

A G E N D A

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

August 9, 1973

RECEIVED

AUG 8 9 22 AM '73

CALL TO ORDER:

7:30 P.M. in the Commission Chambers of the City Hall, 400 Stewart Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada.

ROLL CALL:

MINUTES:

Approval of the minutes of the regular meetings of July 12, 1973.

OLD BUSINESS:

1. Tentative Map
Towne & Country
Ranch Estates

Property generally located at Elkhorn and Bradley.
Owner: John S. Stuhmer
Subdivider: Towne & Country Realty
No. of Acres: 40 No. of Lots: 16
Zoning: R-E

2. Final Map
Towne & Country
Ranch Estates

Property generally located at Elkhorn and Bradley.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. Z-22-73

TABLED from
3/27/73

Application of JERRY MOSS & COMPANY AND DENELCO, INC. for reclassification of property generally located between Bonanza Road and Washington Avenue, 525 feet east of Decatur Boulevard, from R-E to R-1 and R-3.

Proposed Use: Single Family Dwellings and Apartments

2. Z-59-73

Application of VINCE ERARDI for reclassification of property generally located on the east side of Monterey Avenue between Exley Avenue and Sahara Avenue, 300 feet north of Sahara and on the west side of San Jose Avenue between Exley and Sahara, 300 feet north of Sahara Avenue, from R-1 to P-R.
Proposed Use: Parking Lot

3. Z-60-73

Application of FRANK WEINMAN for reclassification of property generally located on the east side of South 4th Street between East Charleston Boulevard and Las Vegas Boulevard South at 1337 South 4th Street, from R-4 to C-2.

Proposed Use: General Offices, Retail Stores or Shops

4. Z-61-73

Application of NEVADA NATIONAL BANK for reclassification of property located on the southwest corner of South Decatur Boulevard and Michael Way, from R-1 to C-2.

Proposed Use: Branch Bank of Nevada National Bank

5. Z-62-73

Application of WILLIAM B. HARRIS, M.D. for reclassification of property generally located on the south side of West Charleston Boulevard between Rancho Drive and Pahor Drive, 550 feet west of Rancho Drive at 2121 West Charleston Boulevard, from R-E to C-1.

Proposed Use: Boarding House and/or Home for Aged

6. Z-63-73

Application of STEVE ALLEN, ET AL, for reclassification of property generally located on the west side of South Highland Drive between Hastings Avenue and Pinto Lane, 550 feet north of Hastings Avenue, from R-3 to R-4.

Proposed Use: Apartments

7. Z-64-73

Application of D. S. DE SURE for reclassification of property generally located on the southwest corner of O'Bannon Avenue and South Decatur Boulevard, extending south 600 feet along Decatur Boulevard and west 1270 feet along O'Bannon Avenue, from R-4 to C-1.
Proposed Use: Shopping Center

8. Z-65-73

Application of JOE NOLAN for reclassification of property generally located at the south end of Third Place, south of East Charleston Boulevard at 1108 South Third Place, from R-1 to P-R.
Proposed Use: Parking Lot

9. Z-67-73

Application of ARDSLEY, INC. for reclassification of property located on the northeast corner of "E" Street and West Bonanza Road, from C-2 and R-4 to M and C-2.
Proposed Use: Monument Engraving and Sales and Parking Lot

10. Final Map
Charleston Rainbow #15A

Property generally located at the northeast corner of West Charleston Boulevard and Buffalo Drive.
Owner/Subdivider: Sproul Homes of Nevada
No. of Lots: 46

11. Z-100-64
Plot Plan Review

Approved application of MADELINE GARTLAND concerning property located at 500 South Third Street.

12. Z-29-70
Reinstatement and
Extension of Time

Approved application of NEVSUR INSURANCE AGENCY for reclassification of property generally located on the southeast corner of Vegas Drive and Jones Boulevard, C-1 Zone.
Reinstatement and Six Month Extension of Time
Granted February 3, 1971.

13. Tentative Map
Valley West Unit #2

Property generally located at Valley View Boulevard and Alta Drive.
Owner/Subdivider: McGah & Bailey
No. of Acres: 15+ No. of Lots: 65
Zoning: Under Resolution to R-2 P.U.D.

14. LD-8-73

Lot Division submitted by WILL JONES concerning property generally located at Durango and LaMadra Way.

15. Final Map
Northridge Village

Property generally located at Bromley and Decatur Boulevard.
Owner: Bromley Group, Ltd.
No. of Lots: 19

16. M Zone Aesthetic Review

Submitted by STERLING PLUMBING AND HEATING CO., INC. concerning property located at 3400 Meade Avenue, M Zone.

17. Z-18-68
Review

Submitted by HUSTON SANDERS concerning property located at 2909 West Charleston Boulevard, C-D Zone.

18. C-D Allowable Use
RATIFICATION

Approval of recording studio as an allowable use in the C-D zone.

19. VAC-3-73

Petition of Vacation submitted by ROBERT RISHLING, ET AL, of a portion of Kingsbury Lane generally located on the east side of Rose Street extending approximately 125 feet east between Pinto Lane and Goldring Avenue.

20. VAC-4-73

Petition of Vacation of Tanya Street submitted by JERRY MOSS AND COMPANY, ET AL, generally located between West Washington Avenue and West Bonanza Road, 525 feet east of North Decatur Boulevard.

21. VAC-5-73

Petition of Vacation submitted by WANDA A. HATHAWAY, ET AL, of property generally located on the southeast boundary of Westwood Tract No. 1.

22. VAC-6-73

Petition of Vacation submitted by WILLIAM A. HOLT, ET AL, for property generally located in the area bounded by Rigel Avenue on the east, Procyon Avenue on the west, Desert Inn Road on the south, and Sirius Avenue on the north.

23. Reversionary Map
Starlight Park

Property generally located between Rigel Avenue and Procyon Avenue, and between Desert Inn Road and Sirius Avenue.

24. Reversionary Map
Westwood Village

Property generally located at Oakley Boulevard, east of Barnard Drive.

25. Tentative Map
Casa del Rey Estates

Property generally located on El Concho Drive between Washington Avenue and Bonanza Road.

Owner: Denelco, Inc.

Subdivider: Jack P. DeBoer Assoc., Inc.

No. of Acres: 1.86 No. of Lots: 8

Zoning: R-1.

26. Final Map
Casa del Rey Estates

Property generally located at El Concho Drive between Washington Avenue and Bonanza Road.

27. Z-47-72
Review of Condition

Submitted by NEVADA SOUTHERN TITLE concerning property generally located on the southeast corner of East Charleston Boulevard and South Sixth Street, P-R Zone.

28. Z-6-66
Plot Plan Review

Submitted by MC DONALD'S RESTAURANT for remodeling and expansion at 4840 West Charleston Boulevard.

29. Z-6-67
Plot Plan Review

Submitted by MC DONALD'S RESTAURANT for remodeling and expansion at 2230 West Bonanza Road.

30. Z-20-66
Plot Plan Review

Submitted by MC DONALD'S RESTAURANT for remodeling and expansion at 2830 East Charleston Boulevard.

31. Z-24-68
Plot Plan Review

Submitted by GILBERT D. BUCK concerning property generally located on the south side of McWilliams, east of Highland, C-M Zone.

32. Z-43-71
Plot Plan Review

Submitted by MOFFITT & MC DANIEL ARCHITECTS concerning the approved application of Jerome Snyder et al for reclassification of property generally located on the north side of Ogden Avenue between Flower Avenue and 25th Street, C-2 Zone.

33. M Zone Architectural
Review

Submitted by GORDON LEISHMAN, GENERAL BUILDING CONTRACTOR, concerning property located at 3296 Meade, M Zone.

34. Z-62-72
Request for Extension
of Time

Approved application of SECURITY LAND & INVESTMENT CO. concerning property generally located on the northwest corner of Nellis Boulevard and East Bonanza Road, C-1 Zone.

No previous extensions.

35. Final Map
Cimarron West

Property generally located at Washington Avenue and Torrey Pines Boulevard.

RECEIVED
CITY MANAGER

MINUTES

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

SEP-6 1973

August 9, 1973

PM
7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6

A regular meeting of the Las Vegas City Planning Commission was called to order by Chairman Willard at 7:30 P.M. in the Commission Chambers of the City Hall, Las Vegas, Nevada.

PRESENT:

Chairman Willard, Vice-Chairman Ward, Messrs. Tiberti, Jenkins, McGarry, and Mrs. Coleman (excused at 9:45 P.M.)

STAFF PRESENT:

Don J. Saylor, AIP, Director of Community Development
Harold P. Foster, Deputy Director
Jan Stewart, Deputy City Attorney
Betty Jo Winter, Recording Secretary

MINUTES:

Mrs. Coleman made a correction on Page 8 concerning remarks she had made pertaining to item Z-58-73 as follows: "Mrs. Coleman indicated the vision when approaching from the artery of the long side of the building was disgusting..." She indicated she was referring to the new development near Hyde Park Junior High, not the applicant's development.

Mrs. Coleman moved the Minutes of July 12, 1973 be APPROVED with the correction. The motion was seconded by Mr. Ward and carried by unanimous vote.

