



AGENDA MEMO

CITY COUNCIL MEETING DATE: DECEMBER 20, 2006
DEPARTMENT: PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT
ITEM DESCRIPTION: VAR-16516 - APPLICANT: NUVISION HOLDINGS, LLC -
OWNER: THE MOYER TRUST

**** CONDITIONS ****

The Planning Commission (7-0 vote) and staff recommend DENIAL.

Planning and Development

1. Approval of and conformance to the Conditions of Approval for Rezoning (ZON-16510), Special Use Permit (SUP-16520), Site Development Plan Review (SDR-16508), Variance (VAR-16512) shall be required.
2. This approval shall be void two years from the date of final approval, unless a certificate of occupancy has been issued or upon approval of a final inspection. An Extension of Time may be filed for consideration by the City of Las Vegas.

**** STAFF REPORT ****

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The purpose of this request is for a Variance to reduce the amount of required parking to 88 spaces where 122 spaces are required for a proposed 5-story, mixed-use development consisting of 10,500 square feet of commercial space and 32 residential units with waivers for residential adjacency in conjunction with a mixed-use project as well as companion items for a Rezoning (ZON-16510) from U (Undeveloped) to C-1 (Limited Commercial), Variance (VAR-16512) for increased percentage of lot coverage, as well as and a Special Use Permit and Site Development Plan Review (SUP-16520 and SDR-16508) for a mixed-use project on 0.98 acres at the southwest corner of Rainbow Boulevard and Peak Drive U (Undeveloped) Zone [SC (Service Commercial) Land Use Designation] [Proposed: C-1 (Limited Commercial) Zone].

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

<i>Related Relevant City Actions by P&D, Fire, Bldg., etc.</i>	
05/18/85	The City Council approved a Rezoning (Z-51-85) from U (Undeveloped) to R-3 (Medium Density Residential) for an apartment complex, which was constructed, but left out this 0.97 acre site.
09/06/89	The City Council approved a Rezoning (Z-79-89) this parcel from U (Undeveloped) to C-1 (Limited Commercial); however this application has since expired.
01/12/98	The City Council denied a request to Rezone (Z-113-97) from U (Undeveloped) to C-1 (Limited Commercial).
01/12/98	The City Council denied a request for a Special Use Permit (U-118-97) to construct a 3,150 square-foot convenience store with a retail pad site and a billboard.
11/16/06	The Planning Commission recommended denial of companion items ZON-16510, VAR-16512, SUP-16520 and SDR-16508 concurrently with this application.
11/16/06	The Planning Commission voted 7-0 to recommend DENIAL (PC Agenda Item #20/ng).
<i>Related Building Permits/Business Licenses</i>	
	No buildings exist on this parcel.
<i>Pre-Application Meeting</i>	
08/04/06	The applicant was informed that the height of the proposed building was significantly taller than any building in the area, and that the residential adjacency standards were not being met. Additionally, the applicant was informed that parking would need to be reconfigured to meet the handicapped parking standards as well as the site being under parked.

Neighborhood Meeting	
	A neighborhood meeting is not required for this application, nor was one held.
Details of Application Request	
Site Area	
Gross Acres	1.05
Net Acres	0.97

Surrounding Property	Existing Land Use	Planned Land Use	Existing Zoning
Subject Property	Undeveloped	SC (Service Commercial)	U (Undeveloped)
North	Condominiums	M (Medium Density Residential)	R-3 (Medium Density Residential)
South	Apartments	M (Medium Density Residential)	R-3 (Medium Density Residential)
East	Condominiums	M (Medium Density Residential)	R-PD18 (Residential Planned Development 18 Units Per Acre)
West	Apartments	M (Medium Density Residential)	R-3 (Medium Density Residential)

Special Districts/Zones	Yes	No	Compliance
Special Area Plan	Y		
Special Districts/Zones	Yes	No	Compliance
Special Purpose and Overlay Districts	Y		Y
A-O Airport Overlay District	Y		Y
Trails		N	N/A
Rural Preservation Overlay District		N	N/A
Development Impact Notification Assessment		N	N/A
Project of Regional Significance		N	N/A

DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

Per 19.08 the following development standards apply:

Standard	Required/Allowed	Provided	Compliance
Min. Lot Size	N/A	0.97	Y
Min. Lot Width	60 Feet	190 Feet	Y
Min. Setbacks			
• Front	20	20	Y
• Side	10	10	Y
• Corner	15	15	Y
• Rear	20	25	Y
Min. Distance Between Buildings	N/A	N/A	Y

Max. Lot Coverage	50%	68%	N
Max. Building Height	150	70	Y
Trash Enclosure	50	In Garage	Y
Mech. Equipment	Screened	Screened	Y

