



## AGENDA MEMO

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING DATE: APRIL 18, 2007**  
**DEPARTMENT: PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT**  
**ITEM DESCRIPTION: VAC-19586 - APPLICANT/OWNER: VALLEY HEALTH SYSTEM, LLC**

---

### **\*\* 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 the entire width (including the cul-de-sac bulb) and associated pedestrian access easements on Rose Street, south of Pinto Lane.
5. Public sewer easements shall be retained through this Petition of Vacation. Alternatively, a sanitary sewer relocation/abandonment plan must be submitted to and approved by the Department of Public Works. If relocation is proposed, the relocated sewer lines must be constructed and active prior to the recordation of the Order of Vacation.
6. A Drainage Plan and Technical Drainage Study must be submitted to and approved by the Department of Public Works prior to the recordation of the Order of Vacation for this application. Appropriate drainage easements shall be reserved if recommended by the approved Drainage Plan/Study.
7. Meet with the Fire Protection Engineering Section of the Department of Fire Services prior to recordation of the Order of Vacation to discuss fire access.
8. 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.

9. 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 petition to Vacate the Rose Street alignment and the adjacent pedestrian easements south of Pinto Lane.

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

<i>Related Relevant City Actions by P&amp;D, Fire, Bldg., etc.</i>	
04/21/71	The City Council approved a Site Development Plan Review [Z-0053-65(3)] for a proposed hospital and convalescent home on this site adjacent to the subject right-of-way.
04/27/76	The Planning Commission approved a request for Rezoning C-1 (Limited Commercial). (Z-0027-76) adjacent to the subject right-of-way.
11/29/79	The Board of Zoning Adjustment approved a request for a Variance (V-0085-79) to allow a second freestanding on-premise sign where only one sign is permitted and for this second sign to be five times the allowed height, at 647 Tonopah Drive adjacent to the subject right-of-way.
06/19/02	The City Council approved a request for a Major Modification [Z-0020-97 (33)] to the Las Vegas Medical District Neighborhood Plan including the subject right-of-way. The Planning Commission and staff recommended approval.
09/18/02	The City Council approved a request for a Site Development Plan Review [Z-0020-97(38)] for a 27,000 square foot addition to an existing hospital on 9.51 acres at 620 Shadow Lane adjacent to the subject right-of-way. The Planning Commission and staff recommended approval.
04/07/04	The City Council approved a Vacation (VAC-3057) of Valerie Street between Tonopah Drive to Rose Street adjacent to the subject right-of-way. The recordation number of this Vacation is 01657.
07/22/04	The Planning Commission approved a request for a Master Sign Plan on property located at 620 Shadow Lane (MSP-4481) adjacent to the subject right-of-way. Staff recommended approval.
11/04/04	The Planning Commission approved a Tentative Map (TMP-5303) for a one-lot commercial subdivision adjacent to the subject right-of-way. Staff recommended approval.
05/18/05	The City Council approved a Site Development Plan Review (SDR-6197) for a 104,000 square-foot building addition to an existing hospital and an expansion of the existing parking lot adjacent to the subject right-of-way. The Planning Commission and staff recommended approval.
01/18/06	The City Council approved a Special Use Permit for a proposed Helipad adjacent to the subject right-of-way. The Planning Commission and staff recommended approval.



03/22/07	The Planning Commission voted 7-0 to recommend APPROVAL (PC Agenda Item #12/rl).
----------	--

<b><i>Pre-Application Meeting</i></b>					
A pre-application meeting is not required for this application nor was one held.					
<b><i>Neighborhood Meeting</i></b>					
A neighborhood meeting is not required for this application nor was one held.					
<b><i>Details of Application Request</i></b>					
<b>Surrounding Property</b>	<b>Existing Land Use</b>	<b>Planned Land Use</b>	<b>Existing Zoning</b>		
Subject Property	Public Street Right-of-Way	ROW (Right-of-Way)	PD (Planned Development)		
North	Single Family Residential, Office	MD-1 (Medical Support)	PD (Planned Development)		
South	Parking, Helipad, Medical Offices	MD-2 (Major Medical)	PD (Planned Development)		
East	Hospital, Medical Offices	MD-2 (Major Medical)	PD (Planned Development)		
West	Parking, Medical Offices	MD-1 (Medical Support)	PD (Planned Development)		
<b><i>Special Districts/Zones</i></b>			<b><i>Yes</i></b>	<b><i>No</i></b>	<b><i>Compliance</i></b>
<b>Special Area Plan</b>					
Las Vegas Medical District			<b>X</b>		<b>Y</b>
<b><i>Special Districts/Zones</i></b>			<b><i>Yes</i></b>	<b><i>No</i></b>	<b><i>Compliance</i></b>
<b>Special Purpose and Overlay Districts</b>				X	NA
<b>Trails</b>				X	NA
<b>Rural Preservation Overlay District</b>				X	NA
<b>Development Impact Notification Assessment</b>				X	NA
<b>Project of Regional Significance</b>				X	NA

**ANALYSIS**

- **Planning and Development**

The applicant intends to incorporate the public right-of-way for Rose Street into the parking lot development that serves Valley Hospital and surrounding medical offices and support facilities. No properties other than those owned by the applicant are accessed via the right-of-way to be vacated, and this request serves to further the Las Vegas Medical District plan. The section of Rose Street that the applicant seeks to vacate ends in a cul-de-sac surrounded by the applicants property. A street which previously connected the southern tip of Rose Street to Tonopah Drive was previously vacated in 2004. In addition, two pedestrian access easements previously granted to the City of Las Vegas will be vacated as well as the public right-of-way. These include a 5.43-foot pedestrian access

easement along the east side of Rose Street containing 633 square feet, granted on

02/26/03; and a five-foot pedestrian access easement along the west side of Rose Street containing 826 square feet, granted on 05/07/04. This request is appropriate, as the subject right-of-way is not needed and will not result in reduced access traffic handling capability for the area.

- **Public Works**

A. Does this vacation request result in uniform or non-uniform right-of-way widths? *It will result in a uniform right-of-way width as it will completely eliminate Rose Street south of Pinto Lane.*

B. From a traffic handling viewpoint will this vacation request result in a reduced traffic handling capability? *No, since the current alignment of Rose Street ends in a cul-de-sac and mostly serves as access to a parking lot.*

C. Does it appear that the vacation request involves only excess right-of-way? *Yes as the vacated portion of Rose Street will be incorporated into the University Medical Center campus.*

D. Does this vacation request coincide with development plans of the adjacent parcels? *Yes, the expansion of the University Medical Center campus.*

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** 19

**ASSEMBLY DISTRICT** 13

**SENATE DISTRICT** 9

**NOTICES MAILED** 12 by City Clerk

**APPROVALS** 0

**PROTESTS** 0