OLD BUSINESS:

1. Tentative Map and
Final Map
Towne & Country
Ranch Estates

APPROVED

Property generally located at Elkhorn and Bradley.

Mr. Foster indicated this was held in abeyance at the last meeting so certain items could be worked out with Public Works. He stated it involved 8 lots, 2-1/2 acres in size. One of the items in question was paved access to be provided to the site. There were some indications by Public Works the City would be paving the access to the site. Staff had no objection whether the developer did it or the City, but it was recommended as a condition of approval. It was also recommended no building permits be issued to develop any of the lots until there was paved access to the property. He advised the subdivision ordinance stipulated there is no access to the lots from a primary street, such as Elkhorn. Four lots do front on Elkhorn and access to the lots is to be prohibited. He stated access must be provided by a secondary access alley along the rear of the properties to eliminate curb openings on a major street. The developer is to dedicate access rights on Elkhorn. He pointed out the 8 corner lots, according to the subdivision ordinance, must have the narrow portion fronting on the street as the legal front yard. The setback lines will have to be reversed so the legal front will be on Thom and Bradley. He stated Public Works recommended that as a restriction of the covenants in each deed when each lot is sold, the purchaser should agree to enter into an assessment district for future off-site improvements. There is a further request by the developer to waive the normal off-site improvements due to the location and it being a rural type development. The request is to waive the curb and gutters, sidewalks, street lighting, and public water and sewer service. There are waiver provisions in the subdivision ordinance and both this Commission and the City Commission must act upon it. He stated if the Commission felt the waiver was logical, staff recommended a condition be placed there be no further reduction of

these lots in size unless the required street improvements are constructed. Staff felt possibly with the lots being 2-1/2 acres in size and their proximity to the urban area, the paving that is suggested by Public Works and the requests by the developer are logical in this area. He stated street names should be provided as required by the Department of Community Development. The conditions also apply to the final map.

Mr. Tiberti asked how much they were going to reduce the pavement.

Mr. Foster indicated Public Works would require a 32' wide paved section.

Mrs. Coleman asked if Elkhorn were a main arterial.

Mr. Foster indicated it was a primary 100' wide street and they are dedicating a 50' half street.

Mrs. Coleman asked if the people would have to agree in the covenants to an assessment district when the urban area moved out there.

Mr. Foster indicated that was staff's recommendation.

Mr. Tiberti asked if the subdividers were willing to comply with the paved access to the subdivision.

MR. JACK STUHMER, the subdivider, appeared and indicated they were not. He stated he was under the impression the City would pave the access to the property.

Mr. Foster indicated the subdivider had indicated to staff that the City would pave it, but the Public Works Department had not indicated this to staff. He also stated if the City was not going to pave it, it would be required of the developer.

Mr. Stuhmer indicated Jones Boulevard was the nearest paved road to the area. He was informed by Public Works that the City, when it was deemed necessary, would pave from Jones to his property and before obtaining building permits he would be required to put in the 32' wide paved streets within the subdivision.

Mrs. Coleman indicated the paving was the reason it was held in abeyance in the first place.

Mr. Stuhmer indicated the condition of no building permits being issued until such time as the City had paved access put them in limbo as to when they could start developing.

Mr. Foster indicated it could be held until the developer could work it out with Public Works.

Mr. Tiberti indicated the Board could approve it subject to an agreement that this would be done.

Mr. Tiberti then moved the Tentative Map and Final Map of Towne & Country Ranch Estates be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. No building permits to be issued to develop any of the lots until there is paved access to the property.
2. Prohibition of access to any lots abutting Elkhorn.
3. Provisions of an accessway along the rear of those properties abutting Elkhorn.

4. The setback lines to be reversed on the corner lots.
5. No further division in the lot sizes unless the required street improvements are constructed.
6. A covenant on the sale of each property in the deed shall require an agreement to enter into an assessment district for remaining off-site improvements.
7. Waiver of following improvements: public sewer, public water, sidewalks, curb and gutter, street lights. Modified street paving to be permitted.
8. Street names to be provided as required by the Department of Community Development.
9. Approval of the tentative map shall be for no more than twelve (12) months. If a final map is not recorded on all or a portion of the area embraced by the tentative map within twelve months of approval of the tentative map, a new tentative map must be filed. If a final map is recorded within twelve months of the approval of the tentative map for only a portion of the area embraced by the tentative map, the Planning Commission may require that a new tentative map be filed and approved prior to any further final maps being approved.

The motion was seconded by Mrs. Coleman and carried by unanimous vote.

This item will be heard by the City Commission on August 15, 1973.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. Z-22-73

DENIED

Application of JERRY MOSS & COMPANY AND DENELCO, INC. for reclassification of property legally described as Parcel I: The Northwest Quarter (NW $\frac{1}{4}$) of the Southwest Quarter (SW $\frac{1}{4}$) of Section 30, Township 20 South, Range 61 East, MDB&M, except the west 525 feet and also excepting Parcel II as described below, from R-E to R-3. Parcel II: Commencing at the northeast corner of the Northwest Quarter (NW $\frac{1}{4}$) of the Southwest Quarter (SW $\frac{1}{4}$) of said Section 30, Township 20 South, Range 61 East, MDB&M, thence S.00°29'25" East 916.60 feet; thence Northwest along a tangent curve having a radius of 198.00 feet a distance of 121.27 feet; thence tangent to said curve N.35°35'00" West a distance of 85.14 feet to a tangent curve to the right having a radius of 138.00 feet; thence along said curve a distance of 84.52 feet; thence N.00°29'25" west a distance of 652.28 feet; thence N.88°38'05" East 110.01 feet to the point of beginning, from R-E to R-1. Property generally located between Bonanza Road and Washington Avenue, 525 feet east of Decatur Boulevard.

Mr. Saylor indicated this application was before the Board in March and tabled due to an error in the legal description. Staff has sent revised notices to the property owners. He stated the property is presently zoned R-E. The R-E zoning on this property is not intended as a zoning under which the property should be developed, but exists essentially as a holding zone. He stated the Master Plan calls for low density residential development, and it does not exclude the possibility of apartment house development. They are proposing to leave a small strip along the east property line and subdivide for 8 single family homes. They propose a street to Bonanza and are asking

the street on the west portion of the development be vacated. The remainder of the area would be developed with apartment houses with one access to Bonanza. The primary access from the apartment house development would be to the minor street on which the single family homes will front. He pointed out when the first changes to C-2 occurred on Decatur, the City required this street be dedicated and felt it would serve as a buffer between the general commercial and the residential and would also serve to channel the traffic from this development westerly hoping that instead of using Bonanza to go east, thereby going through the residential area and past the elementary school, they would go out to Decatur and use the Expressway. This proposal would void that possibility. They are proposing a street along the east line and no street on the west. Staff doesn't feel the design that has been proposed is proper nor is it proper to put the single family homes across from the apartment house development. Staff felt it would not be desirable to funnel the traffic from the apartment house development onto Bonanza, past the elementary school, and further east to more residential development. He stated as the application is submitted, staff recommended denial. Staff did feel with a proper design change they could recommend approval. Staff felt if the street were made into two cul-de-sacs with one having access on Washington and the other to Bonanza and the remainder being apartments with the traffic pattern directed toward the west, staff would recommend approval of the application. There was no record of protest.

Chairman Willard declared the public hearing open.

MR. GEORGE DICKERSON, of Dickerson, Miles and Pico, representing Jerry Moss & Company and DeBoer & Assoc., who would be the developer of the property, appeared. He stated a redesign has been made to show the site in reference to the area, its total compatibility with the area, and its compatibility with that which exists within the community. On Bonanza Road there is Western High School. On Washington is the Municipal Golf Course. On Decatur it is totally commercial from Washington to Bonanza. The adjacent subdivision is set up with cul-de-sac streets, with the back yards to the wall. They have provided a buffer area of 8 lots with eight homes to be developed. There would be no intrusion into the cul-de-sac properties. When they were here a year ago, the people were concerned about there being immediate two-story apartments adjacent to their properties with people looking into their back yards and invading their privacy. He stated the main artery serving this area is a proposed dedicated street along the easterly side of this property. He felt it would give the high school students an additional way to get from Washington to Bonanza without going through the residential area which is now affected by cross traffic. It is reducing the amount of traffic as far as existing residential is concerned. He indicated the apartment house complex is a natural buffer between single family homes and the high school. He stated the DeBoer Company is the second largest apartment developer in the United States. He stated they operate their own complexes. There is a club house and a recreation area. He stated DeBoer found this property wasn't compatible with three stories, and they propose a two story complex. There is no ingress or egress into the single family areas and no disruption of the traffic pattern as far as the adjacent residences are concerned. He indicated DeBoer and Associates made a market survey with reference to the vacancy factor and secured from the Post Office in the period of October 17 to 19, 1972, a vacancy

factor of 5.9 percent. He stated they have no vacancy factor in their developments. They further made a study of what would be the impact on the schools. They found apartments have a .2 to .2 students per unit and there are less students in an apartment complex than in the development of R-1 property. He further stated they are contemplating a \$6 million construction project which would put that amount of money on the tax rolls. He stated Mr. Herb Conyer was present to discuss the background of DeBoer, the occupancy factor and the traffic. Mr. Kirk Anderson of DMJM and Mr. Jan Jester, Architect, were also present. He indicated the R-1 development would be developed by the same developer who constructed the homes in the subdivision immediately adjacent and contiguous to this property. They contemplate eight homes with the same type of architecture as in the area and they would develop a portion of them simultaneously with the apartment complex. They would construct at least 3 homes and the remaining 5 when the demand is present.

