



City of Las Vegas

Agenda Item No.: 6.

**AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: OCTOBER 8, 2009**

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
DIRECTOR: M. MARGO WHEELER

☐ Consent ☒ Discussion

SUBJECT:
SPA-3572 - GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT - PUBLIC HEARING - APPLICANT:
CITY OF LAS VEGAS OWNER NETWORK, LLC, ET AL - Request to amend the Master
Plan of Streets and Highways and modify Map 2A of the Transportation & Streets and Highways
Element of the Las Vegas 2010 Master Plan TO ADD A SECONDARY COLLECTOR TO
CONNECT BOLLWEEL AVENUE WITH CLARK AVENUE BETWEEN CASINO
CENTER BOULEVARD AND FIRST STREET, AND TO RECLASSIFY BONNEVILLE
AVENUE FROM AN 80-FOOT SECONDARY COLLECTOR TO A 125-FOOT PARKWAY
ARTERIAL BETWEEN CASINO CENTER BOULEVARD AND MAIN STREET, Ward 3
(Reese)

C.C.: 11/04/2009

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

2

City Council Meeting

0

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

3

City Council Meeting

0

RECOMMENDATION:
APPROVAL

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location and Aerial Maps
2. Conditions (Not Applicable) and Staff Report
3. Supporting Documentation
4. Photos
5. Justification Letter
6. Support Postcard
7. Submitted after Final Agenda Condition Confirmation Letter and Protest/Support Postcards
8. Submitted at Meeting Copy of Agenda Summary Pages from City Council Meeting of July 6, 2005

Motion made by BYRON GOYNES to Approve

Passed For: 5; Against: 0; Abstain: 0; Did Not Vote: 0; Excused: 2

VICKI QUINN, BYRON GOYNES, RICHARD TRUESDELL, STEVEN EVANS, GUS
FLANGAS; (Against-None); (Abstain-None); (Did Not Vote-None); (Excused-KEEN
ELLSWORTH, GLENN TROWBRIDGE)

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: OCTOBER 8, 2009

Minutes:

VICE CHAIR TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing open.

GREG McDERMOTT, Public Works, explained that the General Plan Amendment will amend the City's Master Plan of Streets and Highways. On the overhead he showed the areas affected by the amendment. The amendment deals specifically with a new connector road between Clark Avenue and Bonneville Avenue and amends the right-of-way width on Bonneville Avenue between Casino Center Boulevard and Main Street to a parkway standard of 122 feet. This amendment would provide for better linkages and connectivity through some of the redevelopment areas of downtown, through Symphony Park, the Regional Transportation Center Bonneville Transit Center, and residential developments.

MR. McDERMOTT stated that the project is being designed and the first phase is called the Bonneville/Clark Couplet System, which will have Bonneville Avenue running one-way eastbound, Clark Avenue one-way westbound with the two-way traffic that connects onto Main Street. Additionally, the project looks at narrowing the roadway to allow three lanes of traffic with bicycle lanes, wider sidewalk areas, trees and streetlights according to the Downtown Centennial Standards. Only the first phase is currently in the design phase.

With regards to the plan to widen Bonneville Avenue between Casino Center and Main Street, MR. McDERMOTT pointed out that currently the traffic volume does not merit the widening. At this time, the City has no intention of widening the roadway to a 122-foot standard, although it intends to include it in the Master Plan of Streets and Highways. As demands increase downtown, this amendment would allow widening that portion of Bonneville Avenue to a 122-foot right-of-way. The City Attorney's office confirmed there has been no announcement to condemn or begin any right-of-way acquisition in this area.

ELIZABETH GONNAM appeared in opposition to the widening of the street from the 80-foot to the 122-foot on behalf of WICKY HAM, the Ham/Peto Trust and JOHN HUEY, owners of properties on the corner of Main Street and Bonneville Avenue. MS. GONNAM indicated that on July of 2005, there was a similar issue relating to the current owner's property located closer to Main Street and Bonneville Avenue. It was brought before the City Council who imposed 25 conditions in order to add the couplets and other plans. She asked whether those conditions have been met. Promises were also made by the developer, who at that time, was applying for the couplets. The developer assured the owners that there would be no impingement upon their properties. Since the City does not have any projects planned at this time, it will not be necessary to widen Bonneville Avenue from two lanes to three lanes.

MS. GONNAM stated that approving the plan would be an imposition on the property owners, either for investment or future development. There has been no traffic analysis to indicate the necessity to widen the street from 80 feet to 122 feet. She referred to the minutes of the July 6, 2005 City Council meeting, pointing out the comments made by MR. MITCHELL, who

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: OCTOBER 8, 2009

stipulated there would be no opposition to locating the one-way couplet in a manner that would not impact the other property owners. With the City stating that they have no need to widen it, she wondered why the plan is being put into effect that will affect future saleable lots and development.

ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY BRYAN SCOTT pointed out that simply because a plan is put into the Master Plan of Streets and Highways, it does not necessarily implicate any pre-condemnation damages nor pre-condemnation activity. This has been done in a number of locations throughout the City for a very long time and it has never had any effect before. MS. GONNAM replied she is aware that the law in the State of Nevada does not require the government agency to pay for condemnation and damages upon amendment of the plan. ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY SCOTT rebutted that currently there is no project or funding; it is just an effort to show what could be placed at this particular location and it could be 10, 20, 30 years in the future.

VICE CHAIR TRUESDELL added this does not prevent property owners from bringing forward a development plan. ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY SCOTT indicated that the plan would not be amended when that person comes in for an application and be amended by the City, if in fact, there is a development on the way.

VICE CHAIR TRUESDELL stated that when there is a significant potential for improvements, it would be imprudent on the City's part not to let property owners know that there might be a potential aerial grade intersection based on what is on both ends of the couplet. This does not mean that the final designs are done. It does not mean somebody cannot use their property the way they want to or bring forth a project a year from now and be successful in getting it approved and developed. MS. GONNAM understood the City's responsibility to provide notice to all property owners, but, on behalf of her clients, she wanted to state her objections on the record. It is unnecessary to lay the plans down on the road when there are no projects at this time or a traffic analysis that provides support for widening the roadway from 80 feet to 122 feet, and they will continue to object. VICE CHAIR TRUESDELL remarked that staff will keep her clients informed on what moves forward along that area.

VICE CHAIR TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing closed.