

**Planning & Development Department
Scanning Cover Sheet**

Case No A-8-61

APN N/A

Location N/A

Applicant North Las Vegas Investment Co.

Subject

Proposal for Annexation: Northeast One-
Quarter of Section 35, Township 20 South,
Range 60 East.



ORDINANCE NO. 938

AN ORDINANCE ANNEXING TO, AND MAKING A PART OF THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS CERTAIN SPECIFICALLY DESCRIBED TERRITORY ADJOINING AND CONTIGUOUS TO THE CORPORATE LIMITS OF THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS; DECLARING SAID TERRITORY AND INHABITANTS TO BE ANNEXED THERETO AND SUBJECT TO ALL LAWS AND ORDINANCES; ORDERING A PLAT SHOWING SAID TERRITORY TO BE RECORDED IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF THE COUNTY OF CLARK, STATE OF NEVADA; AND PROVIDING OTHER MATTERS PROPERLY RELATED THERETO.

THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS DO ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. Pursuant to a Petition duly presented to the Board of Commissioners of the City of Las Vegas, signed by a majority of the freeholders in the area containing the hereinafter described parcel of real property requesting the Board of Commissioners of the City of Las Vegas to annex to and make a part of the City of Las Vegas, the hereinafter described parcel of real property, the exterior boundaries of the City of Las Vegas are hereby extended to annex to, and include therein, the following described parcel of real property, to-wit:

A certain tract or parcel of land lying and being situated in the County of Clark, State of Nevada, more particularly described as follows:

The Northeast One-Quarter (NE $\frac{1}{4}$) of Section 35, Township 20 South, Range 60 East, M.D.B.&M.

Together with the tenements, property and inhabitants within said parcel of real property is hereby declared to be a part of the City of Las Vegas.

SECTION 2. Said parcel of real property, together with the tenements and inhabitants thereof, shall be subject to all of the laws applicable to the City of Las Vegas.

SECTION 3. The City Engineer of the City of Las Vegas is hereby instructed to prepare plats of said territory described in Section 1 of this Ordinance and to file the same for record in the Office of the County Recorder of Clark County, Nevada.

SECTION 4. This Ordinance shall be in full force and effect upon its final passage and publication as in the next section provided.

SECTION 5. The City Clerk and Clerk of the Board of Commissioners of the City of Las Vegas shall cause this Ordinance to be published once a week for two successive weeks immediately following its final reading and adoption in a daily newspaper published in the City of Las Vegas, Nevada.

APPROVED:

ATTEST:

ORAN K. GRAGSON, Mayor

EDWINA M. COLE, City Clerk

The above and foregoing ordinance was first proposed and read by title to the Board of Commissioners on the 15th day of November, 1961, and referred to the following committee composed of Commissioners _____ and _____ for recommendation; thereafter the said committee reported favorably on said ordinance on the _____ day of _____, 1961, which was a regular meeting of said Board; that at said regular meeting the proposed ordinance was read by title to the Board of Commissioners as first introduced and adopted by the following vote:

VOTING "AYE": _____

VOTING "NAY": _____

ABSENT: _____

ATTEST:

APPROVED:

EDWINA M. COLE, City Clerk

ORAN K. GRAGSON, Mayor

A-8-61

ORDINANCE NO.
938 - ANNEXATION

Adopted

Commissioner Fountain, speaking for himself and in behalf of Commissioner Mirabelli, the other member of the Committee for Recommendation on this ordinance, voted said ordinance out of Committee favorably.

An ordinance entitled: "AN ORDINANCE ANNEXING TO, AND MAKING A PART OF THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS CERTAIN SPECIFICALLY DESCRIBED TERRITORY ADJOINING AND CONTIGUOUS TO THE CORPORATE LIMITS OF THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS; DECLARING SAID TERRITORY AND INHABITANTS TO BE ANNEXED THERETO AND SUBJECT TO ALL LAWS AND ORDINANCES; ORDERING A PLAT SHOWING SAID TERRITORY TO BE RECORDED IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF THE COUNTY OF CLARK, STATE OF NEVADA; AND PROVIDING OTHER MATTERS PROPERLY RELATED THERETO." was read by title by City Attorney Sidney R. Whitmore, (second reading)

Commissioner Fountain moved the foregoing entitled ordinance be ADOPTED.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Mirabelli and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Mirabelli, Levy, Fountain, Whipple, and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

REQUEST TO MOVE
A DWELLING WITHIN
THE CITY

Abeyance

REQUEST TO MOVE A DWELLING WITHIN THE CITY

From: Victory Row, Union Pacific RR property
To: 629 South 6th Street.