Mr. McGarry asked the square footage of the apartments.

MR. JAN JESTER, architect, appeared and indicated they have 12 efficiency units with 450 sq. ft. There are 80 one bedroom, one bath with 682 sq. ft. There are 18 one bedroom, one bath and loft, with a two story living room with 688 sq. ft. There are 36 one bedroom, one bath with den with 755 sq. ft. There are 72 two bedroom, one bath units with 913 sq. ft., and 72 two bedroom, one bath with extra lavatory containing 913 sq. ft. There are 24 three bedroom units with two baths containing 1318 sq. ft. The total number of units is 314.

Mr. Tiberti asked the density on the acreage.

Mr. Jester indicated the density is 16.12 units per acre. They propose 1.74 parking spaces per unit which is 547 spaces with 347 open. The remaining 200 units have carports.

Mrs. Coleman asked the width of the green belts between the apartment units.

Mr. Jester indicated the minimum spacing between units is 40'.

Mrs. Coleman asked the width of the area where the clusters front in the central area.

Mr. Jester replied it was 63'. They have 150' from curb line to curb line. He stated all the traffic circulation is within the boundary of the site. They screen with masonry walls and decorative walls.

Mr. Jenkins asked the main reason for the accessway onto Bonanza.

Mr. Dickerson indicated it was to satisfy staff so the funneling would be onto Bonanza rather than utilizing the residential area onto Washington.

There followed a brief discussion concerning the access and the parking.

MRS. THOMAS BOYLE, 4428 St. Andrews Circle, appeared in protest. She indicated they felt this was a high density non-conforming use in their low density area. There would be 16.12 units per acre. If they developed R-1 with 6 units per acre, there would be 120 single family homes. She stated when this came up several years ago with the commercial zoning along Decatur, they were concerned with what happens when they turned

the corner. They want to vacate the street which she felt was wrong. She stated they do not have apartments in that area to compete with this so it would be very nice for DeBoer Company. She pointed out they have added two more apartments and decreased the number of parking spaces. She asked the height of the two story apartments.

A gentleman indicated they would be 32' high.

Mrs. Boyle stated it is almost three stories which has a maximum height of 35'. The property sits higher than the residential property adjoining it. She stated she was also concerned with the dumping of caliche. She indicated the streets in the area would not handle the traffic. She didn't think anyone would buy the R-1 homes with the traffic that would be generated on the street in front.

NATHAN HODGKINS, 4424 Thompson Circle, appeared in protest. He stated he didn't feel this would be compatible with the area. They view this as an encroachment of commercial into a residential area. He stated the applicants brought out this would be nice for the students to cross from Washington to Bonanza. They use the desert now and he didn't think this would help them too much. He indicated everybody agrees a profit should be made, but he objects strenuously when it is made at his expense.

Mrs. Coleman asked if the property was owned by Jerry Moss when the people bought their homes.

Mr. Hodgkins stated it has changed hands several times.

Mrs. Coleman asked if they were led to understand there would be residential homes all the way to Decatur.

Mr. Hodgkins replied in the affirmative.

BRUCE MORRIS, 4412 Thompson Circle, appeared in protest. He indicated their homes amount to more than \$6 million dollars invested. He objected to the high density apartments in the area and the traffic congestion to Western High School.

Chairman Willard declared the public hearing closed.

Mr. Saylor pointed out he and Mr. Dickerson may be looking at two different plans. He stated the whole circulation pattern was connected and no matter where you park, you are on a continuous access route. They have a sign which says "Main entrance" at the opening on the proposed street to the east.

Mr. Willard asked if the vote could encompass the zoning action, the vacation, and the tentative and final maps.

Mr. Saylor indicated they were all related and if the Board recommended denial of the application for zoning, it would then necessarily follow they would also recommend denial of the vacation of this street on the west, and the Board could not approve the subdivision because it is not designed to meet the existing zoning. Conversely, if the Board recommended approval of the design, it would follow the Board would recommend approval of the vacation and the subdivision.

Mr. Jenkins indicated he felt the density was too high and then moved the application Z-22-73, VAC-4-73, and the Tentative and Final Maps of Casa del Rey Estates be DENIED. The motion carried by the following vote:

"AYES": McGarry, Coleman, Tiberti, Jenkins, Willard
"NOES": Ward

Mr. Dickerson asked when these items would be heard by the City Commission.

Mr. Saylor stated the zoning action would be heard by the City Commission on August 22, 1973.

Mr. Dickerson stated the vacation, subdivision, and the zoning were totally intertwined and if the zoning was denied, there was no reason for the vacation, nor possibly the subdivision.

Mr. Saylor stated if the City Commission approved the zoning application, it would necessarily follow they would approve the vacation; however, the zoning approval would be subject to vacation of the street and it doesn't have to be on the same agenda.

2. Z-59-73

DENIED

Application of VINCE ERARDI for reclassification of property legally described as the South Half of Lot 2, and Lots 3, 4, 25, 26, and 27, Block 9, of Amended Plat of Metropolitan Addition and generally located on the east side of Monterey Avenue between Exley Avenue and Sahara Avenue, 300 feet north of Sahara and on the west side of San Jose Avenue between Exley and Sahara, 300 feet north of Sahara Avenue, from R-1 to P-R.

Mr. Saylor indicated over the past few years, the Sahara Avenue frontage has been transitioning to commercial and have been extending north in the interior to a certain depth to allow a useable commercial depth in that the frontage is only 70 to 90 feet. This application is tied into the overall development which has offices on Sahara. It is zoned P-R at the northern termination of encroachment into the single family area. There have been several requests in the past for changes in zoning north of that line which have been denied. He stated it is quite obvious, although this line is relatively arbitrary, that unless you stop it somewhere, there is no end to the encroachment further north into the residential. Staff found no need to continue the encroaching to the north. The request is to allow parking immediately adjacent to the single family homes. Staff recommended denial as not being in conformity to the policy that had been established in terms of the northerly movement. There was one letter of protest.

Chairman Willard declared the public hearing open.

MR. VINCE ERARDI appeared and indicated he was the owner of the Allstate property and also the owner of the property under consideration. They are requesting additional parking due to the expansion of the building. The building is now under construction. Originally, they had 30 employees with 40 parking stalls and 4000 sq. ft. They are expanding the building to 7710 sq. ft., doubling the size and there would be 60 to 70 employees. He stated the new request for parking of 87 stalls would adequately handle all the employees and the public parking. They felt the additional parking would keep the people from parking on San Jose and Monterey. They also satisfy the safety problem and would be cleaning up the property. The building is being constructed to a depth of 120' and they are asking for approximately 65' additional property for the expansion of the parking area. He indicated he had contacted the owners directly affected by this expansion to the north and he read a letter from Mrs. Carson agreeing with the expansion. He stated the neighbors felt if there

was a 6' block wall it would adequately take care of any problems of automobiles being parked there. He indicated there were several large developments proposed in the area which would go back as far as this development.

Mrs. Coleman asked the height of the present fence.

Mr. Erardi indicated it was 6' high and graduated down on the side streets.

MR. PETER TODD, 2319 Mariposa, appeared in protest. He stated they have had three proposals which invade the single family area. He felt Allstate knew the size of the building when they first built it and now they are expanding. He stated they have a small lot in back of the present parking lot which would hold 40 cars. He indicated Mr. Erardi bought knowing Sahara would be commercial, and he is getting into the single family area inch by inch. He objected to Allstate expanding and saying they need more parking. He indicated they should have taken that into consideration.

MR. JOHN ERWIN, property manager for Allstate, appeared and indicated when they built the building, they had a large operation in Reno. They have closed the Reno claim operation and consolidated into Las Vegas. He stated at present they have 20 employees parking on the street. The parking lot is full.

Mr. Tiberti asked how far back from Sahara the existing P-R zoning extended.

Mr. Saylor indicated 250 feet.

Mr. Tiberti asked if they were now asking for 66' more.

Mr. Erardi indicated the overall development would be 315' with the expanded parking area.

Mrs. Coleman asked if there were some way to limit the use to parking only.

Mr. Saylor indicated the Board could limit it to parking with this zoning action.

Mrs. Coleman indicated she felt the lot was a mess and it would be better blocked off, landscaped and paved. She further indicated unless they get additional parking spaces, the people will be parking on the residential streets. She moved the application Z-59-73 be APPROVED.

Mr. Saylor stated the history of this had been the continuous extension of the P-R zoning. They first built the building, had enough parking, then came in and got zoning for more parking because they were going to add to the building. He indicated he didn't feel it was a good practice to grant zoning to get a lot cleaned up. He indicated it was staff's approach that it is not just this piece of property, but property to the north, east and west. If this is going to be a parking lot, the other people in the area will come in with logical requests to change from single family to something else.

