

Planning & Development Department
Scanning Cover Sheet

Case No Z-0041-63

APN 139-32-403-014

Location NEC & NWC of Campbell & Charleston

Applicant William H. Anzuoni & Morris R. Gentry

Subject

Reclassification of property legally described as the East 300' of the West 1,290' of the South 283' of Section 32, Township 20 South, Range 61 East, and the South 320' of the SW Quarter of the SE Quarter of the SW Quarter of Section 32, Township 20 South, Range 61 East, except the East 525' thereof.



PROPERTY OWNERS

PROTESTS

APPROVALS

- ① J D + Artino Smith
1170 Campbell
 - ② Wm. E Searle
12400 Brookglen Dr.
Saratoga Calif
 - ③ Douglas W MacMillan MD
1640 W 3rd - La
 - ④ Dr Ronald Mac Millan
1640 W 3rd - La
 - ⑤ Mr + Mrs Edwin M Belmont
1125 Campbell Dr
 - ⑥ Charlie + Sally Steel
2920 Ashby
 - ⑦ Mrs. R W Kelly
3009 W Charleston
- FILE No. Z-41-63

CHECK LIST -- FOR PROCESSING APPLICATIONS

- | | TO BE DONE | CHECK IF
DONE | BY |
|-----|--|------------------|----|
| 1. | Check the legal and general description with Mel. | | |
| 2. | Enter in register. | | |
| 3. | Enter file number and fill in blanks "For Department Use Only" on application. | | |
| 4. | Make up folder with appropriate label.
Attach application on right hand side. | | |
| 5. | Type 3 index cards - numerical, legal, applicant. | | |
| 6. | File above cards in proper metal file. | | |
| 7. | Make up draft of Notice of Public Hearing in duplicate.
a. Type date to be mailed -- 15 days prior to meeting.
b. Put one copy rough draft in folder. | | |
| 8. | Enter proper information on tentative agenda and place other copy of Public Hearing with agenda. | | |
| 9. | Type memos and send with plot plans to Engineering, Building, and Fire - others if told to. This will be for Variances and Use Permits only. | | |
| 10. | Place "Protest and Approval" sheet on right side of applicant's file. | | |
| 11. | Give folder to Mel, he will prepare property owner's list.
a. Type property owner's list.
b. Type envelopes.
c. Type Notice of Public Hearing on multilith.
d. Mail out notices. | | |
| 12. | Prepare Legal Notice for newspapers.
a. Call newspapers and have messenger pick up legal. | | |
| 13. | Ask Don regarding Resolutions. | | |

FILE NO:

2-41-63

MEETING DATE:

March 14, 1963

PLACE THIS SHEET UNDER PROPERTY OWNER LIST WHEN COMPLETED.



NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

March 14, 1963

Protest

February 27, 1963

Notice is hereby given that on March 14, 1963, at 7:30 P.M. in the Council Chambers of the City Hall, Las Vegas, Nevada, the City Planning Commission will hear the application of:

Z-41-63

WILLIAM H. ANZUONI AND MORRIS R. GENTRY FOR THE RECLASSIFICATION OF PROPERTY LEGALLY DESCRIBED AS THE EAST 300 FEET OF THE WEST 1290 FEET OF THE SOUTH 283 FEET OF SECTION 32, TOWNSHIP 20 SOUTH, RANGE 61 EAST, AND THE SOUTH 320 FEET OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER (SW $\frac{1}{4}$) OF THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER (SE $\frac{1}{4}$) OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER (SW $\frac{1}{4}$) OF SECTION 32, TOWNSHIP 20 SOUTH, RANGE 61 EAST, EXCEPT THE EAST 525 FEET THEREOF. GENERALLY LOCATED ON THE NORTHEAST AND NORTHWEST CORNERS OF CAMPBELL DRIVE.

FROM: R-E (Residence Estates)

TO: C-1 (Limited Commercial)

*1170 Campbell Dr.
Estline Smith
J. W. Smith*

We do object to this request for reclassification for numerous reasons, some of which are stated in accompanying letter.

Any and all interested persons may appear before the City Planning Commission either in person or by counsel, and object to or express approval of the proposed reclassification, or may prior to this hearing file with the City Planning Director written objections thereto or approval thereof.