Director of Building and Safety, William E. Adams: It is again my request that we hold this in abeyance as we are having a zoning problem with the buildings that are existing there now. We have met twice today with the people and are still not in full agreement.

Commissioner Whipple: I'd like to ask Mr. Adams, is there a solution to it?

Mr. Adams: Yes, sir, there is a solution. It can be worked out.

Commissioner Fountain moved the request to move a dwelling from Victory Row, Union Pacific RR property, to 629 South 6th Street, be held in ABEYANCE.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Levy and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Mirabelli, Levy, Fountain, Whipple, and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

LOYAL ORDER OF
MOOSE - Proposed
sale of portion of
property held under
option to Sheriff's
Jeep Posse

Abeyance

Commissioner Fountain moved the request of the Loyal Order of Moose to sell a portion of the property which they now have under option to purchase from the City, to the Sheriff's Jeep Posse, be held in ABEYANCE.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Whipple and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Mirabelli, Levy, Fountain, Whipple, and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

Code Assistance Program - a very small part of the total report - says a great deal. I might note that our program reviewed last year when it was recertified by the Administrator was cited for excellence in the field of controlling urban blight with exclusively local powers. The Declaration of Policy, which is sort of a summary of the thing, I can summarize very quickly as follows. Most of you recall the Statement of Policy which was submitted in last year's program, indicating that the City was satisfied with the results to date of slum clearance and redevelopment but felt very strongly that this was logical only if we at the same time were strongly pursuing a program of slum prevention. This present policy statement, which I will read if you wish, or in summarizing, it says three things: 1, we hereby reaffirm our stand of last year - this is our fundamental policy, to not only clear up existing blight but to go strongly ahead to prevent blight; 2, we are particularly proud of our Code Assistance Program, which has been achieved without threatening a single person or taking one person to Court; and 3, while we're satisfied with our first stab at redevelopment, we recognize the need for a more efficient method of operation through a separate agency and are proposing to create same. That, in essence, I think covers the program. We would request the approval of this Board so that I may submit it to the H.H.F.A. for a recertification of our program.

Commissioner Whipple moved that the Annual Report of Progress on the Program for Community Improvement, as outlined by the Director of Planning, be APPROVED.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Fountain and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Mirabelli, Fountain, Whipple, and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

REZONING ORDINANCE
NO. 934-6

Adopted

An ordinance entitled: "AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND TITLE XI, CHAPTER 1, SECTION 3, MUNICIPAL CODE OF THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, 1960, BY AMENDING THE LAND USE PLAN MAP ADOPTED BY THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS, AND CHANGING THE ZONING DESIGNATION OF CERTAIN AREAS OF THE SAID MAP." was read by title by City Attorney, Sidney R. Whitmore.

Commissioner Whipple, speaking for himself and in behalf of Commissioner Mirabelli, the other member of the Committee for Recommendation on this ordinance, voted said ordinance out of Committee favorably.

Commissioner Whipple moved the foregoing entitled ordinance be ADOPTED.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Mirabelli and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Mirabelli, Fountain, Whipple, and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

A-8-61
ANNEXATION ORDINANCE
NO. 938

Abeyance

At the request of Commissioners Fountain and Mirabelli, the Committee for Recommendation, Annexation Ordinance No. 938 was held in ABEYANCE.

STAFF PRESENT:

George Ullom
Sidney R. Whitmore
Donald J. Saylor
Sigrid Dodgson

City Manager
City Attorney
Deputy Director of Planning
Assistant City Clerk

REZONING ORDINANCE
NO. 934-5

Adopted

Commissioner Fountain, speaking for himself and in behalf of Commissioner Mirabelli, the other member of the Committee for Recommendation on this ordinance, voted said ordinance out of Committee favorably.

