



*City of Las Vegas*

Agenda Item No.: 44.

**AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING**  
**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: SEPTEMBER 13, 2016**

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING  
DIRECTOR: TOM PERRIGO

☐ Consent ☒ Discussion

**SUBJECT:** BEYANET - GPA-64786 - GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT - PUBLIC HEARING - APPLICATION OWNER: K. K. KALANJOY LLC - For possible action on a request for a General Plan Amendment FROM: RNI (RURAL NEIGHBORHOOD PRESERVATION) TO: R (RURAL DEVELOPMENT RESIDENTIAL) for 5.0 acres at the northwest corner of Elkhorn Road and Grand Canyon Drive, NEEN (251-18-408-003), Ward 6 (Ross) [PRJ-64704]. Staff recommends APPROVAL.

C.C.: 10/19/2016

**PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:**

Planning Commission Mtg.

31

City Council Meeting

0

**APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:**

Planning Commission Mtg.

1

City Council Meeting

0

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends APPROVAL

**BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:**

1. Location and Aerial Maps
2. Conditions and Staff Report - GPA-64786, ZON-64787, WVR-64788, WVR-64789 and TMP-64790 [PRJ-64704]
3. Supporting Documentation - GPA-64786, ZON-64787, WVR-64788, WVR-64789 and TMP-64790 [PRJ-64704]
4. Photo(s) - GPA-64786, ZON-64787, WVR-64788, WVR-64789 and TMP-64790 [PRJ-64704]
5. Justification Letter - GPA-64786, ZON-64787, WVR-64788, WVR-64789 and TMP-64790 [PRJ-64704]
6. Concern Email and Protest/Support Postcards for GPA-64786 and ZON-64787 [PRJ-64704], Protest Email for GPA-64786, ZON-64787, WVR-64788, WVR-64789 and TMP-64790 [PRJ-64704] and Protest Comment Forms for GPA-64786 [PRJ-64704]
7. Submitted after Final Agenda - Protest Postcard for GPA-64786 and ZON-64787 [PRJ-64704]

Motion made by SAM CHERRY to Approve

Passed For: 5; Against: 1; Abstain: 0; Did Not Vote: 0; Excused: 1

GLENN TROWBRIDGE, VICKI QUINN, TODD L. MOODY, TRINITY HAVEN  
SCHLOTTMAN, SAM CHERRY; (Against-CEDRIC CREAR); (Abstain-None); (Did Not Vote-None); (Excused-GUS FLANGAS)

**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: SEPTEMBER 13, 2016**

NOTE: COMMISSIONER CREAR disclosed that one of the neighbors that spoke was his podiatrist, but he did not believe this would affect his ability to vote.

Minutes:

CHAIR MOODY declared the Public Hearing open for Items 44-48.

STEVE GEBEKE, Planning Supervisor, reported that the applicant had revised their request for rezoning from R-1 (Single Family Residential) to R-D (Single Family Residential Restricted), and was providing lots with a minimum area of 10,000 square feet. Staff supported the requested General Plan Amendment (GPA) and rezoning as being appropriate for the area and compatible with other single-family residential development in the area. However, staff did not support the waivers to allow no interior street lights and for private streets that did not meet public street standards as these requests would not further the City's goal of providing safe, walkable communities for residents. For this reason, staff recommended denial of the waivers and the associated Tentative Map.

ATTORNEY BOB GRONAUER, 1980 Festival Plaza Drive, appeared on behalf of the applicant. He explained this item had been abeyed a couple of times because of the neighborhood meetings that were held. The initial application started with a 17-lot layout and a GPA for rural which staff recommended approval and a zone change for R-1 which staff also recommended approval. Based on the neighborhood meetings, the plan was redesigned. Instead of 17 lots, the applicant was now requesting 12 lots and downzoning it from R-1 to R-D which was more compatible and harmonious to the area. ATTORNEY GRONAUER reviewed the site plan, ingress, egress, lighting and changes that made the project more compatible than the initial plan.

JACK FESSLER, resident, questioned the statement that the project was harmonious to the surrounding area since the area had always been categorized Rural Neighborhood Preservation (RNP) in the County and not a lot of property under 20,000 square feet existed. He would like there to be eight homes to a cul-de-sac; 10 maximum. No one in the area wanted the streetlights because it was a rural area, especially with no ingress or egress on Solar Avenue.

DAVID POECHMANN, resident, agreed with MR. FESSLER's statements that this was not a good fit, and he was in favor of eight lots and the ingress/egress off of Grand Canyon Drive. MICHAEL PETERSON, resident, agreed with these comments and pointed out that this project affected him directly because he lives next to the proposed site.

DENISE TROPEA KELLY, resident, agreed with limiting the lots to eight, keeping it in line with the community and keeping the homes one story.

BRIGITTE SOLVIE, resident, believed this to be a precedent setting property for the RNP area that was left. She did note that the developer has been amicable and paid attention to the grading, but she would still like the number of lots limited to eight and single-story homes if possible. She thought this product should reflect the continuity of what was already there.

**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: SEPTEMBER 13, 2016**

ATTORNEY GRONAUER explained the reason why the project was initially R-1 zoning but was then reduced to R-D zoning after listening to the neighbors. The developer was amenable to certain lots being single story if need be. With respect to the streetlights on Solar Avenue and Elkhorn Road, no waiver of standards were submitted as part of this application, so no action could be taken, but if this was something the neighbors wanted, a request could be submitted at another time.

CHAIR MOODY asked ATTORNEY GRONAUER to address the concerns voiced regarding single-story homes being built versus two-story homes. ATTORNEY GRONAUER re-stated that the developer would be amenable to building single-story homes on certain lots.

Noting the compromises that have been made by the developer, CHAIR MOODY supported this application. COMMISSIONER QUINN thought it was important that the homes backing the residents be single story. ATTORNEY GRONAUER agreed to a condition being added to the Tentative Map to make the lots on the west side of the project single story.

COMMISSIONER CREAM stated he lived in an RNP area, and he had an issue going from this to a rural density residential so could not support the rezoning but was okay with everything else. After listening to both sides, COMMISSIONER CHERRY indicated he could support the application.

Regarding Item 45, MR. GEBEKE indicated a condition would need to be added to address the zoning approval to R-D. TOM PERRIGO, Planning Director, indicated that the Commission could choose to approve a lesser intense zoning district without an added condition.

Regarding Item 48, LUCIEN PAET, Engineering Project Manager, stated that Condition 12 would need to be deleted, as it was a cleanup item from the previous layout. Although PETER LOWENSTEIN, Planning Section Manager, pointed out that when dealing with straight zoning it was not a common practice to restrict the ability to use a zoning districts innate development standards, CHAIR MOODY wanted a condition added to make the parcels on the west side single-story homes. ATTORNEY GRONAUER acknowledged agreement with these conditions.

COMMISSIONER CREAM was not clear whether the neighbors wished to have the entire development single-story homes or just those on the west side. CHAIR MOODY indicated the neighbors would have another opportunity to speak at City Council if they had concerns with single-story homes being strictly on the west side.

CHAIR MOODY declared the Public Hearing closed for Items 44-48.