

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*August 1, 2007*  
**VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEM 130 – ROC-22767**

1 **PUBLIC HEARING - APPLICANT: CLEAR CHANNEL OUTDOOR - OWNER:**  
2 **REDROCK PLAZA, LLC - Request for a Review of Condition to remove Condition**  
3 **Number One of an approved Required Review (RQR-5682) WHICH STATED THAT THE**  
4 **BILLBOARD SHALL BE DEMOLISHED PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF THE**  
5 **CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION PERMITTED BY THE**  
6 **SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW SDR-5556 at 5191 West Charleston Boulevard**  
7 **(APN 163-01-515-001), C-1 (Limited Commercial) Zone, Ward 1 (Tarkanian).**

8

9 **APPEARANCES:**

10 OSCAR GOODMAN, Mayor  
11 LUCAS TUCKER, on behalf of Clear Channel Outdoor  
12 MARGO WHEELER, Director of Planning and Development  
13 BRYAN SCOTT, Assistant City Attorney  
14 TOM McGOWAN, Las Vegas resident  
15 LOIS TARKANIAN, Councilwoman

16

17 5 minutes

18

19 Typed by: Lean Coleman

20 Proofed by: Gabriela Portillo-Brenner

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*August 1, 2007*  
**VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEM 130 – ROC-22767**

21 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

22 130 is ROC-22767. It's gonna be a public hearing. The applicant is Clear Channel Outdoor.  
23 The owner is Redrock Plaza, LLC. Request for review of condition to remove Condition  
24 Number One of an approved Required Review, which stated the billboard shall be demolished  
25 prior to the issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy for new construction permitted by the Site  
26 Development Plan Review, SDR-5556 at 5191 West Charleston Boulevard in Ward 1. The staff  
27 recommends denial. It's a public hearing, which is now open. Yes, Sir.

28

29 **LUCAS TUCKER**

30 Good evening. Lucas Tucker, 300 South Fourth Street, here on behalf of the applicant, Clear  
31 Channel. We believe that removal of this condition is appropriate. The billboard was initially  
32 approved in 1990. It's been the subject of four prior reviews and approvals. Since the last time  
33 of the approval, a commercial plaza was designed and constructed and those tenants are now  
34 doing business there. The property owner specifically designed the plaza to accommodate the  
35 existing and future continued use of the billboard. And, he strongly supports the billboard  
36 remaining on the property.

37 In our application, I attached a letter of support from the property owner. If I could just read  
38 three or four sentences from that?

39

40 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

41 Go ahead, please.

42

43 **LUCAS TUCKER**

44 Okay. And this is the property owner again: In no way does this billboard cause any harm to the  
45 property or to its tenants. While designing the site plan for this project, we took into account that  
46 the billboard was already existing and designed the site around it to accommodate structure. It is  
47 our sincere wish for the billboard to stay as it has been existing for over 15 years without  
48 incident.

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*August 1, 2007*  
**VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEM 130 – ROC-22767**

49 There have been no objections by any of the plaza tenants. The property owners received no  
50 complaints, and the property is still zoned commercial, as it – was when it was initially approved  
51 back in 1990.

52 Briefly, the staff report contained a concern about possibly a safety issue because there's a  
53 driveway, or drive-thru lane that goes underneath the billboard. But Clear Channel does have  
54 insurance policies in the amount of a million dollars on all of their boards. So I think that  
55 satisfies any safety concerns. And so, we respectfully request that that condition be removed.

56

57 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

58 Okay. Ms. Wheeler?

59

60 **MARGO WHEELER**

61 Yes, Sir.

62

63 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

64 Are you able to tell us why there's a recommendation for denial here?

65

66 **MARGO WHEELER**

67 Certainly, Sir. This is not a new condition that is being imposed. The condition to remove the  
68 billboard at the time of C of O was imposed at the time that the project was originally approved.  
69 And that condition was accepted by the applicant, the property owner at this time. They are now,  
70 subsequently, requesting to keep the billboard, even though the project has proceeded. This,  
71 again, is not a new condition. They are asking for removal of a condition that was already  
72 approved previously. Staff certainly seems, sees no reason why we would recommend against  
73 the Council's original recommendation.

74

75 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

76 I see. Okay. I appreciate that. Thank you. Would you like to (inaudible) –

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*August 1, 2007*  
**VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEM 130 – ROC-22767**

77 **LUCAS TUCKER**

78 Yes. May I comment on that real quick. I think the condition was both on the site plan, and then  
79 it was also a condition on the last time that we were approved. So I think, so, for us, I think it  
80 was a new condition. It – wasn't, it didn't appear before –

81

82 **BRYAN SCOTT**

83 And just – for the record, Your Honor –

84

85 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

86 Yes.

87

88 **BRYAN SCOTT**

89 I agree with Ms. Wheeler, that is not a new condition. The applicant specifically agreed on the  
90 record to the removal of the – billboard at time of C of O. I mean, originally, I think it said that it  
91 was gonna be removed at time of building permit, but he came back to the Council and requested  
92 that it be at City, at time of C of O. You agreed to that, and he – did, specifically, agree to  
93 removing the billboard.

94

95 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

96 Alright. Thank you.

97

98 **LUCAS TUCKER**

99 Then my last comment, Mayor, would be that, because of the support that the billboard receives  
100 and because of the business relationship between the property owner and Clear Channel, we don't  
101 believe that the conditions have changed that require its removal.

102

103 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

104 Alright. Thank you very much. Yes, public comment?

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF**  
*August 1, 2007*  
**VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT – ITEM 130 – ROC-22767**

105 **TOM McGOWAN**

106 Yeah. Tom McGowan, Las Vegas resident. I concur with the Director of Planning Department,  
107 its recommendation and also the recommendation of the Deputy City Attorney (sic), that is  
108 directly to the point, forthright, unambiguous. And I recommend, also, that it be denied.

109

110 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

111 Five o'clock. Okay. Alright. Any other public comment? Alright, we'll close the public  
112 hearing then. Councilwoman.

113

114 **COUNCILWOMAN TARKANIAN**

115 Mr. Mayor, I was involved in these meetings with the owner of that property, and it was very  
116 clear to him about removing that sign. And if we're being told that it was specifically designed,  
117 those buildings to work around that sign, I have to tell you, I can't believe that's true, because I  
118 remember what was said in those earlier meetings. And I will tell you now that if you're heading  
119 west, the Taco Bell obstructs a good portion of the billboard. And if you're heading east, the  
120 applicant's, excuse me, the owner of the property's own building, now operated with Starbucks in  
121 it, obstructs the view of it. It looks like a big conglomeration, and I think this is an exact  
122 example of how conditions change. **And I move for denial.**

123

124 **MAYOR GOODMAN**

125 Alright. Please vote. Post. Motion carries. **(Motion carried unanimously.)** Thank you.

126

**(END OF DISCUSSION)**

127 /lc:gpb