Mrs. Coleman reiterated her motion for approval. The motion failed to carry by the following vote, therefore the application Z-59-73 was denied:

"AYES": Coleman, Tiberti, Jenkins

"NOES": McGarry, Ward, Willard

This item will be heard by the Board of City Commissioners on August 22, 1973.

3. Z-60-73

APPROVED

Application of FRANK WEINMAN for reclassification of property legally described as Lot 13, Block 22, Boulder Addition and located on the east side of South 4th Street between East Charleston Boulevard and Las Vegas Boulevard South at 1337 South 4th Street, from R-4 to C-2.

Mr. Saylor indicated the zoning pattern in the area consisted of mostly general commercial, with some high density residential. The General Plan indicates a transition to commercial and this request is in accord with that recommendation. The property has a small block building on it. Landscaping is proposed in the front and parking to the rear. Staff recommended approval of the application as being in conformity with the General Plan subject to the usual conditions concerning landscaping, parking, plot plan, etc. There was one letter of approval and no letters of protest.

Chairman Willard declared the public hearing open and there being no comments, declared the public hearing closed.

Mr. Ward moved the application Z-60-73 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. Resolution of Intent be restricted to a twelve (12) month time limit.
2. Conformance to the plot plan.
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. In accord with the code requirements and design standards of City departments.
5. Landscaping shall be provided as required by the Planning Commission and shall be permanently maintained in a satisfactory manner. Failure to properly maintain required landscaping shall be cause for revocation of a business license.
6. Submittal of a landscaping plan prior to or at the same time application is made for a building permit.

Motion for approval carried by the following vote:

"AYES": McGarry, Ward, Coleman, Tiberti, Jenkins and Willard

"NOES": None

This item will be heard by the Board of City Commissioners on August 22, 1973.

4. Z-61-73

APPROVED

Application of NEVADA NATIONAL BANK for reclassification of property legally described as being the North 190 feet of the east 220 feet of the South Half (S $\frac{1}{2}$) of the Northeast Quarter (NE $\frac{1}{4}$) of Section 36, Township 20 South, Range 60 East, MDB&M, and located on the southwest corner of South Decatur Boulevard and Michael Way, from R-1 to C-2.

Mr. Saylor indicated the General Plan does recommend commercial development along Decatur. The plot plan showed the proposed bank building, landscaping with access from Decatur and Michael Way for flow-through traffic. The proposal was in accord with the recom-

mendation of the General Plan and staff recommended approval subject to the usual conditions. There were no protests on record.

Mrs. Coleman asked why they were asking for C-2 zoning rather than C-1 zoning.

Mr. Saylor indicated because most of the zoning in the area was C-2, but they could do it under the C-1.

Chairman Willard declared the public hearing open and there being no comments, declared the public hearing closed.

Mr. McGarry moved the application Z-61-73 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. Resolution of Intent be restricted to a twelve (12) month time limit.
2. Conformance to the plot plan.
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. In accord with the code requirements and design standards of City departments.
5. Landscaping shall be provided as required by the Planning Commission and shall be permanently maintained in a satisfactory manner. Failure to properly maintain required landscaping shall be cause for revocation of a business license.
6. Submittal of a landscaping plan prior to or at the same time application is made for a building permit.

The motion for approval carried by the following vote:

"AYES": McGarry, Ward, Coleman, Tiberti, Jenkins, and Willard

"NOES": None

This item will be heard by the Board of City Commissioners on August 22, 1973.

5. Z-62-73

APPROVED

Application of WILLIAM B. HARRIS, M.D. for reclassification of property legally described as that portion of the Northwest Quarter (NW $\frac{1}{4}$) of the Northwest Quarter (NW $\frac{1}{4}$) of Section 4, Township 21 South, Range 61 East, MDB&M, described as follows: Commencing at the northwest corner of said Section 4; thence S.1⁰ 00'45" West, 40.00 feet; thence due east 520.25 feet to the true point of beginning; thence due east 140.50 feet; thence due south 420.00 feet; thence due west 140.50 feet; thence due north 420.00 feet to the true point of beginning and located on the south side of West Charleston Boulevard between Rancho Drive and Pahor Drive, 550 feet east of Rancho Drive at 2121 West Charleston Boulevard, from R-E to C-1.

Mr. Saylor indicated the property was recently zoned P-R to allow a professional office use. It was never consummated and the proposed use now is a facility for senior citizens. The applicant sent the Board members a letter describing the use. It consists of various services provided to senior citizens, including a chauffeur service and the person in charge would have certain medical background to render emergency assistance. He stated it is not really a convalescent home nor a boarding house; however, it does fall within the permissions of the C-1 zone. They propose a

landscaped courtyard in the center of the two story building, a pool, and landscaping in the front with two driveways onto Charleston. Staff felt in that the General Plan recognized this area as transitioning to something other than R-E, the proposed use was a very good use, seemingly very compatible with the neighborhood. Staff recommended approval of the application subject to the usual conditions. There was one letter of approval and one of protest. He indicated he had talked with Mrs. Hurley, a nearby property owner, and she indicated she was in agreement.

Chairman Willard declared the public hearing open.

MR. THOMAS BIGGAR, Attorney from Weiner, Goldwater and Galatz Law Firm, appeared and indicated he represented home owners in an area directly affected which is the Scotch Eighty. He stated they were in favor of a proposal similar to this but they were concerned about the proposed building and what was actually anticipated. He stated the residential area around the proposed development consisted of very expensive homes and all the area is zoned R-E. He indicated he would have no objections if it were limited to two stories and would not become an invasion of privacy. He further stated the R-E zoning allowed a convalescent home and he did not know why they proposed a change to C-1.

Mr. Saylor indicated if the application was approved by the Planning Commission, he felt sure it would be conditioned upon being approved for this development in accord with this plan and for this use only.

Mr. Biggar asked what kind of buffer area was proposed between the back of the two story building and the adjoining residences.

Mr. Saylor indicated this law firm had previously indicated they represented people in Scotch Eighty and staff had repeatedly requested they furnish a list of the people they represent, for the record. He stated they have refused to submit a list.

Mr. Biggar indicated they would submit a list.

MR. TOM BELL, Attorney representing the applicant and Mr. Robert Hirsch appeared and indicated this was a residence for senior citizens and it is not a convalescent center nor an extended care facility. The people are ambulatory and can take care of themselves. They do not need nursing care.

Chairman Willard indicated all of the members received a brochure which stated how the building was to be operated. He stated the question posed by the gentleman was why the change from R-E to C-1.

MR. ROBERT HIRSCH, the applicant's representative, and escrow holder for the property, appeared and stated there was not an exact frame of reference in the zoning code for what they intended to build.

Mrs. Coleman stated she had worked for senior citizens for a long time in the community and she recognized an intermediate facility was needed, but didn't understand why they picked this particular location. She felt the traffic on Charleston would be extremely difficult for older people to cope with when driving onto Charleston.

Mr. Hirsch indicated they picked this location because it was ideally suited with respect to medical facilities and there is a bus service on the street. Most of the residents do not have cars, less than 15 percent.

That is why they will have a limousine service available to take them to their appointments.

Mrs. Coleman asked the prices for renting the facility.

Mr. Hirsch indicated they average two to a room and it would be approximately \$375 monthly per person for board and care, daily linen, all meals, social programs, pool and employees available to take them to their appointments. He stated it would be \$375 up to \$500 per month if they wanted a single room. He stated there is a 120' distance from the building to the rear property line. They have two side yards, the west side being 20' and the east side being 10'.

Mrs. Coleman asked what would happen if they couldn't rent the units.

Mr. Hirsch indicated they would be signing on a loan for \$750,000 to build this and it would be pretty difficult for them to use it for any other type of facility. If they wanted a change of use, they would have to come back before the Board. Therefore, they will be taking a business risk that they are going to be successful.

Mrs. Coleman asked if it would be built with wide doors for wheel chairs, etc.

Mr. Hirsch indicated they do not have any wheel chair patients. Some people will have a cane or walker and they might need a little wider door, but less than 10 percent are provided with wider doors.

An unidentified gentleman indicated 21 percent of the land area was devoted to landscaping.

Mr. Tiberti asked how much space was between the building and the property line.

Mr. Saylor indicated they have increased it to 120'.

Mr. Willard asked what was back there.

Mr. Hirsch indicated there is some landscaping, a few plantings, but 90 percent would be blacktop. He stated they have a density of 66 rooms.

Mr. Biggar indicated the home owners were satisfied if this is the facility they will be constructing.

Chairman Willard declared the public hearing closed.

Mr. McGarry moved the application Z-62-73 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. Resolution of Intent be restricted to a twelve (12) month time limit.
2. Conformance to the plot plan.
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. In accord with the code requirements and design standards of the City departments.
5. Landscaping shall be provided as required by the Planning Commission and shall be permanently maintained in a satisfactory manner. Failure to properly maintain required landscaping shall be

cause for revocation of a business license.

