

MINUTES

Las Vegas, Nevada
December 16, 1970

A Regular Meeting of the Board of City Commissioners of the City of Las Vegas, Nevada, held this 16th day of December, 1970, was called to order by His Honor, Mayor Oran K. Gragson, at the hour of 10:00 a.m., with the following members present:

Mayor	Oran K. Gragson
Commissioner	Alexander Coblentz, M.D.
Commissioner	Hank Thornley
Commissioner	Wesley G. Howery
Commissioner	James J. Corey

STAFF PRESENT

City Manager	A. R. Trelease
Administrative Assistant	Kenneth A. Bouton
Deputy City Attorney	Ian Ross
Director of Planning	Donald J. Saylor
Director of Public Works	Richard P. Sauer
Director of Lic. & Rev.	Jean Dutton
Fire Chief	J. D. Miller
Traffic Engineer	Al Bossi
Procurement Officer	J. C. Cathcart
City Clerk	Edwina M. Cole

INVOCATION

The Invocation was given by Rev. Mike Friedman, Pastor, First Baptist Church of North Las Vegas:

"Let us pray. Again, Father, let us thank you as individuals who have intelligence - individuals who have the wisdom and capabilities You have given us that we would come and ask your guidance and blessings and to invoke a special blessing on this meeting today. We thank You, Heavenly Father, that we are frail enough to realize that we cannot go it alone; that we need to look to the Supreme Creator who made all that was made. And as the Holy Scripture says - everything that was made, was good. We ask, Father, that during this special time of the year that we might put aside our busyness - that we might put aside our commercialism - that we might put aside our materialism and our wants and for a time realize what Christmas is all about. That somehow, some way, we might insert a Spiritual dimension into our living. I ask, Father, for guidance for these who serve. I ask also that we who are their helpmates have a charge also to be responsible citizens - to uphold them in what these servants are trying to do and that through the democratic process we might all together, in one body, as a majority stand behind what these men and women are trying to do. I thank You, God, personally for the many hours behind the scenes that so many people do not understand - what goes into a program - the hours of planning and preparation, and I personally want to thank at this time of the year, these who have served me. I pray, Father, that today's meeting might be a different meeting. That even though we are in a secular dimension here, we might sense the Spirit of God permeating this room in what is said and what is done, and the manner in which it is done. I ask a special blessing, Father, on these servants and their families during this Special Time of the Year; those who are in attendance today and their families, and our City of Las Vegas. I ask this all in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, Amen."

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

His Honor, Mayor Gragson, called the meeting to order and the Pledge of Allegiance was given.

AWARD OF
CONTRACTS

BID No. 70.124 - PICNIC SHELTERS FOR TULE SPRINGS
(Public Works)

(Estimate: \$4,600.00)

Commissioner Howery moved that the recommendation of the City Manager, the Procurement Division and using department for rejection of the bid of TIBERTI COMPANY under Bid No. 70.124, be APPROVED.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Corey and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Coblentz, Thornley, Howery, Corey and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

Commissioner Corey moved that the recommendation of the City Manager, the Procurement Division and using department for award of contract under Bid No. 70.124 to ROBERT WIDEN RECREATION COMPANY for the bid in the amount of \$4,450.00, be APPROVED, and the Procurement Division authorized to proceed.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Howery and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Coblentz, Thornley, Howery, Corey and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

BID No. 70.128 - 1,000 TON 3/8-INCH ASPHALTIC CONCRETE
TYPE I-C (Public Works)

(Estimate: \$4,350.00)

Commissioner Howery moved that the recommendation of the City Manager, the Procurement Division and using department for award of contract under Bid No. 70.128 to WELLS CARGO for the low bid in the amount of \$4,600.00, be APPROVED, and the Procurement Division authorized to proceed.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Thornley and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Coblentz, Thornley, Howery, Corey and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

BID No. 70.129 - REPAIR OVERHEAD DOORS - FIRE STATION
No. 4 - Alternate Bid (Fire Department)

(Estimate: \$2,200.00)

Commissioner Corey moved that the recommendation of the City Manager, the Procurement Division and using department for award of contract under Bid No. 70.129 to OVERHEAD DOOR COMPANY for the only bid received in the amount of \$1,580.00, be APPROVED, and the Procurement Division authorized to proceed.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Thornley and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Coblentz, Thornley, Howery, Corey and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

BID No. 70.131 - 1/2 TON PICK-UP TRUCKS - 2 FOR TRAFFIC ENGINEER (NEW) 1 FOR STREET DEPARTMENT (NEW)

(Estimate: \$7,000.00)

Commissioner Howery moved that the recommendation of the City Manager, the Procurement Division and using department for award of contract under Bid No. 70.131 to FAIRWAY CHEVROLET for the low bid in the amount of \$6,890.47, be APPROVED, and the Procurement Division authorized to proceed.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Corey and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Coblentz, Thornley, Howery, Corey and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

BID No. 70.132 - UNIFORMS FOR FIRE DEPARTMENT - 1/1/71 THRU 6/30/72 (Fire Department)

(Estimate: \$15,000.00)

Commissioner Howery moved that the recommendation of the City Manager, the Procurement Division and using department for rejection of the bid of FECHHEIMER BROS. for failure to submit a complete bid, be APPROVED.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Corey and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Coblentz, Thornley, Howery, Corey and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

Commissioner Howery moved that the recommendation of the City Manager, the Procurement Division and using department for award of contract under Bid No. 70.132 to UNIFORMS, INC. for the low bid in the amount of \$11,110.50, be APPROVED, and the Procurement Division authorized to proceed.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Thornley and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Coblentz, Thornley, Howery, Corey and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

BID No. 70.119 - INSTALLATION OF TRAFFIC SIGNALS AND APPURTENANCES AT OGDEN AND THIRD STREETS (Public Works)

Commissioner Thornley moved that the recommendation of the City Manager, the Procurement Division and using department that all proposals received under Bid No. 70.119 be rejected as exceeding the Engineer's estimate, be APPROVED, and the Procurement Division authorized to readvertise.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Howery and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Coblentz, Thornley, Howery, Corey and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

PERMISSION TO
RECEIVE BIDS
Approved

MATERIALS NECESSARY TO MOVE FIRE ALARM & TRAFFIC CONTROL
CABLES AND OLD CITY HALL FACILITIES (Fire Department and
Traffic Engineer)

Commissioner Howery moved that the recommendation of the City Manager, the Procurement Division and using departments to advertise for bids on materials necessary to move fire alarm and traffic control cables and old City Hall facilities, be APPROVED, and the Procurement Division authorized to proceed.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Corey and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Coblentz, Thornley, Howery, Corey and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

PURCHASE ORDER
Approved

Commissioner Howery moved that the recommendation of the City Manager, the Procurement Division and using department for issuance of a Purchase Order

To: Nevada State Highway Department
For: Installation of 24-inch RCP storm drain along
Highland Avenue adjacent to West Fremont
Expressway

Amount: \$2,300.00 (50% participation)

be APPROVED, and the City Manager and Director of Finance authorized to proceed.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Corey and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Coblentz, Thornley, Howery, Corey and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

SERVICE AND
MATERIAL WARRANTS
Approved

Commissioner Corey moved that Service and Material Warrants Nos. K-104395, K-104603, K-104604 and L-200012 thru L-200297, in the amount of \$1,158,899.17, be APPROVED, and the Director of Finance authorized to issue.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Coblentz and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Coblentz, Thornley, Howery, Corey and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

PAYROLL
WARRANTS
Approved

Commissioner Coblentz moved that Payroll Warrants Nos. 69919 thru 71300 for the Pay Period ending December 5, 1970, in the amount of \$352,380.20, be APPROVED, and the Director of Finance authorized to issue.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Howery and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Coblentz, Thornley, Howery, Corey and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

MINUTES

Approved by
Reference

Commissioner Howery moved that minutes of the following meetings of the Board of City Commissioners be APPROVED BY REFERENCE, and the Mayor and Clerk authorized to sign:

REGULAR MEETING OF NOVEMBER 4, 1970

REGULAR MEETING OF NOVEMBER 18, 1970

SPECIAL MEETING OF NOVEMBER 9, 1970 - 10:00 A.M.

SPECIAL MEETING OF NOVEMBER 9, 1970 - 5:00 P.M.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Thornley and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Coblentz, Thornley, Howery, Corey and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

Z-62-70

Abeyance

ZONE CHANGE - Z-62-70 - GUY MATHIS AND GRACE REED

Property generally located on the west side of 4th Street between Charleston Blvd. and 3rd Street:

From: R-4
To: C-M
Proposed
Use: Public Garage, including body repair

Abeyance from December 2, 1970 - Planning Commission recommends denial (16 protests)

Director of Planning, Donald J. Saylor: The first item is the application of Mathis and Read which, in fact, is a request for change in zoning to permit the expansion of Gaudin Ford to the west side of 4th Street. You will remember at the last meeting it was held in abeyance to see if Mr. Ackerman could work out some arrangement whereby the body repair and paint booth could be located on the present facility of Gaudin Ford and have just the repair facility on the west side of 4th Street. I talked to Mr. Ackerman yesterday and he advised me they were still working on this with their architect but, as of yet, did not have anything definite worked out and needed more time.

Commissioner Corey moved that the request of the applicant for more time to work out the details of body repair and paint booth operations under the expansion facilities proposed under Z-62-70, be APPROVED.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Howery and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Coblentz, Thornley, Howery, Corey and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

Z-6-70
Abeyance

REQUEST FOR REINSTATEMENT AND EXTENSION OF TIME -
Z-6-70 - RICHARD TAM

Property generally located 180 ft. east of Valley View Blvd.
and 570 ft. south of Sahara Avenue:

R-2 P.U.D. and
R-4 P.U.D. Zones

Planning Commission recommends approval of a reinstatement
and a 12-month extension of time. Abeyance from 12/2/70.

Mr. Saylor: The next item also was held in abeyance from the
last meeting and it was my understanding that it would con-
tinue to be held in abeyance until the Court acts.

Commissioner Howery: Yes - we will have to give it more time.

Z-64-70
Approved
subject to
Conditions

ZONE CHANGE - Z-64-70 - DR. RONALD STRICKMAN

Mr. Saylor: This is the application of Strickman on West
Bonanza for a change in zoning. The original application asked
for C-M (commercial/industrial) zoning on the entire three
lots. There was a protest factor when it came before you and
you referred it back to the Planning Commission for further
evaluation. At that meeting it was brought out in further detail
that the proposed operation would involve only the installation
of radios and accessories. It would not involve any repair
work insofar as automobiles are concerned. Due to that
clarification, the proposed operation could be permitted in a
C-1 Zone with the exception of the warehouse facility located
at the rear of the property. The Planning Commission has re-
commended approval amending the application to C-1, with the
exception of the south 100 ft. We had a protest from the
abutting property owner to the west and two or three property
owners to the north. The attorney for Mr. Binion and Searway
was not at the meeting. However, one of the other protestants
indicated that he had received a verbal protest from those two.
The Planning Commission recommends approval with those
changes.

Mayor Gragson: All the ingress and egress has to come from
Bonanza - right?

Mr. Saylor: That's right. The plot plan proposes a driveway
here (wall map) and a driveway here.

Mayor Gragson: What is the proposed use for the C-M?

Mr. Saylor: It will accommodate the warehouse facility.

Commissioner Howery: What is the warehouse to be used for?

Mr. Saylor: He wholesales to other outlets and the supply would
be stored in this facility.

Commissioner Howery: Have they changed the hours of operation
now?

Mr. Saylor: They have indicated in their letter that they would
be in operation from eight to five.

Mayor Gragson: I don't mind the C-1, but it seems to me that C-M may be the cause for other heavier industry in the adjoining area -

Commissioner Howery: You have to have C-M in order to have a warehouse?

Mr. Saylor: Yes.

Commissioner Howery: You can't have C-1 with a Use Permit?

Mr. Saylor: No.

Commissioner Corey: Can you restrict it to "warehouse only"?

Mr. Saylor: Yes, as a part of the approval for this zoning.

Commissioner Coblenz: That was the understanding at the Planning Commission meeting.

Dr. Strickman: Don Walker was unable to attend the meeting this morning, but the C-M was to be at the back of the property.

Commissioner Corey: Would there be any objection to restricting the C-M for storage warehouse purposes only?

Dr. Strickman: That's what it is to be used for - storage of radios, TV's, etc.

Commissioner Corey: If he ever wanted to use it for anything else, he would have to come back before us.

Commissioner Corey moved that the recommendation of the Planning Commission under Z-64-70, be APPROVED, subject to the following conditions:

1. Application to be amended to C-1, excepting the south 100 ft. to C-M which shall be used for warehouse facilities only.
2. Conformance to the Plot Plan on file in the Planning Department.
3. Resolution of Intent to be restricted to a twelve (12) month time limit.
4. Dedication of necessary rights-of-way and signing an agreement and posting a bond for the installation of off-site improvements as required by the Department of Public Works.
5. Conformance to the requirements of the Fire and Building Departments.
6. A screening hedge to be installed along the south property line according to the requirements of the Planning Department. This will necessitate moving the building north to accommodate the hedge.
7. Hours of operation to be restricted from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Howery and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Coblentz, Thornley, Howery, Corey and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

Z-66-70
Approved
subject to
Conditions

ZONE CHANGE - Z-66-70 - KENNETH AND DONLEE SIMKINS

Mr. Saylor: This is the application of Simkins which was for a parking lot use located on the west side of Casino Center Blvd. just south of Imperial. This is the lot in question (wall map) - there are apartments here and here. The lot was to be a patron lot to be used in conjunction with the automobile facility here and the Planning Commission had recommended approval with the stipulation that there be a wall across the front of it, inset with a landscaping strip so that ingress and egress would be from the alley only, and that there be also a block wall on both sides. It was sent back from your last meeting to the Planning Commission for further clarification. They have determined that it could be allowed in a C-1 Zone as a Patron Parking Lot and they have recommended approval subject to several conditions.

Commissioner Howery: We referred this back because they had applied for C-2 - right?

Mr. Saylor: Yes.

Mayor Gragson: Is there anyone here who wants to be heard?

(No response)

Commissioner Howery moved that the recommendation of the Planning Commission under Z-66-70 be APPROVED, subject to the following conditions:

1. Application to be amended to C-1.
2. Resolution of Intent to be restricted to a twelve (12) month time limit.
3. Conformance to the Plot Plan on file in the Planning Department, as amended.
4. Dedication of necessary rights-of-way and signing an agreement and posting a bond for the installation of off-site improvements, as required by the Department of Public Works.
5. Conformance to the requirements of the Fire and Building Departments.
6. A 6 ft. high block wall on the north, south and east sides, to be constructed with no access permitted to Casino Center Blvd. The wall on the east side to be set in 3 ft. The said 3 ft. shall be sprinklered and landscaped with a hedge.

