

A G E N D A

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

JANUARY 8, 1976

CALL TO ORDER:

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

ROLL CALL:

MINUTES:

Approval of the Minutes of the regular meetings of
October 28, 1975, and November 13, 1975.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. Z-59-75
Application of OSCAR AND TOKUKO DIXON for reclassification of property generally located on the north side of West Lake Mead Boulevard between "H" Street and La Salle Street at 838 West Lake Mead Boulevard, from R-2 to C-1.
Proposed Use: Retail Store
2. Z-60-75
Application of HOME SAVINGS ASSOCIATION for reclassification of property generally located on the north side of Alexander Road extended between Lorenzi Boulevard and Torrey Pines Drive extending north approximately 900 feet along Lorenzi Boulevard and 1400 feet along Torrey Pines Drive, from R-E to R-MH.
Proposed Use: Mobile Home Residential Estates
3. Z-61-75
Application of LAURA KELLY, DOROTHY CULLEY AND THOMAS AND GLADYS GEE for reclassification of property generally located southeast of East Bonanza Road and North Eastern Avenue extending south along Eastern Avenue 655 feet and east along Bonanza Road 629 feet, from R-E to C-1.
Proposed Use: Neighborhood Shopping Center
4. Z-62-75
Application of LOUIS WIENER, JR., Attorney for the estate of Frank Fishman, for reclassification of property located on the north side of Washington Avenue between Rancho Drive and Robin Street extending north 1,362 feet from Washington Avenue, from R-1 to C-1.
Proposed Use: Commercial Office and Retail Complex
5. Z-63-75
Application of ROBERT T. BIGELOW for reclassification of property located on the northeast corner of South Main Street and Clark Avenue at 429 South Main Street, from C-M to C-2.
Proposed Use: Apartments
6. Z-64-75
Application of MARVIN STRUSSER for reclassification of property located on the southwest corner of South Maryland Parkway and Jessica Avenue at 1200 South Maryland Parkway, from R-1 to C-D.
Proposed Use: Retail Sales (Home Accessories)
7. Z-65-75
Application of CHARLESTON CONTINENTAL VILLAGE, INC. for reclassification of property generally located 150 feet south of Stewart Avenue between North Lamb Boulevard and Prince Lane extending west from North Lamb Boulevard 1,242 feet, from R-1 (Under ROI to R-2 P.U.D.) to R-3.
Proposed Use: Apartments
8. Z-66-75
Application of BANK OF NEVADA, Executor of the estate of Archie C. Grant, deceased, and Trustee U/W of Zora Faye Grant for reclassification of property located on the northwest corner of South 7TH Street and Gass Avenue, from R-1 to R-4.
Proposed Use: Apartments (16 Units)

9. Z-66-73
Use Review
Submitted by ROYAL CREST, INC. to allow an engineering company, Kraemer Engineering, to be located in their administrative offices at 3300 West Sahara Avenue, C-1 Zone (under resolution of intent).
10. Final Map
Spanish Oaks #3
Property generally located on the north side of El Camino Avenue east of Valley View Boulevard.
Owner/Subdivider: Collins Brothers
No. of Lots: 19
11. Z-82-71
Plot Plan Review
Submitted by RON RUDIN REALTY AND CONSTRUCTION COMPANY ON BEHALF OF CHARLESTON CONTINENTAL VILLAGE concerning property generally located on the west side of Lamb Boulevard between East Charleston Boulevard and East Stewart Avenue.
12. Tentative Map
Stewart Arms #2
Property generally located on the west side of Lamb Boulevard 200 feet south of Stewart Avenue.
Owner/Subdivider: Charleston Continental Village
No. of Lots: 208
13. PM-32-75
Street Dedication
Street Dedication submitted by UNION PACIFIC LAND RESOURCES CORPORATION for Mineral Avenue generally located on the east side of Highland Avenue between Alta Drive and Bonanza Road.
14. AV-18-75
Administrative Variance request submitted by FRANK F. DIXON to allow a deviation in the rear yard setback on an irregular shaped lot located at 1213 Stout Way.
15. Tentative Map
Jade Park #3
Property generally located on the west side of Torrey Pines Drive south of Craig Road.
Owner/Subdivider: Home Savings Association
No. of Lots: 40
16. Z-49-73
Plot Plan Review
Submitted by VALLEY HOSPITAL MEDICAL BUILDING concerning property generally located on the northwest corner of Goldring Avenue and Shadow Lane, extending west along Goldring Avenue 101 feet and north along Shadow Lane 301 feet at 700, 716, 716½ Shadow Lane, C-1 Zone.

RECEIVED
CITY MANAGER
DEC 30 1975

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

MINUTES

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

January 8, 1976

RECEIVED
CITY MANAGER

MAR 15 1976

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

CALL TO ORDER:

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

PRESENT:

Chairman Busch, Vice-Chairman Jenkins, Messrs. Tiberti, Ward, Miller, Dr. Parker and Mrs. Coleman.

STAFF PRESENT:

Don J. Saylor, AIP, Director of Community Development
Harold P. Foster, Deputy Director of Community Development
Howard Null, Supervisor of Planning and Zoning
John Herbert, Planning Assistant
Patricia Malizia, Recording Secretary

NEW BUSINESS:

1. Z-59-75

APPROVED

Application of OSCAR AND TOKUKO DIXON for reclassification of property legally described as Lot 2C, Vegas Heights. Generally located on the north side of West Lake Mead Boulevard between "H" Street and La Salle Street at 838 West Lake Mead Boulevard.

FROM: R-2

TO: C-1

PROPOSED USE: RETAIL STORE

Mr. Saylor stated this property was located on Lake Mead Boulevard. Just west of the intersection is commercial zoning and further west there is also commercial zoning, and on the south side there is more commercial zoning. He stated that staff realized some steps have been taken toward allowing commercial zoning on Lake Mead Boulevard, which is proposed for a 100' wide major street, while at the same time staff feels there is sufficient integrity to the residential development along there that an attempt should be made to preserve this use for awhile. If approved, staff would be taking the position that all frontage along Lake Mead would be allowed the same privilege. He stated this is proposed to be a retail outlet and of no specific nature. He pointed out the location of the proposed rezoning, and he stated that staff recommended denial. There was one letter of protest on record and no letters of approval.

MRS. COLEMAN asked the size of the property?

MR. SAYLOR stated 40' x 135'.

DR. PARKER asked if this would take in two lots?

MR. SAYLOR replied only one lot.

CHAIRMAN BUSCH asked what the specific use would be of the building?

MR. WARD asked if this was in the Vegas Heights area?

MR. SAYLOR said "yes".

MR. TIBERTI asked where the nearest residence was in relation to this property, and he was informed it was right next door.

MR. SAYLOR pointed out the land use in the area; he pointed out the location of the park and the pattern of houses and vacant lots down the street.

Chairman Busch declared the public hearing open and asked to hear from the applicant.

Mr. Oscar Dixon, 2600 Royal Street, appeared. He stated that the property up for rezoning was to be used as a seamstress shop.

Mrs. Coleman asked if he was going to use the existing building on the property?

Mr. Dixon stated "yes".

Mr. Tiberti asked if there were going to be any additions or changes to the existing building on the property if it is going to be used as a seamstress shop?

Mr. Dixon stated nothing would be added, but the building would be made to look like a business.

Mrs. Coleman asked if the parking area would be black-topped?

Mr. Saylor stated "yes", there is parking in the rear and landscaping in the front.

Mr. Tiberti asked if there was any other use permitted he could use without changing the actual zoning.

