction in the amount of perimeter and parking lot landscaping. There is adequate justification for this request with the exception of the provision for parking lot landscape planter islands. There is a condition to provide landscape planter islands at the end of each parking row in a minimum of one additional parking lot landscape planter finger island with a minimum of two 24-inch box trees within each parking row exceeding 24 spaces.

Staff recommended approval, subject to the conditions.

BILL CHILDS, 2001 South Rainbow Boulevard, represented the applicant. In regard to Condition 13, there is a wall along the eastern property line. Along the southern property line there is a 10-foot high wrought iron fence that is used primarily for security. There will be security lighting in the back of the building. He objected to reducing that fence to six feet. It is currently screened to make the fence less noticeable and they would be willing to add more screening. MR. McCULLOCH said staff would be willing to delete Condition 13.

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL felt the renovation of the Center is long overdue and can be a great asset to that area of the community. In regard to the additional parcels on the corner, VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL asked if any thought was given to cross access? MR. CHILDS replied that they have not. One of the driveways may become a common driveway with the retail center immediately to the south.

There was no further discussion.

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing closed.

(9:11 - 9:17)

2-3640

CONDITIONS:

Planning and Development

1. This Site Development Plan Review shall expire two years from date of final approval unless it is exercised or an Extension of Time is granted by the City Council.

2. The site plan shall be revised and approved by the Planning and Development Department staff, prior to the time application is made for a building permit, to depict one of the provided handicap accessible parking spaces in front of the new retail as “van accessible”. All handicap access aisles shall access forward, either provide ramps to each access aisle or cut the existing sidewalk so that the asphalt and walk are flush. All handicap parking spaces shall meet the minimum design requirements of Section 19A.10.010(G3a).

CONDITIONS – Continued:

3. Pave the portion of the site where the abandoned gas station is located and remove the chain link fence trash enclosure area at the south side of the abandoned gas station.

4. Remove the telephone pole at the north end of the "new" parking lot.

5. The landscape plan shall be revised and approved by the Planning and Development Department staff, prior to the time application is made for a building permit, to provide landscape planter islands at the end of each parking row and a minimum of one additional parking lot landscape planter finger island with a minimum of two 24-inch box trees within each parking row exceeding 24 parking spaces; and to meet the minimum planting requirements of the Las Vegas Urban Design Standards and Guidelines.

6. All development shall be in conformance with the site plan and building elevations, except as amended by conditions herein.

7. All mechanical equipment, air conditioners and trash areas shall be fully screened in views from the abutting streets.

8. Landscaping and a permanent underground sprinkler system shall be installed as required by the Planning Commission or City Council and shall be permanently maintained in a satisfactory manner. [Failure to properly maintain required landscaping and underground sprinkler systems shall be cause for revocation of a business license.]

9. A landscaping plan must be submitted prior to or at the same time application is made for a building permit.

10. Wallpack lighting shall utilize 'shoe-box' fixtures and downward-directed lights on the proposed building. Non-residential property lighting shall be directed away from residential property or screened, and shall not create fugitive lighting on adjacent properties.

11. A Master Sign Plan shall be approved by the Planning Commission prior to the issuance of any business license on the property.

12. All City Code requirements and design standards of all City departments must be satisfied.

CONDITIONS - Continued:

13. If not already existing, the applicant shall construct a six-foot high decorative block wall, with at least 20 percent contrasting materials, along the side and rear property lines. Fence heights shall be measured from the side of the fence with the least vertical exposure above the finished grade, unless otherwise stipulated.

14. A fully operational fire protection system, including fire apparatus roads, fire hydrants and water supply, shall be installed and shall be functioning prior to construction of any combustible structures.

15. All City Code requirements and design standards of all City departments must be satisfied.

Public Works

16. Remove all substandard public street improvements and unused driveway cuts adjacent to this site, if any, and replace with new improvements meeting current City Standards concurrent with development of this site.

17. Meet with the Traffic Engineering Representative in Land Development for assistance in the possible redesign of the proposed driveway access, on site circulation and parking lot layout prior to the submittal of any construction plans or the issuance of any permits, whichever may occur first. Driveways shall be designed, located and constructed in accordance with Standard Drawing #222a. Driveways onto Eastern Avenue shall receive approval from the Nevada Department of Transportation.

