



City of Las Vegas

Agenda Item No.: 15.

**AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: NOVEMBER 8, 2007**

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
DIRECTOR: M. MARGO WHEELER

Consent Discussion

SUBJECT:
TABLED - RENOVATION AT 867 VARIANCE - PUBLIC HEARING -
APPLICANT/OWNER: WORLDWELLYNESS GROUP, LLC - Request for a Variance TO
ALLOW 26 PARKING SPACES WHERE 48 IS THE MINIMUM REQUIRED FOR A
PROPOSED ADDITION TO AN EXISTING MEDICAL OFFICE on 0.39 acres at 3100 South
Valley View Boulevard (APN 102-08410-001), C-1 (Limited Commercial) Zone [PROPOSED:
M (Industrial) Zone], Ward 1 (Clarkman) NOTE: THIS APPLICATION HAS BEEN
AMENDED FOR 20 PARKING SPACES PROVIDED WHERE 42 SPACES ARE REQUIRED

C.C.: 12/05/2007

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

City Council Meeting

RECOMMENDATION:

DENIAL

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location and Aerial Maps
2. Conditions and Staff Report
3. Supporting Documentation
4. Photos
5. Justification Letter
6. Submitted after final agenda Protest postcard

Motion made by RICHARD TRUESDELL to Deny

Passed For: 4; Against: 2; Abstain: 0; Did Not Vote: 0; Excused: 1
GLENN TROWBRIDGE, LEO DAVENPORT, RICHARD TRUESDELL, SAM DUNNAM;
(Against-DAVID STEINMAN, BYRON GOYNES); (Abstain-None); (Did Not Vote-None);
(Excused-STEVEN EVANS)

NOTE: COMMISSIONER GOYNES disclosed that MR. GRAUBERGER was his realtor when he purchased his residence two years ago. Being as that transaction was completed he would vote on this item.

Minutes:

CHAIRMAN DAVENPORT declared the Public Hearing open for Items 15 and 16.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: NOVEMBER 8, 2007

DOUG RANKIN, Planning and Development Department, explained that both applications were initially tabled to enable the applicant to reduce the scope and scale of the project. Despite their efforts, he could not support the requested variance and recommended denial of both applications.

MICHAEL LIVINGSTON, 231 West Charleston Boulevard, architect, and JOE LAWRENCE, appeared on behalf of the applicant. MICHAEL LIVINGSTON explained that the property owner owns all three parcels and is seeking a shared use access agreement between those parcels. He stated that with the revisions to the Site Development Plan, there would be a total of 42 spaces available to accommodate both staff and visitor parking.

TODD FANLOW, 240 North 19th Street, complimented the design of the building. With regard to the garden aspect that was removed to provide additional parking, he suggested relocating it instead to the rooftop.

COMMISSIONER STEINMAN asked the applicant if a cross parking easement was considered. RYAN GRAUBERGER, 10220 West Charleston Boulevard, stated that a cross-access agreement had been prepared and filed. He explained that the three parcels were in the process of being combined into one parcel but that process could take up to a year to be finalized. COMMISSIONER STEINMAN queried whether adequate parking in accordance with Code would be provided with the combining of the three parcels. MR. LAWRENCE replied affirmatively.

Hearing COMMISSIONER STEINMAN's concern regarding the cross-easements, MARGO WHEELER, Director of the Planning and Development Department, explained that the cross-easements are necessary to consolidate the properties. BART ANDERSON, Public Works Department, stated that Condition 10 of the Site Development Plan Review requires the applicant to provide a copy of the joint access agreement but it could be modified to say joint access and parking. MS. WHEELER interjected and stated that the Planning Department would work with the City Surveyor to establish the proper language necessary to create a condition prior to the project's hearing before the City Council.

COMMISSIONER TRUESDELL maintained that the project is overburdening the site as well as adjacent properties and did not meet the parking requirements established by Code. MR. GRAUBERGER replied that future plans would include a parking structure.

COMMISSIONER TROWBRIDGE stated that the project would enhance the neighborhood; however, he expressed concern with the parking deficiency. COMMISSIONER TRUESDELL added that although the applicant owns all three parcels, there is no firm commitment regarding parking and the conditions would not be binding for all parcels. MR. RANKIN referred to Title 19.10 and explained the purpose for the Variance and for staffs recommendation for denial.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: NOVEMBER 8, 2007

CHAIRMAN DAVENPORT shared the same concerns expressed by the Commissioners. He noted that the driveway exiting onto Valley View is very hazardous and asked Public Works whether it would still be utilized with this project. MR. ANDERSON stated it would continue to be used for exiting.

CHAIRMAN DAVENPORT declared the Public Hearing closed on Items 15 and 16..

