



City of Las Vegas

Agenda Item No.: 8.

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING
SPECIAL PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: OCTOBER 18, 2016

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING
DIRECTOR: TOM PERRIGO

☐ Consent ☒ Discussion

SUBJECT: BAYNES - ZON-63601 - REZONING RELATED TO MOD-63600 AND GPA-63599 - PUBLIC HEARING - APPLICANT: KOWALSKI 180 LAND CO, LLC, ET AL - For possible action on a request for a Rezoning FROM: PD (PLANNED DEVELOPMENT) - 7 UNITS PER ACRE TO: R-4 (RESIDENCE ESTATES) AND R-4 (HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL) on 2.13 acres at the southwest corner of Alta Drive and Rampart Boulevard (APNs 138-31-702-002; 138-31-801-002 and 003; 138-32-202-001; and 138-32-301-002 and 003) (Ward 2 - Beer) [PRJ-63491]. Staff recommends APPROVAL.

C.C.: 11/16/2016

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

530

City Council Meeting

0

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

124

City Council Meeting

0

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Consolidated Backup
2. Location and Aerial Maps - ZON-63601 and DIR-63602 [PRJ-63491]
3. Supporting Documentation

Motion made by VICKI QUINN to Deny

Passed For: 4; Against: 3; Abstain: 0; Did Not Vote: 0; Excused: 0

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

NOTE: A previous motion for Approval by Trowbridge failed with Crear, Quinn, Flangas and Cherry voting No.

NOTE: CHAIR MOODY disclosed his friendship with BILL BAYNES, CEO for the original developer of Queensridge. However, because Peccole no longer had any development interest in Queensridge and therefore is not a party and interest in any land use application, he was advised that that is not a conflict. CHAIR MOODY also disclosed that he is a partner in the law firm of Hutchison and Steffen, whose offices are located directly north of Queensridge and Badlands

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: OCTOBER 18, 2016

Golf Course, and that Peccole is a joint owner of the building where the law offices are located; however, he personally does not have any pecuniary interests or other interests that would affect his independent judgement of all applications. Furthermore, any affect approval or denial of these applications may have on the value of the law office or the property on which it sits, would be no more or less than for any other business or group in the area. Therefore, he was advised he has no conflict and would vote on all items.

Minutes:

See Items 6 and 7 for related backup and Item 6 for related discussion.