CONDITIONS - Continued:

18. A Traffic Impact Analysis must be submitted to and approved by the Department of Public Works prior to the issuance of any building or grading permits, recordation of a Final Map or submittal of any construction drawings whichever may occur first. Comply with the recommendations of the approved Traffic Impact Analysis prior to occupancy of the site. The City shall determine area traffic mitigation contribution requirements based upon information provided in the approved Traffic Impact Analysis; such monies shall be contributed prior to the issuance of any permits or recordation of a Final Map for this site. The Traffic Impact Analysis shall also include a section addressing Standard Drawings #234.1 #234.2 and #234.3 to determine additional right-of-way requirements for bus turnouts adjacent to this site, if any; dedicate all areas recommended by the approved Traffic Impact Analysis. All additional rights-of-way required by Standard Drawing #201.1 for exclusive right turn lanes and dual left turn lanes shall be dedicated prior to or concurrent with the commencement of on-site development activities unless specifically noted as not required in the approved Traffic Impact Analysis. If additional rights-of-way are not required and Traffic Control devices are or may be proposed at this site outside of the public right-of-way, all necessary easements for the location and/or access of such devices shall be granted prior to the issuance of permits for this site. Phased compliance will be allowed if recommended by the approved Traffic Impact Analysis. No recommendation of the approved Traffic Impact Analysis, nor compliance therewith, shall be deemed to modify or eliminate any condition of approval imposed by the Planning Commission or the City Council on the development of this site.

    Alternatively, in lieu of a Traffic Impact Analysis, the applicant may participate in a reasonable alternative mutually acceptable to the applicant and the Department of Public Works.

19. A Drainage Plan and Technical Drainage Study or other acceptable information must be submitted to and approved by the Department of Public Works prior to the issuance of any building or grading permits, submittal of any construction drawings or the recordation of a Final Map for this site, whichever may occur first. Provide and improve all drainageways recommended in the approved drainage plan/study.

20. Submit an application for an Occupancy Permit for all landscaping and private improvements in the Eastern Avenue public right-of-way adjacent to this site prior to the issuance of any permits.

City of Las Vegas

Agenda Item No.: 39

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 28, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER [ ] **CONSENT** [X] **DISCUSSION**

SUBJECT:

ABEYANCE - Z-0139-88(41) - TRIPLE FIVE NEVADA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION - Request for a Site Development Plan Review and Reduction in the Perimeter Landscape Requirement FOR A PROPOSED 3,600 SQUARE FOOT STORAGE BUILDING at 9450 West Sahara Avenue (APN: 163-06-816-030), C-1 (Limited Commercial) Zone, Ward 2 (L.B. McDonald).

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:		**APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:**	
Planning Commission Mtg.	**0**	**Planning Commission Mtg.**	**0**
City Council Meeting		**City Council Meeting**	

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends DENIAL.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

McSWAIN - ABEYANCE TO 3/28/2002 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING - UNANIMOUS with GALATI and QUINN excused

NOTE: VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL announced he has had several dealings with this applicant and has abstained on their items in the past, but did not feel that would affect his ability to vote on an abeyance.

MINUTES:

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing open.

JOEL McCULLOCH, Planning and Development, stated the applicant has requested this item be held in abeyance to the 3/28/2002 Planning Commission meeting in order to modify the application.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF JANUARY 24, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item B-39 - Z-0139-88(41)

MINUTES - Continued:

JAMES GRINDSTAFF, 2230 Corporate Circle, appeared on behalf of the applicant. During the redesign of the building it was discovered there were some underground utility issues that needed to be taken care of. He requested this item be held in abeyance for 30 days.

No one appeared in opposition.

There was no further discussion.

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing closed.

(6:12 - 6:13)

1-380

City of Las Vegas

Agenda Item No.: 40

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 28, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER [ ] **CONSENT** [X] **DISCUSSION**

SUBJECT:

DB-0002-02 - JAMES D. MASON - Appeal of a Directors Decision to DENY a request for a home occupation permit which would have allowed a forensic firearms examiner where Title 19A.18.110G Item E states that business activity involving ammunition or firearms shall not be permitted as a home occupation at 8301 Spanish Meadows (APN: 125-09-313-023), Ward 6 (Mack).

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:		APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:	
Planning Commission Mtg.	0	Planning Commission Mtg.	0
City Council Meeting		City Council Meeting	

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends DENIAL.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report
4. Letter from James D. Mason

MOTION:

BUCKLEY - APPROVED subject to amending conditions as follows:

3. Live ammunition must be secured in *an appropriate safe and in containers appropriate for the storage of ammunition*.

4. The applicant must comply on an ongoing basis with all *local, state and federal firearms* licensing requirements.

5. The applicant must comply with all the *applicable* requirements of the City Zoning Code;

and added conditions for a one year review and for an operable and maintained alarm system - UNANIMOUS with GALATI and QUINN excused

This is final action.

MINUTES:

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing open.

