



City of Las Vegas

Agenda Item No.: 31.

**AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: JANUARY 22, 2019**

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING

DIRECTOR: ROBERT SUMMERFIELD

☐ Consent ☒ Discussion

SUBJECT:

UP-7520 - SPECIAL USE PERMIT PUBLIC HEARING - APPLICANT/OWNER: MONET MONIMASANO, ET AL. For public hearing on a request for a Special Use Permit FOR A PROPOSED 18-UNIT HOTEL, MUSEUM FOR HOTEL SUITES USE on 0.53 acres at 846 East Sahara Avenue (MP-62-031801-404), C-1 (Limited Commercial) Zone, Ward 3 (Coffin) [PRJ-75054]. Staff recommends DENIAL.

C.C.: 3/6/2019

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

2

City Council Meeting

0

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

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. Submitted after Final Agenda - Protest Postcards

Motion made by TRINITY HAVEN SCHLOTTMAN to Deny

Passed For: 7; Against: 0; Abstain: 0; Did Not Vote: 0; Excused: 0

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

Minutes:

CHAIR CHERRY declared the Public Hearing open.

ERIC McCAMMOND, Senior Management Analyst, stated the applicant is requesting a Special Use Permit (SUP) to operate a two-story, 18-unit hotel in a vacant building. While a hotel would be a compatible use on the proposed site, the submitted floor plans are insufficient in detail for staff to determine if the use is consistent with the overall objectives of the General Plan and that the use will not compromise the health, safety, and welfare of the public. Therefore, staff

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: JANUARY 22, 2019

recommended denial. He noted additional letters of protest were received since publication. ERIC ASTRAMECKI appeared representing MONET MANSANO, owner of 846 East Sahara Avenue and several other buildings in the immediate area. PAUL WORKMAN, consultant, and Project Manager MASON WORKMAN, Bilmar Contracting, were also present. MR. ASTRAMECKI thanked the Commission for the opportunity to speak. He reviewed the staff report and addressed some of the concerns listed.

The building was built in 1964 and has been vacant since it was sold by the Church of Scientology to MR. MANSANO in 2013. The historic commercial center district has struggled and local businesses tend to go bankrupt. This project is unique and includes a scope of work over \$600,000 to retrofit the building for Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accessibility, install a fire suppression system, backflow preventers and bring it up to fire and safety codes. Although that spec is \$600,000, the contractor agreed to fulfill the plans with a 20 percent deposit. They cannot pay that and finalize the plans showing the changes for ADA accessibility until they receive the entitlements and approval of the SUP. He explained this was the reason the final plans were not detailed. He noted making the bathrooms ADA accessible involved moving internal fixtures around and widening door frames, but the room sizes would remain the same.

COMMISSIONER SCHLOTTMAN agreed with staff and found the layout awkward and confusing and not that of a typical hotel. He thought a hotel in the area would be good, but he did not think the justification for not having a complete set of plans was sufficient and that the applicant needed to bring the Commission a complete package. The Commissioner especially noted the awkward layout of the bathrooms.

MR. ASTRAMECKI indicated their contractor tried to schedule a meeting with the Department of Building and Safety to review the plans, but they were instructed the entitlements could be approved with the plans as they were, but no building permit would be issued until the final plans were submitted and approved. COMMISSIONER SCHLOTTMAN clarified he was not looking for a building permit but rather plans as to what the applicant intends to build.

MR. ASTRAMECKI stated the plans depict the existing layout. He reiterated they would be bringing those rooms that are not ADA compliant into compliance. He noted the bathrooms are large enough, but the fixtures have to be moved which is detailed in the scope of work. He acknowledged the full-bill plans from the architect are not finalized. COMMISSIONER SCHLOTTMAN stated he was not speaking about a full set of plans, but he would like a floor plan showing what they intend to do.

MR. ASTRAMECKI reiterated the rooms will remain as they are, but the bathroom fixtures will change. He stated the contractor and project manager could speak to this if the Commission wished. COMMISSIONER SCHLOTTMAN thought the layout was possibly better suited to a hostel versus a hotel. MR. ASTRAMECKI stated it was their understanding the zoning requirements were the same for both. Originally, they considered a hostel but were told it had to be a hotel.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: JANUARY 22, 2019

COMMISSIONER SCHLOTTMAN would like to see something happen at this location but wished the applicant had spent a little more time on a floor plan the Commission could consider.

CHAIR CHERRY saw this as an out-of-the-box project and expressed confusion because the renderings shown were different than what is in the backup. Typically when there is a unique project, the applicant will reach out to the Ward and/or Commission to discuss the project to provide clarity. While he understands it now, it feels more like a hostel than a hotel. MR. ASTRAMECKI stated they met with COUNCILMAN COFFIN and FELIPE ORTIZ, Special Assistant to Council, on November 27, 2018, who supported the plans and renderings. CHAIR CHERRY pointed out it is easier to understand a project and get behind it when meetings occur, but he did not get that opportunity.

COMMISSIONER SCHLOTTMAN also wished the applicant had reached out to the Planning Commission so they could have understood the project better and had the rendering that was displayed prior to the meeting.

COMMISSIONER ROUSH spoke to the number of bedrooms and bathrooms on each floor and asked what the code was in regard to shared bathrooms. MR. ASTRAMECKI explained potentially there would be eight to nine bathrooms for 18 bedrooms. The intent is for a corporation to rent out the entire building for guests to stay for an extended period of time. COMMISSIONER ROUSH pointed out what the applicant described was different than the floor plan presented. MR. ASTRAMECKI indicated their architect advised more bathrooms should be added.

COMMISSIONER ROUSH also found the layout confusing and thought it looked like it was being set up for a future short-term rental or other high-intensity use. She asked staff about the bathroom to bedroom ratio. MR. GEBEKE explained that is addressed through the building permit process and not in the zoning code.

Noting she has a disabled son, COMMISSIONER QUINN indicated she could not support what was presented because the applicant used terminology such as going to and might but in actuality may not follow through because what was described was not included in the plan before them.

COMMISSIONER TOUSSAINT indicated she is sensitive to ADA compliance as well and was confused with the various plans before them. As such, she could not support this request.

COMMISSIONER SCHLOTTMAN wished he had the other set of plans to review prior to the meeting which would have helped him visualize and understand the project better. He reiterated that it is always good to share such things with the Commission before the meeting and hoped the applicant would reach out to the Council Office. He indicated he would have to follow staffs recommendation of denial.

CHAIR CHERRY declared the Public Hearing closed.