Don J. Saylor
DON J. SAYLOR
Director of Planning

Z-41-63

the east 300 feet of the ~~so~~ west 1290 feet
of the south 283 feet ~~and~~ of ~~the~~ section.

32 T20S R-61E, and the south 320
feet of the southwest quarter of the southeast
quarter of the southwest quarter of section.

32, T20S, R-61E, except the east 525 feet
thereof.

Generally located on the northeast and
northwest corners of Campbell Drive

APPLICATION FOR RECLASSIFICATION OF PROPERTY

TO THE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION:

Pursuant to Section 27, Chapter 24, of the Las Vegas City Code, as amended, the undersigned owner of property hereinafter described, hereby presents his application requesting that certain property be reclassified from the RE Use District to a C1 Use District, as established by Section 10, Chapter 24, of the Las Vegas City Code, as amended. Also accompanying this application is the prescribed fee of \$55.00.

The property hereinbefore referred to and in relation to which said changes are hereby applied for, is described as follows, to wit:

Part of the SW 1/4 of Sec 32 T 20 R 61
Acres 1.60

ATTACHED IS LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.

Retail Store Bldg - Parking Lot

OWNER'S AFFIDAVIT

STATE OF NEVADA)
COUNTY OF CLARK) ss:

ANZUONI

I, William A. Anzoni

being duly sworn, depose and say that I am (~~was~~) an owner of property involved in this application and that the foregoing statements and answers herein contained and the information herewith submitted are in all respects true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Signed: (In Ink) Mailing Address: 328 FREEMONT Phone No.: 702-4408

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 30th day of JAN, 1963

[Signature] 2-13-64
Notary Public in and for said County and State My Commission expires

FOR PLANNING DEPARTMENT USE ONLY

This is to certify that the foregoing has been inspected by me and was filed with the office of the Las Vegas City Planning Commission in accordance with the provisions of Section 27, Chapter 24, of the Las Vegas City Code.

Filed: 2/15, 1963

Fee: \$ 55.00

Receipt No.: 50622

Case No.: 2-41-63

By: [Signature]
Director of Planning

3/14/63

(In Anzoni's Interest)

That portion of the Southwest Quarter (SW 1/4) of the Southwest Quarter (SW 1/4) of Section 32, Township 20 South, Range 61 East, M.D.B. & M. described as follows:

COMMENCING at the Southwest corner of said Section 32; thence North 0.56' West along the West line of said Section 32 a distance of 50.00 feet to a point on the North line of Charleston Blvd.; thence East along the North line of Charleston Blvd., a distance of 990.00 feet to the Southeast corner of that certain parcel of land conveyed by Jack Wollenzien et al to Jerry Block by deed recorded May 29, 1950 as document No. 340764 Clark County, Nevada records, the true point of beginning; thence continuing East along the said North line a distance of 299.60 feet to a point on the West line of Campbell Drive; thence North 0.42' West along the said West line a distance of 233.00 feet to a point; thence West parallel to the South line of said Section 32 a distance of 300.55 feet to the Northeast corner of the said conveyed parcel; thence South 0.56' East a distance of 233.00 feet to the true point of beginning.

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION -- CITY HALL -- LAS VEGAS, NEVADA

APPLICATION FOR RECLASSIFICATION OF PROPERTY

TO THE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION:

Pursuant to Section 27, Chapter 24, of the Las Vegas City Code, as amended, the undersigned owner of property hereinafter described, hereby presents his application requesting that certain property be reclassified from the RE Use District to a CI Use District, as established by Section 10, Chapter 24, of the Las Vegas City Code, as amended. Also accompanying this application is the prescribed fee of \$ 5.00.

The property hereinbefore referred to and in relation to which said changes are hereby applied for, is described as follows, to wit:

~~North West Corner of Campbell and West Charleston 115 x 280~~

South 320 Feet of the southwest Quarter of the Southeast Quarter of the Southwest Quarter of Section 32, Township 20 South, Range 61 East, M.D.B. & M. EXCEPTING THEREFROM the East 525 feet. FURTHER EXCEPTING therefrom the interest in and to the West 30 feet thereof as conveyed to the City of Las Vegas for road purposes by deed recorded April 29, 1954 as Document #9278 Clark County, Nevada records and FURTHER EXCEPTING therefrom the South 50 feet used for road purposes (Charleston Boulevard).