6. Submittal of a landscaping plan prior to or at the same time application is made for a building permit.

Motion for approval carried by the following vote:

"AYES": McGarry, Ward, Coleman, Tiberti, Jenkins,
Willard

"NOES": None

This item will be heard by the City Commission on August 22, 1973.

RECESS:

Chairman Willard declared a ten minute recess at 9:35 P.M. The meeting reconvened at 9:45 P.M. with Mrs. Coleman having been excused for the remainder of the meeting.

6. Z-63-73

DENIED

Application of STEVE ALLEN, ET AL, for reclassification of property legally described as that portion of the Southeast Quarter (SE $\frac{1}{4}$) of the Southwest Quarter (SW $\frac{1}{4}$) of Section 33, Township 20 South, Range 61 East, MDB&M, described as follows: Beginning at the northeast corner of the said Southeast Quarter (SE $\frac{1}{4}$) of the Southwest Quarter (SW $\frac{1}{4}$); thence S.0°17'15" West along the east line thereof a distance of 159.19 feet; thence N.89°49'45" West a distance of 305.47 feet; thence N.0°06'30" East a distance of 159.39 feet; thence S.89°46' East a distance of 305.94 feet to the point of beginning and located on the west side of South Highland Drive between Hastings Avenue and Pinto Lane, 550 feet north of Hastings Avenue, from R-3 to R-4.

Mr. Saylor indicated the property in the area was zoned predominantly R-3 with a pattern of single family development. The Master Plan indicates medium density. The request for change is to high density and staff felt it was quite obvious from the existing zoning pattern that the request was spot zoning and not in conformity with the General Plan. Staff recommended denial. He indicated the application was before the Board four months ago for the same request and the Planning Commission and City Commission denied it. There were no letters of protest or approval.

Chairman Willard declared the public hearing open and there being no comments, declared the public hearing closed.

Mr. Tiberti moved the application Z-63-73 be DENIED. The motion carried by the following vote:

"AYES": McGarry, Ward, Tiberti, Jenkins, Willard
"NOES": None

This item will be heard by the Board of City Commissioners on August 22, 1973.

7. Z-64-73

APPROVED

Application of D. S. DE SURE for reclassification of property legally described as the north 660 feet of the Southeast Quarter (SE $\frac{1}{4}$) of the Southeast Quarter (SE $\frac{1}{4}$) of Section 1, Township 21 South, Range 60 East, MDB&M, and located on the southwest corner of O'Bannon Avenue and South Decatur Boulevard, extending south 600 feet along Decatur Boulevard and west 1270 feet along O'Bannon Avenue, from R-4 to C-1.

Mr. Saylor stated the proposal involved a two-phase development, one portion in the City and the other in the County. The plan on Phase I showed a bank building on the northeast corner and a proposed Grand Central Store and Albertson's market to the rear.

Phase II which staff simply described was not part of the application because it was in the jurisdiction of the County. The Master Plan provides for commercial zoning along Sahara and along Decatur in this location. He indicated this was a little difficult to know where to logically stop the commercial expansion to the west and to the north. He indicated conceivably it could be said the proposal was generally in consonance with the recommendation of the General Plan, but it can set up a problem as to what happens to the properties to the north and west. He stated the City has been successful in a couple of cases where they had this type of situation of restricting access and requiring a relatively wide 10' to 15' landscaping strip along the exterior and a block wall. Staff recommended if the Board did find the application in consonance with the recommendations of the General Plan, that treatment be given to this property. He indicated they should provide one access only from O'Bannon and one access only from Edmond. There were two letters of approval and none of protest.

Chairman Willard declared the public hearing open.

ATTORNEY JACK LEHMAN, representing John Price & Assoc., appeared and indicated they agreed with all of the conditions. He stated this would be a 100,000 sq. ft. store, a 27,000 sq. ft. market, and they have proposed a 6' block wall so whatever adjoins it will not be disturbed. He indicated he felt it would be compatible with the area. He read a letter from Cal Vada Volkswagen Agency approving of the development.

Chairman Willard asked where they were going to put the waste disposal facility.

MR. DICK HARRIS appeared and indicated the services area for the stores would be screened by a block wall and the waste disposal would be handled in that area also.

Chairman Willard declared the public hearing closed.

Mr. Tiberti moved the application Z-64-73 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. Resolution of Intent be restricted to a twelve (12) month time limit.
2. Conformance to the plot plan subject to parking lot ordinance.
3. Limited to one access to O'Bannon located in relatively close proximity to Decatur, and one access from Edmond located in close proximity to Sahara.
4. A 6' block wall to be provided along the west and north with a 10' planter strip on the exterior side of the wall.
5. 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.
6. In accord with the code requirements and design standards of City departments.
7. Landscaping shall be provided as required by the Planning Commission and shall be permanently maintained in a satisfactory manner. Failure to properly maintain required landscaping shall be cause for revocation of a business license.

8. Submittal of a landscaping plan prior to or at the same time application is made for a building permit.

Motion for approval carried by the following vote:

"AYES": Tiberti, Jenkins, Willard
"NOES": McGarry, Ward

This item will be heard by the Board of City Commissioners on August 22, 1973.

8. Z-65-73

DENIED

Application of JOE NOLAN for reclassification of property legally described as Lot 8 in Beckley Subdivision and located at the south end of Third Place, south of East Charleston Boulevard at 1108 South Third Place, from R-1 to P-R.

Mr. Saylor stated Third Place is a small cul-de-sac running south of East Charleston between Main and Las Vegas Boulevard. It existed for many years with single family homes on it, even though the surrounding area was utilized for commercial and high density apartments. Several years ago, the first application was approved and at that time consideration was given to all the properties in the cul-de-sac and it was recognized if any were going to start changing, it would have an adverse effect on continued use for single family homes. He stated two lots are zoned commercial and two are zoned R-4 with parking lot uses on them. The lot in question proposes a parking lot use. The layout showed existing block wall on three sides and they are proposing a 6' high chain link fence which staff felt should be a block wall in keeping with the rest of it. Staff recommended approval in keeping with the pattern that had been established. There were two letters of protest and one letter of approval.

Chairman Willard declared the public hearing open.

MR. JOE NOLAN appeared and indicated he concurred with staff's recommendations. He indicated he bought the property with the idea of expanding his parking area. He stated there was parking to the north, south, and one lot away from this property used by Lee Office Equipment. He stated the character of the area is pretty well committed already.

Mr. Jenkins asked if he intended to tear down the house that existed on the property.

Mr. Nolan indicated it was his intention to either demolish it or move it off the property.

MR. TOM BELLIS, 1111 South Third Place, appeared in protest. He indicated he had been in Clark County for 41 years and a policeman for 39 years. He stated this was the only piece of property he owned. He stated the property in question has only one entrance. There is no back alley, and he only has a 34' or 35' wide entrance and exit. He indicated he was greatly opposed.

Mr. Willard asked him what encroachment this would represent if they put in a block wall and screened the development.

Mr. Bellis indicated people had driven through his wall several times and he stated he had the area in front of his house red zoned so they could get an ambulance in if his wife needed it as she was very ill.

Mr. Jenkins asked if this wouldn't help alleviate that parking problem.

Mr. Bellis indicated it would not because these lots were never cleaned up and he didn't feel it was fair to him.

Chairman Willard declared the public hearing closed.

Mr. McGarry moved the application Z-65-73 be DENIED. The motion for denial carried by the following vote:

"AYES": McGarry, Ward, Tiberti, Jenkins, Willard
"NOES": None

This item will be heard by the Board of City Commissioners on August 22, 1973.

9. Z-67-73

APPROVED

Application of ARDSLEY, INC. for reclassification of property legally described as Lots 9, 10, 11, 12, Block 4, of Amended Plat Of Las Vegas Townsite, from C-2 to M, and Lots 13 and 14, Block 4 of Amended Plat of Las Vegas Townsite, from R-4 to C-2. Property generally located on the northeast corner of "E" Street and West Bonanza Road.

Mr. Saylor indicated there was an alley separation between the two parcels and the proposed use was to have a building and office and a small parking area on one parcel and parking on the lot to the north. The proposed use is monument engraving and sales. The application was in keeping with the recommendations of the General Plan which calls for industrial. The property to the west is industrial and to the south it is transitioning toward that use. The only question staff had on it was the "L" shaped building was proposed as a shell which is simply a roofed area. He stated even though this is an industrial area and there is nothing to protect in terms of aesthetics, staff felt it would be preferable for the building to have a wall along the Bonanza exposure and extending 20' back with the remainder open. Staff recommended approval subject to those conditions and indicated there was one letter of protest.

Chairman Willard declared the public hearing open.

MR. MILTON KEEFER, Attorney, indicated it was his understanding that it was going to be an enclosed building with walls and a roof, etc.

Mr. Saylor stated if that was the case, staff withdrew their recommendation and put in a condition of a completely enclosed building.

MR. RICHARD GILLESPIE indicated they intended to put \$72,000 into a building on the property and it would be totally enclosed.

Chairman Willard declared the public hearing closed.