Mr. Saylor stated if they lived in the house it would be possible to take out a home occupation use permit provided they did not advertise. If they are proposing to run it as a business this is the only way it can be done; an outright business requires commercial zoning.

Mrs. Coleman asked if the residence is occupied next door.

Mr. Saylor stated he did not know if the two houses immediately adjacent to this property were occupied.

Mr. Dixon stated they are vacant.

Mr. Ward asked if they were proposing to build a new building in this area.

Mr. Saylor stated they are proposing to utilize the existing building, and they may fix up the front.

Mr. Ward asked if anything was going to be done about cleaning up this particular area; he added there is a program now going on in the West Las Vegas area to clean up the entire area.

Mr. Saylor stated he did not know what the applicant was planning on doing with regard to the cleaning up of his property, but he would be required to take care of his own property. The City is embarking on a general clean up in this general area. There is currently a program underway to put in the offsite improvements in the Vegas Heights area and improve the housing.

Mrs. Coleman asked the applicant if he understood that he would be required to put in landscaping and upgrade the building.

Mr. Dixon stated "yes".

Mr. Jenkins asked how many employees would be involved.

Mr. Dixon stated only two.

Mr. Ward asked about the lighting proposed on and around the building.

Mr. Dixon stated there would be lighting on the building for security reasons.

Mr. Ward asked if there would be neon signs?

Mr. Dixon stated there would be no neon signs, but there would be a sign with regular light to illuminate it.

Mr. Jenkins asked what type of sewing would be done?

Mr. Dixon said there would be no heavy duty industrial sewing, only small garments.

Dr. Parker asked if he would be selling any materials.

Mr. Dixon stated "no", all materials will be brought in by potential customers.

Chairman Busch suggested restricting the signing by stating that no off-premise signs be allowed.

Mrs. Coleman suggested that this use be restricted to the seamstress operation only and no off-premise signs, and lighting for safety purposes only.

Chairman Busch declared the public hearing closed.

Mrs. Coleman moved Z-59-75 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. Resolution of Intent be restricted to a twelve (12) month time limit.
2. Access to the parking area on the rear portion of the property shall be by the driveway only and the parking layout shall be revised and surfaced as required by the Department of Community Development.
3. No off-premise signs shall be allowed.
4. Dedication of 20' for Lake Mead Boulevard and signing an Assessment District Agreement for half street improvements along Lake Mead Boulevard.
5. Landscaping and a permanent underground sprinkler system shall be provided as required by the Planning Commission and shall be permanently maintained in a satisfactory manner. Failure to properly maintain required landscaping and underground sprinkler systems 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.
7. Conformance to the plot plan as amended to reflect the above conditions.
8. Conformance to code requirements and design standards of City Departments.

The motion carried by the following vote:

"AYES" Miller, Tiberti, Jenkins, Busch, Coleman, Ward
Parker

"NOES" None

This item will be heard by the City Commission on February 4, 1976.

Application of HOME SAVINGS ASSOCIATION for reclassification of property legally described as the southwest quarter (SW $\frac{1}{4}$) of Section 2, Township 20 South, Range 60 East, MDB&M. Excepting therefrom Jade Park Unit No. 1 and also excepting therefrom: The southeast quarter (SE $\frac{1}{4}$) of the southeast quarter (SE $\frac{1}{4}$) of the northeast quarter (NE $\frac{1}{4}$) of the southwest quarter (SW $\frac{1}{4}$) of said Section 2; and the northwest quarter (NW $\frac{1}{4}$) of the northwest quarter (NW $\frac{1}{4}$) of the southwest quarter (SW $\frac{1}{4}$) of the southwest quarter (SE $\frac{1}{4}$) of said Section 2; and the northwest quarter (NW $\frac{1}{4}$) of the southwest quarter (SW $\frac{1}{4}$) of the southwest quarter (SW $\frac{1}{4}$) of said Section 2; and further excepting therefrom the following parcel: PARCEL I: That portion of the southwest quarter (SW $\frac{1}{4}$) of Section 2, Township 20 South, Range 60 East, MDB&M bounded by a line legally described as follows: Commencing at the northwest corner of the southwest quarter (SW $\frac{1}{4}$) of Section 2, Thence S.0 $^{\circ}$ 31'52" west 75.36 feet; thence S.83 $^{\circ}$ 50'31" east 50.24 feet to the point of beginning; thence continuing S.83 $^{\circ}$ 50'31" east 1056.64 feet; thence S.0 $^{\circ}$ 03'27" west 1384.41 feet; thence S.83 $^{\circ}$ 55'22" east 859.27 feet to a point in a curve from which a radial line bears N.48 $^{\circ}$ 59'18" west; thence from a tangent bearing S.41 $^{\circ}$ 00'42" west, turn right along the arc of a 390.00 foot radius curve, through a central angle of 55 $^{\circ}$ 03'56" a distance of 374.82 feet; thence N.83 $^{\circ}$ 55'22" west 753.16 feet; thence from a tangent bearing N.83 $^{\circ}$ 55'22" west turn left along the arc of a 421.00 foot radius curve, through a central angle of 32 $^{\circ}$ 21'20" a distance of 237.18 feet; thence S.63 $^{\circ}$ 43'18" west 156.23 feet; thence from a tangent bearing S.63 $^{\circ}$ 43'18" west, turn right along the arc of a 480.00 foot radius curve, through a central angle of 32 $^{\circ}$ 20'08", a distance of 270.89 feet; thence N.83 $^{\circ}$ 56'34" west 205.84 feet; thence N.0 $^{\circ}$ 31'52" east 165.77 feet; thence S.83 $^{\circ}$ 56'34" east 261.34 feet; thence N.0 $^{\circ}$ 28'19" east 337.13 feet; thence N.83 $^{\circ}$ 55'22" west 261.00 feet; thence N.0 $^{\circ}$ 31'52" east 1273.41 feet to the point of beginning. Generally located on the north side of Alexander Road extended between Lorenzi Boulevard and Torrey Pines Drive extending north approximately 900 feet along Lorenzi Boulevard and 1400 feet along Torrey Pines Drive.

FROM: R-E (Residence Estates)

TO: R-MH (Mobile Home Residence District)

PROPOSED USE: MOBILE HOME RESIDENTIAL ESTATES

Mr. Saylor pointed out the specific property and its location in question on the screen. He stated there is a strip of commercial zoning in the area which was approved years ago; there are approximately 660 feet on both sides of the highway in the City out to the County line. There is a development of mobile homes estates in this area, and property to the west has an Resolution of Intent to allow the same type of development. This application involves a larger piece of land to the south. This was under Resolution of Intent at one time but has since expired. Mobile home estates is similar to the R-1 zone in all respects. There are standard sized lots, and you are allowed to have mobile homes on the property. He stated the entire piece is somewhere near 160 acres; they have existing zoning for slightly more than half of that if they complete that area which they have under Resolution of Intent being 80 acres of mobile home estate zoning. He pointed out the existing Resolution of Intent on the plot plan. He stated that staff did not feel it would be prudent to zone more area for the mobile home estates development, but staff realizes it is a very legitimate type of residential development. Staff also recognizes they have approximately enough land zoned and not developed at this time to double the existing development. However, because of the boundary of this design

the application should be approved to the extent that it takes in one additional tier of lots. At the time this was originally approved there was a protest factor, a very strong protest factor. He pointed out the area on the screen that will still remain in County territory after consolidation, in the general area of this application. He added that staff realizes when people move out away from the urban core of the City they do so because they want elbow room, open space, and places to ride horses, and this is a very legitimate basis for protest. We also recognize that R-E development can be and is compatible with R-1 development; there are several areas zoned R-E which are surrounded by R-1 development, and we don't feel there is an incompatibility factor here. He stated that urbanization and spreading out is a legitimate desire on the part of the people that have R-E development as well as to have a monopoly on that type of land use without other types of urban development being intermixed. On one hand when we say that we don't feel it would be advisable to allow additional mobile home estates, staff is not recommending denial but would recommend squaring the development off. Staff's recommendation is not predicated on the fact that all of the area should be protected or given a monopoly to R-E zoning; but that there is a justifiable mixture existing in the area. There are three letters of protest and two letters of approval on record.