An ordinance entitled: "AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND TITLE XI, CHAPTER 1, SECTION 3, MUNICIPAL CODE OF THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, 1960, BY AMENDING THE LAND USE PLAN MAP ADOPTED BY THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS, AND CHANGING THE ZONING DESIGNATION OF CERTAIN AREAS OF THE SAID MAP." was read by title by City Attorney, Sidney R. Whitmore.

Commissioner Fountain moved the foregoing entitled ordinance be ADOPTED.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Mirabelli and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Fountain, Mirabelli, and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

U-30-61

Approved

APPLICATION OF FREMONT HOTEL, INC., to construct a six-level ramp parking structure in excess of 50 feet in height on property legally described as

Lots 26 through 32, Block 15, Clark's Las Vegas Townsite,

generally located on the southwest corner of 2nd Street and Ogden Avenue, in Land Use Zone C-S.

Recommended for approval by Board of Zoning Adjustment.

Commissioner Mirabelli moved the above described application of Fremont Hotel, Inc. (U-30-61) be APPROVED.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Fountain and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Fountain, Mirabelli, and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

ANNEXATION ORDINANCE
NO. 938

Action of 12/6/61
adopting ordinance
rescinded.

Referred to
Committee

Annexation of Northeast Quarter (NE 1/4) of Section 35, Township 20 South, Range 60 East (area now known as east half of the La Mesa Tract).

It was suggested by Ernest A. Becker that the action taken by the Board of City Commissioners at the regular meeting of December 6, 1961, adopting Annexation Ordinance No. 938, should be rescinded and the ordinance adopted at a later meeting in order to allow for the vacation of streets and the rezoning classification by the County of Clark and in order that the tract map may then be properly recorded.

Deputy Director of Planning, Donald J. Saylor, concurred with Mr. Becker's suggestion.

Commissioner Fountain moved the action of the Board of City Commissioners at the regular meeting of December 6, 1961, adopting Annexation Ordinance No. 938, be RESCINDED.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Mirabelli and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Fountain, Mirabelli, and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

An ordinance entitled: "AN ORDINANCE ANNEXING TO, AND MAKING A PART OF THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS CERTAIN SPECIFICALLY DESCRIBED TERRITORY ADJOINING AND CONTIGUOUS TO THE CORPORATE LIMITS OF THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS; DECLARING SAID TERRITORY AND INHABITANTS TO BE ANNEXED THERETO AND SUBJECT TO ALL LAWS AND ORDINANCES; ORDERING A PLAT SHOWING SAID TERRITORY TO BE RECORDED IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF THE COUNTY OF CLARK, STATE OF NEVADA; AND PROVIDING OTHER MATTERS PROPERLY RELATED THERETO." was read by title by City Attorney Sidney R. Whitmore, who recommended it be referred to Committee.

Mayor Gragson appointed Commissioners Fountain and Mirabelli as the Committee for Recommendation on the foregoing entitled ordinance.

There being no further business to come before the Board, at the hour of 11:10 a.m., Commissioner Fountain moved the meeting be ADJOURNED.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Mirabelli and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Fountain, Mirabelli, and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

APPROVED:

ORAN K. GRAGSON, MAYOR

ATTEST:

ASSISTANT CITY CLERK

Ordinance
Referred to
Committee

THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, HAS ORDERED TO AMEND TITLE 21 OF THE CITY CODE OF MUNICIPAL ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, BY AMENDING THE LAND USE ZONING MAP TO REFLECT THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS' REDESIGNING THE ZONING DESIGNATION OF CERTAIN PORTIONS OF THE SAID MAP" was used by title b. City Attorney Susan R. Wainwright. (Tr. 1-28-84)

[illegible]

Adopted

© 1995 by McGraw-Hill, Inc. All rights reserved. Printed in the United States of America. This book is registered at the Copyright Clearance Center, Inc., 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923.

[illegible][illegible]

Adopted

On the 10th day of the month of January, 1904, the following Ordinance be voted and passed by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Santa Clara:

APPROVED AND ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, BY AMENDING SECTIONS 8, 9, 10 AND 11 OF THE CIVIL SERVICE RULES AND REGULATIONS OF THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS, COUNTY OF CLARK, STATE OF NEVADA, PROVIDING FOR INCREASED ELIGIBILITY OF APPLICANTS FOR THE SERVICE POSITIONS; PROVIDING OTHER MATTERS PROPERLY RELATING HERETO AND REFERRING ALL ORDINANCES, RESOLUTIONS OR ORDINANCES IN CONTRADICTION HEREWITH TO BE NULL AND VOID.