Page 8
Minutes
Regular Meeting
December 16, 1970

Motion seconded by Commissioner Thornley and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Coblentz, Thornley, Howery, Corey and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

Z-69-70

Application
Withdrawn

ZONE CHANGE - Z-69-70 - HOWARD AND DORIS GREENE

Mr. Saylor: This concerns an application of Greene for a change in zoning from R-1 to P-R for property located on the west side of Desert Lane between Hastings and Pinto. Highland Drive is further to the east - Charleston Blvd. to the south. This (wall map) is the lot in question. Across the street it is zoned for apartments and developed for apartments all along here. These are all single family homes in through here. The Clark County Health facility is here and the convalescent home here. There is commercial zoning, of course, over on Highland and south on Charleston. There is a single family home on the property and the request is for P-R zoning to allow a professional office use. The Planning Commission recommended denial primarily on the basis that it would obviously constitute spot-zoning. Furthermore, the policy up to this point has been in connection with P-R, to allow it on major streets. This is an interior residential street. In fact, that was the very reason that P-R Zoning was originated - to allow the transition of the residential along major streets to something that is not quite commercial. There were no protests at the Planning Commission meeting.

Mayor Gragson: Is the applicant here and want to be heard?

Howard Greene: It had been my intention to appear before you and try to persuade you to approve my application. Most of you don't know me from a bale of hay, but many years ago I attended many of these meetings and if memory serves me right, never do I remember the City Commission reversing . . . or seldom . . . the Planning Director and almost never both the Planning Commission and the Director. As Mr. Saylor has pointed out, approval of this application would be a violation of City policy as far as spot zoning is concerned and reserving P-R for major thoroughfares. Desert Lane is not a major thoroughfare. It may seem that I am arguing against my own application, but I am really not. I do want to point out - which you already know - that there was not one protest registered against my application. In contrast, I have here (if you would like to see them, and which I presented to the Planning Commission) many signed letters in favor of this zone change. I think possibly the significance of this is that the property owners (and surely the ones I talked to) were all in favor of a zone change from R-1. I think they have all come to the conclusion that this is no longer a desirable single family dwelling area. Although I was disappointed with the recommendation of both the Planning Director and the Planning Commission, I am a newly-licensed real estate broker and we own this property free and clear and I would like to have an office there. However, I feel if I can petition these same property owners and change my request to an R-3, I feel I can get favorable consideration from the property owners. At this time I would like to ask the City Commission if they would consider sending my application back to the Planning Department for this amendment.

Page 9
Minutes
Regular Meeting
December 16, 1970

Mr. Saylor: Insofar as sending the application back to Planning for a change to R-3 - we would have to go through a whole new application procedure. I somehow have the feeling he has indicated that other property owners in the area want to join in. So I think the best procedure for him would be to withdraw and submit a new application.

Mayor Gragson: Were you indicating there would be other property owners interested in R-3?

Mr. Greene: Yes. As a matter of fact, not only do I have this written support letters, but there was one property owner who appeared in support of this zone change and it was his - his alone - idea that we should change to apartment zoning. He felt we couldn't get the P-R. However, he did support the zone change, and he said that from the people he contacted (he contacted about half of them and I contacted the other half) - of course, we were speaking at that time of the P-R zoning -- I was - but this gentleman was talking about apartments because that is actually what he wants. He wants R-3 zoning - so I think we can get a favorable reaction from the property owners toward an R-3 zoning. However, I didn't know what the procedure was. I thought you could recommend . . . send it back to the Planning Department for reconsideration on that basis.

Commissioner Howery: If you withdraw your application you still don't lose your filing fee and there is quite a different application for R-3 over P-R. I would suggest that you withdraw and re-file.

Mr. Greene: At this time, then, I wish to state for the record that I withdraw the application for a zone change from R-1 to P-R.

Mayor Gragson: I think the applications of all property owners who might desire the R-3 in this area should be included in one submission. You can get together with our Planning Staff and work out the details.

Z-70-70
Approved
subject to
Conditions

ZONE CHANGE - Z-70-70 - THOMAS BECK, PRESIDENT OF
SHAPEMAKERS, INC.

Mr. Saylor: This involves the application for change of zone from P-R to C-1 to allow a weight reducing salon on the northwest corner of Santa Clara and Sahara. This (wall map) is the particular lot in question. There is C-1 zoning to the west and to the east. The Planning Commission has recommended approval. There were two protestants based on the fact that if the C-1 zoning was allowed, it also ipso facto allowed the erection of off-premise signs and they were objecting to that. The applicant indicated that he proposed to use the existing facility the same way it is now. That he did not propose to erect any off-premise signs so the Planning Commission recommended approval with the usual conditions and the further condition that there be no off-premise signs on this property.

Mayor Gragson: Is there anyone present who wants to be heard in opposition?

(No response)

Commissioner Thornley moved that the recommendation of the Planning Commission under Z-70-70, be APPROVED, subject to the following conditions:

1. Resolution of Intent to be restricted to a twelve (12) month time limit.
2. Conformance to the Plot Plan on file in the Planning Department.
3. Dedication of necessary rights-of-way and signing an agreement and posting a bond for the installation of off-site improvements as required by the Department of Public Works.
4. Conformance to the requirements of the Fire and Building Departments.
5. Landscaping as required by the Planning Department.
6. No off-premise signs to be constructed on the property.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Howery and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Coblentz, Thornley, Howery, Corey and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

Z-71-70
Denied

ZONE CHANGE - Z-71-70 - D. A. McELRATH AND JERRY MOSS

Mr. Saylor: This concerns the application of McElrath and Moss for a change in zoning from R-E to R-3 for property generally located between Washington and Bonanza, east of Decatur. This (wall map) is Decatur - Western Hi - this is the commercial zoning along Decatur which involves the Friendly Ford Agency and Albertson's at this location. This is the area of the single family homes in through here - Gibson Hi School here and the Golf Course here. I think you remember the many other hearings that were involved with this property. At the time commercial zoning was approved for Friendly Ford, recognition was given to the need to set up some type of buffer (you might say) so that the existence of the commercial could not be used as a practical argument to change this to some higher density use pattern. As a result of that, you required that a street be dedicated along the west line of this vacant property - that a wall be constructed and that when this is developed, there be a hedge between the wall and the street.

Commissioner Corey: Who is the owner of record on this?

Mr. Saylor: McElrath and Moss, at this time.

Commissioner Howery: This was purchased from Anne Greta Jones?

Mr. Saylor: Right - the other hearings were all conducted under her name.

Commissioner Howery: This isn't an option, then, it is owned by these people?

Mr. Saylor: As far as we know, they do. They have indicated that they are the owners of record. That's all I can tell you on that point. They have signed as owner. At the Planning Commission meeting, of course, we were presented with a protest petition containing the names of a substantial number of property owners in this area. The plot plan submitted indicated

a row of R-1 lots along the east line backing up to the R-1 development - then the apartment house development. The plan did not take into consideration this road, however. It left that out. That has been dedicated - it's unimproved.

Commissioner Corey: Was that brought to their attention at the Planning Commission meeting?

Mr. Saylor: Yes.

Mayor Gragson: Is there anyone present who wants to be heard?

Dr. Robert F. Kaufman, 4421 Thompson Circle: At the meeting with the Planning Commission the arguments that the developer advanced are now centered on, first of all, that good planning requires that a buffer zone be established between commercial and residential. I would like to point out that Albertson's has already dedicated a right-of-way for a road, which could easily be a buffer zone between the residential development and commercial. The argument was also given - in answer to an objection - that the question was - what happens to the schools in the area as far as overcrowding? The answer was that a little more school-crowding won't hurt. We have always been behind. I would like to recap three arguments: The first, the dedication already of the buffer zone in the area. The second one is an economic argument. Messrs. McElrath and Moss bought this land at a premium price - something in the area of \$400,000 or \$500,000, which is quite high to sell for residential lots. I don't feel that the Charleston Estates neighborhood wasn't Master-planned - which calls for residential development - has to be violated to get this developer out of an economic bind. The expense of putting in the apartments is going to be felt by the neighboring owners - the adjacent owners. It's going to consist of the aesthetic derangement of a residential area, which is already highly sought - not for expensive homes or plush development - but simply as a good place to raise a family. Twin Lakes, Charleston Estates, the Charleston Heights area are highly thought of in the City. The development is, again, Master-planned and I don't feel that the residents, or the City Commissioners, have to accept development otherwise, simply on the basis of economic grounds.

Question: Will the record show, please, what the Planning Commission recommended on this application?

Mayor Gragson: They recommended denial.

Vern Albright: I have here a petition signed by some thirty (30) property owners in the area, recommending approval of this application, stating that "the undersigned reside in the vicinity of said property and are of the opinion that such re-classification for said use would be beneficial to the neighborhood, and would provide a desirable buffer between existing commercial on Decatur and the existing residential area, and that said buffer would be further enhanced by the proposed construction of a row of single family dwelling homes, and a street running north and south adjacent to the east side of the proposed development". It is addressed to you and I would like to leave it with you.

Commissioner Corey: The homes that back up to this - what's that street in there?

Mr. Saylor: They are on Thompson and St. Andrew - east/west cul-de-sacs.

Commissioner Corey: Hogan?

Mr. Saylor: Hogan is the first north/south street - here (on map) - this is Hogan - Thompson - St. Andrew -

Commissioner Corey: Most of these protestants are on Hogan, Thompson Circle - how many in this petition?

Mr. Saylor: I think there were pretty close to 300 - I don't know exactly.

Dr. Kaufman: It is impossible for most of those signatures to have come from Hogan and Thompson Circle and St. Andrew - There are 230 signatures representing 159 property owners. You couldn't possibly have that many people on Hogan, Thompson and St. Andrew. The protesting signatures are from the whole neighborhood . . .

Commissioner Corey: Dr. Kaufman, I'm on your side on this thing - these are the ones who are protesting and these are on Hogan and Thompson Circle - that's what I'm saying.

Dr. Kaufman: May I ask a question - the 30 signatures in support, or approval - are they 30 homeowners or 30 people?

Commissioner Corey: I don't know - I haven't seen that petition yet.

Mayor Gragson: I think most of them are single owner's names - some may be man and wife - there are 25 property owners -

Unidentified Speaker (female): I think you can see that the applicants are ably represented by legal counsel whereas we, as homeowners, have only our vested interest in this property and I must say I'm sure you realize the only thing to take into consideration is whether it is good and proper zoning. We do not feel that it is. We feel that it goes against the Master Plan - it brings in too much density into this area, which is not in keeping. We have nothing against R-3 if it is placed in the right location and I personally feel that this is commercial, of a type, being pushed upon us - if you will recognize Webster's dictionary, they say - commercial - having financial profit as the primary aim - and I'm sure we have to agree that this is the primary aim.

Mrs. Gordon Jack: I am here speaking on behalf of the many interested parents at Ruth Fife Elementary School. As I mentioned the other evening to the Planning Board, we have a rather unique situation in this neighborhood where we have an elementary school, a junior high school and a senior high school, all within walking distance, so that no child has more than a ten to twelve-minute walk to school. In the past year, since the commercial has gone in on the corner of Washington and Decatur, we are trying to learn to live with it. It has put much more traffic into there than we were ever lead to believe, or ever

thought possible. Morning after morning, I am "safety" over at the Ruth Fife School and I sit there and watch, and you really can't believe the traffic that we have in that area. We have the two interior streets - we have Washington - then we have Snead Drive - then we have Fortune - then we have Bonanza and then we have Fremont. In an area of low density to put in an apartment complex like this and say that growth is good just because it's growth, is not necessarily so - a wart on the end of your nose, for instance. I know they feel we have been obstructive in this, but we feel that we are working for a good neighborhood - a neighborhood that has had a number of problems which have developed because of the commercial coming in. As I say, we are trying very hard to learn to live with that, but maximum density housing - as this apartment complex would be - would utterly change the whole neighborhood and we feel, strongly, that the low density is a zoning that must be kept.

Art Johnston: I also live in the neighborhood to be affected by the zoning change. My wife and I moved into the area about three years ago and we went to a lot of effort to determine which area in town best suited our needs - the area in which we could afford to buy and have those attributes we thought very important. One of those was to get into as nice a residential district as possible and one of low density in this nature. I even took off time and came down to City Hall to find out what the zoning was in that area and with that in mind, believing the City Council would uphold what they had previously promised someone, said - let's go ahead and buy here. Then later on - maybe a year or so ago - there was a big squabble about a commercial area on Decatur. We had promises then that we would have a street, shrubbery and things to separate this area we wanted to maintain as a home area. Now, again, rearing it's ugly head is an attempt to try to convince you that you ought to renege on something that has been promised to people who have put their money into homes here and would like to live in this area.

Commissioner Corey: Mr. Johnston, there is no reneging on what we promised, or what we made the stipulation on on the original commercial - that there will be a wall - a road and the shrubbery . . .

Mr. Johnston: I said there was an attempt being made to get you to do this - to change the zoning from R-1 . . .

Commissioner Corey: We're not even considering that.

Mr. Johnston: At least I would like to voice this objection to making a change from something we have taken for granted as being part of what we bought when we bought our homes - something we feel we are due. I would like to add one other thing: In coming down to meetings like this, it is very difficult for homeowners to get here. People have to take off from work to get here to protect their property rights and I don't know why developers coming into an area like this can't be required to contact every single property owner that is concerned and make them present to you, the feelings of the property owners who are concerned, rather than the property owner, every few months, has to come down here and defend something they thought they already had. Half the people in the area don't even know that this is going on right now. It places a big burden on people who do own property there.

Edward Haven: I live in the area. I also wish to protest the proposed zoning change. However, I would like to add one point here. I think it is timely for the City Commissioners to consider a change in procedure in which it is possible to avoid these repeated protests taking up our time and your time. My suggestion for procedure, which I would like to have you consider, is that when a protest has been voiced to the Commission, if your decision is to be a denial, to announce this denial prior to the need for a protest and save ourselves a whole lot of time.

Commissioner Corey: We have changed one thing - if we do turn it down, and deny a matter, they can't re-apply and bring it back in here next month. It takes four months for the first time and then if they try again, it takes another specified period of time, but we are trying to keep it where you are not continually brought back time-and-time again.

Mr. Haven: I think this is a City-wide problem and there should be some procedure to streamline it so we can get together more easily.

Commissioner Thornley: I think there has been a misunderstanding here as to what Commissioner Corey said. I think it was interpreted that you meant that we had already decided against this. What Commissioner said is - we were not considering extending the commercial from where it had been originally granted . . .

Mr. Haven: Yes - I understand this -

Mayor Gragson: I believe that you, or any other citizen, has the right to expect their views and opinion to be heard and I'm sure if you made an application and we refused to hear it, you would be very disappointed in us, so I believe we are required to hold these hearings, when requested . . . I believe it is incumbent upon us to determine each request upon its merits and hold these hearings when we have the requests. In fact, it is required in our City Charter that we do.