MRS. COLEMAN asked if this land was under the same ownership who came in on Jade Park and does the same owner own both of these parcels of land?

MR. SAYLOR stated the developed portion is under single family ownership and one of the requirements for R-MH zoning is that it be bordered with a block wall. This entire large piece is bounded by major streets. These streets are not developed to full width. Torrey Pines has a large amount of traffic because people are using Torrey Pines to go south into the City instead of going out to the highway. Torrey Pines is designed and will be constructed as a major street.

CHAIRMAN BUSCH declared the public hearing open and asked to hear from the applicant.

MR. CLAY LYNCH appeared representing SUN Home Builders and Home Savings Association. He stated that the market at this time shows that more than 2/3 of the mobile home estates are sold out, and there are little or no lots available. A market analysis shows that there is a need for more mobile home estates development, and he stated that he was present at this meeting to assure the Commission that they intend to build the same high quality and the same standard characteristics as exist now.

MR. TOM YELEY, 6417 Sapphire, appeared and stated they had a meeting of the Board of Directors and talked with most of the people in Jade Park. These people are in favor of this park being extended all the way to where it was originally intended to go, down to Lorenzi Road. There were 585 lots and all of the lots in Jade Park I and II were sold in the first week in May, and we have approximately 6-8 people coming into the park every week, with no advertising, looking for lots to buy and we do not have them.

Mrs. Coleman asked regarding the previously approved Jade Park #3 wondering where it was located in relation to this plan.

MR. LYNCH stated in Jade Park #3 we found it was not feasible to build lots on one side of the street only. The main reason for this rezoning is to straighten out the boundary and to have access to water lines off Torrey Pines Drive. The present use of these lines

is at capacity. We came in with this development plan to finish what Jade Park had been planned for. If this was left as R-1 zoning it would result in a different type of living than mobile home estates.

Mrs. Coleman asked if the approval of the tentative map expired on Jade Park #3.

Mr. Saylor stated they could build on part of the property right now and put in more mobile home estates.

Mr. Lynch stated they can build where the water and sewer lines are available. He stated there was no way they could get water and sewer into this new proposed development without coming to a point which he pointed out on the map. He stated they could live within the line that staff has recommended approval on until the time when a need is demonstrated for more mobile home estates, and then the Jade Park people can go in and apply all the way to Alexander.

MR. GREG MUNSELL, 4009 West Torrey Pines, appeared in protest. He stated he protested to this planned development because of the impact on the municipal problem in the area and the transportation problem. He stated it was his understanding the proposed change would encompass 180 acres. The proposed population of this corner of land would be approximately 3,000 people; he stated he was not exactly sure of that statistic. He stated a population of this size would produce 1,200 school age children. This would result in overcrowding of schools, water and sewer distribution and the lack of availability of water to other residents. He stated another problem would be fire and police protection, and he stated at this time it takes approximately 10 to 15 minutes to get a fire truck or police protection to this area. He stated that he felt the trailer park was a fire hazard. He stated they are also concerned about the increase in crime with no protection to the residents. He stated at this time there is no public transportation in the area. The question of maintenance of the trailer park is of concern to the protestants, and they wondered what assurance that they will have that they will maintain the area.

Mrs. Coleman asked how long Mr. Munsell had lived there.

Mr. Munsell stated nine months.

Mrs. Coleman indicated that he did not live there before Jade Park went in.

Mr. Munsell stated "no".

Mrs. Coleman asked how he felt about the way this park is being operated.

Mr. Munsell stated he lived about 3/4 of a mile away, and he does not go in that direction. He added that he had not been in the trailer park to see about the maintenance problems.

Chairman Busch commented that it is maintained very well.

Mrs. Coleman asked if Mr. Munsell's life style had been changed by this development, and if it was across the street and up a ways would it change his life style.

Mr. Munsell stated that the development does cause him concern. He stated that there was a fire there recently, and they wondered when the fire truck was going to get there. He added that police protection and vandalism is a large problem there. He added that another one of their concerns was Torrey Pines becoming a main throughway for quite a sizeable population. He felt there would

be a danger to the children with that much traffic on the street, and there is a minimum of police to protect the traffic laws.

Mr. Miller asked if Mr. Munsell was in objection to any more mobile homes being put in there at all even to the boundary lines.

Mr. Munsell stated "yes". He stated he was concerned about statements made by Mr. Lynch with regard to the area they needed to go to for water and sewer. He stated that he thought it was very strange to have to change the zoning in order to bring in water and sewer lines.

Mrs. Coleman asked if people buy the lots.

Mr. Munsell stated he thought they bought the lots. He stated that he could not understand why it was not feasible to get water and sewer to the property in order to develop the back half without changing the zoning.

Mr. Saylor commented that he thought that Mr. Lynch stated it was economically not feasible. This is the only street coming out to Torrey Pines, and this is where connections to sewer and water would have to be made without having lots on both sides. He would be paying to lay sewer and water lines without developing any abutting lots.

Mr. Jenkins asked what the density would be at total completion.

Mr. Saylor stated that staff feels that the family size for mobile homes is slightly less than that of a single family home, and they could get approximately 600 lots on the entire piece with a population of somewhat less than three persons per family. The average would be just under three persons per family, and this would be slightly less than 2,000 people.

Mr. Munsell asked if the zoning application allowed $4\frac{1}{2}$ lots an acre.

Mr. Saylor stated under the R-MH zoning you have to have a minimum lot size of 6500 sq. ft. so whatever number of lots you can get per acre on an amount of land after setting aside for streets and possibly a recreation area could come out between 4 and $4\frac{1}{2}$ lot per acre.

Mr. Munsell asked what the total acreage was of the development.

Mr. Saylor replied about 150 acres.

Mr. Munsell stated with 600 units there would be a possibility of 4,000 people which would be a more reasonable figure than staff's estimate of 2,000 people. He added if this application was approved he wondered if the Commission is planning on doing anything with regard to the abuses the present land owners would face with regard to the dust problems and things of this nature connected with new development.

Mr. Jenkins stated that the protection would be the same as any other development.

MR. TONY NOVACK, 4241 Jory Trail, appeared in protest of the proposed rezoning. He asked what part of the Jade Park development is existing now.

Chairman Busch stated units #1 and #2.

Mr. Novack asked who owned the roads and public streets at this time.

Mr. Saylor stated that these are City streets.

Mr. Novack stated it was stated that all lots have been sold and presently there are thirteen empty in the park at this time.

Mr. Saylor stated if not all were occupied almost all were.

Mr. Novack stated he did a survey of available mobile home lots. He stated there is a park located west of the Winterwood Trailer Park that presently has only one or two trailers in it.

Mrs. Coleman asked if that was located near Lamb Boulevard.

Mr. Novack stated it was near Nellis Boulevard two blocks north of Charleston Boulevard.

Mr. Herbert stated that is in the County.

