



City of Las Vegas

Agenda Item No.: 129.

**AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: AUGUST 14, 2018**

**DEPARTMENT: PLANNING
DIRECTOR: ROBERT SUMMERFIELD**

☐ Consent ☒ Discussion

SUBJECT: PR-7388 - SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW - PUBLIC HEARING -
APPLICANT/OWNER: BRIDAL VILLAGE - For possible action on a request for a Site
Development Plan Review FOR A 3,615 SQUARE-FOOT WEDDING CHAPEL WITH
WAIVERS OF CITY OF LAS VEGAS OVERLY DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS
PERTAINING TO ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN, CORNER SIDE YARD SETBACK AND TO
ALLOW A SIX-FOOT FRONT YARD WALL WHERE FIVE FEET IS THE
MAXIMUM ALLOWED AND TO ALLOW A 11-FOOT PERIMETER WALL WHERE EIGHT
FEET IS THE MAXIMUM ALLOWED on 0.24 acres at 827 South Las Vegas Boulevard (APN
139-34-410-171) C-2 (General Commercial) Zone, Ward 3 (Coffin) [PRJ-73655]. Staff
recommends DENIAL.

C.C.: 9/5/2018

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

3

Planning Commission Mtg.

2

City Council Meeting

0

City Council Meeting

0

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends DENIAL, if approved, subject to conditions:

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location and Aerial Maps
2. Conditions and Staff Report
3. Supporting Documentation
4. Photo(s)
5. Justification Letter
6. Protest Postcards
7. Submitted after Final Agenda Traffic Notes Submitted by the City of Las Vegas Department of Public Works, Protest/Support Postcards and Support Documentation Not Vetted Comment Forms (3)

Motion made by VICKI QUINN to Approve subject to conditions

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

CHRISTINA ROUSH, DONNA TOUSSAINT, SAM CHERRY, VICKI QUINN, LOUIS DE
SALVIO, BRENDA J. WILLIAMS; (Against-TRINITY HAVEN SCHLOTTMAN); (Abstain-
None); (Did Not Vote-None); (Excused-None)

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: AUGUST 14, 2018

NOTE: CHAIR CHERRY disclosed that he lives directly across the street in the notification area; however, it would not affect his judgment one way or another, so he would vote on the item.

Minutes:

CHAIR CHERRY declared the Public Hearing open.

PAUL BENGTON, Sr. Planner, reported that this project is located on the northeast corner of Las Vegas Boulevard and Hoover Avenue in the Downtown Las Vegas Overlay - Civic and Business District. The applicant proposed to construct a one-story 3,692 square-foot wedding chapel with an associated front entry courtyard and permanent parking lot area.

The applicant requested several waivers of the Interim Downtown Las Vegas Development Standards. The proposed development is inconsistent with Downtown Las Vegas Overlay development standards pertaining to the architectural design, setbacks and wall height; therefore, staff recommended denial. Additional protest and support letters were received since publication.

GREG BORGEL applied with BARRETT POWLEY, Architects with Encompass Studio. MR. BORGEL stated that the existing building is currently inoperable, and they proposed replacing the old building with a new modern wedding chapel as shown in a rendering he displayed. They feel the waivers are justified and make a better project. He explained that the six-foot wall would provide privacy for a few moments after wedding ceremonies and how extending it toward the build line would destroy the architectural integrity of the building. In the alley they are requesting a wall height that would provide security for where the limousines would park, it matches the height of the carport, and it is more architecturally compatible to have the matching effect.

CHAIR CHERRY agreed that this was a difficult site with older buildings on it. He was initially concerned about the orientation of the building to Las Vegas Boulevard, but discovered that he had looked at it incorrectly. He thought this was fit for the area and was in support.

COMMISSIONER ROUSH wished to look at the site plan and asked for clarification on the wall heights. MR. BORGEL stated that the 11-foot wall is only against the alley. MR. PAWLEY explained that along Las Vegas Boulevard is a five-foot wrought iron decorative fence that transitions to six feet then goes to the building, which is 10 feet four inches. COMMISSIONER ROUSH commented that she does not usually like to see that high of a wall on a street facade.

COMMISSIONER SCHLOTTMAN expressed concern about the variance for the wall along the alley. The justification for the wall height was so it was even with the carport and provides clean lines. He did not think that was justification when looking at something from the alley. He asked the applicant about the nine-foot wall on the north side of the building; he did not know why it was necessary but did not have an issue with it since it is adjacent to a five-story building. The Commissioner asked if it was existing or proposed, and MR. BORGEL replied it would be a

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: AUGUST 14, 2018

new wall. He showed on the map the area where limousines would be parking noting that they wanted to have a wall of sufficient height to conceal and provide security for those.

COMMISSIONER SCHLOTTMAN thought this was a great project, but he opined that there was no justification for a 10-foot two-inch wall against the alley. He asked if a variance was needed for the alley wall if it was approved at nine feet. ROBERT SUMMERFIELD, Director of Planning, replied that if the Commissioners choose to augment the applicant's waiver request for the wall height, which is Condition 1, they would need to modify what the approval recommendation would be with regard to the condition.

COMMISSIONER ROUSH pointed out that if the Commissioners were to deny the wall height in the alley, there would still be the issue of the height of the building wall that faces Las Vegas Boulevard and matches the alley wall. COMMISSIONER SCHLOTTMAN clarified that the portion of Las Vegas Boulevard would not require a variance as it is part of the building.

COMMISSIONER SCHLOTTMAN asked MR. BORGEI if he would be able to see the alley wall if he was standing on Las Vegas Boulevard or if he would be able to see the Las Vegas Boulevard wall if he was standing in the alley, and MR. BORGEI said no.

COMMISSIONER QUINN opined that the waivers made the project better and she liked it just the way it is.

CHAIR CHERRY declared the public hearing closed.