OWNER'S AFFIDAVIT

STATE OF NEVADA)
COUNTY OF CLARK) ss:

I, Morris R. Gentry
Justice R. Gentry

being duly sworn, depose and say that ~~I am~~ (we are) an owner of property involved in this application and that the foregoing statements and answers herein contained and the information herewith submitted are in all respects true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Signed: (In Ink) Mailing Address: Phone No.:
Morris R. Gentry 1416 Virginia City Ave. 384-6406
Justice R. Gentry

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 30th day of Jan, 1963

[Signature] 2-13-63
Notary Public in and for said County and State My Commission expires

FOR PLANNING DEPARTMENT USE ONLY

This is to certify that the foregoing has been inspected by me and was filed with the office of the Las Vegas City Planning Commission in accordance with the provisions of Section 27, Chapter 24, of the Las Vegas City Code.

Filed: _____, 19____ Fee: \$ _____
Receipt No.: _____ Case No.: _____
By: _____
Director of Planning

Commissioner Fountain moved that the application of William R. Devlin (Z-33-63) for reclassification of property generally located on the west side of South Third Street, between Lewis and Bridger Avenues, from C-1 to C-2, be APPROVED.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Whipple and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Mirabelli, Levy, Fountain, Whipple, and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

ZONE CHANGES

Z-35-63

Z-38-63

Z-39-63

Z-41-63

Z-42-63

Z-43-63

Z-44-63

Z-45-63

Z-46-63

Z-47-63

Z-48-63

Z-49-63

ZONE CHANGE - Z-35-63 - APPLICATION OF THE LAS VEGAS MORTGAGE COMPANY, INC. for reclassification of property generally located on the south side of West Charleston Boulevard, between Strong Drive and Rancho Drive, from R-1 to C-1, legally described as:

Lot 5, Block 1, McNeil Tract No. 2.

ZONE CHANGE - Z-38-63 - APPLICATION OF JOHN P. AND DOROTHY SCREEN AND TOM AND EMMA JAGGERS for reclassification of property generally located on West Charleston Boulevard between Cahlan Drive and Campbell Drive, from R-E to C-1, legally described as:

Lots 11 and 12, Block 2, Resubdivision of Blocks 1, 2, and 3, McNeil Tract.

Denied

ZONE CHANGE - Z-39-63 - APPLICATION OF E. R. HERBST for reclassification of property generally located on the southwest corner of West Charleston Boulevard and Melville Drive, from R-1 to C-1, legally described as:

Lot 1, Block 5, Westleigh Tract No. 1.

ZONE CHANGE - Z-41-63 - APPLICATION OF WILLIAM H. ANZUONI AND MORRIS R. GENTRY for reclassification of property generally located on the northeast and northwest corners of Campbell Drive, from R-E to C-1, legally described as:

The east 300 feet of the west 1290 feet of the south 283 feet of Section 32, Township 20 South, Range 61 East, and the south 320 feet of the Southwest Quarter (SW-1/4) of the Southeast Quarter (SE-1/4) of the Southwest Quarter (SW-1/4) of Section 32, Township 20 South, Range 61 East, except the east 525 feet thereof.

ZONE CHANGE - Z-42-63 - APPLICATION OF OZZIE AND CYNTHIA KRAFT AND CLARENCE E. FERRIEL for reclassification of property generally located on the northeast and northwest corners of West Charleston Boulevard and Shetland Road, from R-1 and R-E to C-1, legally described as:

The west 130 feet of the south 230 feet of the East Half (E-1/2) of the Southwest Quarter (SW-1/4) of the Southeast Quarter (SE-1/4) of the Southwest Quarter (SW-1/4) of Section 32, Township 20 South, Range 61 East, MDB&M, and the south 190 feet of the Southwest Quarter (SW-1/4) of the Southwest Quarter (SW-1/4) of the Southeast Quarter (SE-1/4) of Section 32, Township 20 South, Range 61 East, MDB&M.

ZONE CHANGE - Z-43-63 - APPLICATION OF E. R. HERBST for reclassification of property generally located on the northeast corner of West Charleston Boulevard and Cashman Drive, from R-E to C-2, legally described as:

The east 95 feet of the west 610 feet of the south 283 feet of Section 32, Township 20 South, Range 61 East, MDB&M.