Mr. Novack stated that one of his concerns regarding this proposed rezoning application would be the overcrowding of the school buses. He has one son of school age, and now there are sometimes five children to a seat and about 60 children get on the bus from Jade Park. He stated that the Bertha Ronzone school is 2½ to 3 miles from this location, but they have to be bused to Paul Culley which is 5 miles away. He stated another concern was the fact that there is no public transportation in the area and no business areas. He stated they have to go 7-8 miles to the nearest shopping center at Vegas Drive; there are no services in the area. He stated that he bought his home in the R-E zone in July 1975, and he was opposed to having another mobile home estate development across the street. He stated there would be extra traffic; as it is now he said he is not affected except for a noise factor. He stated the entrance and exit to the mobile homes are on Craig Road, two blocks from his residence.

MR. RICHARD FANKHAUSER, 4025 Torrey Pines, appeared in protest. He stated his residence is located across from the affected area, and he is opposed to the rezoning of this area bounded by Alexander. He stated that he has lived in several cities and while looking for a home in this city was extremely shocked by the unusual zoning in this city. He stated there were many examples where they would find a nice home and across the street there would be slums; there are homes mixed with apartments and with mobile homes. He stated that he felt there was very little planning done in some areas of Las Vegas as far as zoning of the land. People are established in homes of ½ acre or more and they ride horses, and there is very little crime. It is an established fact that crime increases with the increase in population density. He stated there would be incompatibility with people owning different types of homes, he commented on the increased traffic on Torrey Pines as a thoroughfare, and he stated that no freeway was going to take care of some of the traffic problems in this area. He stated they moved to this area to have horses and room to ride them. He added that they have nearly \$55,000 invested in their home. They have found what they want as far as a house and property, and he stated he felt if the zoning was changed we would have been sold out by our own city. He added that their entire reason for moving there would be destroyed. He commented that their property values would be affected, and he asked who would pay them for the decrease in their property values. He asked the Commission to put themselves and their

families in their position with a house and property and lifestyle you have always wanted and strived for and now have it threatened by this rezoning. He asked the Commission how they would feel.

Mr. Miller asked Mr. Fankhauser how long he had lived at this address and if the park was there when he moved in.

Mr. Fankhauser stated one year and part of the park was already in. He added that the area on the corner did not affect them, only the area directly across the street.

Mr. Miller asked if he knew that the section adjacent to the mobile home park already is zoned for that type of usage.

Mr. Fankhauser stated that he did not know that.

Mr. Miller stated the reason this was brought up was because he did not feel the people knew what section of land they were trying to rezone or if they were trying to rezone the whole piece.

Mr. Fankhauser stated that he understood that they were trying to extend the park south from Craig Road.

Mrs. Coleman commented that many of the people at this meeting were not aware of this fact, and she added that she was reading from the minutes of the March 27, 1973 meeting when this was brought before this Commission. It states that "staff and the Commission concurred that they felt Lorenzi, Craig Road and Alexander were logical stopping points for this development because they were major streets". She stated there was also a protest factor at that time, because the Commission felt this was a logical place for this type of rezoning that is possibly part of the reason they asked for the whole section.

MS. KAY JENSEN, 3588 Torrey Pines, appeared in protest. She stated Jade Park 1 and 2 went in, in 1973, and it was not a factor that she was concerned with, but now she has children of school age and she requested that his application be denied because of the overcrowding of the schools and school buses. She stated that she had tried to get some figures from the School District on the number of school buses and children in the area. She estimated that there were five school buses in the area each morning and six in the afternoon with an average of 73 children on each bus. She stated if this mobile home estates development is allowed to go in it will overcrowd the schools which are already full. She added that she had been a trailer home owner in the past.

Mr. Jenkins stated children are going to go to school in an area where they reside.

A lady in the audience stated there are 35 children in each classroom now and there is no more room.

Mr. Tiberti commented that the question of the lack of schools would be under the School District's jurisdiction, and if they felt there was a need for another school they would build one.

Ms. Jensen stated her concern was why this development should be allowed at this time in this area to dump population density in this area and create problems when the population could be absorbed in other parts of the City and County.

MR. BRIAN W. POLAR, 3460 West Torrey Pines, appeared in protest. He stated he lived one quarter mile south of

the proposed development. He thanked the Commission for their consideration in hearing their comments. At this time, the community around them is exactly what they are seeking, and if this proposed reclassification goes through it will no longer be the case. There will be increased population, and increased traffic problem, and crime and fire hazards will increase. He requested that the Commission recommend denial and have the land retained in its present status.

MR. ED JORY, 4017 North Torrey Pines, appeared in protest. He stated that he has been a resident in this area since 1952, and he developed the present R-E subdivision in the area. He stated that he respectfully submits that he objects to the application for rezoning. He presented an appraisal to the Commission which was an unbiased opinion of the situation in the area. He stated that he also did a market study concerning mobile home parks in Clark County and the City of Las Vegas and stated he did not see any mobile home parks or trailer estates where land around it was large parcels of land. He stated it was not economically feasible to put anything across the street from a mobile home park other than another mobile home park.

Mr. Fankhauser stated that he was one of the first owners in the Lazy J Ranch Estates, and he used all available funds to buy the land and raise his children. He added he would like to correct staff's description of the street that goes into Torrey Pines. The only street used for the park entrance is on Craig Road, on the south side, which is a north/south street. There is no entrance from Jade Park to North Torrey Pines. He added that they are trying to convince staff that it is necessary to put this new street in to secure water and sewer. He stated there is an 8" sewer line in that street (Jadestone Avenue) and adequate water.

Mr. Jory stated that Mr. Saylor had stated there were 585 lots under question in the area in the application, and he asked if staff understood that those are in addition to the existing lots that are in.

Mr. Munsell stated there is some confusion there. He felt his estimate of the number of residents was more correct than the planning staff's. He stated there is also an engineering concern here. In the area north of Alexander to Jory Trail there is a grade down to almost three feet in order to provide for water run-off. In the event this rezoning is allowed all street run-off from Lorenzi to Torrey Pines will drain out into that one block area in the 1400 block of Torrey Pines, and there is no way for the natural drain to flow along Alexander or Jory Trail to Rancho Drive until the land is developed; and the land cannot be developed until the market is there, and there will be no market if a trailer park is put in. He stated he wished he had the experience Mr. Lynch had with regard to talking and dealing with people, and he understands that Mr. Lynch has agreed with staff to rezone only a portion of it. He stated that Unit #3 is not rezoned; the letter of intent has expired, and without a formal hearing they cannot issue a map on that.

Chairman Busch asked staff to explain the status on the Resolution of Intent.

Mr. Foster stated the ROI is active and will expire in April of this year unless development commences. A portion of it is in the tentative map area on this agenda. There are 600 units for the entire 150 acres not just for the area proposed in this application; it will include all that is under the ROI for those two areas plus the existing development. In talking about the access street to Torrey Pines, staff did not indicate it was improved at this time, only proposed.

Mrs. Coleman asked if the area in the original approval required the perimeter to have a block wall.

Mr. Foster stated that is an ordinance requirement.

Mr. Jory asked if the entire block wall is complete at this time.

Mrs. Coleman commented it is supposed to be if the park is.

Mr. Jory stated he was told the development was not completed, and that is why there is a Resolution of Intent.

Mr. Foster stated there was discussion along this line, and he did inform Mr. Jory there was no time left on the first unit, but there was a separate action in 1973 to further extend the time, and it was granted and brought the extension up to April 1976.

Mr. Jory asked if that was the proper location of the street in the event that this is approved.

Mr. Foster stated it would have to meet all engineering requirements.