Most of the data for the model were obtained by the following procedure. First, the data for the 1970-1971 Whipple and McLaughlin study were used. Then, the data for the 1971-1972 study were used. Finally, the data for the 1972-1973 study were used.

Adopted

Ordinance No. 14, which is attached to the proposed Ordinance to amend the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance, is APPROVED:

AND TO CAUSE THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS TO JOIN TO, AND MAKING A PART OF THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS, THE LAND SPECIFICALLY DESCRIBED TERRITORY ADJOINING AND CONTIGUOUS TO THE CORPORATE LIMITS OF THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS, INCLUDING SAID TERRITORY AND JURISDICTION TO BE ANNEXED THERE TO, AND SUBJECT TO ALL LAWS AND ORDINANCES, ORDERING SAID CITY OF LAS VEGAS TO BE ANNEXED TO THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS, AND TO BE RECORDED IN THE OFFICE OF THE CLERK OF THE COUNTY OF CLARK, NEVADA, AND INCLUDING OTHER MATTERS OF RECORD RELATIVE TO SAID TERRITORY, TOGETHER WITH THE

Attorney Sidney R. Whitmore.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Mirabelli and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Mirabelli, Levy, Fountain, Whipple and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

MAYOR GRAGSON
APPOINTED MEMBER
OF A.M.A. CIVIL
DEFENSE
COMMITTEE

Authorized to
Attend meeting
in Washington
Dec. 13, 1961

Commissioner Fountain: I have a wire that was received by Mayor Gragson yesterday, December 5, 1961, from the President of the American Municipal Association. It says:

Honorable Mayor Oran K. Gragson
Mayor of the City of Las Vegas, Nevada

I am pleased to appoint you a member of the American Municipal Association Civil Defense Committee to consider adoption of a new National-Municipal policy on fallout shelter program at a meeting at 10:00 A.M., December 13th, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., adjourning at 3:00 P.M. Can you attend? Please notify American Municipal Association of arrival time.

Commissioner Fountain moved the Director of Finance be authorized to issue the appropriate travel expenses to Mayor Gragson to attend this meeting.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Levy and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Mirabelli, Levy, Fountain and Whipple voting aye; noes, none. Mayor Gragson passed his vote.

WIDENING OF
FIRST STREET
Priority
Set

Commissioner Fountain: Your Honor, I believe you were out of town when the widening of Second Street was approved by the Commission. The Second Street widening is not a part of the Downtown Improvement District, which this Commission has approved. I neglected to tell the Commission that in a meeting with the downtown merchants, with Mr. Sauer and myself, at that time it was agreed that Second Street, if approved by the Commission, would be widened and the next street to be approved for widening would be First Street.

Mayor Gragson: In other words, and I believe I am right, in that we are not required to meet any time schedule.

Commissioner Fountain: No specific date has been set. I now move that in the matter of the street widening schedule in the downtown area that First Street receive the next approval for widening from Stewart to Bridger Avenues following the widening of Second Street.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Whipple and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Mirabelli, Levy, Fountain, Whipple and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

There being no further business to come before the Commission at the hour of 11:10 P.M. Commissioner Whipple moved the meeting be ADJOURNED.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Fountain and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Mirabelli, Levy, Fountain, Whipple and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

APPROVED

ATTEST:

ORAN K. GRAGSON, MAYOR

CITY CLERK

improvement, such addresses and owners being those appearing on the local property assessment roll for general (ad valorem) taxes of the County of Clark, be and the same hereby is ratified and confirmed.

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City Clerk and Clerk of the Board of Commissioners be and she is hereby directed to publish notice of the time and place when and where the Board and the County Assessor and Ex-Officio City Assessor, will meet to consider objections to said Assessment Roll and to review said assessments by publication once a week for two successive weeks in the Las Vegas Review Journal, a daily newspaper published in the City of Las Vegas.