Attorney George Dickerson: I represent the applicants. I was very glad to hear the clarification by Commissioner Thornley because for a while it reminded me somewhat of an appearance before Judge Ross in the United States District Court in which he looked down and said - I wish you attorneys wouldn't argue so persuasively and cause me to revise an opinion I have already arrived at. If I may, Commissioner Corey, I would like to point out what your problem was with the streets. As you will see - Hogan and St. Andrew and Thompson are all cul-de-sacs -

Commissioner Corey: They are not all cul-de-sacs -

Mr. Dickerson: I beg your pardon - Hogan comes in right here, but some distance from the property with which we are here involved. Those who are concerned about the preservation of the integrity of the residential character of their neighborhood have no fears, because there is nothing which fronts upon the property which is to be developed. They are, in fact, a designed self-contained unit within the City as far as its residential character is concerned. If this whole area had initially come before you for development as one project, then good planning would very well have dictated that you have a transitional buffer provided for the commercial to a higher density residential to a lower density residential, which is, in fact, what has

been accomplished. As I can show you from the diagram here where this is, in fact, the nature of the development in the immediate proximity and represents this good planning practice is the shopping center on Decatur and Vegas Drive. You will find in immediate adjacency to that shopping center are your R-3 development as a transition between the single family residential area. As evidence of the fact that apartment dwellings are compatible with, and in good planning practice, with school sites, I can only point out that which is in the immediate proximity of Clark High School where the entire area is apartment complexes. These people are in fear of what may be the result upon the schools as far as the crowding of the schools within the area - unfortunately, our Federal Courts have told us that we cannot be concerned with preservation of sanctuaries in any parts of any cities in the United States as far as our school population is concerned because something must be done with reference to the integration problem which, in itself, causes a bussing or a transition problem either from or to a neighborhood school. Something I think that might very well be overlooked, and I would be hopeful that the statistical analysis which will result from the recent census, is how many, in fact, in numbers do occupy apartments? I think you will find that the trend lately is for the older, retired people to give up the single family occupancy - take up apartment occupancy - and for the very young, married - to take up the apartment occupancy, but not the large family and I would question - what type of an influx as far as the school population would be concerned in this immediate area by apartment complex as contrasted to R-1 development? If, in fact, it is ever to be developed R-1, because there is no virgin territory in the entire City that is more compatible for R-3 development than that which immediately has adjacent to it a municipal golf course, commercial on one side and school on the other side and a completely self-contained integrity-preserved residential area on the fourth side. I would like to present to you a diagram that has been presented to me as far as the layout of this contemplated development. I don't think Mr. Saylor has seen this because there has been some revision as far as the ingress and egress streets are concerned, which would feed off into Bonanza on the one side and on Washington on the other. We have the LDS Church property here and by eliminating the single family dwellings and moving the apartment complex and causing a street which gives frontage - secondary street accessibility to the Church property in this area, would provide a park area in the immediate adjacency thereto and allow the buffer that these people are concerned about - that they not abut upon an R-3 or an apartment dwelling complex, by single family dwellings the full perimeter of this area, which a block wall to be provided on the perimeter of this property. . . . In addition, an error is in the form of the plan that was presented to Mr. Saylor - there would be no ingress or egress off either Bonanza or Washington. The ingress and egress, in effect, should probably be compatible with that which is in this area and an adaptation be made as far as the location of the apartment complex is concerned, so that the ingress and egress would be off of the existing dedicated street, which is already provided for, so there would be absolutely no ingress except on the perimeter of the property here which, I would say, would be a secondary street servicing both the Church and the area of the property which is the apartment area in immediate adjacency to the residential - which would be provided. What we are talking about is not anything that would violate aesthetics. What is contemplated is a very

attractive apartment complex that would be, in the most part, geared to the occupancy by the elderly, particularly, and those families who would cause a congestion problem as far as schools are concerned, this would be type of apartments that you would note in this area here. This would be the type of apartment frontage that is indicated on this size apartments. This is the frontage which is contemplated for the S-shaped type apartment complex. What we are talking about in this 23 acres for development is a total of 446 units. A total investment of \$6,250,000.00. All the National studies presently indicate that there is, in fact, a lessening of development as far as R-1 is concerned, principally because of the high cost of money - people are just not going to pay the interest rate over the long period of mortgages that are required for the single family dwelling and we have had, as far as all Planning Commissions are concerned, a greater demand for apartments in this respect. So that the investment need not be made by either the young or the old for the purpose of providing them with the accommodations required. An investment of this amount has to benefit the economy of our community in its depressed nature. As far as the building trades are concerned it stimulates the economy. As far as those who may be concerned about the schools - it puts upon the tax rolls additional properties of higher valuation to provide the wherewithal for the increased school facilities that may be needed, not only for this area but the other areas to be serviced within this City. Good planning dictates - and this is your concern - I heard comments made - this is only a project for economic purposes - this is a high-risk investment. If there be profit in the end, then that's the risk of the investor but that's not the concern of a Board or Commission of this nature because it then gets into the area of what is, in fact, never intended for Boards of this nature. Your concern is only - is it good planning - is it good zoning practice and I say the project, as presented - the project which is contemplated - is, in fact good zoning - good practice and is good for the City of Las Vegas. If you have any questions, I will be glad to answer them.

Commissioner Corey: How many acres in this?

Mr. Saylor: Twenty-three.

Question: Has this plan changed from what was presented.

Commissioner Coblenz: Yes, it has been changed and I have a suggestion right here and now. You have 300 names on a protest petition and if I was Mr. Dickerson, I would take the builder, or the owner of the property, and have a meeting with you people and show them exactly what you propose to do, because the original attitude you presented was inadequate for these people to accept. The way you have changed the entire plan, showing the street on the east side of the property and the street on the west side of the property, with what you call a buffer zone (which is not a buffer zone) of single family homes may change their attitude toward this whole project.

Answer: Nothing has changed - we don't want apartments whether there is a home buffer or not. It's just that it would be too crowded. We have spent a lot of money on our homes. We take pride in a quiet area and a good community. It is just a nice residential section. If you have apartments in there you don't have the stability, do you? You aren't going to say this

is planned for retired people - you can't say that - it is something vicious . . .

Commissioner Coblentz: Let me say this - will you show them the plan the way the street is arranged now, with the wall blocking off all the street access to their area - that there will be no traffic into their area . . .

Answer: I'm not interested in the traffic on my street - I'm worried about the traffic on the streets where my children are going to cross -

Commissioner Coblentz: Your children are not going to cross those streets because there's a wall being built there -

Qnswer: They go to the Ruth Fife School - they have to cross Bonanza -

Commissioner Coblentz: Say you were to have all single family residences there, don't you believe these people would have children?

Answer: That's right, but there's not going to be 443 houses there either, with two or three or four people in each - I don't know how many houses you could put in there, but it's quite a difference.

Commissioner Thornley: I can certainly appreciate the feeling of the people. We recently went through another hearing of this type and, very frankly, I would state at this time I don't see how this Commission can, in view of the action they took on the Tam petition, where there wasn't even any commercial property involved, and abutting against residential property - an established residential area - this Commission rezoned that for R-3 or R-4 for a teachers' retirement project, ostensibly that it could not be restricted to that. Now, how this same Commission could come in and say these people cannot put this in, I don't know, but I can appreciate your position - but I think one day, if this is turned down, I can say in all honesty that one day you will look back and say - I wish we had not opposed this plan because even though we can sit here and say - we promise you that there will be no commercial encroachment, we are not going to be here forever and I can see where that property - and, to me, this does make a sensible progression from the commercial to the residential and, as I say, I cannot see how this same Commission that approved the Tam rezoning can, in all integrity, turn around and disapprove this.

Question: What about the area behind Wonderworld? In the apartments behind there buffering this progression - it looks terrible. There are garbage cans and everything in the streets and beautiful houses in the other part of it - it just looks terrible - it really has down-graded it as far as the aesthetics are concerned.

Mr. Dickerson: Mr. Belcher, the Architect, may be able to satisfy these people as far as the aesthetics, with which he is concerned, relative to the adjoining area. What would be provided is a secondary street which would run from Bonanza to Washington, which would front upon the Church property and provide a park area immediately behind the residential area in

which you reside. Immediately adjacent to that park area and abutting upon your properties, would be single family dwellings. The whole perimeter of the property would have a block wall through the park area and immediately upon and adjacent to the Church property at the corner of Bonanza and whatever this street has been nominated to be. There will be no ingress or egress, as indicated on this chart, on either Bonanza or Washington. These ingress and egress points would be in approximately this position off of what is now the existing, dedicated un-named street, which already has the block wall provided behind the commercial development - the Automobile Agency and Albertson's Market on Decatur, so that the full ingress and egress would first feed into the secondary street and then right out onto the ingress and egress off of Decatur Blvd. As far as the traffic problem is concerned, to the people in this area would be negligible because for the most part, the feed will be from Decatur as far as ingress and egress is concerned. I can't say that is not true, however, as far as the apartments area which is closest in proximity to the property that you own, in that the ingress and egress would be off of Bonanza and off of Washington in those areas. To the lady who is concerned about her children crossing the street to get to the elementary school, as well as the junior High, this is a problem we have on every major thoroughfare - they do it at Charleston Blvd. (in my own area) and they have crossing guards for this purpose -

Answer: Yes, but Bonanza is so narrow there -

Mr. Dickerson: All of us within this City have to accommodate the problem of traffic and children to and from school. Mr. Belcher, if you could explain what is contemplated as far as the apartments themselves and the facilities which would be provided within the contemplated development.

Mr. Belcher: The only thing I can say will be very brief - it will be a beautiful Spanish-type - tile roof - apartment project.

Commissioner Corey: How many bedrooms?

Mr. Belcher: There are some one-bedroom and some two-bedroom.

Mr. Dickerson: There are 184 two-bedroom, 96 one-bedroom and 96 two-bedroom - 48 three-bedroom.

Commissioner Corey: How many square feet?

Mr. Belcher: One-bedrooms are 750 sq. ft.; the two-bedrooms vary from 1,000 to 1,300 sq. ft. for the three-bedroom. They are large units - not little units. I would like to have the Commission, if they do approve it, tie it up so that it cannot be cheapened so that it is a beautiful project.

Mr. Dickerson: It was never contemplated that it be a cheap development. There is a large recreational building that would be provided with badminton, shuffleboard, three swimming pools and massive park and landscaping development between each of the structures.

Mr. Belcher: There would be more landscaped area than you could put in an R-1.

Commissioner Corey: What is the density, per acre, in an R-3 zone?

Mr. Saylor: R-3 I think would run about 20 units as opposed to an R-1 at four or four and a half -

Mr. Belcher: We are under 20 units per acre and it will be a very beautiful project.

Mayor Gragson: What is the maximum height?

Mr. Belcher: Two stories. The number of stories on the front units facing this street, which is abutting the R-1, would be just one story. The only two story would be on the back . . .

Dr. Kaufman: There have been a lot of judgments made by the developers . . . the statistics of the population in a multi-level apartment dwelling vs. residential, haven't been exactly brought out. We are told they are lower. The recent census does say that approximately three or three and a half people per unit for the Las Vegas area and on that basis you come up with somewhere around 1500 people, plus. There is nothing, ever, beautiful to a home owner in an apartment complex. It may be beautiful to an architect - it may be beautiful in terms of dollar signs to a developer, but it's not beautiful to an adjacent homeowner - whether it has tile roofs - gold roofs - or what. You put in tennis courts - a sauna bath - etc. - if there are retired people in these dwellings, I would like to see them playing these games. Money, we are told, is loosening up for apartment-type development in the second half of the 1970 fiscal year. The same is true for residential development. Mortgage rates are going down - that is as true for home-type dwellings as it is for apartment houses. The growth of Las Vegas has been pushed and growth is fine, but as Mrs. Jack brought up, there are different kinds of growth. If we are looking at a transient type population, apartment houses will bring it in. If we are looking for a population that intends to stay - at least a lot longer than apartment-type dwellers - I believe that home-type dwellings attract this type of growth. The growth of the City is quite stable according to the Little & Co. Report about two or three months ago. They are not dependent upon Nellis - they are not dependent on the Test Site - it's a stable growth and stable growth, I believe, is synonymous with residential type suburban sprawl. Once again, through the mouth of an attorney, the dictates of good planning require "development in a total community sense". The dictates of planning are very, very strong to go to apartment houses for very obvious economic reasons . . . and I will come back to the first argument: We have heard that - we know the approximate amount of money that has been spent and was spent deliberately - knowing they could get the money out only with a high-return type of investment, namely, an apartment house. If we are talking about precedent cases, is there going to be a precedent set right here - where a developer can spend whatever he wants knowing that he can change residential zoning to zoning for apartments just because he has an economic bundle at stake? There has been a case very much closer than the Tam case - namely, down at Rancho Road and Washington, where rezoning was requested for part of the K-Mart property. The home owners accepted the zoning and they went back and wanted commercial in there. In other words, they wanted zoning for economic gain and it was refused on the precedent that we cannot have rezoning every time

somebody gets themselves into an economic bind. The very subtle hint was made that tax money would be coming in. I know that is dear to the heart of every Commissioner or politician, but let me also if we are going to show claws, there are also votes involved and the votes of a residential community are there - in that area.

Commissioner Coblentz: Just one question, Doctor, do you feel that if you owned this property that on the west side of this property adjacent to the Market and the Automobile Facility there, that you would build single residential homes on that street facing the markets? Is that what you would do with that property? What would you do with that if you owned that property, especially that on the west side facing the back of the Market and Automobile Agency?

Dr. Kaufman: There is already a buffer zone in the way of the dedicated street -

Dr. Coblentz: I am talking about the street being there - do you feel that people would want to have single family homes facing those markets?

Dr. Kaufman: I believe that with the same kind of effort that has been devoted to this plan, and the hiring of an architect and an attorney to advance it, yes, that kind of development is possible. I will ask a question now - do you think people are going to buy single family dwellings facing an apartment house?

Dr. Coblentz: Yes, I do.

Unidentified Speaker: I almost bought a house on Bonanza. I have three children under five. If you want to see a heavily traveled street, stop at Bonanza and see the the number of cars back and forth from Western and also local - I don't know if it's oriented to the school or not. It's a narrow street. It's not going to be widened. Heavier traffic on Bonanza is just asking for trouble and I am quite sure it won't be my children who will be run over. That street is thick with traffic already and that is one reason I didn't buy a house there. I spent another \$5,000.00 to move over two blocks. Thank you.

Don Benson, 4412 St. Andrew Circle: I am a realtor, but as a citizen and resident of that area, to answer Dr. Coblentz, I would say that condominiums, or town houses, might be acceptable to all these people who are protesting and would probably make these people more money than apartments would.

Lee Paul, 4341 Fortune: My boy, last night, brought up a point I want to bring up to you people, because sometimes we overlook the children. I moved from the 25th Street area down to the Sunrise School . . . with apartments two blocks away. Bicycles and things of this nature were stolen quite often but I didn't even think of this. Last night my boy, when my wife and I were talking about this, said - well, Dad, I guess if those apartments go in there I'll have to start locking my bike up again. I got to thinking - I'm in the insurance business and could gain thousands of dollars profit a year by having those units back there . . . a tenant policy to cover these apartment dwellers belongings would cost them \$49.00 a year, minimum, for \$4,000.00 coverage. I'm not trying to sell anyone, except

on an idea. I can go to a residential area and write an \$8,000 policy under which you get \$4,000 contents in this - so I am insuring \$4,000 plus \$8,000 more for the house, and it only costs \$39.00 - \$39.00 for a house and contents against \$49.00 for apartment dwellers. Why? The crime and vandalism frequency is much higher in apartments and we don't need it in our area. I moved out of that area - paid three times more for this home because it is a residential. There is more crime and vandalism in apartments even if they are seventy year-old ladies.