MINUTES - Continued:

JOEL McCULLOCH, Planning and Development, stated the applicant's Home Occupation permit was formally denied on January 25, 2002 by the Director of the Planning and Development Department based on the requirements of Section 19.18.110 (G)(1) Chapter E, which states that no motor vehicle repair, paint or body work, commercial preparation of food for service on the premises, business related to or involving explosives, ammunitions or weapons; beauty parlor or barber shop, or ambulance or related emergency services shall be permitted as a Home Occupation. This business does not conform to the letter of the Zoning Code. Staff recommended denial.

JAMES D. MASON, 8301 Spanish Meadows, said he has recently retired after 38 years as a college professor. He moved to Las Vegas to avoid onerous gun laws in California. In that state he conducted a consulting business for 30 years as a forensic witness, etc. His concern with the Zoning Code section is that is throws in businesses related to or involving explosives, ammunitions or weapons with other businesses that involve knives, traffic, etc. What he does is consult with professional clients. The activity that is done in the home is to examine gun parts that are given to him as evidence. He photograph unusual things. No one goes to his home and there is no danger. There will be guns stored in a safe in his home. The safe can hold up to 40 guns and weighs 2,200 lbs. He has a security system in his home. This activity was permitted in San Diego.

COMMISSIONER McSWAIN did not believe the law was intended to disallow this type of activity. It would not be a hazard in the neighborhood.

COMMISSIONER BUCKLEY asked if there is a homeowners association in his neighborhood. MR. MASON said there is a homeowners association, but he has not approached them in regard to his intentions. Previously he was in a homeowners association for 17 years and all the neighbors were aware of what he was doing. He preferred to contact his present homeowners association after he has become more acquainted with his neighbors. He speculated that many residents in the area have firearms.

MR. MASON wondered about the word fireproof in Condition 3. In addition, he questioned complying with all governmental licensing requirements in Condition 4. There are probably many requirements on the State and Federal level. In reference to Condition 5, he has no idea how many requirements would pertain to this activity in the City Zoning Code.

MINUTES - Continued:

COMMISSIONER EVANS was concerned about circumventing the code. DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY BRYAN SCOTT thought the Commission should determined the intent of the regulations.

COMMISSIONER EVANS thought the neighbors should be aware of this business activity. DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY SCOTT noted that this application was notified in the newspaper. In addition, the Planning Commission does not have the ability to enforce CC&R's, but they could be taken into consideration. COMMISSIONER EVANS wondered who reads the legal notices in the newspaper.

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL commended the applicant for making his business known and coming before the City. Since there is very little apparent activity involved with this business it would be possible for the neighbors to be unaware of what is taking place. This seems to be a reasonable home occupation.

MR. MASON said he does not solicit business. There are periods when he does not have any cases and then periods where he has several.

COMMISSIONER EVANS asked MR. MASON if he would object to having a condition added to have an operable and maintained alarm system. MR. MASON said he plans to have an operable alarm system and will be adding an alarm system in his garage.

JOHN KOSWAN, Planning and Development, explained that Condition 3 could be amended by having the live ammunition secured and in an appropriate safe and in containers appropriate to the storage of ammunition. As far as the applicant complying with all ongoing governmental licensing requirements in Condition 4, that condition could be amended to state: The applicant must comply on an ongoing basis with all local, state and federal firearms licensing requirements. Condition 5 could be amended to state: The applicant must comply with all the applicable requirements of the City Zoning Code.

There was no further discussion.

MINUTES - Continued:

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing closed.

(9:17 - 9:40)

3-170

CONDITIONS:

1. No public sales of firearms are allowed as a part of this home occupation permit.

2. Test firing must be done at licensed shooting ranges.

3. Live ammunition must be secured in a fireproof safe when not being actively examined.

4. The applicant must comply on an ongoing basis with all governmental licensing requirements.

5. The applicant must comply with all the requirements of the City Zoning Code.

City of Las Vegas

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 28, 2002

CITIZENS PARTICIPATION:

Items raised under this portion of the Planning Commission agenda cannot be deliberated or acted upon until the notice provisions of the Open Meeting Law have been met. If you wish to speak on a matter not listed on the agenda, please step up to the podium and clearly state your name and address. In consideration of others, avoid repetition, and limit your comments to no more than three (3) minutes. To ensure all persons equal opportunity to speak, each subject matter will be limited to ten (10) minutes.

MINUTES:

MR. McCULLOCH, Planning and Development, informed the Commissioners that Title 19A is no longer in existence as it is now officially Title 19.

COMMISSIONER EVANS asked for an updated map of the Centennial Hills and Town Center Plans.

COMMISSIONER McSWAIN commented on a letter in the backup information for Item 11 [GPA-0047-01] which states the writer "objects vehemently to the City of Las Vegas request to amend portions of the application. Detailing this objection would accomplish nothing." She would hope that person would reconsider their position because she listens to what people say and needs the input from the community.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 9:41 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted:

_____

LINDA OWENS, DEPUTY CITY CLERK