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the said Notice of Special Assessment shall be in substantially the same form attached to this Resolution and made a part hereof. "

Commissioner Whipple moved the foregoing Resolution on Assessment District No. 100-57 be ADOPTED.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Levy and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Mirabelli, Levy, Whipple and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

PROPOSED ORDINANCE
AMENDING CIVIL
SERVICE RULES

(First Reading)
Referred to
Committee

An ordinance entitled "AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND TITLE I, CHAPTER 18 OF THE MUNICIPAL CODE OF THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, 1960, BY AMENDING SECTIONS 340.8 AND 340.9 OF THE CIVIL SERVICE RULES AND REGULATIONS OF THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS, COUNTY OF CLARK, STATE OF NEVADA; PROVIDING FOR INCREASED ELIGIBILITY OF APPLICANTS FOR CIVIL SERVICE POSITIONS; PROVIDING OTHER MATTERS PROPERLY RELATED THERETO AND REPEALING ALL ORDINANCES OR PARTS OF ORDINANCES IN CONFLICT HEREWITH" was read by title by City Attorney Sidney R. Whitmore, who recommended it be referred to Committee.

Commissioner Whipple: I thought we just amended the Civil Service Rules. What does this ordinance propose to do?

City Manager, George Ullom: This was a matter of discussion before the Civil Service Board and representatives of the Police, the Fire and other employees of the City. Everybody is now in agreement and it amounts to making equal the grades on written and oral examinations at a level of 70%. After some study, it was believed this was the proper way to do it. The matter had just not come up before the Commission.

Mayor Gragson referred the above entitled proposed ordinance to Commissioners Mirabelli and Whipple as the Committee for Recommendation.

PROPOSED ORDINANCE
- ANNEXATION - EAST
HALF OF LA MESA TRACT
(First reading)
Referred to
Committee

Page 34
Minutes
11-15-61

An ordinance entitled: "AN ORDINANCE ANNEXING TO, AND MAKING A PART OF THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS CERTAIN SPECIFICALLY DESCRIBED TERRITORY ADJOINING AND CONTIGUOUS TO THE CORPORATE LIMITS OF THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS; DECLARING SAID TERRITORY AND INHABITANTS TO BE ANNEXED THERETO AND SUBJECT TO ALL LAWS AND ORDINANCES; ORDERING A PLAT SHOWING SAID TERRITORY TO BE RECORDED IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF THE COUNTY OF CLARK, STATE OF NEVADA AND PROVIDING OTHER MATTERS PROPERLY RELATED THERETO" was read by City Attorney, Sidney R. Whitmore, who recommended it be referred to Committee.

Mayor Gragson referred the above entitled ordinance to Commissioners Mirabelli and Whipple as the Committee for Recommendation.

PROPOSED ORDINANCE
FALSE AND FRAUDULENT
ADVERTISING

(First Reading)
Referred to
Committee

An ordinance entitled "AN ORDINANCE PROHIBITING FALSE AND FRAUDULENT ADVERTISING, INCLUDING ADVERTISING OF RATES BY RENTAL CAR AGENCIES WITHIN THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS; PROVIDING FOR INSURANCE; PROVIDING PENALTIES THEREFOR; PROVIDING OTHER MATTERS PROPERLY RELATED THERETO AND REPEALING ALL ORDINANCES AND PARTS OF ORDINANCES IN CONFLICT THEREWITH" was read by title by City Attorney, Sidney R. Whitmore, who recommended it be referred to Committee.

Mayor Gragson referred the above entitled proposed ordinance to Commissioners Fountain and Levy as the Committee for Recommendation.

There being no further business to come before the Board, at the hour of 10:15 P.M. Commissioner Whipple moved the meeting be ADJOURNED.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Levy and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Mirabelli, Levy, Whipple and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

APPROVED

ORAN K. GRAGSON, MAYOR

ATTEST

CITY CLERK

October 12, 1961

HON. MAYOR AND BOARD OF
CITY COMMISSIONERS

FRANKLIN J. BILLS,
Director of Planning

ANNEXATION OF EAST ONE-HALF (E₁)
OF LA MESA TRACT

Sidney R. Whitmore, City Attorney
George Ullom, City Manager

Following directive of Mayor and Board of Commissioners, a meeting was held on Thursday, October 12th, to consider the possibilities of early annexation of the E₁ of the La Mesa Tract, which has been petitioned by the owners of this property.