Commissioner Thornley: Are you then saying that apartments, generally, are bad and not desirable, or just not desirable in this area?

Mr. Paul: We are talking about State rates - or local rates . . .

Commissioner Thornley: Then are you opposed to apartments generally? Any place?

Mr. Paul: Around where I live - yes.

Commissioner Thornley: They would be alright in other places?

Mr. Paul: As long as the residential dwellers in that area okey them.

Commissioner Thornley: What I am getting at, and this isn't the way it works - are you proposing that we outlaw apartment houses?

Mr. Paul: No.

Commissioner Thornley: But then when we get right down to it, if they are near you, you don't want them . . . then your argument on the crime aspect is inappropriate - if they are bad for your area they are bad for all.

Mr. Paul: Let's do it a little differently . . . the area I come from, homes were \$22,000, or so. Alright - they are of an income people (I was and still am) right at the same level with apartment dwellers. In general (and I know there are some wealthy people in apartments) I raised my house payment to get into an area that is not Rancho Circle, but it's very, very nice - better than the average by far. Most of the homes have swimming pools . . . I say keep the apartments at the level of the income of the area where the houses are. In other words, if people are making \$6,000.00 a year and the people are living in a \$22,000 home, put the apartments in with them. I don't know what area you live in, but I'm sure there are no apartments there and you don't want them because you have too much dogone money invested to have someone come in making \$7,000 a year (and there's nothing wrong with that) and living there and not having everything you want. There has to be a jealousy among our children and yours -

Commissioner Thornley: Under our laws, you know there is only one way you can acquire restrictions of this type, and that is to buy the property. Otherwise there is no guarantee that this Commission, or anyone else, could give you of what will eventually happen to that piece of property. It just is not possible. That's why I made the statement - and believe me, I am in sympathy with you - I can appreciate your position - but I can

see - and I'm just positive I'm right - that in years to come that if this is turned down, you will look back and say - Gee, I wish we had accepted that, because we can give you no guarantee that it won't go commercial.

Mr. Paul: Okey - what about \$40,000.00 condominiums? Up-grade it?

Question: What do you mean when you say - we will look back and wish we had . . .

Commissioner Thornley: Because I am convinced that that will never be single family residential, since it went commercial on Decatur and just as Dr. Coblenz has pointed out, I don't think a developer would risk trying to sell single family homes in there. I am trying to be practical. I feel that something else is going in there other than single family residential.

Answer: In other words, you are saying this is the lesser of two evils and we had better grab the lesser evil?

Commissioner Thornley: I'm afraid that's about it, and I'm trying to be practical about it.

Unidentified Speaker: The people who bought that property knew how it was zoned. Do you mean to tell me they buy property in this town knowing they can come in and cry on your shoulders and get it changed?

Commissioner Coblenz: You have to go through every possibility for the development of a piece of property - because of the factors you have there, basically, they are very highly commercial. Now what would happen if the people from Albertson's decided they want to put up a warehouse on the other side of the Street? If they decided to get the street vacated and put a warehouse in along that street, and kept moving to the east, then you would be back here again screaming and yelling -

Question: What do we have zoning laws for? Why do we keep changing all the time?

Commissioner Coblenz: Conditions change zoning regulations because of the changes in the community. There is development going on - the City is growing -

Answer: Doctor, I read the newspapers and it is obvious to anybody who is up on the news that the crime rates follow population concentration, and that is precisely the point I am making -

Commissioner Coblenz: Then we had better close off the City of Las Vegas and have no more people come into Las Vegas . . .

Question: What street width are they proposing there?

Commissioner Coblenz: They are proposing a street 60 ft. wide.

Question: And how would that park be maintained?

Commissioner Coblenz: By the property owners.

Question: Would there be any Federal funds for this?

Commissioner Coblenz: No.

Question: As far as developing it for home ownership - and I am talking about interest rates - by the same token if they were up, it wouldn't matter to people. They have to have a place - they have to pay the going rate - they think nothing of their Master Charge, which is 18-1/2% - what they pay for cars - this is really - home-ownership is the cheapest interest rate you can obtain. As for elderly people, I don't think elderly people particularly want to climb to a second story. I have known people who have moved out of two stories because they are elderly and they want to be on a single level. Nothing has been brought up about the rental on these apartments - \$175.00, I believe, is the rate on the majority of them. Is it \$175.00?

Answer: \$175.00 for the one-bedroom; \$230.00 for the small two-bedroom and \$250.00 for the large one - unfurnished.

Question: Then I think you are going to have mostly swingers in there . . . we want home-owners in there - we would feel much more secure in having neighbors who are home-owners . . . I really think that having rentals is going to bring in people we would really not like to have . . . they are of a different type.

Question: I would like to hear from the City Planning Commission representative here as to the basis for its denial of this application, and the consideration that went into this denial.

Mr. Saylor: I will repeat my earlier comments which were to that effect. The Planning Commission felt that the matter of the buffer had been taken care of at the time of the commercial zoning. In other words, the action of the street, the wall and the hedge, they felt, adequately protected this area until a street pattern could be worked out in here for lowdensity residential, without any units fronting on either Washington or Bonanza or the commercial.

Helen Gallette: I am a home owner on St. Andrew Circle. I am here on my own time. I am an elementary school principal and have been in this community since 1955 and I have some views on apartments. I am not speaking for the Clark County School District . . . I am speaking strictly for Helen Gallette. Any time you add apartment buildings to the school where I am principal I know immediately that I am going to have an influx of population. It has never happened otherwise, unless these apartments are designated for special people - like retired people. Western High School is right behind my property and there is already a heavy influx of traffic due to people bringing children - most modern children don't walk more than a block or two now-a-days. There is fairly heavy traffic going into the golf course - there is heavy traffic from Gibson. Albertson's and Friendly Ford have contained their properties so that it is not unsightly to the residences on our side. I'm not afraid of something else coming in there, Dr. Coblenz. If it is, we will come down and protest at the proper time. If you people see fit to zone this land for this density . . . you are moving a little city in there - approximately 1,600 people - into a little area that is already over-populated. If you would see fit to zone this, then I own a lot over in Scotch 80 - I would like to have you zone my lot over there for apartments of some sort. I think I could make a little money and maybe I wouldn't have to teach school any more. Thank you.

Mrs. Gordon Jack: Just to recap to leave you with one thought. Things like this have happened all over our country and we have a chance here to keep what we have - what is good for that area, we feel, and we're not against growth, as such - but a good growth - not a maximum density of the type they would like to introduce into this area. That is the point I would like to make.

Attorney Dickerson: To respond to some of the comments - I think, principally, the only one I would like to respond to - as I feel she was very persuasive in her presentation, and very honest and I think has a very genuine and legitimate concern - the principal of the school - Miss Gallette. She says once you have apartments in an area, of necessity you have an increase in school population. Once you have any development in an area - R-1 would cause an increase as far as the density of the school population is concerned, and with all due respect to all the concern you may have for the schools, that addresses itself to another board - the School Board - who must make provision for accommodating - no matter what the population may be with reference to the student population in any school or any area of the City, and our Federal courts have indicated that we can no longer believe that we live in little isolated preserved sanctuaries in any community - where we can move into a certain area with the assurance that our children will, in fact, go to a school in that area. So, with that remark and with the remarks that have been made here before, you cannot look at this project and say that it is not good planning. It provides the buffers that are required so that the transition from R-1 to R-3 is accommodated. These people live in an entirely preserved, integrated residential area. No matter what the development may be behind them it will not affect the values of their properties.

Dr. Kaufman: The statement that it will not affect our property values - Mr. Lawyer, that is a conjecture.

Attorney Dickerson: I am entitled to make my conclusions based upon experience that this community has had. Every time that people have come before this Commission and bemoaned the fact that a development would cause a devaluation of their property, the reverse has occurred because there is not a piece of property in this community in the past five years that has not had an appreciation in value - regardless of what the development in the area may be, or our tax rolls would not indicate that our Assessor appraises them at a higher value than he did before.

Mayor Gragson declared the hearing on Z-71-70 closed.

Commissioner Howery moved that the recommendation of the Planning Commission for denial of the application of D. A. McElrath and Jerry Moss for a zone change from R-E to R-3 on property generally located 475 ft. east of Decatur Blvd. between Washington Blvd. and Bonanza, Road, under Z-71-70, be APPROVED.

Commissioner Corey: Knowing Mr. Belcher and the beautiful work that he does, that these would be a beautiful group of apartments. However, I feel that a Planned Unit Development would be a much better transition in this area. I don't know whether you people have considered this or not, but I would sure like to see that go into this area, so I would second

the motion.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Corey.

Roll call vote:

Commissioner Coblentz	Aye
Commissioner Thornley	No
Commissioner Howery	Aye
Commissioner Corey	Aye
Mayor Gragson	Aye

At the hour of 11:35 Mayor Gragson declared a 5-minute recess.

Meeting reconvened at the hour of 11:45 a.m. with all members of the Board in attendance.

Z-72-70
Denied

ZONE CHANGE - Z-72-70 - THEODORE KEEHN

Mr. Saylor: This concerns an application from Keehn for change of zoning from R-1 and C-1 to R-3. The property is located on the west side of Valley View, north of Alta. This (wall map) is all Water District property in through here. Hyde Park School - Cragin Park - Hyde Park subdivision - Charleston Heights single family subdivision - E. W. Griffiths Elementary School here - this is all vacant owned, I believe, by Mr. Beam. The proposal here was for the construction of apartments somewhat in accordance with this design as submitted here. It was also proposed to leave a strip of R-1 between the apartments and the single family homes over here which back up to it - enough room to have a street going through it and homes on both sides of it. The southeast corner of the property is already zoned C-1, which was done several years ago. The application specifies R-3. However, the density meeting the R-2 density. The only reason for the R-3, I believe, was because of the difference in setback provisions. There was a substantial protest factor from the single family property owners in this area. The Planning Commission has recommended denial.

Mayor Gragson: Is there anyone present who wants to be heard?

Question: What type of apartment buildings are these?

Commissioner Coblentz: They were condominiums -

Mr. Saylor: You are right in one respect, Commissioner, they were proposed to be built somewhat in the condominium design - of a series of apartments in rows, but the actual construction (I don't know if I have an elevation) - some one-bedroom, some two-bedroom.

Question: Would these face Alta?

Mr. Saylor: The plan proposes some access to Alta and some to Valley View - both streets . . . this is the plot plan that was shown at the meeting and it shows the apartment units fronting, in some cases, on Alta and in some cases on Valley View. In other words, the rear of the apartments were all to the interior of the property.

Question: On that Water District property - is there an easement? We live on the corner of Bedford and Alta, facing Alta . . . we look into the side of the house across the street.

There is supposed to be an easement of some kind back of the existing homes -

Mr. Saylor: This doesn't indicate any easement. This indicates that they propose to leave a strip of 260 ft. wide where they would have a street down the middle and houses on both sides, but I know of no easement . . . that has nothing to do with the design of the proposed apartments . . . this property extends all the way back of the homes on Bedford.

Mayor Gragson: Is the applicant here?

(No response)

Commissioner Howery moved that the recommendation of the Planning Commission for denial of the application of Theodore Keehn for rezoning from R-1 and C-1 to R-3 for property generally located on the northwest corner of Valley View Blvd. and Alta Drive (Z-72-70) be APPROVED.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Coblentz and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Coblentz, Thornley, Howery, Corey and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

Z-73-70
Approved

ZONE CHANGE - Z-73-70 - CITY OF LAS VEGAS

Mr. Saylor: This relates to an application initiated by the City on the recommendation of the Planning Commission for a change in zoning out along Tonopah Highway. We have a very chaotic zoning pattern there. Many, many years ago the County just arbitrarily zoned a strip 660 ft. deep on each side and the subdivision of the land didn't follow that pattern, or vice versa, consequently the commercial zoning line in many cases cuts across properties and in this particular area from Gowan Road north to Duncan is where we have initiated the action. The present zoning line runs down through here (wall map). You can see it makes part of this lot a little bit commercial - all of this is commercial and this residential lot is completely in a commercial area. This piece is owned by the School District; the zoning line cuts it so that you have C-2 on one side and R-E on the other. The subdivision pattern is such that you have lots fronting on Tonopah Highway backing up to an alley. The zoning recommended by the Planning Commission would bring this commercial line over to the alley, down here and back here and then along the rear of this existing development. What brought this up was that the owner of this lot wanted to build some houses here and we told him he couldn't because it was zoned commercial. He indicated he had bought it as a residential lot and I believe there are houses on this one already. The Planning Commission does recommend approval. We have protests from some of the owners of these lots, fronting on the Highway, protesting to the fact that if this is zoned residential, it may seriously affect the utilization of their properties, and the School District gave us a letter of protest saying that the sale of this property was in process and the change in zoning might affect the sale. However, the Planning Commission felt that anybody buying this would necessarily have to come in for some type of zoning action to correct this situation and, therefore, they felt it should stay in the application and bring the C-2 line over here.

Mayor Gragson: How many lots are in the two different zones?

Mr. Saylor: In this particular area there are five lots fronting on the Highway in the commercial zone -

Mayor Gragson: What is the depth of those lots?

Mr. Saylor: They are 275 ft. deep, plus an alley to rear.

Commissioner Corey: Are they built on?

Mr. Saylor: No - I believe they are all vacant . . . these lots are 200 x 300 here.

Mayor Gragson: What does the School District own - all the way out?

Mr. Saylor: They own this piece right here - from the alley out to this street . . .

Commissioner Corey: How many acres?

Mr. Saylor: Three or four acres -

Commissioner Corey: Not big enough to develop for a school site anyway -

Mr. Saylor: No, they're selling it.

Mayor Gragson: Why didn't you go all the way commercial?

Mr. Saylor: For one reason there are some homes in here and it would then bring the commercial across from these lots, which are residential.

Mayor Gragson: Is there anyone here who wants to be heard in protest?

(No response)

Commissioner Thornley moved that the recommendation of the Planning Commission under Z-73-70, be APPROVED, and the Planning Department authorized to proceed in behalf of the City of Las Vegas.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Howery and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Coblentz, Thornley, Howery, Corey and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

RE-EVALUATION -
MULTIPLE UNIT
DEVELOPMENT
Report only

Page 28
Minutes
Regular Meeting
December 16, 1970

Mr. Saylor: Before I go on to the next item, in reference to the two items that were recently denied on apartments, the Planning Staff has recognized a need to re-evaluate our thinking and policies on apartment house zoning. We have very little land zoned for apartments in the City and, furthermore, we are receiving quite an influx on applications for Planned Unit Development, so we plan to - as soon as we get over the Holidays - I plan to put the full Staff on this matter because I think we must necessarily make some decisions along this line as to locations for apartment house development, planned unit development and single residence areas.