ZONE CHANGE - Z-44-63 - APPLICATION OF BANK OF NEVADA, TRUSTEE, for reclassification of property generally located on the southeast corner of West Charleston Boulevard and Cashman Drive, from R-E to C-1, legally described as:

Lot 1, Block 1, Resubdivision of Blocks 1, 2, and 3, McNeil Tract.

ZONE CHANGE - Z-45-63 - APPLICATION OF ANN GRETA JONES for reclassification of property generally located on the north side of West Charleston Boulevard, between Cashman Drive and Campbell Drive, from R-E to C-1, legally described as:

The east 95 feet of the west 990 feet of the south 283 feet of Section 32, Township 20 South, Range 61 East, MDB&M.

ZONE CHANGE - Z-46-63 - APPLICATION OF HELEN KAYLOR for reclassification of property generally located on the south side of West Charleston Boulevard, between Cahlan Drive and Campbell Drive, from R-E to C-2, legally described as:

Lot 4, Block 2, Resubdivision of Blocks 1, 2 and 3, McNeil Tract.

ZONE CHANGE - Z-47-63 - APPLICATION OF DONNA JEAN HARDY for reclassification of property generally located on the north side of West Charleston Boulevard, between Cashman Drive and Campbell Drive, from R-E to C-2, legally described as:

The east 95 feet of the west 800 feet of the south 283 feet of Section 32, Township 20 South, Range 61 East, MDB&M.

ZONE CHANGE - Z-48-63 - APPLICATION OF QUINCY E. FORTIER, M. D. for reclassification of property generally located on the north side of West Charleston Boulevard between Mohawk Street and Upland Boulevard, from R-1 to C-1, legally described as:

Government Lots 55 and 56, Section 36, Township 20 South, Range 61 East, MDB&M.

ZONE CHANGE - Z-49-63 - APPLICATION OF CHARLES P. HALE, JR. for reclassification of property generally located on the southeast corner of West Charleston Boulevard and Barnard Drive, from R-1 to C-1, legally described as:

Lot 13, Block 1, Westleigh Tract No. 1.

The Director of Planning, Mr. Donald J. Saylor: Items "O" through "Z" on the Agenda are concerned with applications for commercial zoning on West Charleston Boulevard, starting west of Decatur and on up to Rancho Road. I understand that the Commission has received a letter from Attorney Dwight B. Claar, Jr., dated March 25, 1963, asking that these applications be sent back to the Planning Commission for further study. There were approximately 300 protests, and the Planning Commission has recommended denial of these applications.

Mr. Dwight B. Claar, Jr., Attorney at Law: I have previously written you, requesting that these items be taken off the Agenda and referred back to the Planning Commission because of the nature of the hearing held by the Planning Commission. These applicants have been trying for a number of years to get some relief for the conditions now prevailing on West Charleston Boulevard. All of us know the tremendous increase in traffic out in that area, which has essentially rendered the property useless as R-1. I did not in my letter intend to argue the merits of the petitions, but I did ask that these applications be referred back to the Planning Commission, so that these people might be informed as to what considerations are being considered in order to provide them some relief on their problem. I was at the meeting and did not see 300 protestants, but regardless of that, there was no attempt at all to identify these people with the property interests involved, nor any attempt to show proximity to applicants' properties, etc. I think the primary consideration behind the recommendation of denial of these applications is the affect that the rezoning might have on other property. We don't deny that there will be some affect; but what we do say is that if the people of this area want the convenience of having a thoroughfare -- essentially almost a race track -- to get to and from their residences, then bearing the brunt of it should not be restricted to the few property owners who are on that particular thoroughfare... some consideration should be given to them. All we are asking at this time is that the Commission take these off of the Agenda and refer them back to the Planning Commission with the stipulation or provision that these applicants be informed of the concrete reasons or considerations embodied in the Planning Commission's recommendation, so that they may have an opportunity to present concrete arguments in their own defense.

In response to inquiries by the Commissioners, Mr. Saylor stated that petitions of protest bearing numerous signatures had been received, objecting to this commercial zoning on West Charleston Boulevard.

Commissioner Mirabelli: Obviously, Mr. Claar, you have read the petition drawn up by Mr. Bruner. Don't you feel that the burden of proof should be on the applicants, rather than the protestants?

Mr. Claar: Yes, I agree. We only ask that the reasons against the proposal be submitted to us, so that we might give some form of answer thereto.