Present at the meeting were Sidney Whitmore, City Attorney; Ernest Becker, representing property owners; Attorney G. William Coulthard, representing Mr. Becker; and the undersigned.

Following discussion it was agreed that any attempt to annex this particular parcel, which is a part of the overall annexation previously instituted by action of the Board of City Commissioners, might have legal ramifications since the annexation of this parcel would necessarily change the overall description of property contained on all resolutions, public notices and notification to the Board of County Commissioners.

Mr. Becker and his attorney agreed to the following general procedures:

1. No action will be taken by the City towards the annexation of this property prior to November 15th, the date set for the public hearing on the overall annexation.
2. If the overall annexation is successful this property would, of course, be included.
3. In the event the overall annexation is unsuccessful for any reason, there could be introduced immediately by the Board of City Commissioners an ordinance to annex this parcel only. (E₁ of the La Mesa Tract)
4. In the event the overall annexation appears successful and is later legally challenged, the owners of this parcel will petition the Court for permission to release this parcel only from court review and permit its early annexation.

Mayor and Board of Commissioners
Re: Annexation E₁ of La Mesa Tract
October 12, 1961
Page Two.

- 5. Planning Department and other affected departments and agencies will work with the subdivider to set in motion proceedings for the necessary zoning change, the street vacations, and the issuance of building permits at the earliest moment possible following annexation.**
- 6. In the event the subdivider is able to work some arrangement to secure building permits issued by the County prior to annexation, the City will honor these building permits and provide the necessary inspections in accordance with previously agreed policy in such matters.**

FRANKLIN J. BILLS
Director of Planning

F
J
B:ec

CHARLESTON ASSOCIATES

5017 ALTA DRIVE
Charleston Heights
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA
ORCHARD 8-1903

October 101 1961

The Honorable Mayor
Oran Gragson
City of Las Vegas
Las Vegas, Nevada

Dear Sir:


This is a formal request for the annexation of the NE $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 35 which is by name the La Mesa Tract, adjoining the west end of the city limits.

This request is for action by the City to make this area a part of the City of Las Vegas, as soon as possible; and to act on this request prior to the proposed annexation of the 25 square miles anticipated by the City.

Being an owner of land in the above named area, I would appreciate every consideration to this request.

Yours very truly,

NORTH LAS VEGAS INVESTMENT CO.



Jay C. Casada
Treasurer

JCC.alg

CHARLESTON ASSOCIATES

5017 ALTA DRIVE
Charleston Heights
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA
ORCHARD 8-1903

October 10, 1961

The Honorable Mayor, Oran Gragson
City of Las Vegas
County of Clark, Nevada

Dear Sir:


This is a formal request for the annexation of the NE¹/₄ of Section 35 which is by name the La Mesa Tract, adjoining the west end of the city limits.

This request is for action by the City to make this area a part of the City of Las Vegas, as soon as possible; and to act on this request prior to the proposed annexation of the 25 square miles anticipated by the City.

Being an owner of land in the above area, I would appreciate every consideration to this request.

Yours very truly,

LA MESA DEVELOPMENT CO.


Jay C. Casada
Agent

JCC/alg

NEVSUR INSURANCE AGENCY INC.

Land Development Office

5017 ALTA DRIVE

Charleston Heights

LAS VEGAS, NEVADA

ORCHARD 8-1903

October 10, 1961

His Honor, Oran Gragson
Mayor, City of Las Vegas

Dear Sir:

This is a formal request for the annexation of the NE $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 35 which is by name The La Mesa Tract, adjoining the west end of the city limits.

This request is for action by the City to make this area a part of the City of Las Vegas, as soon as possible, and to act on this request prior to the proposed annexation of the 25 square miles anticipated by the City.

Being an owner of land in the above area, I would appreciate every consideration to this request.

Yours very truly,

NEVSUR INSURANCE AGENCY, INC.

William F. Kaercher

William F. Kaercher
Agent

WFK/alg

CHARLESTON ASSOCIATES

5017 ALTA DRIVE
Charleston Heights
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA
ORCHARD 8-1903

October 10, 1961

Oran Gragson, Mayor
City of Las Vegas

Dear Sir:


This is a formal request for the annexation of the NE $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section ✓
35 which is by name the La Mesa Tract, adjoining the west end of
the city limits.