ZONE CHANGE Z-24-70 - REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF TIME - CHARLES FUSCO

Mr. Saylor: This is a request for extension of time by Charles Fusco. He is the one who was going to build the apartments on 6th Street and due to lack of money, etc., he has asked for a 12-month extension of time. The Planning Commission has recommended approval.

Commissioner Corey moved that the recommendation of the Planning Commission for a 12-month extension of time under the Resolution of Intent on Z-24-70, be APPROVED.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Howery and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Coblantz, Thornley, Howery, Corey and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

VISUAL
ENVIRONMENT
PLAN
Resolution
Adopted

Mr. Saylor: This merely concerns the adoption of a Resolution. You have already adopted the Visual Environment Plan - at your last meeting - but we find out it has to be done by means of the following Resolution:

"RESOLUTION TO APPROVE AND ADOPT FIVE-YEAR VISUAL ENVIRONMENT PLAN - 1970-1975"

"WHEREAS, the City of Las Vegas has always maintained a continuing interest in the promulgating of beautification activities within the City; and

"WHEREAS, the efforts expended by the City in this endeavor has resulted in Las Vegas being referred to as 'an oasis in the desert'; and

"WHEREAS, the tremendous rate of population increase and development experienced by the City within the last decade has created a dire need for the provision of aesthetical developments on a large scale; and

"WHEREAS, the City desires to provide such amenities for the benefit of all Las Vegas residents as well as the millions of tourists visiting the City annually; and

"WHEREAS, the City recognizes the importance of such developments proceeding on a planned basis with priorities established in terms of time, expenditures and geographical locations; and

"WHEREAS, the Las Vegas Beautification Committee with the assistance of the Planning Department has prepared a five-year Visual Environment Plan; and

"WHEREAS, this Plan provides for the scheduling and budgeting of Beautification Projects in Las Vegas on an orderly basis; and

"WHEREAS, the City of Las Vegas Planning Commission approved and adopted said Visual Environment Plan on November 12, 1970.

"NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Las Vegas that the VISUAL ENVIRONMENT PLAN FOR THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS be, and the same is, APPROVED and ADOPTED this 16th day of December, 1970."

Commissioner Coblentz moved that the foregoing Resolution approving and adopting the five-year Visual Environment Plan (1970-1975) be ADOPTED and the Planning Staff authorized to proceed.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Thornley and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Coblentz, Thornley, Howery, Corey and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

HELICOPTER
PILOT TRAINING
Approved

APPLICATION FOR FUNDS UNDER THE SAFE STREETS AND CRIME CONTROL ACT

Application for helicopter pilot training:

Total Project cost:	\$30,567.00
Federal share:	\$ 4,125.00
Local share:	\$26,442.00

Mr. Saylor: This involves an application from the Police Department for funds under the Safe Streets & Crime Control Act. The total project is thirty thousand plus the Federal share requested is four thousand. It's for the training of an additional helicopter pilot.

Commissioner Howery: This is for the training of a pilot, but we still don't have our second helicopter?

Mr. Saylor: No.

Commissioner Howery: And our funds were not approved? In other words, the Government is not going to give them to us, is that right?

Mr. Saylor: Not this fiscal year. I have learned from long experience never to promise you that it will be forthcoming, but it appears quite likely that funds will be available, starting next Fiscal Year, for a second helicopter.

Commissioner Howery: The only way I can see where we can spend this type of money to train some more people on helicopters, is to get another helicopter.

City Manager, A. R. Trelease: There is no out-of-pocket money to the City - this is all in-kind.

Commissioner Howery: If this is in-kind services only - fine. What about another helicopter?

Mr. Trelease: It has to go into the State plan and be approved . . .

Commissioner Howery: What about us buying another helicopter?

Mr. Trelease: We are quite certain we will be able to buy one with Federal funds after July 1st.

Commissioner Howery: But we were certain last year and we didn't get that one either. Next year we will be certain again and still won't have it, and one helicopter - you might as well not have it because the program will not work. You all know this - your own police will tell you it won't work. Let's either sell the one we have or get another one. If we can get another

one the following year on Federal funds, fine. But let's do something now because the one you have - you might as well forget it.

Commissioner Coblentz" That's right.

Commissioner Howery: Then let's sell it. I'll move to sell it or buy another one - either way you want to go - but the one is no good.

Commissioner Corey: This helicopter pilot training will be done in our chopper? Or it is another one in which it will be done?

Mr. Trelease: It will be done in one just like it -

Commissioner Corey: So what we will actually be doing is to have two choppers?

Commissioner Coblentz: You will still only have one.

Commissioner Corey: We'll have ours that we have now . . . and this one that is going to be like ours?

Answer: It is one he would receive the training in, but would not be ours. -

Commissioner Corey: So then we would have two helicopters . . . do we have one, or don't we?

Answer: We have one.

Commissioner Corey: Okey, this is another one -

Mr. Trelease: No, this is a pilot training helicopter -

Commissioner Corey: We will have this training chopper and ours - is that correct? It's a different helicopter than ours so we'll have two, in effect.

Commissioner Coblentz: No - the training would not be done over City property - the training will be done at the Pilot Training School property -

Mr. Trelease: It will be done out at the North Las Vegas Air Terminal in a 300-B. The one we own is a 300-C.

Commissioner Corey: In the letter you sent along with this request, didn't you say it would have the effect of having another person in the air?

Mr. Trelease: It will put the helicopter in the air more often than it is now.

Answer: It is a question of availability on the one helicopter - if you train an additional pilot you are putting additional time on the machine, and by putting additional time on the machine, you are going to have additional down time.

Mr. Trelease: Maybe the Police Department doesn't want this but they are the ones who asked for it.

Answer: This was with the idea in mind of an additional machine.

Mayor Gragson: How long does it take to train the pilot?

Answer: Probably about a two-month period.

Commissioner Coblentz: Aren't there any trained helicopter pilots in this area?

Answer: Yes, there are a few.

Commissioner Corey: But they aren't Police Officers.

Mayor Gragson: After the application for another helicopter is approved, if it is, it will be two months before you could have delivery of the machine - then you would have ample time to train the other helicopter pilot. During this training period, what is this \$26,442.00 in-kind?

Mr. Trelease: In salaries - and I don't know how they compute this, but it is the benefits from the extra use of the present machine.

Commissioner Thornley: We would get extra use out of the present machine because you wouldn't have to take it out of service for training.

Mr. Saylor: Right - what it amounts to - I think they have two pilots now, is that right?

Answer: That's right.

Mr. Saylor: And when they are off-duty or sick - both of them - or something of that nature, then the 'copter is down. Having an additional pilot would allow more use time of the one helicopter we have.

Mr. Trelease: And this would help us after we get the second machine in July - we will have the three pilots -

Commissioner Coblentz: Then you will need two more.

Mr. Trelease: We will need more pilots when when we get the second machine - yes.

Mayor Gragson: This isn't going to take much of the officer's time off his present duties and you need two pilots at all times - if you have one ill - I think we should approve this application.

Commissioner Corey: Roy - we have two pilots now and they are flying our helicopter - a 300-C. Are our pilots going to be training this new pilot?

Answer: No, he will be trained through a regular flight school.

Commissioner Corey: And the flight school has its own chopper? It's a 300-B?

Answer: Yes sir.

Commissioner Corey: When he is up in that 300-B our people are up in the 300-C?

Answer: Yes sir.

Commissioner Corey: So he can also, in his training while he is learning to fly a 300-B, be used as an observer, etc., for the City?

Answer: No - the training is a specialized training and does not involve actual observation.

Commissioner Corey: He will not be working in our machine at all?

Answer: Not until he obtains his two hundred hours of training.

Commissioner Corey: Then it would not put any extra time on our machine which would require down time on ours until after he is trained?

Answer: Yes, that's right.

Commissioner Corey moved that an application for helicopter pilot training funds under the Safe Streets and Crime Control Act, be APPROVED, and the Planning Staff and Police Department authorized to proceed.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Howery and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Coblentz, Thornley, Howery, Corey and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

EAST BONANZA
PARK
Approved in
Concept

Mr. Saylor: This is the same design we discussed with you at the last meeting. It has been to the Park & Recreation Board and I have been advised that they have endorsed this Plan and we feel that the Commission should also endorse it, in principle, as an over-all concept and then it can go to Engineering for final detailing and cost estimates.

Commissioner Corey: Is there one additional area in this that is not on this map?

Mrs. Anderson: Originally - some months ago - the original sketch that was presented this summer shows property not only this side of 30th street, but property on the other side - we are suggesting that the City sell this property and use the money to put into our Park and judging from the last page of today's agenda, that's exactly what you gentlemen have in mind.

Commissioner Corey: No - we haven't gone that far with it yet.

Mrs. Anderson: I don't understand what has happened to the property on the other side of Mojave. It has suddenly disappeared from the drawing boards and has appeared as property to be used for City purposes and also being made saleable - which originally was not our understanding.

Commissioner Howery: How many acres are there in this piece?

Mr. Saylor: A little less than eighty acres. If this line came down straight, it would be eighty acres.

Mrs. Anderson: The only thing I am asking about is that originally there was more property shown - I believe the area was

81-1/4 acres. I'm not quibbling over the 1-1/4 acres. However, (and I am putting this in advance of what is on your agenda) there is property on the other side of Washington and Mojave that is being considered for sale to a church . . . and we understood that that property because of its being across the street from the Park would not be feasible for Park use - for playground use - we don't want our children running back and forth across Mojave or Washington - and that could ideally be used for a tree orchard, or what have you, to be used for the Park so we can grow our own trees. Now, suddenly, this property has just disappeared and proposed to be put up for sale.

Mr. Saylor: The property hasn't disappeared in any sense of the word. The over-all development plan of the property from Bonanza to here - Pecos - almost over to 25th Street, remains the same. This Park does not involve the rest of that land. Part of it is committed for expansion of the Public Works yard - part for a joint library and part for other public uses.

Mrs. Anderson: But the part I am concerned with is the part on the opposite side of 30th Street that extends up to the old sewage disposal plant.

Commissioner Howery: You are telling me something I've never heard before. Was this originally a part of this Park?

Mr. Saylor: No - this is what I'm trying to explain -

Mrs. Anderson: You will recall the original plans that were shown our Committee - I believe it was in August of this year - you will find on the drawings that were made by the Planning Department that area was included in the Bonanza Park -

Mr. Saylor: No -

Mrs. Anderson: I do not have that drawing -

Commissioner Howery: When I came into this picture we were talking about approximately 80 acres - and I know of no other property involved.

Mrs. Anderson: The thing we are trying to get at - I am talking about a narrow strip of land . . .

Commissioner Coblenz: That is not a part of this property - It is not connected to this property.

Mrs. Anderson: It is part of the Park the City dedicated -

Commissioner Coblenz: It belongs to the City but is not a part of this Park . . . we can sit here and talk about it for two hours. All we can do is for you to get the old plan and you go over it with Mr. Saylor - that is the only way the question can be answered.

Mrs. Anderson: I am trying to get money for our Park - I want to get our Park off the ground. You gentlemen have seen fit to hear us - we have gone through the proper channels - we want to be approved, but if this property has been designated as Park property and if it is going to be sold - we are not against having a church of any denomination on the property - but let us have the money - the funds resulting from the sale of the property be, in turn, used for our Park.

Mayor Gragson: We aren't going to discuss this any further - other than . . .

Mrs. Anderson: I want you to go ahead and approve it and we'll fight about the other piece of property later.

Mayor Gragson: The money from the sale of all City-owned property goes into the Capital Improvements Fund - by Law - and this would be a Capital Improvements item if it went into the Park.

Mr. Anderson: In your meeting where you set the Park aside you said it was 81-1/2 acres -

Mayor Gragson: Approximately -

Mr. Anderson: I would like to ask Mr. Saylor how many acres, actually, does this include?

Mr. Saylor: This particular parcel is less than 80 acres.

Mr. Anderson: How much less?

Mr. Saylor: I don't know exactly . . . 73 acres, I believe -

Mr. Anderson: Alright, then we are talking about this side and the other side -

Mr. Saylor: That has not changed whatsoever - that's still designated as Park - the other piece you are talking about. It simply doesn't have the development plan on it.

Commissioner Corey (at wall map with Mr. Anderson): Here is the 80 acres we are talking about and with this chunk out of it there is a little less than 80 acres in this piece here. This is the piece we are talking about for the church, across the street.

Mr. Anderson: I'm not so sure that this wasn't part of it right here -

Commissioner Howery: We wouldn't cross the street . . .

Mrs. Anderson: It was included -

Mr. Saylor: The over-all development plan they are talking about called for public use on all of this - the branch library in here - quasi public uses in here - all the remainder of it was for public use. The person who made the request on the church asked me about this piece, and I told him it was a part of this over-all development plan for public purposes, and if any sale was to be made by the City that they would have to amend that Plan in order to do so . . . I tried to discourage him from filing an application on it - on that particular piece.

Commissioner Corey: We have made no deal with them - we haven't even had our first meeting with the church people.

Mrs. Anderson: What I am asking - I don't know exactly how you operate - but in the event that this does come to pass and this piece of property is sold, could the funds developing from the sale be directly transmitted to the development of our Bonanza Park? Will they? Or will they go into a big pot and we would just get a percentage? I want all of it because I

feel that originally that was designated as our Park and when you take away from what you gave us . . .

Commissioner Howery: We should redefine it, then, as a part of the Park with no money to develop it.

Mrs. Anderson: I agree it is not practical to develop it as part of the Park, but it was originally designated as a part and parcel of that piece of land.

Commissioner Corey: I don't think so -

Commissioner Coblentz: It was shown as property for public use - not part of the Park.

Mr. Anderson: Where did the other part of the 81-1/4 acres go then?

Commissioner Coblentz: Right there - where you see that little piece cut off by the Highway. If you will look at the map you can see it for yourself.

Commissioner Corey: Why don't we get together after the meeting and take a look at what you saw before.

Mrs. Anderson: Alright, but may we pass this resolution please.

Commissioner Howery: I want one clarification before I make a motion: We are passing a resolution for the concept of this Park and that does not include the piece across the street.

Commissioner Howery moved that the overall concept of Bonanza Park, as approved by the Park and Recreation Advisory Board, be APPROVED, and Staff authorized to proceed.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Thornley and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Coblentz, Thornley, Howery, Corey and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

V-49-70
Set date for
Public Hearing

APPEAL FILED BY JOSEPH C. SCHLAGETER - V-49-70
to action by the Board of Zoning Adjustment in denying the applicant's request for a Variance to allow a second detached single family dwelling unit in an R-1 Zone to within 5 ft. of the rear property line where 25 ft. is required, and to within 3 ft. of the side property line where 5 ft. is required, on property located at 1111 Desert Lane between Charleston Blvd. and Ellis Avenue in Land Use Zone R-1.

Commissioner Howery moved that a Public Hearing before the City Commission be set for 10:30 a.m. January 20, 1971, and the Clerk authorized to proceed.