Mr. Jory stated it would be important where that street would go.

Mr. Foster stated there would be a 125' offset from the center lines of streets intersecting Torrey Pines.

Mr. Jory stated that this street would make a very strong difference with regard to the flood problems they have in this area now. He indicated they have removed a portion of a block wall for drainage and have replaced two sidewalks.

MR. JOE ORLANDO, 3536 Torrey Pines, appeared in protest. He stated that he has lived there a few more years than many of the people in the area (6 years). He moved out there for the same reasons many of the other people have moved out there, for the area and plenty of room. These people have built nice houses out here. He stated he has two small children, and the buses go by this area faster than the speed limit. He questioned Mr. Saylor's figure of three persons per trailer adding that he has seen children climbing the fence and holes in the block walls and he stated he did not think the children were living in the trailers by themselves. He objected to this application because it would create a traffic hazard with the school buses and more traffic. He stated that he felt the only reason why they were applying for this rezoning was because it was too expensive to put in sewer and water lines across undeveloped land. He stated when he moved in he had to pay for the water and sewer, and he stated he would like to see them develop the other part first.

Mr. FELIX LAFOND, 4333 Torrey Pines, appeared in protest. He stated that he is the closest neighbor to the trailer park, and he would not invest \$57,000 again knowing what he knows about trailer parks now. He stated his property is for sale now, and he does want to go into another estate piece of property. He stated his main objection to this application was that the property values were going to depreciate; he stated he has already lost one sale on his house because of the trailer park. He stated that there are some good and some bad people in all developments, and there are several kids who climb over the wall and ride motor bikes through the property. He stated the water problem never was solved. The drain comes out next to his house, and during the heavy rains last summer the water washed out Mr. Novack's sidewalk.

MR. THOMAS MASON, 4401 Torrey Pines, appeared in protest and stated he objected to this application because he would be looking at a block wall rather than houses when this development is completed.

MR. J. W. GAREHIME, 1700 Griffith, appeared in protest stating that he owned the 160 acres south of Alexander, directly south of the trailer park. He stated this property has been in the family for 30 years, and he had been waiting for the time when the property around it would develop and he could find a buyer and sell the property or part of it. He stated initially he spent one year trying to get R-E in there in 1973, but because of the energy shortage he had a problem getting a developer. Now he stated he has a developer who wants to build R-E on the entire 160 acre section. He stated that he has talked to people in the area who are all R-E property owners, and they have their investments in the property and are in favor of this area remaining R-E. He stated the people in the area have already developed the capability to buy these houses. He was hoping they would make it a plan to build this type of house in this area. He stated that he had a chance to sell his property for R-1 development, and he turned it down because he did not think the people in the area wanted that type of development. He stated if this application does go through all the property will be good for is R-1 development; the people will be boxed off with a block fence on his section on R-1 property, and the horse people will be cut off from going out into the open property.

MS. JOYCE MARTIN, 3250 Torrey Pines, appeared in protest. She stated that she has lived in this area for 9 months. She was in objection to this application on the basis that there are a concentration of problems in many aspects of a trailer park. She questioned whether or not there would be a caretaker on the property.

MR. TIBERTI informed her many of these parks do have homeowner associations.

Ms. Martin stated that she moved out in this area because it was R-E, and she did not want to live near a trailer park.

MS. JANET WEATHERS, 4440 Jory Trail, appeared in protest. She stated she is looking at a house now, and it is in escrow; but she will not buy it and live across the street from a mobile home park.

MR. FRANK COMPARONI, 4614 Balsam, appeared in protest. He stated that he was also concerned about the maintenance of the park.

MS. RUTH CAPLETTE, 6408 Sapphire, a resident in Jade Park, appeared stating that she took objection to the snobs that have appeared at this meeting in objection to the proposed addition to the Jade Park development. She stated they have just as much money invested. She stated she did not agree with the association, and they do not represent the people.

MR. JERRY HAIN, 4001 Torrey Pines, appeared in protest and stated that he feels the same as others do in terms of the schools, and he resented being notified of this application at 5:00 P.M. on Christmas Eve. He stated he did not want a clapboard structure across the street from his house.

Another lady from the mobile home park appeared and stated they have a lovely park if the people would live by the rules and regulations in the first place. There are more than 3 people in a mobile home; she added that she loved animals but she added she would like the horses to be kept in their own place and out of the park.

Ms. Joyce Martin reappeared and asked what is going to keep the developers of the mobile home parks from going into other areas. She asked how many parks can they have in an area with R-E zoning.

Mr Fankhauser appeared and stated according to the notice received any and all interested persons may appear before this Commission. He stated that every individual does have the right to speak and he stated that everyone should be allowed to speak.

Mr. LaFond reappeared and stated that there is no street that comes out to Torrey Pines; there is a deadend street at the end of his property that is supposed to have a permanent barrier. He stated that he has called the Traffic Department regarding this barrier, and they state they will do something about it and never have.

Mr. Garehime asked Mr. Saylor according to what he stated since the west side of the existing park is already zoned for mobile home estates can they build right now.

Mr. Saylor stated "yes".

Mr. Garehime stated he did not feel that they needed the additional property at this time; they have the existing zoning, and it should be left as it is at present and see how it develops in the future. He stated if people go in there and start building R-E uses he felt it should be held to what it is.

MR. WAYNE HAIN, 4001 Torrey Pines, appeared in protest. He stated a trailer that burned down last summer is still in the trailer park, and he objected to the plywood buildings the people have built. He stated he would also object to a block wall in front of his house. He stated that he has horses, and he moved out there because of the zoning. He stated 2/3 of the existing trailer park is established, and he felt they should go with what they have.

Mr. Neely reappeared and stated that Mr. Jory was well aware of the mobile home park when planning his development because it existed at that time. He added if Mr. Jory was having problems selling his 1/2 acre lots because of the mobile home park it was his problem. He added the mobile home park is patrolled by Allied Security; and it was not put in there because of the people; it was put in there because outside people destroyed the recreation facility. He stated there are some very nice homes in this park, and they are very proud of it. We represent 137 families who are in favor of extending this zoning all the way to Lorenzi Road to have a natural barrier between the R-E housing and the mobile home park.

Mrs. Coleman asked about the flood water problem and if something had been done about it.

Mr. Yeley stated there are no particular problems in the park. The drain was not open into Torrey Pines, and when it is open the water does go through. The natural drain would go south into the future development. Regarding the block wall, he stated that is is 7'4" high on Torrey Pines.

Mr. Jory reappeared and stated that he did know that Jade Park Unit #1 was in and developed, but he did not think there would be any problems because their only entrance and exit was on Craig Road.

Mr. Novack reappeared regarding the water problem, stating when the drain is plugged it costs him his sidewalk; and Mr. Jory has paid for two sidewalks on his property. He asked if this trailer park were

approved he wondered if there would be a condition regarding the drainage of water from the trailer park.

MR. ELDON GARRISON, 4595 Balsam, appeared in protest. He stated that he lived in the area long before the trailer park, and he questioned the size of the streets surrounding the trailer park. He further stated that he felt the water table level would be lowered in this area with this development going in.

MR. RICHARD FESKER, 4505 Torrey Pines, appeared and stated that he put in a well, and he has since had to go to the depth of 160' from the original well of 85' which cost him \$6,000. He stated that they live in the County, and they have to look at Jade Park because they have to drive by it. He stated they received no notice before on this public hearing and got one this time.

