



AGENDA MEMO

CITY COUNCIL MEETING DATE: DECEMBER 6, 2006

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

ITEM DESCRIPTION: GPA-16168 - APPLICANT/OWNER: JOHN HERNANDEZ

**** CONDITIONS ****

Staff recommends DENIAL. The Planning Commission (5/2/se/bg vote) recommends APPROVAL.

**** STAFF REPORT ****

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The purpose of this request is to amend a portion of the Southeast Sector Plan of the Master Plan from: L (Low Density Residential) to O (Office) on 0.2 acres at 11 Prince Lane (APN 140-31-812-020), Ward 3 (Reese).

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

<i>Pre-Application Meeting</i>	
08/02/2006	The applicant was informed that parking for this project is at a ratio of 1:300 sq. ft. The applicant was informed that access issues may exist and a signal impact fee would be required.
11/02/06	The Planning Commission recommended approval of companion item ZON-16169 and denial of SDR-16174 concurrently with this application. The Planning Commission voted 5-2/se/bg to recommend APPROVAL (PC Agenda Item #10/jk).
<i>Neighborhood Meeting</i>	
9/13/2006	At the meeting the residents in attendance had the following questions/comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Would like a block wall to be provided along the side and rear property lines (it was noted that a 6-foot high wall is required between residential and commercial properties, and the applicant will comply with the requirement). * There are concerns about homeless individuals occupying the property as the structure is currently vacant; however, they noted that having a commercial use in operation on the property will deter any homeless encampment. * The residents stated that they were in support of the conversion.

<i>Details of Application Request</i>	
<i>Site Area</i>	
Gross Acres	.40
Net Acres	.20

Surrounding Property	Existing Land Use	Planned Land Use	Existing Zoning
Subject Property	Single-family Residential	Low Density Residential	R-1 Single-family Residential
North	Single-family Residential	Low Density Residential	R-1 Single-family Residential
South	Strip Commercial	Clark County Commercial Low & Commercial General	C-1 & C-2
East	Single-family Residential	Low Density Residential	R-1 Single-family Residential
West	Single-family Residential	Low Density Residential	R-1 Single-family Residential

<i>Special Districts/Zones</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Compliance</i>
Special Area Plan		X	
<i>Special Districts/Zones</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Compliance</i>
Special Purpose and Overlay Districts		X	
Trails		X	
Rural Preservation Overlay District		X	
Development Impact Notification Assessment		X	N
Project of Regional Significance		X	N

ANALYSIS

The plans show a 1,186 square-foot, single-family home on an 8,836 square-foot, R-1 zoned lot, located at the northwest corner of Charleston Boulevard and Prince Lane. This home was constructed in 1963 and from the photographs provided appears to be in minor disrepair. This residence is located in the 40-lot Treasure Park subdivision. An observation of aerial photographs to north and west, in the Park Ridge subdivision, are at least six lots with what appears to be significant numbers of derelict vehicles in each lot. Many of the lots in this area appear to have poorly maintained landscaping. There are five corner lots along the Charleston Boulevard frontage within this subdivision and the adjacent subdivision to the west. Of the five lots along Charleston Boulevard, one of those lots has filed for a re-zoning from R-1 to P-R. The parcel on which a re-zoning was filed is located on the northwest corner of Charleston Boulevard and Ronald Lane. The City Council approved a General Plan Amendment and a Re-zoning (GPA-39-98 and Z-68-98). Although the General Plan Amendment and Re-zoning were approved, a site inspection of this property indicates that the site is not being used as a business, nor have any of the improvements on the plans submitted for the aforementioned cases been completed. On the south side of Charleston Boulevard are C-1 and C-2 zoned strip shopping centers within the jurisdiction of Clark County.

Currently, this site has grass that is not in a living state and there are several large deciduous trees that will be removed and replaced with Mondel Pine Trees and Chilean Mesquite Trees. The grass areas will be xeriscaped with a combination of Desert Cassia, Mountain Marigold, Green Bush Daisy, and Trailing Lantana with decomposed granite ground cover to fill in the areas without vegetation. There is a waiver to provide zero feet of landscaping along Prince Lane due to the need for a handicapped drive aisle. The building is a ranch-style home with wooden panel siding that is painted in two tones in the range of cream to sand in color, with a green trim. The roof is low-pitched with asphalt shingles and roof-mounted mechanical equipment that is not screened. The applicant is providing a cyclone fence along the north property line rather than providing a zone boundary wall, which can be requested through a Site Development Plan Review pursuant to 19.08.050(E) (6) by showing convincing and substantial evidence that the exception or modification will not compromise the objective of the City in

safeguarding the interests of the citizens of the City. Photographs of the house show that the rain gutters are pulling away from the eaves on the north side of the house. There is an existing carport that will be removed; however, the existing garage door that faces Charleston Boulevard will remain as shown on the plans.

FINDINGS (GPA)

Section 19.18.030.I of the Las Vegas Zoning Code requires that the following conditions be met in order to justify a General Plan Amendment:

1. The density and intensity of the proposed General Plan Amendment is compatible with the existing adjacent land use designations,
2. The zoning designations allowed by the proposed amendment will be compatible with the existing adjacent land uses or zoning districts,
3. There are adequate transportation, recreation, utility, and other facilities to accommodate the uses and densities permitted by the proposed General Plan Amendment; and
4. The proposed amendment conforms to other applicable adopted plans and policies that include approved neighborhood plans.

In regard to 1:

Staff believes that a residential office conversion at this location is inappropriate because the General Plan designates this property for residential land uses and access to this site will be gained via Prince Lane. Staff also believes that it may be more appropriate to have this parcel and the adjacent parcel to the west amended to permit commercial land uses so that the neighborhood to the north would not be impacted as severely and the site could have a common access point from a 100-foot arterial road (Charleston Boulevard).

In regard to 2:

The intensity of uses typically found in the P-R (Professional Office and Parking) zoning district is not compatible with the residential uses on Prince Lane. As explained above, staff believes that the adverse impacts to the adjacent residential uses could be mitigated if this site were to be redeveloped in conjunction with the property to the west, which would allow vehicular access to be taken from Charleston Boulevard rather than Prince Lane.

In regard to 3:

The intensity of this request will not negatively impact traffic along Charleston Boulevard. The routing of commercial traffic onto a residential street for the proposed office as depicted on the companion Rezoning (ZON-16169) and Site Development Plan Review (SDR-16174) is not compatible with the residential neighborhood to the north. Additionally, the site is serviced by an overhead power line, which is no longer standard practice. Combining this site with the parcel to the west would provide enough land area to accommodate an integrated development with underground power lines

In regard to 4:

The proposal is not consistent with standard practice of developing residential office conversions as an integrated development with adjacent parcels, which has happened on other 100-foot arterial streets.

NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATIONS NOTIFIED 3

ASSEMBLY DISTRICT 12

SENATE DISTRICT 10

NOTICES MAILED 225 by Planning Department

APPROVALS 0

PROTESTS 0