



City of Las Vegas

Agenda Item No.: 54.

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: OCTOBER 11, 2016

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING
DIRECTOR: TOM PERRIGO

☐ Consent ☒ Discussion

SUBJECT: GPA-66464 - GENERAL PLAN - MEDIUM DENSITY - PUBLIC HEARING -
APPLICANT/OWNER: ALEXANDER WESTER WHITE LIVING TRUST - For possible
action on an request for a General Plan Amendment FROM: ML (MEDIUM LOW DENSITY
RESIDENTIAL) TO: S (SERVICE COMMERCIAL) on 1.83 acres at the northeast corner of
Gowan Road and Las Vegas Drive (APN 138-09-201-020), Ward 4 (Anthony) [PRJ-66413]. Staff
recommends DENIAL.

C.C.: 11/10/2016

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

14

City Council Meeting

0

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

1

City Council Meeting

0

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends DENIAL

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location and Aerial Maps
2. Conditions and Staff Report - GPA-66464 and ZON-66465 [PRJ-66413]
3. Supporting Documentation
4. Photo(s) - GPA-66464 and ZON-66465 [PRJ-66413]
5. Justification Letter - GPA-66464 and ZON-66465 [PRJ-66413]
6. Protest Comment Form for GPA-66464 and Support Postcard - GPA-66464 and ZON-66465 [PRJ-66413]
7. Submitted after Final Agenda Protest Comment Form for GPA-66464 and Protest Postcards/Letter/Emails/Comment Forms for GPA-66464 and ZON-66465 [PRJ-66413]
8. Submitted at Meeting - Letter from Lynn Ratcliffe for GPA-66464, ZON-66465 [PRJ-66413], GPA-66474 and ZON-66475 [PRJ-66414]

Motion made by GUS FLANGAS to Hold in abeyance Items 54-57 to 1/10/2017

Passed For: 6; Against: 0; Abstain: 0; Did Not Vote: 0; Excused: 1
CEDRIC CREAR, VICKI QUINN, TODD L. MOODY, TRINITY HAVEN SCHLOTTMAN,
GUS FLANGAS, SAM CHERRY; (Against-None); (Abstain-None); (Did Not Vote-None);
(Excused-GLENN TROWBRIDGE)

Minutes:

CHAIR MOODY declared the Public Hearing open for Items 54-57.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: OCTOBER 11, 2016

STEVE SWANTON, Senior Planner, stated that the staff reports were similar for both sets of related Items 54-55 and 56-57. The subject site contains two undeveloped lots directly adjacent to medium-low density single-family uses. There is no development project associated with the requested changes in land use and zoning designation at this time. The closest commercial zoning district along Durango Drive is located approximately 1,800 feet south near Cheyenne Avenue; along Gowan Road there are no commercial uses of this intensity west of Rancho Drive. Many of the land uses allowed in the C-1 District are too intense for this location and more suitable at the corner of two primary arterial roads; therefore, staff recommended denial.

LINDA PEARSON appeared representing the applicant and requested that the items be held in abeyance to allow time to work with City staff and find a suitable designation; she requested that the items be held to the January 10, 2017 Planning Commission meeting as the owners have a lot of family commitments in December.

CHAIR MOODY announced that anyone wishing to speak on these items should address whether they were supporting or opposing the abeyance request. He also stated that COMMISSIONER QUINN would like the applicant to hold a neighborhood meeting prior to the items being heard (if abeyance was granted).

JEFFREY BRODY lives approximately 1/2 mile from the subject site. He was not necessarily opposed to an abeyance, but he thought there were already commercial properties in the area already. He was concerned about property values declining and that rezoning could set a precedent. He agreed with staff recommendation of denial.

DONNA VENCHIL opposed holding the items in abeyance as the applicant has had ample time to take care of this. She has been a realtor for more than 25 years; she was in opposition and felt this development would not be good for the area. She requested that the abeyance request be denied.

STEVEN BEST thought staff did a great job summarizing why this should be denied and requested denial of the abeyance.

LYNN RATCLIFFE stated that she had requested sidewalks believing the City was responsible for installing them but did not realize the property owner had to pay for them. She discussed a possible compromise with the applicant, but they would not compromise. She submitted a letter withdrawing her request for sidewalks as she thought that would put an end to the issues.

CHAIR MOODY asked how she felt about the request to hold the items in abeyance. MS. RATCLIFFE stated that there were many children in the area, and if any type of business is developed, kids will get hurt and killed. She confirmed for CHAIR MOODY that she opposed holding the items in abeyance.

MARY MARSHALL was in opposition of the abeyance; she felt that any form of commercial enterprise at the location would have a negative impact on the neighborhood. She took leave from work to attend this meeting, and she hoped the items would be addressed today.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: OCTOBER 11, 2016

ROBERT FISHER opposed the abeyance and rezoning. He believed the applicant was trying to stall, and he wanted this to be resolved as soon as possible.

FRANK TAMOND opposed the abeyance request as they already had a neighborhood meeting, and the neighbors did not support this. Across the street from the subject site is a YMCA, a pool and a skate park that are filled with kids. He was also concerned about odors from the restaurant drifting into the neighborhood.

SUZANNE DUBOIS opposed the abeyance and was in support of denial of the items as she was concerned about the impact to home values, noise, odors, light intrusion, increased traffic, increased crime and additional potential land use change request.

DONNA VENCHE asked what could be done to stop this from progressing and wondered if they should get a petition together. CHAIR MOODY stated that this public hearing was when people should share their feelings regarding this request.

COMMISSIONER QUINN stated that this is an impactful corner and asked if a neighborhood meeting had been held and what the outcome was. MS. PEARSON said they held a neighborhood meeting, 33 postcards were mailed and 25 people came to the meeting. Approximately 15 people were in opposition and five did not vote.

COMMISSIONER CHERRY asked the applicant why they were requesting an abeyance, and MS. PEARSON explained that the applicant purchased the property in the 1970s as a five-acre parcel. Because Go-man Road was extended, they split the parcel into two two-and-one-half-acre parcels. With the street improvements, those parcels have been reduced to approximately 1.8 acres each. The property owners have tried to sell the parcels, but potential buyers do not want to go through the rezoning process. They would like to have time to work with staff to see if there is a solution that would be more palatable to the neighborhood.

COMMISSIONER CHERRY understood the neighborhood opposition based on the application. After hearing the applicant and hearing what they are trying to do, he thought it was reasonable to approve the abeyance request. COMMISSIONER FLANGAS was also in support of the abeyance so the applicant could try to resolve this issue.

See Item 6 for related discussion.

CHAIR MOODY declared the Public Hearing closed for Items 54-57.