Mr. Saylor informed the people that the City notifies property owners in the County as well as in the City. Staff goes to the Assessor's Office with a prescribed area and obtains a print-out and labels. On this application we notified all property owners within $\frac{1}{2}$ mile, and staff keeps in the files the receipts from the certified letters.

Mrs. Coleman stated she understood that we have a situation with constitutional rights and everyone should speak, but she must agree that there does not seem to be anything new being brought up. There are many other people here to speak on other matters, and they have their rights. If there are no other new things to present perhaps we could close the public hearing.

Mr. Tiberti stated since the portion on the east of the existing Jade Park is already zoned for mobile home estates, he moved that this application be accepted with the alternative recommendation of staff and deny the balance.

Chairman Busch asked Mr. Lynch if he agreed with the recommendations of staff.

Mr. Lynch repeated the position of Home Savings stating they could proceed for some months into the future as staff has recommended; but they did want to complete the development, as did the people in Jade Park 1 and 2, down to the natural barrier.

Dr. Parker asked if the increase in the number of lots for this section would be less than 60.

Chairman Busch stated it would be approved for the portion below the developed portion, and Mr. Herbert pointed out the area to be rezoned on the screen.

Mr. Jory questioned the street that would intersect Torrey Pines.

Mr. LaFond stated with this approval the property he owned, $2\frac{1}{2}$ acres, would be completely surrounded by the mobile home park.

People from the audience asked the Commission how one developer could make so many people unhappy.

Chairman Busch declared the public hearing closed.

Mr. Tiberti moved Z-60-75 be APPROVED as recommended by staff subject to the following conditions:

1. Resolution of Intent be restricted to a twelve (12) month time limit.
2. Application be amended to extend no further south than the south boundary of the tier of lots proposed

on the south side of Bamboo Drive except at the westerly portion of the development at Lorenzi Boulevard the south boundary shall extend south to the parcel abutting the portion indicated "not a part of this subdivision". The subdivision shall be revised along the south side of Bamboo Drive as required by the Department of Community Development.

3. Third party inspection of all mobile homes to be placed on the lots.
4. A 6' masonry wall shall be required around the external boundary of the development as required by the Department of Community Development.
5. Dedication of half street right-of-ways on Torrey Pines Drive (40'), Alexander Road (50'), and Lorenzi Street (50'), and one 25' radius corner at Torrey Pines and Alexander Road and one 30' radius corner at Lorenzi and Alexander Road as required by the Department of Public Works.
6. Construction of a temporary flood diversion dyke along the west boundary of the tract as required by the Department of Public Works.
7. Conformance to the plot plan as amended to reflect the above conditions.
8. Conformance to code requirements and design standards of City Departments.

The motion carried by the following vote:

"AYES": Tiberti, Jenkins, Busch, Coleman, Ward, Parker

"NOES": Miller

This item will be heard by the City Commission on February 4, 1976.

RECESS:

Chairman Busch declared a 10 minute recess and Mr. George Ward asked to be excused from the meeting.

3. Z-61-75

ABEYANCE

Application of LAURA KELLY, DOROTHY CULLEY AND THOMAS AND GLADYS GEE for reclassification of property legally described as Lots 1 and 2, Block 1, Artesian Acres excepting the west 170 feet of the north 150 feet of Lot 1. Generally located southeast of East Bonanza Road and North Eastern Avenue extending south along Eastern Avenue 655 feet and east along Bonanza Road 629 feet.

FROM: R-E (Residence Estates)

TO: C-1 (Limited Commercial)

PROPOSED USE: NEIGHBORHOOD SHOPPING CENTER

Mr. Saylor pointed out the location of this proposed rezoning on the screen stating it is on the southeast corner of Bonanza Road, which is proposed to be a 100' wide major street and is on the Regional Streets and Highways program to be developed relatively soon, and on Eastern Avenue which is already on the program. He stated there is commercial zoning on the corner immediately east of this proposed development; there are some residential properties zoned commercial in the area, and the remainder is pretty much apartment use zoning. Across Eastern there is commercial development on both sides. Staff feels the application is in accord with the General Plan and existing zoning pattern. There were no protests on record. Staff recommended approval subject to the normal conditions. He pointed out the location of the plantings on the plot plan.

Chairman Busch declared the public hearing open and asked to hear from the applicant.

Mr. Saylor stated that staff did have some indication from the applicant that this item be held in abeyance.

The applicant was not present, and staff advised the Commission that the applicant had informally, through their agent, asked that it be held in abeyance.

Mrs. Coleman moved Z-61-75 be held in ABEYANCE until the next meeting.

The motion carried by the following vote:

"AYES": Miller, Tiberti, Jenkins, Busch, Coleman, Parker.

"NOES": None.

4. Z-62-75

APPROVED

Application of LOUIS WIENER, JR., Attorney for the Estate of FRANK FISHMAN, for reclassification of property legally described as the Southwest Quarter (SW $\frac{1}{4}$) of the Northeast Quarter (NE $\frac{1}{4}$) of Section 29, Township 20 South, Range 60 East, MDB&M. Located on the north side of Washington Avenue between Rancho Drive and Robin Street extending north 1,362 feet from Washington Avenue.

FROM: R-1 (Single Family Residence)

TO: C-1 (Limited Commercial)

PROPOSED USE: COMMERCIAL OFFICE AND RETAIL COMPLEX

Mr. Saylor pointed out the location of this application on the screen stating the parcel in question is approximately 40 acres in size and is located at the intersection of Washington Avenue and Rancho Road. Immediately to the south is the senior citizens housing project, further south the Thriftmart, and across the street is the K-Mart, Safeway and Twin Lakes Shopping Center. Immediately to the north is the LDS Church and to the east a single family home area. The General Plan does recommend a district commercial area in this general location. He pointed out the location of the proposed development, on a well-rendered plot plan, stating their only proposed access is from Washington; and they propose two driveways. He stated there is a substantial amount of landscaping, open space and an adequate amount of off-street parking. The first phase of the development is at the center portion of the property. Staff feels that the plans that have been presented are quite adequate, but staff does have some reservation about recommending approval of the entire development because we are somewhat apprehensive in terms of the totality of it. Staff would recommend the first phase be approved since to the immediate west is the Twin Lakes commercial area. We have one letter from the LDS Church saying that they have no argument if it is developed as represented. We have no protests and one letter of approval.

Mr. Tiberti asked if there was to be a block wall around the development, and Mr. Saylor stated the entire development would have a block wall.

Mr. Coleman asked if the development was done in phases, what would happen to the block wall situation.

Mr. Saylor stated as far as staff was concerned if this phase were developed and nothing further, it would back up to existing vacant land and staff would see no adverse ramifications if this phase stood on its own. If there was some other type of development taking place on the rest of it we would have to take into consideration some type of buffering. He stated staff did not feel it was necessary or feasible to attempt to request to have the block wall installed around the entire property in the initial stages.

MR. HERB JONES, Attorney, appeared stating he had a petition from the residents of the Levy Gardens with 50 people expressing approval. He stated he had five letters from the area around Dunes Drive and Tamrack Avenue and five letters from the Robin Street side. He stated an effort was made to reach most of the people in the area showing them the plan, and they had the opportunity to either reject or accept it.

He pointed out the area where the block wall would be built in the first phase of the development. He stated if it would be feasible he would like to have the entire plan approved at this meeting because the community is going through consolidation and is in a great state of flux. He stated there would be no risk to the commercial at this time to have this entire plan approved; it would all be an integral part of this development. With this particular development the developer is taking the heart out of the development in the first phase so the integrity of the plan is pretty well illustrated; they would not develop in the center and leave nothing around it in the back. He stated if there were any further questions the developer and other qualified people are here to answer any technical questions the Commission may have.

