



City of Las Vegas

Agenda Item No.: 79.

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: JUNE 12, 2018

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING
DIRECTOR: ROBERT SUMMERFIELD

☐ Consent ☒ Discussion

SUBJECT: VAR-7334 - A VARIANCE - PUBLIC HEARING - APPLICANT/OWNER: TARA VISTA, LLC
For possible action on a request for a variance TO ALLOW A ZERO-FOOT CORNER SIDE
YARD SETBACK WHERE FIVE FEET IS REQUIRED AND TO ALLOW A ZERO-FOOT
SEPARATION FROM THE MAIN BUILDING WHERE SIX FEET IS REQUIRED FOR
THREE EXISTING NECESSARY STRUCTURES (CLASS II) [SHEDS] on 1.43 acres at 3979,
3883 and 3931 Tara Vista, Las Vegas, NV 89121, APNs 162-07-623-013, 014, and 015), R-4 (High Density
Residential) Zone, Ward 1 (Tarkanian) [PRJ-73300]. Staff recommends DENIAL.

C.C.: 7/18/2018

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

2

City Council Meeting

0

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

2

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. City of Las Vegas Code Enforcement Compliance Letter
7. Protest/Support Comment Form and Postcards
8. Submitted after Final Agenda Protest Postcard

Motion made by CHRISTINA ROUSH to Approve subject to conditions and adding the following condition as read for the record:

A. This approval shall be for the two sheds only, the carport shall be removed within 60 days of final action.

Passed For: 5; Against: 0; Abstain: 0; Did Not Vote: 0; Excused: 2

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

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: JUNE 12, 2018

Minutes:

CHAIR CHERRY declared the Public Hearing open.

STEVE SWANTON, Senior Planner, stated the subject site contains a multi-family residential development. The applicant is requesting to keep an existing carport and two storage sheds within required corner side and rear yard setback areas on three separate parcels. Per the applicant, the existing accessory structures have been utilized to store apartment maintenance equipment and are estimated to have been there for approximately 40 years. There are no building permits on file for any of the subject structures. Since this is a self-imposed hardship created by the owner, staff recommended denial of the request. He noted additional protests were submitted after publication.

ATTORNEY TONY CELESTE appeared on behalf of the applicant. He pointed out the subject site, existing apartment complex and surrounding streets using an aerial map. The application has three components, one of which is the carport. He noted that the applicant would like to withdraw the request for the carport and asked that they be given 60 days to either remove it or come into compliance. The other two components are the two sheds which according to the staff report are estimated to have been there for approximately 40 years. This is not a case where the applicant built something and was asking for forgiveness. ATTORNEY CELESTE presented some background information with regard to the property ownership and permitting history. He noted research indicated the trail went old in 2005 and 43 years later, the current property owner was cited for a notice of violation with regard to the two existing sheds. As such, the applicant is requesting the two sheds be allowed upon a land use perspective, and they will work on finalizing the building permits. He emphasized the history of the two sheds and that this was not a case where the applicant built them knowing they should have obtained a permit.

COMMISSIONER ROUSH stated she met with the applicant. While a crazy situation, she was glad to hear that the applicant was willing to try to rectify the carport. With regard to the sheds, because they are 40 years old, one can assume that the structures as well as the prior approvals probably pre-date the useful life of the existing or remaining life of the structures at this point. She does not have a problem with the sheds since they have been there so long, and would place a condition on her motion to rectify or remove the carport within 60 days.

COMMISSIONER SCHLOTTMAN agreed with COMMISSIONER ROUSHS comments but suggested tearing down the carport instead because it is horrible. CHAIR CHERRY agreed since the carport is right up against the road and is not aesthetically pleasing.

PAUL BENGTON, Senior Management Analyst, read a new condition into the record to which ATTORNEY CELESTE agreed.

CHAIR CHERRY declared the Public Hearing closed.