Page 36
Minutes
Regular Meeting
December 16, 1970

Motion seconded by Commissioner Coblentz and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Coblentz, Thornley, Howery, Corey and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

CHARITABLE
SOLICITATIONS
PERMITS
Approved

APPROVED BY THE SOLICITATIONS REVIEW BOARD

Commissioner Howery moved that the recommendation of the Solicitations Review Board for approval of the following Charitable Solicitations Permits, be APPROVED, and the Director of License and Revenue authorized to issue:

GIRL SCOUT TROOP No. 306 - Christmas Gift Wrapping

HOPE CORPS - AUXILIARY YOUTH GROUP OF CLARK COUNTY
ASSN. FOR RETARDED CHILDREN - Tickets to Teenage Dance

FIRST AFRICAN METHODIST-EPISCOPAL CHURCH - Raffle Tickets

PILLAR OF FIRE - General Solicitations

Motion seconded by Commissioner Thornley and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Coblentz, Thornley, Howery, Corey and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

GAMING -
ADDITIONAL
Approved

Commissioner Thornley moved that the following applications for additional games under existing Gaming Licenses, be APPROVED, and the Director of License and Revenue authorized to issue:

THE HORSESHOE CLUB
128 Fremont Street
1 FARO

Horseshoe Club Operating Co.

COIN CASTLE CASINO
15 Fremont Street
4 SLOTS

Money Tree, Inc.

CRAZY AL'S
4127 W. Charleston Blvd.
7 SLOTS

Alstate Coin Machine Co.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Howery and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Coblentz, Thornley, Howery, Corey and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

RETAIL TOBACCO -
ADDITIONAL
Approved

Commissioner Thornley moved that the following applications for additional outlets under existing Retail Tobacco Licenses, be APPROVED, and the Director of License and Revenue authorized to issue:

ELK'S PARAN LODGE
1004 West Owens Ave.

Jessabell Vending

RED'S SHOE SHINE
518 Jackson Street

Jessabell Vending

GIL'S RECREATION
605 Van Buren Ave.

Jessabell Vending

Motion seconded by Commissioner Howery and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Coblentz, Thornley, Howery, Corey and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

LIQUOR
Approved

CHANGE FROM SOLE PROPRIETORSHIP TO A CORPORATION

Commissioner Corey moved that the following application for change from a sole proprietorship to a corporation under an existing Liquor License, be APPROVED, and the Director of License and Revenue authorized to make the appropriate change:

EL CHOLO CAFE
625 L. V. Blvd., So.
SERVICE BAR

From:
Hortense McKiernan
To:
El Cholo Enterprises:
Hortense McKiernan, Pres. 100%
Robert Gomez, Secy

Motion seconded by Commissioner Howery and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Coblentz, Thornley, Howery, Corey and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

LIQUOR
Approved

CHANGE OF CORPORATE OFFICERS

Commissioner Corey moved that the following application for change of corporate officers under an existing Liquor License, be APPROVED, and the Director of License and Revenue authorized to make the appropriate change:

McKESSON LIQUOR
271 South Highland Ave.
WHOLESALE LIQUOR

McKesson Liquor Co.
William Pool, Div. Mgr.

To:
McKesson Liquor Co.
Harold L. Pastrich, Pres., Treas.
& Director
Robert J. Leader, V.P., Secy.
& Director
Robert E. Gibbons, Director
William Pool, Div. Mgr.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Howery and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Coblentz, Thornley, Howery, Corey and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

LIQUOR
Approved

ADDITIONAL CORPORATE OFFICER

Commissioner Corey moved that the following application for an additional corporate officer under an existing Liquor License, be APPROVED, and the Director of License and Revenue authorized to make the appropriate change;

BOBBY GREENE'S COW PALACE
1511 Nellis Blvd.
TAVERN

Swanky Club, Inc.

From:

Bobby Greene 33-1/3%
Larry Greene 33-1/3%
Carl Whittenburg 33-1/3%

To:

Bobby Greene, Pres. 25%
Larry Greene, V.P. 25%
Carl Wittenburg,
Secy. 25%
Darlene R.
Simpson, Treas. 25%

Motion seconded by Commissioner Howery and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Coblentz, Thornley, Howery, Corey and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

GAMING
Approved
Subject to
Conditions

CHANGE OF LOCATION - *SUBJECT TO APPROVAL OF THE STATE GAMING COMMISSION - EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1, 1971. ALSO SUBJECT TO THE APPROVALS OF THE PLANNING, BUILDING, FIRE AND HEALTH DEPARTMENTS

From:

EL CORTEZ HOTEL
600 Fremont Street

Exber, Inc.

Mel Exber, Pres.
Jackie Gaughn, Treas.
Julius Walker, V. P.
Don Dobson, Secy.

To:

*WESTERN HOTEL &
BINGO PARLOR
9th & Fremont Streets
BINGO - 1025 Chairs

Exber, Inc.

(Same as above)

Motion seconded by Commissioner Howery and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Coblentz, Thornley, Howery, Corey and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

LIQUOR AND
GAMING -
NEW

Approved
Subject to
Conditions

*SUBJECT TO APPROVAL OF THE STATE GAMING COMMISSION - EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1, 1971 - ALSO SUBJECT TO THE APPROVALS OF THE PLANNING, BUILDING, FIRE AND HEALTH DEPARTMENTS

*WESTERN HOTEL AND
BINGO PARLOR
9th & Fremont Streets
HOTEL BAR
133 SLOTS

Exber, Inc.

(Same as above)

Commissioner Corey moved that the foregoing application for new Liquor and Gaming Licenses, be APPROVED, and the Director of License and Revenue authorized to issue:

Motion seconded by Commissioner Howery and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Coblentz, Thornley, Howery, Corey and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

LIQUOR AND
RETAIL TOBACCO
Approved

REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF FRANCHISE MANAGERS

Commissioner Corey moved that the following application for approval of new franchise managers under existing Liquor and Retail Tobacco Licenses, be APPROVED, and the Director of License and Revenue authorized to proceed:

7-ELEVEN FOOD STORE No. 843
431 Rue 13
BEVERAGE OFF-SALE

Southland Corporation
From:
Robert Sally, Dist. Mgr.
To:
Verle & Norma Poland,
Franchise Managers

Motion seconded by Commissioner Howery and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Coblentz, Thornley, Howery, Corey and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

GAMING AND
RETAIL TOBACCO
Approved

CHANGE FROM A COMPANY TO A CORPORATION, AND REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF ADDITIONAL OFFICER

Commissioner Corey moved that the following application for change from a Company to a Corporation and for approval of additional officer under existing Gaming and Retail Tobacco Licenses, be APPROVED, and the Director of License and Revenue authorized to make the appropriate changes:

From:
WHITE CROSS DRUG CO.

From:
Chris K. Brandt
Emma L. Brandt
Ted H. Brandt, TRUST No. 1117
Wm. E. Ferron, TRUST No. 1050-1

To:
WHITE CROSS DRUG,
INC. No. 1
400 Fremont Street
4 SLOTS

To:
Chris K. Brandt, Pres.
C. Don Brown, V. P.
Emma L. Brandt, Secy-Treas.

AND

From:
WHITE CROSS DRUG
Co. No. 2

From:
Chris K. Brandt
Emma L. Brandt
Ted H. Brandt, TRUST No. 1117
Wm. E. Ferron, TRUST No. 1050-1

To:
WHITE CROSS DRUG,
INC. No. 2
1700 Las Vegas Blvd., So.
6 SLOTS

To:
Chris K. Brandt, Pres.
C. Don Brown, V. P.
Emma L. Brandt, Secy-Treas.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Thornley and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Coblentz, Thornley, Howery, Corey and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

GAMING - NEW
Approved

Commissioner Corey moved that the following application for a new Gaming License be APPROVED, and the Director of License and Revenue authorized to issue:

AUGIE'S RESTAURANT
300 Stewart Street
2 SLOTS

William J. Chappell 100%

Motion seconded by Commissioner Howery and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Coblentz, Thornley, Howery, Corey and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

RETAIL
TOBACCO - NEW
Approved

Commissioner Howery moved that the following application for a new Retail Tobacco License be APPROVED, and the Director of License and Revenue authorized to issue:

BARNSON'S GULF
1624 S. Decatur Blvd.

Clifton M. Barnson

Motion seconded by Commissioner Corey and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Coblentz, Thornley, Howery, Corey and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

SECONDHAND
LICENSE - NEW
Approved
Subject to
Conditions

*SUBJECT TO APPROVALS OF THE BUILDING, FIRE AND HEALTH DEPARTMENTS

Commissioner Corey moved that the following application for a new Secondhand License, be APPROVED subject to condition, and the Director of License and Revenue authorized to proceed:

*SLIM'S NEW AND USED
1050 S. Main Street

J. A. Ewing

Motion seconded by Commissioner Coblentz and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Coblentz, Thornley, Howery, Corey and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

PRIVATE DETECTIVE
LICENSE - NEW
Approved

Commissioner Corey moved that the following application for a new Private Detective License, be APPROVED and the Director of License and Revenue authorized to issue:

LAS VEGAS CANINE PATROL, INC.
2631 S. Highland Drive

Dr. Jos. I. Leveque,
Pres. 50%
Robert E. Clark,
Secy-Treas. 50%

Motion seconded by Commissioner Howery and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Coblentz, Thornley, Howery, Corey and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

LIQUOR -
Approved

REQUESTS FOR EXTENSION OF CLOSURE

Commissioner Corey moved that the following applications for extension of closure under existing Liquor Licenses, be APPROVED, and the Director of License and Revenue authorized to proceed:

CHUCK'S LIQUORS
830-A S. Main Street
TAVERN
Herb Tobman
(Approved 5/6/70. Requests an additional 60 days, 1/2/71 thru 3/2/71)

IDEAL LIQUOR STORE
6000 W. Charleston Blvd.
PACKAGE LIQUOR/BEER BAR
George A. Deverell
(Approved 3/4/70. Requests an additional 60 days, 12/29/70 thru 2/26/71. MUST BE OPEN BY MIDNIGHT 3/4/71)

JOSEPH'S DELI & LIQUORS
Sahara at Rancho
PACKAGE LIQUOR/BEER BAR
Robert C. Rishling
(Approved 3/4/70. Requests an additional 60 days, 12/29/70 thru 2/26/71. MUST BE OPEN BY MIDNIGHT 3/4/71)

PANTRY PRIDE
2909 W. Washington Ave.
PACKAGE LIQUOR
Adelson, Inc.
(Approved 8/19/70. Requests an additional 60 days, 12/17/70 thru 2/15/71)

Motion seconded by Commissioner Howery and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Coblentz, Thornley, Howery, Corey and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

LICENSE -
MOVIE MACHINES
Abeyance

APPLICATION FOR LICENSE FOR TEN (10) COIN-OPERATED
MOVIE MACHINES FOR THE SHOWING OF 8mm "ADULT MOVIES"

TALK OF THE TOWN
2232 E. Charleston Blvd.
Movie-Matic, Inc.

Commissioner Howery: No decision has been rendered as yet on the movie machines?

Mr. Ross: No - I believe there has been a recent conference with the Judge concerning this item, but no decision.

LIQUOR - CHANGE
OF OWNERSHIP
Tabled to
Jan. 6, 1971

Jerry Dies: I am the realtor who handled the sale of Kelly's Liquors and I am here today on behalf of Mr. Calcagno who is in Carson City at the State Gaming Board meeting. I don't know whether you can do this, but he would like - if you have this slated for approval - if you could approve it subject to State approval.

Commissioner Howery: We can do that -

Page 42
Minutes
Regular Meeting
December 16, 1970

Commissioner Howery moved that the following application for change of ownership under an existing Liquor License, be APPROVED, subject to approval of the State Gaming Commission:

KELLY'S LIQUORS, INC.
810 W. Bonanza Rd.
PACKAGE LIQUOR/BEER BAR

Kelly's Liquors, Inc.
From:
Fred L. Beeman,
Pres. 100%
To:
James J. Calcagno,
Pres. 100%

Commissioner Corey: What State approval - on what?

Commissioner Howery: Gaming . . . if he can't get approved he may not want the license -

Commissioner Corey: What gaming does he have in there?

Commissioner Howery: Slots - at this point. The motion was for approval subject to approval of the State Gaming Commission.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Coblentz.

Commissioner Howery: We have to license him too. If he doesn't want to make the deal, apparently . . . If the State Gaming Board says "no", the deal is off.

Lt. Compton, L. V. Police Department: We request that this be held until the next meeting - until after the State acts.

Commissioner Corey: This is for the liquor only - this has nothing to do with slots - is this what you're asking?

Lt. Compton: Yes - because it is my understanding that if they do not get the slots, they don't want the Liquor License and there is some doubt at this time about the slot machines.

Commissioner Howery: He can't do one without the other. Why don't we just hold it until we see how he comes out with the State.

Commissioner Howery withdrew his motion.

Commissioner Coblentz withdrew his second.

Item tabled to January 6, 1971.

PARVIN-DOHRMAN
CORP.

CHANGE OF CORPORATE OFFICERS

On December 2, 1970, the Mayor called a Special Meeting for 2:30 p.m., December 18, 1970, to consider change of corporate officers of Parvin-Dohrman Corp. At the request of legal counsel, the Special Meeting was re-set for 2:00 p.m. on the same date, with approval of the full Board.

CHARLESTON
RAINBOW No. 6-D
Extension of time
Approved

SUBDIVISION AGREEMENTS - EXTENSION OF TIME

Director of Public Works, Richard P. Sauer: The following subdivider has requested permission for extension of time on agreements to cover the installation of offsite improvements. This delay has been due to an attempt to improve method of sewer connection to the Tract. The extension of time would be conditioned upon the renewal of bond to cover the improvements and the establishment of new completion date:

Subdivider :	SPROUL HOMES, INC.
Subdivision:	Charleston Rainbow No. 6-D
Extension:	1st six (6) months
New Completion Date:	June 19, 1971

Commissioner Corey moved that the recommendation of the Department of Public Works for a six months' extension of time under the subdivision agreements for CHARLESTON RAINBOW No. 6-D, be APPROVED.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Howery and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Coblentz, Thornley, Howery, Corey and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

CONTRACT
CHANGE ORDER
Approved (also
45-day extension)

BID No. 70.6 - WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT IMPROVEMENTS

Mr. Sauer: The contractor, SUB-TERRA CONSTRUCTION, has requested a 45-day extension of time as a result of the manufacturer's delay in shipping the required filter arm equipment. Also the contractor has submitted a cost estimate of \$1,800.00 to cover certain desired improvements to existing filter arm equipment. It is recommended the additional cost be approved, bringing the total contract amount to \$193,098.08. The additional time is also recommended since it results from factors outside the control of the contractor.