Mrs. Coleman asked if these were single story buildings.

Mr. Jones stated "yes".

Mr. Saylor pointed out the area where the commercial development was going to be, the elevations, and the types of signs. He added there was nothing showing what the screening wall would look like.

Mr. Jones stated the fence will look like the entrance sign.

Mr. Miller asked when the completion of this project was anticipated.

Mr. Jones stated the entire project would be completed within five years, give or take a year.

Chairman Busch asked if there were any protestants.

Mr. James Tolar, 1401 Mespah, appeared stating that he was not necessarily protesting but questioned if this was a speculative type situation it would be bad for the residential area around there. He asked what the time plan would be.

Mr. Jones stated that they expect to start on the first building within a matter of months.

Chairman Busch asked if this would be the trade school.

Mr. Jones stated "yes".

Mr. Tiberti asked if the fence would go along the south side and part way up the east and west sides.

Mr. Jones stated it will go all the way up and down the side and barely turn the corner on the west.

Mr. Tolar asked if the only egress into the property would be a two lane street as it exists right now going out into Washington.

Chairman Busch stated "yes".

Mr. Saylor stated that if this plan is approved they will have to widen Washington along that part where the development will take place. Eventually the total width of Washington will be 80' plus the sidewalks; there will be two traffic lanes both ways. He stated it was much more preferable to have access on Washington rather than Robin.

Mrs. Coleman stated in view of the way they are going to develop this it should be approved all at once, but she felt the approved plot plan should be limited to single story buildings.

Mr. Saylor stated the Commission could stipulate that as a condition of approval.

Mr. Jones stated he could see no problem with that condition.

Mrs. Coleman stated she felt this was a well-thought out plan and a beautifully presented plan and for that reason, the Commission in spite of staff's recommendation, sees no disadvantage to approving the whole project so she would move for approval with the stipulation the buildings be held to single story as shown on the plan and no off-premise signs be allowed on the property.

Mrs. Coleman moved Z-62-75 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. Resolution of Intent be restricted to a twelve (12) month time limit.
2. All buildings shall be limited to one-story.
3. No off-premise signs shall be allowed.
4. Dedication of 40' for Washington Avenue, 30' for Robin Street with a 15' radius corner at the intersection; half street improvements along Washington and Robin as required by the Department of Public Works.
5. Landscaping and a permanent underground sprinkler system shall be provided as required by the Planning Commission and shall be permanently maintained in a satisfactory manner. Failure to properly maintain required landscaping and underground sprinkler systems 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.
7. All mechanical equipment, air conditioners and trash areas shall be screened from view from the abutting streets.
8. Conformance to code requirements and design standards of City Departments.
9. Conformance to plot plan as amended to reflect the above conditions.

The motion carried by the following vote:

"AYES": Miller, Tiberti, Jenkins, Busch, Coleman, Parker.

"NOES": None

This item will be heard by the City Commission on February 4, 1976.

Dr. Parker asked to be excused from the meeting.

5. Z-63-75

APPROVED

Application of ROBERT T. BIGELOW for reclassification of property legally described as Lots 14, 15 and 16, Block 6, Clarks Las Vegas Townsite. Located on the northeast corner of South Main Street and Clark Avenue at 429 South Main Street.

FROM: C-M (Commercial Industrial)

TO: C-2 (General Commercial)

PROPOSED USE: APARTMENTS

Mr. Saylor stated the property is located on the west side of Main Street in a C-M zone. He stated that Mr. Bigelow has put in similar developments in the area in the past. The parking with the existing development will provide 18 spaces. There are 52 units and 44 units existing for a total of 96 units with 53 parking spaces. This vacant area was used for additional parking, and now the additional 59 units will occupy the entire area

that is now being used for additional parking. They have 92 existing units and are proposing 59 new units for a total of 155 units with only 18 parking spaces. In the past the Commission has allowed apartment house development in the downtown area on the basis of 1 parking space for every two units. Staff has no objection to the proposed development in terms of the apartments but seriously questions the adequacy of 18 parking spaces with that many units. Staff suggested that they acquire additional land for parking or reduce the number of units for more parking. He stated they had no letters of approval or protest on record.

Chairman Busch declared the public hearing open and asked to hear from the applicant.

Mr. Robert T. Bigelow, 415 South Main Street, appeared and stated he was the applicant.

Chairman Busch stated that the parking question was in everybody's mind, and he asked the size of the units.

Mr. Bigelow stated these will be studio apartments. Regarding the parking he stated that he was working on an agreement this week with the Union Pacific Railroad for more parking across the street.

Mrs. Coleman asked what would happen when the UPRR would want to build there.

Mr. Bigelow stated their plans were indefinite.

Mrs. Coleman asked how many spaces he had on his property now.

Mr. Bigelow stated there is not a specific number for each space. Presently when the lot is full there is somewhere between 10 and 15 cars there.

Mr. Jenkins asked how many more units would there be.

Mr. Bigelow stated 59 units.

Mr. Jenkins said there would only be an additional three more parking spaces. He asked about the agreement with the UPRR on the lease and how long it would be.

Mr. Bigelow said they were working on the lease to be for five years. He added upon termination of the lease they were talking about purchasing the land, and they were working on the price.

Mr. Jenkins asked what he would do if this failed.

Mr. Bigelow stated he would buy other property in this area.

Mr. Tiberti stated that Mr. Bigelow would not do something that would hurt his other apartments, and he would have to get property somewhere else down there.

Mrs. Coleman asked if there was street parking.

Mr. Tiberti stated parking is a problem with downtown property.

Chairman Busch declared the public hearing closed.

Mr. Tiberti moved Z-63-75 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. Conformance to the plot plan.
2. Dedication of 5' for Main Street and repair the damaged sidewalk along Main Street and Clark Avenue as required by the Department of Public Works.

3. Landscaping and a permanent underground sprinkler system shall be provided as required by the Planning Commission and shall be permanently maintained in a satisfactory manner. Failure to properly maintain required landscaping and underground sprinkler systems shall be cause for revocation of a business license.
4. Submittal of a landscaping plan prior to or at the same time application is made for a building permit.
5. All mechanical equipment, air conditioners and trash areas shall be screened from view from the abutting streets.
6. Conformance to code requirements and design standards of City Departments.

The motion carried by the following vote:

"AYES": Miller, Tiberti, Jenkins, Busch, Coleman.

"NOES": None.

This item will be heard by the City Commission on February 4, 1976.

6. Z-64-75

APPROVED

Application of MARVIN STRUSSER for reclassification of property legally described as Lot 1, Block 10, Huntridge Subdivision #2. Located on the southwest corner of South Maryland Parkway and Jessica Avenue at 1200 South Maryland Parkway.

FROM: R-1 (Single Family Residence)

TO: C-D (Design Commercial)

PROPOSED USE: RETAIL SALES (HOME ACCESSORIES)

Mr. Saylor pointed out the property in question and stated there is a substantial amount of C-D and P-R along Maryland Parkway. He pointed out the location of this property on the plot plan stating it was on the southwest corner of Maryland Parkway and Jessica. They are proposing to landscape on the corner, and there will be parking in the rear. He stated the existing house does not conform with C-D setback requirements; but there is additional land between the property line and the sidewalk, and from a physical appearance and standpoint it will look like he will have adequate room. He stated the elevation indicated a two-story building, but it was his understanding it was one-story. Staff recommends approval subject to the usual conditions. We have no protests or letters of approval on record.

Chairman Busch declared the public hearing open and asked to hear from the applicant.