This request is for action by the City to make this area a part of
the City of Las Vegas, as soon as possible, and to act on this re-
quest prior to the proposed annexation of the 25 square miles anti-
cipated by the City.

Being an owner of land in the above area, I would appreciate every
consideration to this request.

Yours very truly,

CHARLESTON ASSOCIATES



Ernest A. Becker
Agent

EAB/alg

Commissioner Levy moved the application of Sproul Homes, Inc., (V-19-61) to construct a house within a required side yard on property generally located at the southwest corner of Churchill Drive and Colleen Drive, in Land Use Zone R-1, be APPROVED.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Mirabelli and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Mirabelli, Levy, and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

ANNEXATION

Referred to City
Attorney and
Planning Dept.

PETITION OF CHARLESTON ASSOCIATES, NEVSUR INSURANCE AGENCY, INC., NORTH LAS VEGAS INVESTMENT CO., AND LA MESA DEVELOPMENT CO. for annexation of

The Northeast Quarter (NE 1/4) of Section 35, Township 20 South, Range 60 East,

generally known as the east half of the La Mesa Tract.

City Attorney, Sidney R. Whitmore: The procedure is that these matters have been referred to the Planning Commission and then back to this body for the adoption of an ordinance. I believe this is the first time this matter has come in and I don't believe it has been referred to Planning, has it Franklin?

Planning Director Bills: Not specifically in this case. I believe a part of this area, either all or part of it, was previously proposed for annexation, not by the same owner but in effect the same owner, some time ago, and then at time when the property just north of it was annexed, and then, for some reason or other, while it was under study, this petition was withdrawn. It is, of course, as you know, a part of the area which is now officially under consideration by this Board. I note from the request that there is a request to act on this separately, which I guess would be possible. I'm not sure, though. I think the City Attorney should review this quite carefully, unless he already has, to see whether or not taking this out of an area would in any way affect our other general annexation, and secondly, I think it would require some pretty fast moving to do it any sooner than we would propose on November 15th to annex the entire area. It could be set up, I would think, so that in the event for some reason the entire area is not annexed, this could be annexed forthwith.

Mr. Whitmore: Yes, I believe it could. I was of the opinion when I was asked about it by your department, that it would be ill advised to take this separately in view of the fact that it's a portion of that over-all area. I don't know that there is any legal provision that would prohibit it, but what all of the circumstances may be concerning the over-all annexation I think would require some discussion between possibly your department and others.

Commissioner Mirabelli: Wouldn't that change the description of the area that we propose to annex.

Mr. Whitmore: It would do that. It would change the description that's in that Resolution that's been presented to the County for over-all annexation.

Ernest Becker: I can show it on this map better. This is the piece we're talking about annexing here. There's a tract under construction at the present time here. The flood control goes through here.

Mr. Becker (continued):