Mr. Jenkins moved the application Z-67-73 be APPROVED, subject to the following conditions:

1. Resolution of Intent be restricted to a twelve (12) month time limit.
2. Conformance to the plot plan.
3. The building to be completely enclosed.
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. In accord with the code requirements and design standards of City departments.

6. Landscaping shall be provided as required by the Planning Commission and shall be permanently maintained in a satisfactory manner. Failure to properly maintain required landscaping shall be cause for revocation of a business license.
7. Submittal of a landscaping plan prior to or at the same time application is made for a building permit.

Motion for approval was carried by the following vote:

"AYES": McGarry, Ward, Tiberti, Jenkins, Willard
"NOES": None

This item will be heard by the Board of City Commissioners on August 22, 1973.

10. Final Map
Charleston Rainbow #15A

APPROVED

Property generally located at the northeast corner of West Charleston Boulevard and Buffalo Drive.

Mr. Foster indicated this was before the Commission at the last meeting for the tentative map approval. There was a question on the Water District property concerning grade, etc. and also a question of an additional access point which was left up to staff to work out. He stated it went before the City Commission and they recommended that there be an opening onto Buffalo as well as one on Charleston. He stated the final map does conform to the approved tentative map and staff recommended approval subject to a condition there be a block wall along the rear of the lots on Buffalo and Charleston and there be no vehicular access to the two primary streets. The street names must conform to the requirements of the Department of Community Development and a further condition that they meet the requirements of the various utility companies because of the question with the Water District property to the east.

MR. RICHARD THOMPSON was present representing Sproul Homes.

Mr. Tiberti moved the Final Map of Charleston Rainbow #15A be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. A 6' block wall to be constructed along the rear of the lots on Buffalo and Charleston.
2. Prohibition of access from the lots abutting Buffalo and Charleston.
3. Street names to be provided as required by the Department of Community Development.
4. Satisfaction of the requirements of the various utility companies.

The motion for approval carried by a unanimous vote.

11. Z-100-64
Plot Plan Review

APPROVED
Without Parking

Approved application of MADELINE GARTLAND concerning property located at 500 South Third Street.

Mr. Foster indicated there was a question on the parking as to whether it is to be installed on this particular property. It was approved under the downtown Resolution of Intent for an antique shop. At the time the plot plan was submitted for the review, it indicated some parking on the rear. Staff indicated it would have to be redrawn and the applicant turned in a new plot plan drawn in inches rather than in feet. Staff took it upon itself to redraw a new plot plan. Since the plan indicated parking originally, staff proposed five parking spaces off the alley. He stated it has been the policy of the Commission to require some type of

parking, even though the ordinance doesn't call for it. The applicant has taken the position she doesn't want to put any off-street parking and indicated the last plot plan did not show any parking on it, even though the initial one did. Staff brought this matter before the Commission for a determination as to how much parking should be on it, whether it be five spaces or something less. He stated there are some large trees and a wood fence off the alley. Staff felt there should be at least 2 or 3 spaces for this type of use. He stated she does have street parking on Third Street.

Mr. Tiberti indicated he felt the parking should be eliminated. He stated they don't force anybody else to put in parking in that area.

Mr. Foster stated it had been the policy of the Commission to require some type of parking even though it may be token parking.

Mr. Ward indicated he doubted parking would be needed for this use.

Mr. Tiberti moved the Plot Plan Review on Z-100-64 be APPROVED eliminating the parking requirement. The motion carried by unanimous vote.

12. Z-29-70
Reinstatement and
Extension of Time

APPROVED for 12
Months

Approved application of NEVSUR INSURANCE AGENCY for property generally located on the southeast corner of Vegas Drive and Jones Boulevard, C-1 Zone.

Mr. Foster stated on this approved application, there were two zonings, one for the R-3 P.U.D. along Jones and Vegas Drive, and on the corner some commercial for a neighborhood shopping facility. The planned unit development has been developed and it has been a policy and an opinion from the City Attorney's office when each phase of development is complete to still have an additional six month period after that time to commence on the next phase. The six months has expired for them to commence on the C-1. They are within the six month reinstatement period and are requesting a reinstatement and extension of time for one year. The letter did not indicate any particular reason. This is the second request for an extension. A six month extension was granted in February, 1971.

MR. BARRY BECKER appeared representing the applicant.

Mr. McGarry asked what they were proposing.

Mr. Becker stated they proposed a small neighborhood shopping center with a 7-Eleven store, bar, beauty shop and barber shop.

Mr. Tiberti asked how long it would take to get started.

Mr. Becker indicated they hoped to get started in the next year. He stated they weren't aware of the expiration policy and indicated they thought as long as they started the first phase of the project, they fulfilled the requirements.

Mr. Tiberti moved the request for reinstatement and extension of time on Z-29-70 be APPROVED for one year subject to the following conditions:

1. No further extensions of time shall be granted.
2. All requirements imposed by ordinances adopted subsequent to the initial approval of this application shall be adhered to.

The motion for approval was carried by unanimous vote.

This item will be heard by the Board of City Commissioners on August 15, 1973.

13. Z-6-66, Z-6-67, Z-20-66
Plot Plan Review

APPROVED

Submitted by MC DONALD'S RESTAURANT for remodeling and expansion at 4840 West Charleston Boulevard, 2230 West Bonanza Road, and 2830 East Charleston Boulevard.

Mr. Foster indicated McDonald's restaurant is embarking on a program to enlarge each of their facilities at three locations. He stated it was basically adding 1/3 to 1/2 to the existing facility, to accommodate more people within the restaurant. Staff recommended approval subject to conformance to the plot plan. All of the developments are well maintained in terms of landscaping.

Mr. McGarry raised a question concerning the West Charleston location and indicated it was difficult to get into the parking area. He asked if they could build to the back on West Charleston.

An unidentified gentleman stated the customers' didn't like to move to the rear.

Mr. McGarry moved the application be held in abeyance pending a traffic count. The motion failed to carry.

Mr. Tiberti moved the application for Plot Plan Review on Z-6-66, Z-6-67, and Z-20-66 be APPROVED subject to the following condition:

1. Conformance to the plot plans.

The motion carried by the following vote:

"AYES": Tiberti, Jenkins, Willard

"NOES": McGarry, Ward

This item will be heard by the Board of City Commissioners on August 15, 1973.

14. Tentative Map
Valley West Unit #2

APPROVED

Property generally located at Valley View Boulevard and Alta Drive.

Mr. Foster indicated this involved 15 acres on the north portion of the property formerly owned by the Water District. The area on the south side is where the current planned development is under way. He stated under that zoning application, it involved two parcels which included townhouses on the north portion also. It is zoned R-1 and the property is under a Resolution of Intent to the R-2 P.U.D. classification. The applicant is proposing to not build townhouses on the property but to subdivide the land into single family lots and utilize the existing R-1 zoning. He stated there were two accesses off Alta Drive and none on Valley View. The parcel on the corner is zoned C-1 and is not part of this subdivision. The subdivision, as submitted, conforms to the subdivision ordinance and staff recommended approval subject to a 6' block wall being constructed along the south, east and north sides of the subdivision property. Also, staff recommended that when single family home construction commenced, this portion of the property under the zoning action for the planned development shall be expunged. The street names were to also conform to the Department of Community Development requirements.

Mr. Ward moved the Tentative Map of Valley West Unit #2 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. A 6' block wall to be constructed along the south, east, and north sides of the subdivision.

2. Upon commencement of the single family home construction, the Resolution of Intent running to the property for a planned unit development (Z-59-71) shall be expunged.
3. Street names to be provided as required by the Department of Community Development.
4. Approval of the tentative map shall be for no more than twelve (12) months. If a final map is not recorded on all or a portion of the area embraced by the tentative map within twelve months of approval of the tentative map, a new tentative map must be filed. If a final map is recorded within twelve months of the approval of the tentative map for only a portion of the area embraced by the tentative map, the Planning Commission may require that a new tentative map be filed and approved prior to any further final maps being approved.

The motion for approval carried by unanimous vote.

This item will be heard by the Board of City Commissioners on August 15, 1973.

15. LD-8-73

APPROVED

Lot Division submitted by WILL JONES concerning property generally located at Durango and LaMadra Way.

Mr. Foster indicated the proposal is to divide a parcel of land into four lots under which they are able to proceed by virtue of the parcel map provisions of the recently revised N. R. S. There is dedicated access to the lots. Three lots to the east are approximately 158' X 300' in depth and the remainder is a relatively large parcel of land. Staff recommended approval subject to the requirements of the Public Works Department and the requirements of the N.R.S. relative to parcel maps.

Mr. Tiberti moved the application LD-8-73 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. Conformance to the requirements of N.R.S. 278.320 concerning parcel maps.
2. Conformance to code requirements and design standards of City departments.

The motion for approval carried by unanimous vote.

This item will be heard by the City Commission on August 15, 1973.

16. Final Map
Northridge Village

APPROVED

Property generally located at Bromley and Decatur Boulevard.

Mr. Foster indicated this involved a 19 lot condominium development. The land is already subdivided and there is a reversionary map that has been approved on the site. Staff recommended the reversionary map be recorded first prior to recording this particular subdivision. Also, staff recommended approval subject to all of the conditions of approval on the Tentative Map and the zoning action.