Per 19.08.060, the following development standards apply:

<i>Residential Adjacency Standards</i>	<i>Required/Allowed</i>	<i>Provided</i>	<i>Compliance</i>
3:1 proximity slope	140	60 Feet Most Intrusive	N
Adjacent development matching setback			
Trash Enclosure	50	In Garage	Y
1:1 Step-back Mixed-use			Y

<i>Existing Zoning</i>	<i>Permitted Density</i>	<i>Units Allowed</i>	<i>Proposed Zoning</i>	<i>Permitted Density</i>	<i>General Plan</i>	<i>Permitted Density</i>
U(SC)	N/A	N/A	C-1	N/A	SC	N/A

Per 19.12, the following landscaping standards apply:

<i>Landscaping and Open Space Standards</i>				
<i>Standards</i>	<i>Required</i>		<i>Provided</i>	<i>Compliance</i>
	<i>Ratio</i>	<i>Trees</i>		
Parking Area	N/A Parking Structure	N/A	N/A	N/A
Buffer: Min. Trees	1 Tree/20 Linear Feet	31 Trees	27 Trees	N
TOTAL		31 Trees	27 Trees	N
Min. Zone Width	15/20 Feet		10/15 Feet	N
Wall Height	N/A		N/A	N/A

Per 19.10, the following parking standards apply:

<i>Parking Requirement</i>							
<i>Use</i>	<i>Gross Floor Area or Number of Units</i>	<i>Parking Ratio</i>	<i>Required</i>		<i>Provided</i>		<i>Compliance</i>
			<i>Parking</i>		<i>Parking</i>		
			Regular	Handi-capped	Regular	Handi-capped	
Residential	32 d/u	1.75/du + 1/6du	62	2	44	2	N
Commercial	10,500 sq. ft.	1:175 sq. ft.	60	3	44	2	N

SubTotal			121	5	88	4	N
TOTAL (including handicap)			122		88		
Loading Spaces			1	N/A	1	N/A	Y
Percent Deviation (VAR only)			27.47%				

Waivers		
Request	Requirement	Staff Recommendation
Landscaping (Depth)	15 & 20 Feet	Approval w/conditions
Landscaping (Tree Requirement)	31 Trees	Denial
Landscaping (Shrubs)	5 Shrubs per Tree	Denial

ANALYSIS

The applicant is proposing to develop a five-story, mixed-use project, consisting of two commercial tenant spaces totaling 10,500 square feet and 32 residential units. The first level of the project will contain the retail uses and a portion of the parking garage and a trash collection area. The entire second level of the building will be dedicated entirely to a parking garage. The third, fourth, and fifth levels of the building will contain 32 condominium units with four different floor plans, all of which will have two bedrooms and two bathrooms.

The proposed development lacks adequate parking. The residential component of this development is required to have 62 parking while the commercial component of the development is required to have 60 parking spaces for a total of 122 required parking spaces. The applicant is proposing 88 parking spaces, which is a 27.47% reduction in parking and an indication that the site is being overbuilt.

FINDINGS

In accordance with the provisions of Title 19.18.070(B), Planning Commission and City Council, in considering the merits of a Variance request, shall not grant a Variance in order to:

1. Permit a use in a zoning district in which the use is not allowed;
2. Vary any minimum spacing requirement between uses;
3. Relieve a hardship which is solely personal, self-created or financial in nature.

Additionally, Title 19.18.070L states:

Where by reason of exceptional narrowness, shallowness, or shape of a specific piece of property at the time of enactment of the regulation, or by reason of exceptional topographic conditions or other extraordinary and exceptional situation or condition of the piece of property, the strict application of any zoning regulation would result in peculiar and exceptional practical difficulties to, or exceptional and undue hardships upon, the owner of the property, a variance from that strict application may be granted so as to relieve the difficulties or hardship, if the relief may be granted without substantial detriment to the public good, without substantial impairment of affected natural resources and without substantially impairing the intent and purpose of any ordinance or resolution.

No evidence of a unique or extraordinary circumstance has been presented, in that the applicant has created a self-imposed hardship by proposing a project that exceeds the sites ability to have adequate parking. Alternatively, the proposed development could be scaled back, which would allow conformance to the Title 19 requirements. In view of the absence of any hardships imposed by the sites physical characteristics, it is concluded that the applicants hardship is preferential in nature, and it is thereby outside the realm of NRS Chapter 278 for granting of Variances.

NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATIONS NOTIFIED 4

ASSEMBLY DISTRICT 37

SENATE DISTRICT 3

NOTICES MAILED 177 by City Clerk

APPROVALS 0

PROTESTS 0