Commissioner Mirabelli: Mr. Bruner did an excellent job of drawing up all of the reasons why he thought it should be rezoned, but the Planning Commission indicated that they did not agree with him.

Mr. Elmo Bruner, Architect and Appraiser, restated the desirability

of the applicants being informed of the reasons for the denial of their applications; that the property definitely was not desirable for single family homes; and that he, personally, had anticipated putting an architectural office on his property.

It was pointed out that an architectural office could be constructed under R-4 zoning, by means of a Use Permit. The types of protests received were briefly analyzed and appeared predominantly to be against the rezoning of the West Charleston area as a whole and wanted this area to remain Ranch Estates.

Commissioner Mirabelli: I believe that zoning should not be a popularity contest, and I also feel that the Planning Commission is intelligent enough not to decide these issues solely on the basis of numbers. Often times, they have gone against the majority when they felt that a zoning was right or wrong. Also, I think that this Board is intelligent enough to evaluate this, regardless of numbers involved. I really do not see any need for these applications to be referred back to the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Whipple: The basis objection is that they do not want West Charleston commercial. There are a great many very fine, lovely homes in the area. In all of my experience, I have never received more letters and telephone calls in opposition to commercial zoning than I have on these applications. You say it is no longer useful or desirable for residential development. I think a great many people would argue this point with you. They still feel it is desirable for residential homes.

Commissioner Fountain moved that the following rezoning applications be DENIED:

- Z-35-63 - APPLICATION OF THE LAS VEGAS MORTGAGE COMPANY, INC.
- Z-38-63 - APPLICATION OF JOHN P. AND DOROTHY SCREEN AND TOM AND EMMA JAGGERS
- Z-39-63 - APPLICATION OF E. R. HERBST
- Z-41-63 - APPLICATION OF WILLIAM H. ANZUONI AND MORRIS R. GENTRY
- Z-42-63 - APPLICATION OF OZZIE AND CYNTHIA KRAFT AND CLARENCE E. FERRIEL
- Z-43-63 - APPLICATION OF E. R. HERBST
- Z-44-63 - APPLICATION OF BANK OF NEVADA, TRUSTEE
- Z-45-63 - APPLICATION OF ANN GRETA JONES
- Z-46-63 - APPLICATION OF HELEN KAYLOR
- Z-47-63 - APPLICATION OF DONNA JEAN HARDY
- Z-48-63 - APPLICATION OF QUINCY E. FORTIER, M. D.
- Z-49-63 - APPLICATION OF CHARLES P. HALE, JR.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Levy and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Mirabelli, Levy, Fountain, Whipple, and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

It was pointed out to the applicants who were in attendance at the meeting that if any of these applicants had a particular or specific use in mind for their property, a new application could be submitted on the basis of what they actually intend to use the property for and these would be carefully reconsidered on an individual basis.

OK-RO.
D
R
A
F
T

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

March 14, 1963

D
R
A
F
T

February 27, 1963

Notice is hereby given that on March 14, 1963, at 7:30 PM
In the Council Chambers of the City Hall, Las Vegas, Nevada, the City Planning
Commission will hear the application of:

Z-41-63

WILLIAM H. ANZUONI AND MORRIS R. GENTRY
FOR THE RECLASSIFICATION OF PROPERTY
LEGALLY DESCRIBED AS THE EAST 300 FEET
OF THE WEST 1290 FEET OF THE SOUTH 283
FEET OF SECTION 32, TOWNSHIP 20 SOUTH,
RANGE 61E, AND THE SOUTH 320 FEET OF
THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER (SW $\frac{1}{4}$) OF THE
SOUTHEAST QUARTER (SE $\frac{1}{4}$) OF THE SOUTHWEST
QUARTER (SW $\frac{1}{4}$) OF SECTION 32, TOWNSHIP 20
SOUTH, RANGE 61E, EXCEPT THE EAST 525
FEET THEREOF. GENERALLY LOCATED ON THE
NORTHEAST AND NORTHWEST CORNERS OF
CAMPBELL DRIVE.

FROM: R-E (Residence Estates)
TO: C-1 (Limited Commercial)

Any and all interested persons may appear before the City Planning Commission
either in person or by counsel, and object to or express approval of the proposed
reclassification, or may prior to this hearing file with the City Planning Director
written objections thereto or approval thereof.

