



AGENDA MEMO

CITY COUNCIL MEETING DATE: APRIL 18, 2007
DEPARTMENT: PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT
ITEM DESCRIPTION: VAC-19526 - APPLICANT/OWNER: THE ROMAN CATHOLIC DIOCESE OF LAS VEGAS

**** CONDITIONS ****

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

1. 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.
2. All development shall be in conformance with code requirements and design standards of all City Departments.
3. 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.
4. The limits of this Petition of Vacation shall be defined as an existing 10-foot public alley located south of Oakey Boulevard, between Eleventh Street and Maryland Parkway.
5. Concurrent with the recordation of this Petition of Vacation, dedicate an additional 5 feet of right-of-way for a total radius of 25 feet on the southwest corner of Oakey Boulevard and Maryland Parkway. Coordinate with the Right-of-Way Section of the Department of Public Works for assistance in the preparation of appropriate documents.
6. 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 an Order of Vacation.
7. 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 rightofway 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 rightofway or easement being vacated must be retained.

**** STAFF REPORT ****

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This application is a request to vacate a ten-foot public right-of-way located within an existing parking lot between Maryland Parkway and Eleventh Street south of Oakey Boulevard and north of Canosa Avenue. The City of Las Vegas holds title to the subject right-of-way; however, no physical roadway or alley exists or is planned to be used by the public at this location. The right-of-way is entirely contained within the existing parking lot. The reason for this request is to create a clean title for the property owner and to eliminate liability to the City of Las Vegas.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

<i>Related Relevant City Actions by P&D, Fire, Bldg., etc.</i>	
12/22/95	Planning and Development staff approved administratively a Parcel Map (PM-0039-95) of a "Portion of the East Half (E½) of the Southeast Quarter (SE¼) of Section 3, Township 21 South, Range 61 East M.D.M." generally located between 11th Street and Maryland Parkway, approximately 110 feet south of Oakey Boulevard
10/27/97	The City Council approved a Rezoning (Z-84-97) from R-1 (Single Family Residential) to C-V (Civic) including a site plan for a 306 space parking lot on the subject site.
03/22/07	The Planning Commission voted 7-0 to recommend APPROVAL (PC Agenda Item #11/rl).

<i>Pre-Application Meeting</i>
A pre-application meeting is not required for this application nor was one held.

<i>Neighborhood Meeting</i>
A neighborhood meeting is not required for this application nor was one held.

<i>Details of Application Request</i>			
Surrounding Property	Existing Land Use	Planned Land Use	Existing Zoning
Subject Property	Parking Lot	PF (Public Facilities)	C-V (Civic)
North	Single Family Residential, Office	L (Low Density Residential) and O (Office)	R-1 (Single Family Residential) and PR (Professional Office and Parking)

South	Single Family Residential, Office	L (Low Density Residential) and O (Office)	R-1 (Single Family Residential) and PR (Professional Office and Parking)
East	School, Rectory	PF (Public Facilities)	C-V (Civic)
West	Single Family Residential	L (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	NA
<i>Special Districts/Zones</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Compliance</i>
Special Purpose and Overlay Districts			
C-V (Civic) District	X		Y
A-O (Airport Overlay) District	X		Y
Trails		X	NA
Rural Preservation Overlay District		X	NA
Development Impact Notification Assessment		X	NA
Project of Regional Significance		X	NA

The subject site conforms fully with the requirements of the C-V (Civic) zoning district. While the subject site is located within the Airport Overlay District, it is a parking lot and; therefore, well below the 200 foot height buffer.

DETAILS OF APPLICATION REQUEST

ANALYSIS

- **Planning and Development**

The applicant seeks to vacate a right-of-way located within an existing parking lot. The proposed vacation is supported as the right-of-way is no longer needed and is most likely the result of a mapping error.

- **Public Works**

A. Does this vacation request result in uniform or non-uniform right-of-way widths? *Uniform as it will eliminate public alley right-of-way that is within an existing parking lot.*

B. From a traffic handling viewpoint will this vacation request result in a reduced traffic handling capability? *No, since the alley is not constructed and the right-of-way lies within an existing parking lot.*

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, this vacation request will eliminate unused 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 13

ASSEMBLY DISTRICT 9

SENATE DISTRICT 10

NOTICES MAILED 3 by City Clerk

APPROVALS 0

PROTESTS 0