Commissioner Corey moved that the recommendation of the Department of Public Works for a Contract Change Order in the amount of \$1,800.00 and a 45-day time extension on the contract under Bid No. 70.6, be APPROVED, and the City Manager and Director of Finance authorized to proceed.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Thornley and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Coblentz, Thornley, Howery, Corey and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

RELEASE OF
PERFORMANCE BOND

Mr. Sauer: It is recommended that the Performance Bond posted for installation of improvements at the following site, be released. All work has been completed in accordance with City standards and it is recommended that the work be accepted:

Location:	Nellis Blvd. & Sandra
Builder:	CENTRAL TELEPHONE CO.
Surety:	Peerless Ins. Co.
Amount:	\$11,728.00
Bond No.	45722

Commissioner Corey moved that the recommendation of the Department of Public Works for acceptance of the foregoing work, and release of bond, be APPROVED, and Staff authorized to proceed.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Thornley and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Coblentz, Thornley, Howery, Corey and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

RELEASE OF
CONSTRUCTION
CONTRACT
Approved

Mr. Sauer: The following contractor is requesting release of retention and bond following the expiration of the 35-day lien period. All work has been completed in accordance with contract plans and specifications and it is recommended that the contract bond and retention be released:

Bid No.	70.86
Contractor:	REM CONSTRUCTION, INC.
For:	Temporary City Hall Facilities
Notice of Completion:	Filed Nov. 10, 1970
Release date:	Dec. 15, 1970

Commissioner Howery moved that the recommendation of the Department of Public Works under Bid No. 70.86, be APPROVED, and Staff authorized to proceed.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Corey and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Coblentz, Thornley, Howery, Corey and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

RIGHT-OF-WAY
ITEM
Approved

Commissioner Corey moved that the following right-of-way item, be APPROVED, and the Department of Public Works authorized to proceed:

EASEMENT

From:	FOUR QUEENS, INC.
To:	CITY OF LAS VEGAS
For:	Portion of Lot 13, Block 19, Clark's Las Vegas Townsite (VAC 2-69)

Motion seconded by Commissioner Howery and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Coblentz, Thornley, Howery, Corey and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

LORENZI PARK
Report

Mr. Sauer: In Lorenzi Park we had originally hoped to get this Park in shape to play ball on this coming Spring. However, the special pad-mounted transformer that must go into the pumping plant just east of the lake, and must be furnished by the Power Company. It has to be a special order and as a consequence, it will not be here until about the 13th of March. Therefore, there is no way that this Park will be available, I don't believe, until either late in the Summer or the Fall. The contract was let on time but this is a type of transformer that is not kept stocked by the Power Company, nor can they get them at a moment's notice. They have to be built, so to speak, and involves a 3-month delay. We have gone to all the agencies to try to overcome this delay. As a matter of fact we talked about putting in a temporary facility but it would cost \$3,000 or \$4,000 to put that in and it would just be throwing money out the window. So, I'm afraid

there isn't much we can do about it.

Commissioner Howery: How long has the Power Company known they would need this transformer? The first year I came on this Commission it was said - OK we're going to play ball there next year. We didn't. We didn't the next year and now you tell me we aren't going to play the next either. Are we ever going to play ball over there? They've known for three years they were going to have to have this transformer.

Mr. Sauer: Well, the contract is let and the sub-contractor ordered the transformer, etc., but apparently there is just no way it can be procured in the short time necessary to put the ball park into play. It is a special pad-mounted transformer - it is not something you hang on a pole as we do the normal type.

Commissioner Corey: Is there any penalty for not being able to produce within a time requirement?

Mr. Sauer: In this instance where the manufacturer cannot make it - it cannot be supplied - we cannot assess any penalties on them.

Commissioner Corey: Is it the contractor who places it?

Mr. Sauer: The contractor has to place the order with the Power Company. They are the only ones who can allow this transformer to be installed in their system.

Mayor Gragson: You have only one ball diamond - lighted - is that right?

Mr. Sauer: One lighted ball diamond - that's right.

Commissioner Corey: They will be able to play on it during the day time?

Mr. Sauer: No - this transformer is attached to the pumping plant at the east end of the lake -

Mayor Gragson: And there is no way you can provide the irrigation without that, is that right?

Mr. Sauer: No, we can't. We looked into attaching into the City water line. It would cost us a small fortune though, I'm afraid, because we would be paying for water at the rate of 19¢ per 1,000 gals. to water a 60-acre area and, in addition, it would cost us quite a bit extra to put the pipeline in.

Commissioner Corey: Can you run a pumper down there?

Commissioner Howery: Nothing has been done until the last minute -

Mr. Sauer: We did not, and could not, do anything, even on the plans, until such time as the BOR money was released. We sat there ready to go for some four months and I have a letter on file addressed to the Commissioners and the City Manager to the effect there was no way we could provide a baseball diamond if we have to sit and wait for the funds to become available before we start designing, because you have a lapse of time of six or eight months between the bidding and . . .

Commissioner: I won't argue about that - I'm just saying that we sold some property over there for \$650,000.00. It was earmarked and had to go back in there. If it was necessary, we could have put the ball diamonds in a long time ago. We haven't done anything and another season is here and we still don't have a ball diamond.

Mayor Gragson: If we had used those funds we wouldn't have had matching funds and would have been able to do only half of what is contemplated.

NEW CITY
HALL COMPLEX

Mr. Sauer: I have an additional item to those on the agenda - the Architect has just submitted the plans for the City Hall and they must be checked and then returned to him for final corrections, following which they will go to bid. We would like to have permission to send these plans to a Structural Engineer for checking - structural checks as well as Building Code checks. This is done on all City plans so that we are then insured as far as situations that may occur (such as occurred out at the Library) and will amount to approximately \$4,000.00.

Commissioner Corey: Don't we have the Staff to do it?

Mr. Sauer: We can do it - there is no question about that, but we would strongly recommend against it because this is the new City Hall and we want outside Engineers - qualified Consultants - to check the plans which have been drawn by the Architect so there is no possibility of a doubt of such an occurrence as happened at the Library, for example, in the County, or at the El Cortez . . . as to compliance with Code and compliance with structural design.

Mayor Gragson: This is good insurance -

Mr. Sauer: This is a small amount for an \$8,000,000.00 building and we would strongly recommend it.

Commissioner Corey: They will guarantee that they are accurate?

Mr. Sauer: That's true - they go through the plans and if they find a beam that has been under-sized or a Code requirement that has not been met, they send it back -

Commissioner Corey: I don't care what they send back - if it falls down, will they pay the freight?

Mr. Sauer: No, they will not.

Commissioner Corey: They won't guarantee it either - another \$4,000.00 and you're not guaranteeing anything -

Mr. Sauer: You're talking about an \$8,000,000.00 building and they are going to check the plans against the Architect -

Commissioner Corey: Then who are you going to get to check them?

Mr. Sauer: There is an "Errors and Omissions" insurance which all Architects and Engineers must take out -

Commissioner Corey: What do we get for our \$4,000.00?

Mr. Sauer: We get a complete check of all the plans that have been drawn by the Architect - as far as Code compliance - as far as structural analyses -

Commissioner Corey: We can do that ourselves.

Mr. Sauer: We can, but I don't think it's wise to do it that way.

Commissioner Thornley: I think in this case we need an independent, impartial check . . .

Mr. Sauer: We have people competent to do it - we have a computer, but it is very strongly recommended against because to check one's own plans is not considered the most professional way to do it.

Mr. Ross: Also in the event the Structural Engineers who check these plans over did it in a negligent manner, they would be liable. I think we are getting into semantics - there is no guarantee that they would be liable for their negligence but, as Mr. Sauer has pointed out, most of these firms carry insurance and their insurance carrier would be liable.

Mr. Sauer: They have "Errors and Omissions" insurance which takes care of it.

Mr. Ross: We would have to prove negligence.

Commissioner Howery moved that the recommendation of the Department of Public Works to expend approximately \$4,000.00 for a Structural Engineer's plan-checking of the Architect's drawings of the new City Hall Complex, be APPROVED, and the Department of Public Works authorized to proceed.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Coblentz and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Coblentz, Thornley, Howery and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, Commissioner Corey.

LEWIS HOMES
Approved

TRACTS Nos. 3, 4 and 5 - FINAL MAPS

Mr. Sauer: I have another item not on the agenda: Under the 235 Program, the Government has released money to build these Government-subsidized small homes - funds are available but they have to use it by the 1st of January, 1971. As a consequence we have three subdivisions - LEWIS HOMES, TRACTS Nos. 3, 4 and 5, that although they have not been checked by Engineering yet, we believe they are pretty well in order and we would like to have the Commission's approval subject to checking by the Department of Public Works. This is a standard subdivision tract -

Commissioner Corey: Where?

Mr. Sauer: In the northeast part of town.

Commissioner Corey: Is it to go through Planning?

Mr. Sauer: They have already been through Planning -

Commissioner Corey: Is this the series we had in different areas?

Mr. Sauer: No - it is just west of Nellis and south of Owens Avenue.

Commissioner Howery: You are saying that the plans for these homes have not been approved yet by the Department of Public Works but their funds have to be committed by the first of the year.

Mr. Saylor: Last Thursday FHA came out and said - if you can get under development by the end of December, you have some committments - that's why this is a rush item.

Commissioner Corey moved that the recommendation of the Department of Public Works for approval of the final maps of LEWIS HOMES, TRACTS Nos. 3, 4 AND 5, be APPROVED, subject to approval of the Department of Public Works.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Thornley and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Coblentz, Thornley, Howery, Corey and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

TRAFFIC &
PARKING ITEMS
Approved

APPROVED BY TRAFFIC AND PARKING COMMISSION

Commissioner Coblentz moved that the recommendation of the Traffic & Parking Commission on the following items, be APPROVED, and the Department of Public Works authorized to proceed:

REQUEST OF FAIRWAY CHEVROLET for a variance of the Curb Cut Ordinance at their new business location on Sahara Ave.

Request for 2-hour time limited parking on the west side of 11TH STREET, BETWEEN BONNEVILLE AND CLARK.

Request for a parking control on FREMONT STREET, BETWEEN 9TH AND 10TH STREETS, and on 10TH STREET BETWEEN FREMONT AND OGDEN.

Request of Traffic Engineer to change speed limit on LAS VEGAS EXPRESSWAY BETWEEN DECATUR BLVD. & JONES BLVD. from 35 mph to 45 mph.

Request of property owner to permit existing curb cut along east side of LAS VEGAS BLVD., NORTH AND E. BONANZA WAY for a period of eighteen (18) months.

Request of Mr. Paul Ferguson, Twin Lakes Shopping Center, for a change in curb cut openings onto TONOPAHO HIGHWAY.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Thornley and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Coblentz, Thornley, Howery, Corey and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

BOARD OF
EQUALIZATION
Member
Reappointed

City Manager: The following communication has been received from the Office of the County Clerk:

"December 8, 1970

"Las Vegas Board of City Commissioners

"Re: Board of Equalization

"This is to notify you that Section 361.340 N.R.S. provides that the Board of Equalization of each County shall consist of:

Members of the Board of County Commissioners
One member representing the County School District
One member from each Incorporated City in the County

"The Board of Equalization will meet at 10:00 a.m. on the 7th day of January, 1971, and shall continue in session and hold such number of meetings as may be necessary to care for the business of equalization on or before the 25th day of January, 1971.

"Will you kindly advise this office when you have made an appointment to this Board, and hand the attached Notice to the representative appointed."

/s/ Loretta Bowman, County Clerk
and Ex-Officio Clerk of the
Board of County Commissioners

"NOTICE OF MEETING - BOARD OF EQUALIZATION"

"NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Board of Equalization will meet on Thursday the 7th day of January, 1971, at 10:00 a.m. and shall continue in session and hold such number of meetings as may be necessary to care for the business of equalization presented to it and conclude the business of equalization on or before the 25th day of January, 1971. Appeals must be filed on or before the 15th day of January, 1971. Said meetings are held for the purpose of equalizing assessments and to enable parties to appear and contest the accuracy of the assessment.

"DATED this 8th day of December, 1970."

/s/ Loretta Bowman

Mr. Trelease: On December 17, 1969 Commissioner Corey was appointed to represent the City of Las Vegas on the Board of Equalization for the calendar year of 1970.

Commissioner Howery moved that Commissioner Corey be reappointed to represent the City of Las Vegas on the Clark County Board of Equalization for the calendar year of 1971.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Coblentz and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Coblentz, Thornley, Howery, Corey and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

SOLICITATIONS
REVIEW BOARD
Member
Appointed

Commissioner Corey moved that Mayor Gragson's recommendation for the appointment of LEO LEWIS, 5909 Alta Drive, Las Vegas, Nevada to the SOLICITATIONS REVIEW BOARD for the term 12/20/70 to 12/20/72, be APPROVED, and the Clerk authorized to proceed.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Howery and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Coblentz, Thornley, Howery, Corey and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

PARKS & RECREATION
ADVISORY
COMMISSION
Members
Appointed

Commissioner Howery moved that the recommendation of Mayor Gragson for the reappointment of MRS. ABE MILLER and the appointment of MRS. CHARLES W. ANDERSON, 1317 Denarius Circle, Las Vegas, Nevada, to the Parks & Recreation Advisory Commission for terms commencing 1/3/71 and ending 1/3/74, be APPROVED, and the Clerk authorized to proceed.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Coblentz and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Coblentz, Thornley, Howery, Corey and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

ORDINANCE
No. 934-181
Referred
(C and H)

REZONING ORDINANCE - Z-56-70, Z-10-70 AND Z-100-64

An ordinance entitled: "AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND TITLE XI, CHAPTER 1, SECTION 3 OF THE MUNICIPAL CODE OF THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, 1960 EDITION, BY AMENDING THE LAND USE PLAN MAP ADOPTED BY THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS, AND CHANGING THE ZONING DESIGNATION OF SAID MAP" was read by title by the Deputy City Attorney, who recommended that it be referred to Committee.

Mayor Gragson appointed Commissioners Corey and Howery as the Committee for Recommendation on Ordinance No. 934-181.

CLAIM AGAINST
THE CITY
Denied

CLAIM No. 605

Commissioner Coblentz moved that the recommendation of the Insurance Adjuster and City Attorney's office for denial of the following claim against the City, be APPROVED, and the Clerk authorized to notify claimant:

Claimant:	Crenshaw Backhoe Service Jesse M. Crenshaw c/o Goodman & Snyder, Ltd.
Damage caused by:	Automobile accident
Location:	West Fremont Street
Date:	On or about May 21, 1970
Amount claimed:	\$1,341.00

Motion seconded by Commissioner Howery and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Coblentz, Thornley, Howery, Corey and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

UNION PACIFIC
RAILROAD
Agreement
Approved

AGREEMENT WITH U.P. RAILROAD re PROVISION FOR TRAFFIC
SIGNAL PRE-EMPTION ARRANGEMENTS AT WYOMING AVENUE
CROSSING

Deputy City Attorney, Ian Ross: This pertains to an agreement with the Union Pacific Railroad re provision for Traffic Signal pre-emption at Wyoming Avenue. Pursuant to the Department of Public Works we would recommend that this Commission adopt this agreement. It is in proper form.

Commissioner Corey: They aren't going to contribute anything?

Mr. Sauer: No - this is just for Western Avenue traffic. When the train comes it will pre-empt the signal on Western. It's in connection with the Assessment District . . .

Commissioner Corey: It just allows our people to continue along Western as long as the train . . .

Mr. Sauer: The traffic won't jam up there as it does now -

Commissioner Corey: Then this, actually, is of no benefit to the Railroad?