DON J. SAYLOR
Director of Planning

DJS: omc

March
Twenty-Ninth
1963

Messrs. William H. Anzuoni and
Morris R. Gentry
328 Fremont
Las Vegas, Nevada

Re: Zone Change - Z-41-63

Gentlemen:

The Board of Commissioners of the City of Las Vegas, Nevada, at their regular meeting on March 27, 1963, considered your zone change application (Z-41-63) for reclassification of property generally located on the northeast and northwest corners of Campbell Drive, from R-E to C-1.

By motion duly made, seconded, and unanimously carried, this application was DENIED.

Yours very truly,

(Mrs.) Juanita A. Frary
Deputy City Clerk

jaf

cc - Planning
cc - Public Works

33. Z-44-63

Denied

Application of the BANK OF NEVADA, TRUSTEE for the reclassification of property legally described as Lot 1, Block 1, Resubdivision of Blocks 1, 2, and 3, McNeill Tract, and generally located on the southeast corner of West Charleston Boulevard and Cashman Drive, from R-E to C-1.
Mr. Saylor gave the Staff report pointing out the general location. This parcel is in the general area where Staff felt that the residential impregnability should be continued. The record indicated three protests, however, the many other protests on file are applicable to all of these application along West Charleston. Staff recommended denial.
The Chairman declared the public hearing open.
There were approximately 100 protestants in the audience.
Mr. Ken Christianson appeared in behalf of the applicant.
Mr. Carl Christian presented a petition protesting Items 30 thru 46 inclusive. Again he listed the points protested by the property owners he represented.
The Chairman declared the public hearing closed.
After discussion, Mr. Gilday moved that the application of BANK OF NEVADA, TRUSTEE for the reclassification of property generally located on the southeast corner of West Charleston Boulevard and Cashman Drive, from R-E to C-1 be denied.
Mr. Empey seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous.

34. Z-41-63

Denied

Application of WILLIAM H. ANZUONI and MORRIS R. GENTRY for the reclassification of property legally described as the east 300 feet of the west 1290 feet of the south 283 feet of Section 32, T20S, R61E, MDB&M, and the south 320 feet of the southwest quarter (SW 1/4) of the southeast quarter (SE 1/4) of the southwest quarter (SW 1/4) of Section 32, T20S, R61E, MDB&M, except the E 525' thereof. Generally located on the northeast and northwest corners of Campbell Drive and West Charleston, from R-E to C-1.
Mr. Saylor gave the Staff report pointing out the general location. Staff recommended denial.
The Chairman declared the public hearing open.
There were approximately 100 protestants in the audience.
A petition was filed by Charles W. Deener with 78 names listed protesting the West Charleston reclassification, and specifically Z-41-63, Z-43-63, Z-45-63, and Z-47-63.
Mr. Anzuoni appeared in his own behalf.
There were 20 people approving this application in the audience.
The Chairman declared the public hearing closed.
After discussion, Mr. Johnston moved that the application of WILLIAM H. ANZUONI and MORRIS R. GENTRY for the reclassification of property generally located on the northeast and northwest corners of Campbell Drive and West Charleston, from R-E to C-1 be denied.
Mr. Empey seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous.

35. Z-43-63

Denied

Application of E. R. HERBST for the reclassification of property legally described as the east 95 feet of the west 610 feet of the south 283 feet of Section 32, T20S, R61E, MDB&M, and generally located on the northeast corner of West Charleston Boulevard and Cashman Drive, from R-E to C-2.
Mr. Saylor gave the Staff report, pointing out the general location. Staff recommended denial.
The Chairman declared the public hearing open.
There were 100 protestants in the audience.
There were 20 in favor.
The Chairman declared the public hearing closed.
After discussion, Mr. Johnston moved that the application of E. R. HERBST for the reclassification of property generally located on the northeast corner of West Charleston Boulevard and Cashman Drive, from R-E to C-2 be denied.
Mr. Empey seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous.