We have a tract that's coming up for approval, which has been approved tentatively and the final map, I believe, is on the Planning Board tomorrow. This is the one that involves the well that's going to have to go through the State Engineer, the Water Board, and back to the State Engineer and probably before the Governor before it's solved. It's going to be impossible with that difficulty. The State Engineer has dragged his feet on it up to the present time to get the application through. We anticipated to be able to start houses in here in approximately 30 to 60 days. We have our last 60 lots to start here. But this is going to become a 4 months to a 5 months proposition if we started today to drill the well and order the pumps and have them installed to get water on the tract when the houses are ready for occupancy. Also, a further development that happened today--this is the second time--the flood control has now changed the flood channel in this area. The only solution we have is to go in this area in here, which at the present time is in the County. We anticipated to go from this tract down to this tract, but now these are conditions that seem to be way beyond our control. Several months ago, or at least a month ago, they were going to solve the problem, they felt, by wells. We felt that would be an easy solution, but the Water District, which we're in disagreement on the procedure how it happens but we are in agreement that it's probably a well that's going to have to do it. I was trying to get indications from the State Engineer and the Water Board that wells were the solution to this answer and not pumping station or bringing water from the reservoir at this location down here. If the elevated tank here cannot serve this high--only gives 30 pounds pressure, which we've had in the City for years before the District came in, but they claim now they'd like to have 40 pounds of pressure. So, instead of going to this tract, with all these things popping into it now, it seems like we've got to go in this area or completely leave the area and go into an area which is adjacent to the discussed annexation of North Las Vegas up on Tonopah Highway and down in the County to take care of the purchasers that Sproul has in the County, and leave this area until it either straightens itself out or we have to work out something here in a hurry. As it is, we will only have approximately a 60-day delay if we were able to use this property. And it seems to us that an annexation of that property would allow us to get in there and build. We have the water pressure there, the pipe lines in the ground--so is the sewer. It's one that, if possible, we would like to see happen. In studying some of these ordinances over--it seems that in a 10-day period we could have a hearing and vacate the streets and it's a short matter, as I understand it, to have it annexed. I don't know what the problem is in taking it out of the annexation of the over-all area. There is no guarantee and our public hearing on November 15th is too late for us anyway. If we have to wait for that hearing, we have to move elsewhere with our development. The only property we have at the present time happens to be both of them out of the City. It's unfortunate--it seems like every time we come in here it seems to be a crash program. Even if we could use Tract 29 at the present time, it seems like a problem now with the flood control. We designed the plan to what the flood control gave us. They made a mistake on this map here. The map they gave us was 200 feet off in dimensions and they agreed to the change here. Now I understand they are talking about an additional 600 feet to the west--you might remember 29 was the one where we had just a little bit over the 1200-foot street. You take 600 feet off that tract and we have a problem there. The tract that's in this area, 28, is designed so that we can't get into that area--we've got it in cul-de-sacs

because it backs into the flood control. We're just to a point here where it seems like this annexation, possibly, is the best way. We have the required ownership to ask for annexation and we have the proper ownership to take speedy action on the street vacations which have not been in use since the tract's been recorded. The streets are dedicated but there's no use on the streets whatsoever. So, this is what we wanted to talk over today. To wait for the November 15th meeting, that's our 30 days when we're going to hunt around for lots to put houses on. Now, this is our problem. If it can be solved some way, we'd certainly appreciate it. If it can't be solved, it can't be solved.

Mayor Gragson: (speaking to City Attorney) Do you have any suggestions as to how we can solve this?

Mr. Whitmore: I understand it involves an annexation and a vacation of a plat and a filing of a new subdivision plat. I don't have any suggestions on it other than referring it to the Planning Commission in our usual procedure. We're not in a position to do anything today because you must have an ordinance to refer in when you annex property. This was just brought in and certainly I don't have anything prepared to proceed on it at this time.

Mayor Gragson: I'd like to suggest, then, that we go over this and if it is feasible for us to annex this at this time, that we proceed at the fastest time possible, because frankly I think we are as anxious to have developments in this area as the developer is to put them there. How many homes would you be able to construct in there?

Mr. Becker: 124 on the piece in here. The Mormon Church owns one piece here--5 acres, I believe, on this corner. And we have 124 houses we can get in here, assuming that this change in the flood control, which we just found out about today, doesn't go east. We have 100 and some houses here. We actually could, with the Water District, go on a few houses in here before this was solved up here, because we have pressure at this point. This is what we have no problem with here, which gives us approximately a 60-day waiting period before we would be in a bind to give them more houses. This annexation would be done in, I think, plenty of time if your over-all annexation is not held up. But our problem comes in this piece right in here, which is approximately 5 or 6 hundred feet in depth, and parallels Jones Blvd.

Mayor Gragson: And how many acres are there in that tract?

Mr. Becker: There would be 35 acres, in round figures.

Mayor Gragson: You have other property in this area to be annexed, don't you?

Mr. Becker: The only other property we have is what's in the City at this point, part of this in here. We have this in here, which again is our water problem with the well. It takes two wells to develop this property here, which according to Mr. Renshaw is a hundred and forty to fifty thousand dollars expenditure.

Mayor Gragson: Then, Franklin, will you get with the City Attorney and proceed on this just as fast as you can and advise Mr. Becker at the earliest possible date if we can proceed on this annexation prior to the time of the over-all annexation program. We're going to get our heads together and see if there isn't some way that we can work this out.