



City of Las Vegas

Agenda Item No.: 22.

**AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: MAY 8, 2008**

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
DIRECTOR: M. MARGO WHEELER

Consent Discussion

SUBJECT:
CON-2750 - REZONING - PUBLIC HEARING - APPLICANT/OWNER: LAS VEGAS VALLEY WATER DISTRICT - Request for a Rezoning FROM: U (UNDEVELOPED) [LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION] TO: C-V (CIVIC) on 5.6 acres on the north side of Centennial Parkway approximately 330 feet west of Fort Apache Road (APN 125-19-0118), Ward 6 (Ross)

C.C.: 06/04/2008

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.	1	Planning Commission Mtg.	0
City Council Meeting	0	City Council Meeting	0

RECOMMENDATION:
APPROVAL

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 DAVID STEINMAN to Approve subject to conditions

Passed For: 5; Against: 0; Abstain: 0; Did Not Vote: 0; Excused: 2
BYRON GOYNES, DAVID STEINMAN, GLENN TROWBRIDGE, STEVEN EVANS, VICKI QUINN; (Against-None); (Abstain-None); (Did Not Vote-None); (Excused-SAM DUNNAM, RICHARD TRUESDELL)

Minutes:

CHAIR GOYNES declared the Public Hearing open for Items 22 and 23.

PETER LOWENSTEIN, Planning and Development Department, explained that both the Rezoning and the Site Development applications are in conformance with the Public Facilities General Plan designation and recommended approval.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: MAY 8, 2008

BRONSON MACK, 1001 South Valley View Boulevard, appeared on behalf of the applicant. Using the overhead, he indicated the location of the subject property and summarized the proposed project. MR. MACK agreed to the Conditions of Approval with the exception of Condition 4 of the Site Development Plan Review regarding the landscape plan. He surmised that installing the trees as stipulated in the conditions would impede the view of the adjacent residences and noted that landscaping had never been discussed in the meetings with the neighbors.

MR. MACK stated that there is a difference in elevations between the project site and the residential properties. He noted that a ten-foot fence is planned for the western perimeter of the property; therefore, installing the trees would provide neither aesthetic value nor view for the neighbors, and would require unnecessary use of water at a time when water conservation is imperative.

MARGO WHEELER, Director of the Planning and Development Department, stated that at the time of the original application, there was no waiver request. MR. LOWENSTEIN explained that the development standards are determined at the time of the site review. He added that at staffs recommendation, the request to install the trees was intended to mitigate visual intrusion from the utility installation. MS. WHEELER remarked that staff's recommendation for landscaping is appropriate as trees not only have an aesthetic value, they also provide benefits to the urban environment.

TODD FARLOW, 240 North 19th Street, asked whether the system would be submerged underground. MR. MACK replied that it would be a buried concrete reservoir.

COMMISSIONER EVANS questioned the applicants rationale for not providing the landscaping and listed several reasons why and how the landscaping would be beneficial. He strongly encouraged the applicant to comply with the conditions.

MR. MACK agreed with COMMISSIONER EVANS' comments but added that the subject site is not a public facility that would be open to visitors, mainly because it is a utility site.

COMMISSIONER TROWBRIDGE voiced his support of both applications and commended the applicant for its efforts in water conservation and xeriscaping. He agreed that installing landscaping within a non-public facility would be a waste of time, water and energy.

CHAIR GOYNES declared the Public Hearing closed for Items 22 and 23.