



City of Las Vegas

Agenda Item No.: 36.

**AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: MAY 27, 2010**

**DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
DIRECTOR: M. MARCO WHEELER**

☐ Consent ☒ Discussion

SUBJECT:
VAR-37943 - VARIANCE - PUBLIC HEARING - APPLICANT/OWNER:
INTERNATIONAL CHURCH OF LAS VEGAS, INC. - Request for a Variance TO ALLOW 119
PARKING SPACES WHERE 538 ARE REQUIRED on 4.99 acres at the southwest corner of
Cliff Shadows Canyon and the 21st Bulwary (APNs 13-12-401-011), PD (Planned
Development) Zones 2 and 4 (Anthony). Staff recommends APPROVAL.

C.C.: 07/07/2010

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

23

Planning Commission Mtg.

7

City Council Meeting

0

City Council Meeting

0

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to conditions:

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location and Aerial Maps
2. Conditions and Staff Report VAR-37943 and SDR-37942
3. Supporting Documentation
4. Photos VAR-37943 and SDR-37942
5. Justification Letters VAR-37943 and SDR-37942
6. Protest/Support Postcards
7. Submitted after Final Agenda - Sign Posting Affidavit and Protest/Support Postcards
8. Submitted after Meeting Protest/Support Postcards

Motion made by GUS FLANGAS to Approve subject to conditions

Passed For: 6; Against: 0; Abstain: 0; Did Not Vote: 1; Excused: 0

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

NOTE: Subsequent to the vote, COMMISSIONER ELLSWORTH requested his vote be
reflected in the affirmative.

NOTE: COMMISSIONER GOYNES disclosed that his cousin attends this church and her
husband is the choir director. He has not spoken to him about this and feels confident voting as
it will not benefit him financially.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: MAY 27, 2010

Minutes:

CHAIR TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing open for Items 36 and 37.

STEVE GEBEKE, Planning and Development, stated this is the second Site Development Plan Review with an associated Variance with parking to be submitted for the subject site. These applications will replace the previous submittals and, pending a recommendation from the Planning Commission, will be considered by the City Council along with other previous submittals for a Major Modification, Rezoning and a Vacation of government patent easements. Approval of the previous submittals is required for final approval of the current Site Development Plan Review and associated Variance; all three previous applications received a recommendation of approval from both the Planning Commission and staff prior to being tabled at the 4/1/2009 City Council meeting.

MR. GEBEKE added that the project has been reduced in height, floor area and site disturbance since the previous submittals. The requested Variance for parking is appropriate as the applicant has provided evidence of unique and extraordinary circumstances related to the topography of the site. The requested landscape waivers and exceptions can be supported as they are minor in nature and mitigated by additional landscaping located throughout the interior of the site. Therefore, staff recommended approval of both requests.

ATTORNEY STEPHANIE ALLEN, 8345 West Sunset Road, appeared on behalf of the applicant. After the item was tabled at City Council, the applicant held about four neighborhood meetings and discussed most, if not all, of the issues the residents had, particularly the size of the building. The building was reduced from 85 feet to 35 feet in height as allowed by Code. The square footage was also reduced by two percent. The site disturbance was minimized and meets all the requirements of the Hillside Ordinance, which was a significant concern to the residents.

ATTORNEY ALLEN added that one request of the neighbors was with respect to access to the site and a secondary temporary access, which will be developed in Phase One. Phase Two will involve the parking along Desert Hope Drive and temporary access on Desert Hope Drive will comply with the City's approval.

The variance request is for parking, which is technically met, except that it is not on the church-owned property. A parcel to the north and to the east is owned by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM). Both parcels will be utilized for parking through an agreement with the City and BLM to allow utilizing and developing both parcels for this purpose. The waiver request is for landscaping because that requirement has been met and exceeded. Minimal landscaping is desired to the interior of the site.

ATTORNEY ALLEN stated there are significant topography issues and in order to meet the Hillside requirements, higher retaining walls to the south and one internal wall will be needed. She showed a rendering of the intended attractive building.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: MAY 27, 2010

TODD FARLOW, Las Vegas resident, was pleased with the project and asked if the retaining wall will match the mountain.

CHAIR TRUESDELL commended the applicant on addressing the neighbors' concerns and supported the request because now he regards it as architecturally compatible with the mountain.

COMMISSIONER EVANS supported the project, but preferred the old design.

COMMISSIONER ELLSWORTH complimented the applicant and liked what has been done. This is a better fit and he supports the request.

ATTORNEY ALLEN indicated that the rock will match the color schemes and design of the mountain.

MR. GEMEKE stated that the applicant never submitted a phasing plan for the site. Therefore, a condition was included stating that the approval shall apply to the site as a whole and any proposed phasing plan for site construction shall be submitted to the Planning and Development Department for consideration prior to issuance of a building permit to determine whether a Minor or Major Site Development Plan Review is required for approval. ATTORNEY ALLEN agreed with the condition.

DOUG RANKIN, Planning and Development, clarified that no parking will be allowed on Cliffs Shadow Parkway.

CHAIR TRUESDELL verified with MR. RANKIN that a change to the tower element is considered a material change in the height of the structure and is a major site plan review requiring a review by the Planning Commission.

CHAIR TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing closed for items 36 and 37.