



AGENDA MEMO

CITY COUNCIL MEETING DATE: OCTOBER 18, 2006

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

**ITEM DESCRIPTION: VAC-15661 - APPLICANT/OWNER: NERCES SARKIS
HIMIDIAN LIVING TRUST**

**** CONDITIONS ****

The Planning Commission (7-0 vote) and staff recommend APPROVAL, subject to:

1. The limits of this Vacation shall be the 30-foot radius corner located 40 feet south of Charleston Boulevard, along the west side of Hillside Place.
2. All existing 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 the Order of Vacation.
3. Reservation of easements for the facilities of the various utility companies together with reasonable ingress thereto and egress there from shall be provided if required.
4. All development shall be in conformance with code requirements and design standards of all City Departments.
5. The Order of Vacation shall not be recorded until all of the conditions of approval have been met provided, however, that conditions requiring modification of public improvements 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 or easement being vacated must be retained.
6. If the Order of Vacation is not recorded within one (1) year after approval by the City of Las Vegas or an Extension of Time is not granted by the Planning Director, then approval will terminate and a new petition must be submitted.

**** STAFF REPORT ****

APPLICATION REQUEST

This is a Petition to Vacate all portions of a radius corner generally located west of Hillside Place, south of Charleston Boulevard.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The proposed Vacation Petition will not have a negative affect on the area. This Vacation will allow the currently undeveloped infill parcel to be developed. The Planning Department and Department of Public Works support this Vacation Petition. Approval of this request is recommended.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A) Related Actions

09/21/06 The Planning Commission voted 7-0 to recommend APPROVAL (PC Agenda Item #10/ng).

B) Pre-Application Meeting

A pre-application meeting is not required for a Vacation Petition.

C) Neighborhood Meetings

A neighborhood meeting is not required for a Vacation Petition, nor was one held.

DETAILS OF APPLICATION REQUEST

The subject property is legally described as a thirty-foot (30) radius corner generally located forty feet (40) south of the south right-of-way line of Charleston Boulevard, at the west right-of-way line of Hillside Place; said property being a portion of the Northwest Quarter (NW $\frac{1}{4}$) of the Northeast Quarter (NE $\frac{1}{4}$) of the Northwest Quarter (NW $\frac{1}{4}$) of Section 2, Township 21 South, Range 61 East, M.D.M.

ANALYSIS

A) *Planning discussion*

The vacation of a right turn radius at this location will not have an adverse affect on the surrounding area. This vacation will allow this currently undeveloped infill parcel to be developed. The Planning Department supports this Vacation Petition, approval of this request is recommended.

B) *Public Works discussion*

The following information is presented concerning this request to vacate certain public street right of ways:

- A. Does this vacation request result in uniform or non-uniform right-of-way widths? *Uniform.*
- B. From a traffic handling viewpoint will this vacation request result in a reduced traffic handling capability? *No.*
- C. Does it appear that the vacation request involves only excess right-of-way? *Yes.*
- D. Does this vacation request coincide with development plans of the adjacent parcels? *No, however this vacation is to eliminate a piece of unnecessary right-of-way.*
- E. Does this vacation request eliminate public street access to any abutting parcel? *No.*
- F. Does this vacation request result in a conflict with any existing City requirements? *No.*
- G. Does the Department of Public Works have an objection to this vacation request? *No.*

NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATIONS NOTIFIED

16

ASSEMBLY DISTRICT 12

SENATE DISTRICT 10

NOTICES MAILED 3 by City Clerk

APPROVALS 0

PROTESTS 0