Mr. Tiberti moved the Final Map of Northridge Village be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. Satisfaction of the requirements of the approved tentative map.
2. Satisfaction of the requirements of the approved zoning application.

3. Street names to be provided as required by the Department of Community Development.

The motion for approval was carried by unanimous vote.

17. M Zone Aesthetic Review
APPROVED

Submitted by STERLING PLUMBING AND HEATING CO., INC., concerning property located at 3400 Meade Avenue, M Zone.

Mr. Foster indicated this property abuts trailer park zoning. There is a provision in the ordinance wherein industrial zoning is adjacent to commercial or residential, there must be an aesthetic review and there must be a building setback and other controls within 50 feet. The plot plan showed the building on the very south portion of the property. There is some paving proposed for off-street parking, and the remainder to the north is open storage. There would be no buildings proposed within the 50' area. Staff recommended approval of the submitted plot plan with the condition there be no stored materials higher than the existing 6' block wall on the rear 50' of the property and conformance to the plot plan.

The applicant was present and agreed to staff's recommendations.

Mr. Foster stated any parking area should be asphalted.

Mr. Jenkins moved the Aesthetic Review of Sterling Plumbing and Heating Co., Inc., be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. Conformance to the plot plan.
2. There shall be no stored materials higher than the existing six foot block wall on the rear 50' of the property.

The motion for approval was carried by unanimous vote.

18. Z-18-68
Review
DENIED

Submitted by HUSTON SANDERS concerning property located at 2909 West Charleston Boulevard, C-D Zone.

Mr. Foster indicated there was a veterinary clinic on the front portion of the property, zoned C-D. The request is to utilize the building on the rear which is 50' from the rear property line for a gun repair or customizing type operation. The ordinance requires all uses be approved by the Planning Commission and the City Commission in the C-D zone because it is a very select type of commercial zoning. The applicant indicated he wished to operate a custom gun shop, specializing in the building and rebuilding of rifles, shotguns and hand guns. He also intends to sell sporting goods on a limited basis. Staff indicated retail sales of sporting goods was a permitted use in the C-D zone. He indicated it appeared this is basically a repair or alteration type of business and staff felt there would be lathes, and bluing tanks and machines involved in this type of operation. Staff felt it may set a dangerous precedent in the C-D zone and didn't feel it was an acceptable type of use. Therefore, staff recommended denial.

Mr. McGarry moved the Review on Z-18-68 be DENIED. The motion carried by unanimous vote.

This item will be heard by the Board of City Commissioners on August 15, 1973.

19. VAC-3-73
APPROVED

Petition of Vacation submitted by ROBERT RISHLING, ET AL, of a portion of Kingsbury Lane generally located on the east side of Rose Street extending approximately 125 feet east between Pinto Lane and Goldring Avenue.

Mr. Foster indicated this involved a 25½' street that connected to Rose Street. The proposal is to vacate the 25½' street and cul-de-sac Kingsbury, so there would be a turn-around on the street with access off Pinto Lane only. There is a single family residence on the corner and because of this change in street alignment, if approved, it will alter the front yard. The side yard would become the front yard and the building would become non-conforming and any future addition would require a variance. The property owners want to cul-de-sac the street rather than have it knuckle and go to the west. Public Works recommended if approved the property owners must dedicate the area shaded in red on the map for the cul-de-sac. Also, staff recommended they conform to the requirements of the various utility companies and that the order of vacation not be recorded until they have satisfied all the conditions.

Mr. Tiberti moved the application VAC-3-73 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. Conformance to the code requirements and design standards of City departments, including dedication of right-of-way for a cul-de-sac.
2. Satisfaction of the requirements of the various utility companies.
3. The Order of Vacation not be recorded until the above conditions have been satisfied.

The motion for approval was carried by unanimous vote.

This item will be heard by the Board of City Commissioners on August 15, 1973.

20. C-D Allowable Use

RATIFIED

Approval of recording studio as an allowable use in the C-D Zone.

Mr. Foster indicated this was submitted during July and a telephone vote was obtained. It has been to the City Commission and is already approved. This is merely a ratification of the telephone vote action.

Mr. Tiberti moved the telephone vote concerning a recording studio as an allowable use in the C-D Zone be RATIFIED. The motion was carried by unanimous vote.

21. VAC-4-73

DENIED

Petition of Vacation of Tanya Street submitted by JERRY MOSS & COMPANY, ET AL, concerning property generally located between West Washington Avenue and West Bonanza Road, 525 feet east of North Decatur Boulevard.

See Item #1 under New Business.

22. VAC-5-73 and
Reversionary Map
Westwood Village

APPROVED

Petition of Vacation submitted by WANDA A. HATHAWAY ET AL of property generally located on the southeast boundary of Westwood Tract No. 1.

Mr. Foster indicated this was an existing subdivision; however, all of the lots are vacant. The proposal is to vacate this street and this half street and they have filed a reversionary plat putting it back to acreage which would allow them to redesign without the hindrance of the existing lot lines. Staff recommended approval of the vacation and the reversionary map subject to the requirements of the utility companies, and stipulation they provide a bulb at the end of their property.

Mr. Tiberti asked what happened to all the people on the street.

Mr. Saylor indicated they do have access. This is only a half street. The existing street with houses

have access.

MR. AL COLLINS, Collins Brothers, appeared and indicated the stipulation they put a knuckle on the end of the street should be subject to approval of Planning and Engineering.

Mr. Saylor stated they should provide a turn-around movement.

Mr. Jenkins moved the application VAC-5-73 and the Reversionary Map of Westwood Village be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. Conformance to the code requirements and design standards of City departments, including provision for turn-around movement.
2. Satisfaction of the requirements of the various utility companies.
3. The Order of Vacation shall be recorded simultaneously with the Reversionary Map after the above conditions have been satisfied.

The motion for approval was carried by unanimous vote.

This item will be heard by the Board of City Commissioners on August 15, 1973.

23. VAC-6-73 and
Reversionary Map
Starlight Park

APPROVED

Petition of Vacation submitted by WILLIAM A. HOLT ETAL for property generally located in the area bounded by Rigel Avenue on the east, Procyon Avenue on the west, Desert Inn Road on the south, and Sirius Avenue on the north.

Mr. Foster indicated the purpose of the vacation and reversionary map was to establish better title to the property because there are some problems relative to the title. He indicated there was some development on the westerly portion of the subdivision which is not a part of this area. He stated the Rancho Drive extension from Sahara south extends south along the easterly portion of the property and staff recommended additional right-of-way as required by Public Works be dedicated as a condition of approval of this application. Also, on the platted subdivision, there is an existing sewer easement. The County Sanitation Department has been advised of the proposed vacation and reversionary map. Staff recommended approval subject to meeting the requirements of Public Works relative to the dedication and the requirements of the various utility companies. Further, the reversionary map and vacation be recorded simultaneously after they have complied with those conditions.

MR. RALPH KRAEMER, representing the applicant, appeared and indicated at the time this was originally approved, there was a cloud on the title and the City Attorney recommended it be again processed through the proper authorities. He indicated they agree with staff's recommendations.

Mr. Jenkins moved the application VAC-6-73 and the Reversionary Map of Starlight Park be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. Conformance to code requirements and design standards of City departments, including dedication of right-of-way for Rancho Drive extension.
2. Satisfaction of the requirements of the various utility companies.

3. The order of vacation shall be recorded simultaneously with the reversionary map after the above conditions have been satisfied.

Motion for approval was carried by unanimous vote.

This item will be heard by the Board of City Commissioners on August 15, 1973.

24. Tentative and Final Map
Casa del Rey Estates

DENIED

Property generally located at El Concho Drive between Washington Avenue and Bonanza Road.

See Item #1 under New Business.

25. Z-47-72
Review of Condition

APPROVED

Submitted by NEVADA SOUTHERN TITLE concerning property generally located on the southeast corner of East Charleston Boulevard and South Sixth Street, P-R Zone.

Mr. Foster indicated there was a request for a modified parking plan on the Ward Wengert property on the southeast corner of Charleston and Sixth. As a condition of approval, this Commission imposed a 5' planter along the future line of Charleston Boulevard. At that time there was mention of East Charleston being widened. The City Commission has taken the position they are not going to widen East Charleston Boulevard, at least at this time. The request is to remove this condition so they do not have to put in the planter. He stated it seems it is a logical request from staff's standpoint because they do have an existing hedge in the right-of-way and on the property along 6th Street which will probably remain there for an indefinite period of time.

Mr. Jenkins moved the condition for the 5' planter on Z-47-72 be WAIVED. The motion was carried by unanimous vote.

26. Z-24-68
Plot Plan Review

APPROVED

Submitted by GILBERT D. BUCK concerning property generally located on the south side of McWilliams, east of Highland, C-M Zone.