36. Z-45-63

Denied

Application of ANN GRETA JONES for the reclassification of property legally described as the east 95 feet of the west 990 feet of the south 283 feet of Section 32, T20S, R61E, MDB&M, and generally located on the north side of West Charleston

Planning Department
400 Stewart Street

March 15, 1963

Mr. William H. Anzuoni
328 Fremont Street
Las Vegas, Nevada

Dear Mr. Anzuoni:

At the regular meeting of the City Planning Commission held on March 14, 1963, consideration was given to your request for the reclassification of property generally located on the Northeast and Northwest corners of Campbell Drive, from R-E to C-1.

It was voted by the Planning Commission to refer this item to the Board of City Commissioners with the recommendation that it be denied.

This item will be heard by the Board of City Commissioners on March 27, 1963 at 4:00 P.M. in the Council Chambers of the City Hall, Las Vegas, Nevada.

Very truly yours,

Don J. Saylor
Director of Planning

DJS:omc

cc: Mr. Morris R. Gentry

Z-41-63

TO: City Clerk
FROM: Planning Department

DATE: March 15, 1963

ITEM FOR CITY COMMISSION AGENDA ON March 27, 1963

ZONE CHANGE -- Z - 41-63

Application of WILLIAM H. ANZUONI & MORRIS R. GENTRY

Z-41-63

WILLIAM H. ANZUONI AND MORRIS R. GENTRY FOR THE RECLASSIFICATION OF PROPERTY LEGALLY DESCRIBED AS THE EAST 300 FEET OF THE WEST 1290 FEET OF THE SOUTH 283 FEET OF SECTION 32, TOWNSHIP 20 SOUTH, RANGE 61 EAST, AND THE SOUTH 320 FEET OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER ($SW\frac{1}{4}$) OF THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER ($SE\frac{1}{4}$) OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER ($SW\frac{1}{4}$) OF SECTION 32, TOWNSHIP 20 SOUTH, RANGE 61 EAST, EXCEPT THE EAST 525 FEET THEREOF. GENERALLY LOCATED ON THE NORTHEAST AND NORTHWEST CORNERS OF CAMPBELL DRIVE.

FROM: R-E (Residence Estates)
TO: C-1 (Limited Commercial)

Number of protests: Approx. 300

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

BY: _____

DON J. SAYLOR
Director of Pl/

William B. Galt
1400 Broadway, Suite
San Diego, California

March 11, 1968

Planning Commission
City Hall
Las Vegas, Nevada

The Honorable Sgt. J. Saylor and Honorable members of the
Planning Commission:

In re:

2-29-68
2-4-68
2-23-68
2-26-68
2-27-68

Thanks for the notice of the proposed hearing
of these revised petitions on West Charleston Boulevard.

Please be advised that I am enclosing 50
reclassifications of West Charleston Boulevard. Last year
at this time, the Commission proposed strip lot zoning.
These are also shown, and there is no need for additional
business along West Charleston Boulevard.

I am sure I will be unable to attend this hearing
personally. I am greatly appreciated if you would
present these views to the Commission.

Sincerely yours,

William B. Galt

WBS/clj

DOUGLAS W. MACMILLAN, M.D.

1840 W. THIRD ST. COR. UNION PL.

LOS ANGELES 17, CALIFORNIA

TELEPHONE BURBANK 7-1112

March 11, 1963

Planning Commission
City Hall
Las Vegas, Nevada

The Honorable Don J. Gaylor and Honorable members of the
Planning Commission:

In re: 2-29-63, 2-45-63, 2-41-63, 2-46-63, and 2-67-63

Thanks for the notice of the proposed hearing
of these several reclassifications on West Charleston
Boulevard.

Please be advised that I strenuously oppose
each and all of these applications. The Home owners in
this area opposed this a year ago for a good reason.
There is no need for additional business along Charleston.

I'm sorry I will be unable to attend the hearing
personally. So I thank you for presenting my views to
the commission.

Sincerely yours,

Dr. D. W. Macmillan

DWM/rlp

DR. RANALD MACMILLAN

1848 WEST THIRD STREET

OPTOMETRIST & OPTICIAN

LUS ANGELES 19, CALIFORNIA

DUNELK 7-9112

March 10, 1964

State of California

City of Los Angeles

San Francisco, California

The Honorable Mark J. Sawyer and other members of the
Planning Commission

Dear Sir:

~~San Francisco~~
~~San Francisco~~
~~San Francisco~~
~~San Francisco~~

Thank you for the notice of the proposed hearing
of those regulations on the subject of...

I would like to advise you that I will not only oppose
every one of those regulations but also...