Mr. Sauer: No.

Commissioner Howery moved that the recommendation of the Department of Public Works and the City Attorney's office to enter into an Agreement with the Union Pacific Railroad for traffic signal pre-emption arrangements at Wyoming Avenue, be APPROVED, and the Mayor and Clerk authorized to sign.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Coblentz and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Coblentz, Thornley, Howery, Corey and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

STATE DEPARTMENT
OF HIGHWAYS
Agreement
Approved

AGREEMENT WITH DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS No. 435-70-012
re TRAFFIC SIGNAL AT CASINO CENTER DRIVE AND CHARLESTON
BLVD.

Mr. Ross: This is an Agreement with the Department of Highways pertaining to a traffic signal at Casino Center Drive and Charleston. It is for construction and operation of a traffic signal. The State will do the construction and at that point the City will take over the maintenance of it. We recommend that the Commission adopt this agreement.

Commissioner Howery: We have one there now -

Mr. Sauer: This is a high type of signal that is under the TOPICS Program which we have applied for, and we hope it will correct the problem at this intersection.

Commissioner Thornley moved that the recommendation of the Department of Public Works and the City Attorney's office to enter into an Agreement with the State Highway Department (No. 435-70-012) pertaining to a traffic signal at Casino Center Drive and Charleston Blvd., be APPROVED, and the Mayor and Clerk authorized to sign.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Coblentz and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Coblentz, Thornley, Howery, Corey and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

UNION PACIFIC
RAILROAD
Termination
Rider
Approved

TERMINATION RIDER re CONTRACTUAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN
THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS AND U. P. RAILROAD INVOLVING
SEWER LINE (CADILLAC ARMS)

Mr. Ross: This is a Termination Rider under a contractual agreement between the City and the Union Pacific Railroad with reference to a sewer line. In essence it is not the abandonment of a sewer line, but reconstruction at another location. This came from the Department of Public Works; it is in proper form and we recommend that it be adopted.

Commissioner Coblentz moved that the recommendation of the Department of Public Works and the City Attorney's office to execute a Termination Rider under a Contractual Agreement between the City of Las Vegas and the Union Pacific Railroad involving a sewer line, be APPROVED, and the Mayor and Clerk authorized to sign.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Thornley and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Coblentz, Thornley, Howery, Corey and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

ORDINANCE
No. 1496
Referred
(Mayor and H)

ORDINANCE No. 1496 - LAND SALE REGULATION

Mr. Ross: This is a proposed ordinance concerning regulation of certain types of land sales that have been occurring in the City. More frequently these have been occurring in the County and the County is considering legislation. Rather than refer this to a recommending Committee, we would request that this be sent to a Study Committee to see whether or not the City should engage in the regulation of this industry, or whether recommendations for certain State legislation be proposed.

Commissioner Howery: No - the State can make recommendations on licensing salesmen, but has nothing to do with the operation within the City Limits. An ordinance is required. It is needed as quickly as possible. The County is about ready to move on it and all you are going to do is drive these operators within our City then if we have no ordinance to stop them. There is a dual purpose in this ordinance - one is to regulate the promoters who get the people to go in and see it and the second is the people who sell the land. We need an ordinance on this badly, because the County will pass one within the next two to three weeks.

Mr. Ross: I am not suggesting that we don't need an ordinance but I am suggesting that one is not drafted at this time and that it be put into a Study Committee rather than a Recommending Committee.

Commissioner Howery: What's the difference whether it's a Study or Recommending Committee?

Mr. Ross: The difference between the Recommending Committee would be a situation where we have a drafted ordinance - which is read by title and then referred to the Recommending Committee which then, at the next meeting, refers it back out. I am asking that it be sent to a Study Committee because it hasn't been

determined at this time what should be done . . .

Commissioner Howery: In my own mind it has been determined that we need an ordinance and we need it as quickly as we can and there is no further study needed. Certainly you are going to sit down with some people who are knowledgeable and work up an ordinance, but a Study Committee will delay it for six months and we will be flooded with a bunch of operators in this town with no ordinance to stop them.

Mayor Gragson: Of course, we can't recommend an ordinance we don't have. I am going to appoint myself and Commissioner Howery on a Committee and we will work this through just as fast as possible.

Commissioner Howery: Very good.

ANNEXATION
A-4-70

RESOLUTION re ANNEXATION OF W.M.K. PROPERTY

Mr. Ross: This pertains to the following Resolution annexing the property of W. M. K. Transit. This property had previously come before the Commission on a claim filed by the W.M.K. people concerning a re-zoning situation where they felt they were damaged. It is recommended that the Commission adopt this Resolution of Annexation which contains the Notice of Public Hearing for January 20, 1971 at 10:30 a.m.

Commissioner Howery moved that the following Resolution under A-4-70, setting the Public Hearing for 10:30 a.m. on January 20, 1971, be ADOPTED:

"WHEREAS, certain territory hereinafter described was formerly within the City Limits of the City of Las Vegas, Nevada, and was zoned R-1 (Parcel No. 3); R-2 (Parcel No. 2) and R-3 (Parcel No. 1) in 1965 when the Nevada State Legislature re-defined the boundaries of the City of Las Vegas (Statute 487) and thereby relocated said property in Clark County, Nevada; and

"WHEREAS, the Board of Commissioners of the City of Las Vegas deems it appropriate and in the best interest of the public health, safety, welfare and convenience that said territory, being contiguous to the City of Las Vegas, be annexed thereto and be zoned R-1 (Parcel No. 3); R-2 (Parcel No. 2) and R-3 (Parcel No. 1).

"NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Las Vegas, Nevada, at a regular meeting thereof held on the 16th day of December, 1970:

"1. That it is the intention of said Board to annex to the City of Las Vegas the following described real property:

PARCEL No. 1. The east 646 ft. of the S 1/2 of the NE 1/4 of Sec. 27, T20S, R60E, M.D.B. & M.

PARCEL No. 2. The west 461 ft. of the east 1107 ft. of the S 1/2 of the NE 1/4 of Sec. 27, T20S, R60E, M.D.B. & M.

PARCEL No. 3. The S 1/2 of the NE 1/4 of Sec. 27,
T20S, R60E, M.D.B. & M.

save and except the east 1107 ft. therefrom.

- "2. That said property, when annexed, shall be classified without further proceedings as R-1 (Parcel No. 3); R-2 (Parcel No. 2) and R-3 (Parcel No. 1).
- "3. That said Board of Commissioners shall meet on Wednesday, the 20th day of January, 1971, at the hour of 10:30 o'clock A.M. in the Commission Chambers, Reed Whipple Center, 821 Las Vegas Blvd., North, Las Vegas, Nevada, to conduct a Public Hearing on the question of such annexation.

"The Board of Commissioners of the City of Las Vegas, Nevada, has, by said Resolution, further declared that said property, when annexed, shall be classified without further proceedings as R-1 (Parcel No. 3); R-2 (Parcel No. 2) and R-3 (Parcel No. 1).

- "4. That the City Clerk be, and she hereby is, directed to give notice of such Public Hearing by publication thereof at least three (3) times in the LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, a newspaper published in the City of Las Vegas and of general circulation in the above described territory, the first publication to be at least twenty (20) days prior to the said 20th day of January, 1971, and not less than six (6) days shall intervene between the first publication and the last publication, and by mailing notice thereof by certified mail, return receipt requested, to each record owner of real property within said described territory, said notice to be mailed at the time of the first publication thereof. Said notice shall be in substantially the following form, to-wit:

(SEE OFFICIAL A-4-70 ANNEXATION FILE IN CLERK'S OFFICE)

- "5. That the Director of Public Works and the Director of Planning are hereby directed to prepare and submit to said Board of Commissioners on Wednesday, the 16th day of December, 1970, a Report setting forth plans for the extension into said described territory all major Municipal Services presently furnished by the City to its citizens and residents, which Report shall include, but shall not be limited to:
- a) A metes and bounds description of the territory proposed to be annexed;
 - b) An accurate map, or plat, of such territory prepared under the supervision of a competent surveyor or engineer;
 - c) A map, or maps, of the City and the adjacent territory to show the following information:
 - (i) the present and proposed boundaries of the City;
 - (ii) the present streets and sewer interceptors and outfalls;
 - (iii) the proposed extensions of the present

- street and sewer interceptors and outfalls;
- (iv) the present and proposed general land use pattern into the territory to be annexed;

- d. A Statement showing that the territory proposed to be annexed is eligible for annexation under Chapter 538, Statutes of Nevada, 1967.

"PASSED, ADOPTED and APPROVED this 16th day of December, 1970."

Motion seconded by Commissioner Corey and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Coblentz, Thornley, Howery, Corey and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

Mr. Saylor: In conjunction with that Resolution and at this time we would ask that you also accept the Report, which simply sets forth the facts but, in accordance with State requirements must be adopted and placed on file in the City Clerk's office.

Commissioner Howery moved that the Report on A-4-70 be ADOPTED and placed on file in the office of the City Clerk.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Coblentz and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Coblentz, Thornley, Howery, Corey and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

ORDINANCE
No. 1494
Adopted

Re: WOMEN BARTENDERS
Committee: Commissioners Howery and Thornley

Ordinance No. 1494 voted out of Committee favorably.

An ordinance entitled: "AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND TITLE V, CHAPTER 18, SECTION 24 OF THE MUNICIPAL CODE OF THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, 1960 EDITION, BY REPEALING SUBSECTION (B) THEREOF; PROVIDING FOR OTHER MATTERS PROPERLY RELATING THERETO AND REPEALING ALL ORDINANCES IN CONFLICT HEREWITH" was read by title by the Deputy City Attorney. (2nd reading)

Commissioner Howery moved that Ordinance No. 1494 be ADOPTED and the Clerk authorized to proceed with the required publications.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Corey and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Coblentz, Thornley, Howery, Corey and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

ORDINANCE
No. 934-180
Adopted

REZONING ORDINANCE - Z-11-66
Committee: Commissioners Corey and Thornley

Ordinance No. 934-180 reported out of Committee favorably.

An ordinance entitled: "AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND TITLE XI, CHAPTER 1, SECTION 3 OF THE MUNICIPAL CODE OF THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS, NEVADA, 1960 EDITION, BY AMENDING THE LAND USE PLAN MAP ADOPTED BY THE CITY OF LAS VEGAS, AND CHANGING THE ZONING DESIGNATION OF SAID MAP" was read by title by the Deputy City Attorney. (2nd reading)

Commissioner Corey moved that Ordinance No. 934-180 be ADOPTED and the Clerk authorized to proceed with the required publications.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Howery and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Coblentz, Thornley, Howery, Corey and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

LORENZI PARK -
LEASE AGREEMENT
Approved

GARDEN CLUB LEASE AGREEMENT - LORENZI PARK
Committee: Commissioners Thornley and Howery

Commissioner Howery: This matter is to be moved out of Committee favorably.

Mr. Ross: This is a License Agreement between the Garden Club and the City as was announced at the last meeting and the details of which were announced at that time.

Commissioner Thornley moved that the License Agreement between the City of Las Vegas and the Nevada State Federation of Garden Clubs relating to facilities designated as Building No. 2 of Lorenzi Park be APPROVED.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Howery and carried by the following vote: Commissioners Coblentz, Thornley, Howery, Corey and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

NAVAL TRAINING
CENTER

EXTENSION OF LEASE
Committee: Commissioners Howery and Corey

Commissioner Corey: Have we heard from them yet?

Mr. Saylor: They have indicated to us that they cannot enter into a lease if they have to put in the off-site improvements.

Commissioner Corey: Our thinking on the matter is that if they are not willing to go along with the off-site improvements, we not give them a long term lease because we eventually want that property as a part of this property, which abuts us across the street, etc. We will give them ample time to find new quarters but we would like to go on a year-to-year lease until we see where we stand -

Mr. Trelease: That lease expires in 1972.

Commissioner Howery: I would say - let's just sit on it until we see where we're going.

Mr. Saylor: I think you should indicate to them, though, if you are not going to endorse extending the lease. They should be advised so they can make other arrangements.

Commissioner Corey: What we would like is an indication from the Board if that's alright to go ahead in this manner -

Mr. Trelease: From year-to-year?

Commissioner Corey: Yes - after their present lease expires.

Mr. Ross: If we are no longer on a lease basis, then you are going into tenancy at will, which is month-to-month. It doesn't necessarily follow that we have to give notice at any one month. In other words, we could say year-to-year but if we go off a lease basis then there is no lease -

Commissioner Corey: We can go on a lease basis, year-to-year -

Commissioner Howery: All we want to do is to let them know if we want the building back they will have a year to move.

Commissioner Corey: We'll find out - I just wanted to know how the Commission feels.

NAACP
Reported out
Unfavorably

LAS VEGAS BRANCH OF NAACP - re DEVELOPMENT OF CITY
PARK (as follows)

Committee: Commissioners Howery and Corey

"December 4, 1970

"Mr. Art Trelease, City Manager

"The national office of the NAACP is making a special effort to improve the housing and living conditions of the Black citizens of America. To this end, as chairman of the Nine Western States, I shall devote a considerable portion of my time to the housing and neighborhood conditions of the Black people of West Las Vegas.

"In the planning which you are doing for our City, I see that you have given considerable thought to recreation for teenagers and young adults. There is a crying need, however, in the area of "H" and Doolittle for a park where mothers with infant children might rest and shade under trees or look at a pretty bed of flowers.

"I am proposing, then, that the five acre plot of ground at "H" and Doolittle Streets, now owned by Laura, a private individual and described as S2 SE4 Sec. 21 T.20S R.61 E be purchased and put to such use. This property is now appraised for \$130,000.00 and could probably be purchased for a more advantageous price on a cash offer.

"At any rate, it would improve the neighborhood immeasurably and give a psychological lift to the hundreds of low income families which predominate in the immediate location. I would like very much to have you put this matter on the agenda for consideration by your Planning Commission and by the City

Commissioners.

"Your very earliest reply will be appreciated."

/s/ Charles L. Kellar, Pres.
Las Vegas Branch NAACP
1042 W. Owens Avenue
Las Vegas, Nevada 89106

Commissioner Corey: At the present time there's not much we can do about it.

Commissioner Howery: We don't have the money to do it. It would require going out and buying more land with no money to develop it . . . I'm not saying the park shouldn't be there.

Commissioner Corey: They're developing another park at Highland and Washington -

Mr. Saylor: This is right next door to Doolittle -

Commissioner Corey: There is one going at the Housing Authority -

Mayor Gragson: I don't feel development there is justified at this point.

Mr. Sauer: When they get the mini-parks in along the Freeway, there will be plenty of parks.


Commissioner Corey: In order to get this off the agenda, I would recommend that the City Manager reply to the communication and inform them of our position at the present time.

There being no further business to come before the Board, at the hour of 1:00 p.m. Mayor Gragson declared the meeting ADJOURNED.

APPROVED:


ORAN K. GRAGSON, MAYOR

ATTEST:


EDWINA M. COLE, CITY CLERK

APPROVED BY REFERENCE at a regular meeting of the Board of City Commissioners held on the 6th day of January, 1971