Mr. Foster stated this application was before the Board some time ago, at which time it was approved for a produce company. The proposal is to revise the plot plan eliminating the southwest parcel which is now not part of the property and to construct a two-story office building on the front portion which is the Bonanza side of the property. The plot plan showed two rows of parking spaces with a center driveway, landscaping around the building, parking to the rear and the side and to the north there will be commercial storage units, more commonly known as mini-warehouses. They propose a 10' wide planting strip to provide some aesthetic treatment to the rear of the storage buildings which would back up to McWilliams. To the north is the public housing project known as Marble Manor. Public Works has recommended a 10' dedication on West Bonanza for street widening in accordance with the Master Plan. Staff recommended there be landscaping immediately in front of the property rather than around the building. Staff felt with the parking in front of the building, the motorists would not be able to see the landscaping. Staff recommended a 5' planter on the front portion of the property. Staff further recommended the accessway off McWilliams in the center portion of the property be moved to the westerly portion of the property so the primary access would be more towards Highland Drive which is a shorter distance, rather than in front of the residential properties to the north. There is a proposed perpetual easement along the westerly side of the property which will serve as access from Bonanza to the commercial storage site from the south. They submitted the easement and it will remain with the property. It is

25' wide. Staff recommended approval subject to those conditions.

MR. GIL BUCK, 3672 Cherokee, appeared and Mr. Foster again indicated the changes recommended by staff to him.

Mr. Foster stated there should not be a straight block wall but it should be slump stone or cut block so it will look better to the residential development to the north.

Mr. Buck agreed with staff's recommendations.

Mr. McGarry moved the Plot Plan Review of Z-24-68 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. Conformance to the plot plan as amended.
2. Relocate the driveway opening on McWilliams to the westerly portion of the development as required by the Department of Community Development.
3. A perpetual easement agreement shall be required for the accessway on the southwest portion of the property off West Bonanza Road.
4. Dedication of right-of-way for the widening of West Bonanza Road as required by the Master Plan.
5. Construction of a 5' planter along West Bonanza Road.
6. Landscaping shall be provided as required by the Planning Commission and shall be permanently maintained in a satisfactory manner. Failure to properly maintain required landscaping shall be cause for revocation of a business license.
7. Submittal of a landscaping plan prior to or at the same time application is made for a building permit.
8. Decorative block shall be required on the rear of the buildings along West McWilliams Avenue as required by the Department of Community Development.

The motion was carried by unanimous vote.

This item will be heard by the Board of City Commissioners on August 15, 1973.

27. Z-43-71
Plot Plan Review

APPROVED

Submitted by MOFFITT & MC DANIEL ARCHITECTS concerning property generally located on the north side of Ogden Avenue between Flower Avenue and 25th Street, C-2 Zone.

Mr. Foster indicated the shopping center is being developed at this time. Parking is in the central area with an L-shaped building abutting Flower and property to the south. One of the conditions on the zoning was there be a 6' block wall along Flower to preclude any vehicular access from the street which serves the residential area to the west. This request was to allow an opening off Flower which is 15' wide to serve the utility installations to the rear of the commercial stores. Because of the property to the south, they have no means of access and are requesting this driveway. He stated it appeared to be a necessity and staff felt if it was approved, it should have some type of gate or pole with a chain to restrict access and only be used for the service or emergency service for the utilities to the rear of the buildings.

Staff does not feel it should be left open so cars could use it for parking. Staff requested the gate be locked except during the time when they have to get to the rear of the stores.

Mr. Willard asked who would have the keys.

Mr. Foster replied the manager would have the keys.

The applicant was present and indicated agreement with staff's recommendations.

Mr. Jenkins moved the Plot Plan Review on Z-43-71 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. Conformance to the plot plan.
2. A gate or a chain shall be provided at the entrance to the driveway and it shall remain locked except during emergency use to service the utility installations.

The motion for approval was carried by unanimous vote.

28. M Zone Architectural
Review

APPROVED

Submitted by GORDON LEISHMAN, GENERAL BUILDING CONTRACTOR, concerning property located at 3296 Meade, M Zone.

Mr. Foster indicated this was another industrial development that abutted the trailer park southwest of the Richfield Village Subdivision. They are proposing a storage building towards the rear and will have the required 50' setback. Staff recommended approval of the submitted plot plan with the condition it conform to this plot plan and have no storage above the 6' high block wall along the rear of the property line in the 50' setback area.

The applicant was present and agreed to the conditions.

Mr. Jenkins moved the Review for Gordon Leishman be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. Conformance to the plot plan.
2. There shall be no storage above the 6' high block wall along the rear property line in the 50' setback area.

The motion for approval was carried by unanimous vote.

30. Final Map
Cimarron West

APPROVED

Property generally located at Washington Avenue and Torrey Pines Boulevard.

Mr. Foster stated this involved a townhouse development and the final map conforms to the approved tentative map. Staff recommended approval subject to Fire Department requirements and the conditions of the approved tentative and zoning action.

Mr. Ward moved the Final Map of Cimarron West be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. Satisfaction of the requirements of the Fire Department.
2. Satisfaction of the requirements of the approved Tentative Map and the approved zoning action.
3. Street names to be provided as required by the Department of Community Development.

Motion for approval carried by unanimous vote.

31. Discussion

Rules and Regulations of City Planning Commission.

Mr. Saylor indicated Mr. Stewart of the City Attorney's office has brought out the rules and regulations do not conform to the State requirements. The amendment deals with actions on the amendment to the Master Plan and the rules presently say you may pass any motion by majority vote of a quorum. Statute requires on any action on the Master Plan, the motion must be approved by affirmative vote of not less than 2/3 of the total membership of the Commission. Staff recommended it be changed to conform to the legislative requirements. He stated the Board cannot vote on this at this meeting, but it will be tabled and brought up at the next meeting for action. He stated the Department of Community Development is in the process of consummating a contract with a consultant firm for updating the General Plan and when it gets on the road over the next few months, there will be recommended changes in the General Plan brought before the Commission.

Mr. Tiberti asked why staff wasn't doing the updating.


Mr. Saylor stated the \$55,000 that is being paid to the consultant is not City money. Furthermore, the City couldn't have gotten the \$55,000 for staff to do it. He indicated staff is very busy carrying on the work of the Department and it would take a substantial increase in staff time to do the updating. He indicated the General Plan was almost up-to-date. Some facets need updating and the consultants would be doing this work. He stated three new elements are required by recent legislation: seismic plan, population, and the housing element.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business before the City Planning Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 11:05 P.M.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

By


DON J. SAYLOR, AIP, DIRECTOR

DJS:bjw

Wag AR

plan comm
RECEIVED
CITY MANAGER
AUG - 9 1973
7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 PM

Aug. 7, 1973

WILLIAM PURVIS

DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS

ATTENDANCE - PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETINGS

CITY MANAGER

In accordance with the attached letter, please appoint a member of your staff to attend the Planning Commission Meetings as a technical advisor.

These meetings are held twice a month; the 2nd Tuesday and the 4th Thursday.

The member appointed or the Division Head shall receive comp time or over time whichever is desired.

BH

R. P. Sauer

R. P. Sauer

RPS:jf

SOUTHERN NEVADA
HUMAN RELATIONS
COMMISSION
(continued)

PLANNING
COMMISSION
Abeyance

METRO CIVIL
SERVICE
COMMISSION

Page 32
Minutes
Regular Meeting
City Commission
July 25, 1973

Commissioner Franklin: As we get other vacancies, we just won't fill them -

Commissioner Christensen moved that Paul C. Smith
1301 Ralston
and Fernando Romero
4173 Crater

be appointed as members of the Southern Nevada Human Relations Commission, and the Clerk authorized to so notify.

Motion carried by the following vote: Commissioners Christensen, Lurie, Franklin and Mayor Gragson voting aye; noes, none.

Mayor Gragson: With regard to your recommendations on this Board I would ask that you make the recommendations to me and we will discuss them and I'll tell you why - we've had some problems in the past - in all probability they will be acceptable, but I do want to know who they are, what their background is, etc., because that is the responsibility, indirectly, that comes back to me. I want an open discussion by all of us, but I do want to know who is being recommended -

Commissioner Franklin: I think in years past we somehow got turned around on terms, because it seems to me that we shouldn't have all of these varying times for terms to expire. I think that under the statutes you were supposed to have appointed two for a term of one year, two for two years - whatever it was - what they did, I think, when someone resigned they appointed someone for four years rather than for just the unexpired term. I would like to have our City Attorney check into the exact length of time we should be using on these appointments to the Planning Commission -

Mr. Lovell: The theory is that they should be staggered but, unfortunately, for some reason under the series of resignations, time-wise, we've come now to the new Bill from the Legislature that all of these are supposed to be appointed - there is nothing in the provisions that show they should be staggered now, except initially - originally - when it first started.

Mayor Gragson: When these new appointments are made there is nothing to prohibit us from appointing one for two years or four years, is there?

Mr. Lovell: As I recall, it says you will appoint for "x" number of years - there is no discretion -

Commissioner Franklin: Mayor, didn't I note where you three gentlemen on the Police Commission appointed Don Ashworth to the Metro Civil Service Commission? Don't we need to replace him on our Civil Service Board of Trustees?

Mayor Gragson: He can serve on the other one until we have his replacement -

Commissioner Franklin: All I'm saying is that if he is functioning