I am sorry I cannot be present at the hearing
personally but I will appear by proxy...

Sincerely yours,

Dr. Ranald Macmillan

RM/216

Prudent
Z-411-63

March 9, 1963

Mr. Don J. Saylor,
Director of Planning
City Hall
Las Vegas, Nevada

Dear Mr. Saylor:

We are in receipt of six letters from your office dated February 27, 1963 outlining proposed zoning changes on six parcels of property fronting on Charleston Boulevard. Please be advised that we are against these zoning changes. All of them

With specific reference to the McNeil Tract property we would like to call to your attention the Declaration and Establishment of Amended Conditions and Restrictions Recorded on March 25, 1949 No. 308761, which amended the restrictions recorded July 19, 1946, Document No. 228437 of Book 23 of Miscellaneous Records of Clark County, Nev.

This recorded document stated that the covenants are to run with the land and specifically restricts this land to residential estate use only. Said restrictions are to run until January 1, 1971 and automatically extend over ten year periods unless by a vote of the majority it is agreed to change the covenants in whole or in part.

We respectfully submit that we purchased property in the McNeil Tract expecting to be protected by the said restrictions. According to them no change can be made before Jan. 1, 1971 and only then by a vote of the majority of the owners.

Mr. and Mrs. Edwin M. Belmont
1125 Campbell Drive
Las Vegas, Nevada

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

March 14, 1963

February 27, 1963

Protest

Notice is hereby given that on March 14, 1963, at 7:30 P.M. in the Council Chambers of the City Hall, Las Vegas, Nevada, the City Planning Commission will hear the application of:

Z-41-63

WILLIAM H. ANZUONI AND MORRIS R. GENTRY FOR THE RECLASSIFICATION OF PROPERTY LEGALLY DESCRIBED AS THE EAST 300 FEET OF THE WEST 1290 FEET OF THE SOUTH 283 FEET OF SECTION 32, TOWNSHIP 20 SOUTH, RANGE 61 EAST, AND THE SOUTH 320 FEET OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER (SW $\frac{1}{4}$) OF THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER (SE $\frac{1}{4}$) OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER (SW $\frac{1}{4}$) OF SECTION 32, TOWNSHIP 20 SOUTH, RANGE 61 EAST, EXCEPT THE EAST 525 FEET THEREOF. GENERALLY LOCATED ON THE NORTHEAST AND NORTHWEST CORNERS OF CAMPBELL DRIVE.

FROM: R-E (Residence Estates)

TO: C-1 (Limited Commercial)

Any and all interested persons may appear before the City Planning Commission either in person or by counsel, and object to or express approval of the proposed reclassification, or may prior to this hearing file with the City Planning Director written objections thereto or approval thereof.

Don J. Saylor
DON J. SAYLOR
Director of Planning

City Planning Director

Dear Sir:

In regards to the notice on reverse side,

we certainly do object to reclassification of the Aera.

We bought our home in this Aera because it was an resident estate.

If we had wanted to be in a commercial Aera we would not have bought in an expensive, Ranch estate location and put more and more money into improvements. So why take our Privacy away.

Sincerely

Charlie E. Steel

Sally Steel

DR. J. D. SMITH
DENTIST
127 NORTH FOURTH STREET
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA

March 4, 1963

Mr. Don J. Saylor
Director of Planning
City Hall
Las Vegas, Nevada

Dear Mr. Saylor:

A previous commitment will probably prevent us from attending the meeting of the Planning Commission on March 14th. We do, however, request you to inform the members of the Commission that we do very strongly object to all six of the enclosed proposed reclassifications.

There are very nice homes-valuable homes closely adjacent to all of these proposed reclassifications. The people who built these homes did so with the firm conviction and certainly with at least an implied promise that the area would be restricted to residence estates only. We feel that the homes in the neighborhood-ours included, would be much less valuable and much less desirable as a place to live if any of these applications for reclassifications are granted.

We are also of the opinion that the owners of the property asking reclassification should have no complaint if their request is refused as they purchased the lots in question with full knowledge of the restrictions.

We will appreciate it if you will bring this letter to the attention of The Planning Commission and request that you do so.

Sincerely,

J. D. Smith
Erlene Smith

Residence- 1170 Campbell Drive
(Between West Charleston and Ashby)