MR. PAT NUROD, appeared representing the applicant. He stated the building would be one-story in height.

Mr. Tiberti asked what was meant by home accessories?

Mr. Nurod stated there would be in-store sales of potted plants, live greenery, dried flowers, ceramics, and some antiques and the display of the above merchandise.

Chairman Busch declared the public hearing closed.

Mr. Jenkins moved Z-64-75 be APPROVED as recommended by staff 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. Installation of a concrete sidewalk along Jessica Avenue as required by the Department of Public Works.

3. Landscaping and a permanent underground sprinkler system shall be provided as required by the Planning Commission and shall be permanently maintained in a satisfactory manner. Failure to properly maintain required landscaping and underground sprinkler systems shall be cause for revocation of a business license.
4. Submittal of a landscaping plan prior to or at the same time application is made for a building permit.
5. All mechanical equipment, air conditioners and trash areas shall be screened from view from the abutting streets.
6. Conformance to code requirements and design standards of City Departments.

The motion carried by the following vote:

"AYES": Miller, Tiberti, Jenkins, Busch, Coleman.

"NOES": None.

This item will be heard by the City Commission on February 4, 1976.

6. Z-64-75

APPROVED

Application of MARVIN STRUSSER for reclassification of property legally described as Lot 1, Block 10, Huntridge Subdivision #2. Located on the southwest corner of South Maryland Parkway and Jessica Avenue at 1200 South Maryland Parkway.

FROM: R-1 (Single Family Residence)

TO: C-D (Design Commercial)

PROPOSED USE: RETAIL SALES (HOME ACCESSORIES).

Mr. Saylor pointed out the property in question and stated there is a substantial amount of C-D and P-R along Maryland Parkway. He pointed out the location of this property on the plot plan stating it was on the southwest corner of Maryland Parkway and Jessica. They are proposing to landscape on the corner, and there will be parking in the rear. He stated the existing house does not conform with C-D setback requirements; but there is additional land between the property line and the sidewalk, and from a physical appearance and standpoint it will look like he will have adequate room. He stated the elevation indicated a two-story building, but it was his understanding it was one-story. Staff recommends approval subject to the usual conditions. We have no protests or letters of approval on record.

Chairman Busch declared the public hearing open and asked to hear from the applicant.

MR. PAT NUROD, appeared representing the applicant. He stated the building would be one-story in height.

Mr. Tiberti asked what was meant by home accessories?

Mr. Nurod stated there would be in-store sales of potted plants, live greenery, dried flowers, ceramics, and some antiques and the display of the above merchandise.

Chairman Busch declared the public hearing closed.

Mr. Jenkins moved Z-64-75 be APPROVED as recommended by staff 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. Installation of a concrete sidewalk along Jessica Avenue as required by the Department of Public Works.

4. This action shall constitute approval of an Administrative Variance for an addition to the nonconforming building on the property.
5. The building be limited to one-story.
6. Landscaping and a permanent underground sprinkler system shall be provided as required by the Planning Commission and shall be permanently maintained in a satisfactory manner. Failure to properly maintain required landscaping and underground sprinkler systems 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. All mechanical equipment, air conditioners and trash areas shall be screened from view from the abutting streets.
9. Conformance to code requirements and design standards of City Departments.

The motion carried by the following vote:

"AYES": Miller, Tiberti, Jenkins, Busch, Coleman.

"NOES": None.

This item will be heard by the City Commission on February 4, 1976.

7. Z-65-75

DENIED

Application of CHARLESTON CONTINENTAL VILLAGE, INC. for reclassification of property legally described as that portion of the east half (E½) of the southeast quarter (SE¼) of Section 31, Township 20 South, Range 62 East, MDB&M, described as follows: Commencing at the east quarter corner of said Section 31; thence S.89°10'58" west 1290.13 feet to the east 1/16 corner of said Section 31; thence S.01°27'01" west 200.01 feet to the point of beginning; thence N.89°10'58" east 1242.40 feet; thence S.02°06'10" east 160.04 feet; thence S.89°10'58" west 1114.21 feet; thence S.88°15'03" west 33.17 feet; thence N.65°55'19" west 20.00 feet; thence S.88°32'59" west 78.79 feet; thence N.01°27'01" west 153.00 feet to the point of beginning. Generally located 150 feet south of Stewart Avenue between North Lamb Boulevard and Prince Lane extending west from North Lamb Boulevard 1242 feet.

FROM: R-1 (Single Family Residence) (under Resolution of Intent to R-2 P.U.D. - Planned Unit Development)

TO: R-3 (Limited Multiple Residence)

PROPOSED USE: APARTMENTS

Mr. Saylor stated the parcel in question is just to the south of Stewart Avenue which was recently widened to 100'. Lamb is along the north boundary. Lamb Boulevard is again a major traffic carrier. This strip south of Stewart Avenue is the remainder of what had a ROI to R-2 PUD for quite some time. The southern portion has been developed in accord with that pattern. Staff finds no reason to extend our approval any further south for apartment house zoning. We feel there is adequate density permitted to them to use the R-3 PUD and staff recommends denial. There were 10 protests on record and no approvals. Many of the protests were from the property owners to the west on Prince Lane.

Chairman Busch declared the public hearing open and asked to hear from the applicant.

MR. ROBERT O'BRIEN, 512 West Charleston Boulevard, appeared. He stated he was the construction supervisor

for Ron Rudin, and they are the developers of this proposed development and as Mr. Saylor pointed out they have the strip bordering Stewart. They propose the same development on this new rezoning as was approved to the north. The proposal is for single story four-plexes.

He stated they did an extensive market analysis and they indicated that there is a growing interest in owner occupied and managed apartments in this area. These four-plexes will be built and sold. He stated the reason for this request at this time is basically that they have a master plan that indicates our thinking and our proposal for the development of the entire property. This was the time to bring this before the Board to show what we want to do. He stated they have a vested interest in this development, and they feel they have a good project. For a long time the people have looked at 40 acres of dirt; and this proposed development will have the park situated in the middle of the area, and we feel the landscaping and construction concept is acceptable and compatible with the area.

Mr. Tiberti questioned where the new plan would be located in relation to the other R-3 zoned property.

Mr. Saylor stated that it is another piece of land along the south of that property zoned R-3.

Mr. Tiberti asked the zoning of the first tier of lots on the north and asked if the existing proposal would follow the existing zoning.

Mr. O'Brien stated they are asking for the zone change on 18 lots.

Mr. Saylor stated that under the ordinance requirements this is constituted as a major change in the plan that was approved so notices must be sent out to the property owners in the area; it is a proposed major change in the plot plan. He added that they could not approve the new plot plan tonight.

Mr. Tiberti stated that he felt it was imperative to discuss the top tier of lots with the rest of the plan.

Mr. O'Brien reiterated as Mr. Saylor had stated that on Stewart Avenue they have a strip currently zoned R-3 almost ready for construction. There is an alley between this strip and their proposal, and they are asking for 18 lots to be zoned R-3 for 4-plexes. He stated he was under the impression that they could come in for a plot plan review now. He stated they are proposing to extend Quincy Street into the 40 acre development under R-2 zoning to develop single family homes on the zero lot line concept. This is a duplex with a property line running between a common wall, and it still ends up with each unit being sold as a single family dwelling. A lady from the audience asked who will maintain the common areas.

Mr. O'Brien stated the two acre park will be developed and dedicated to the City and will become a public park. There will be no home owners association, and the street work becomes compatible with the existing area.

Mr. Tiberti asked what would happen to the lots around the outside area.

Mr. O'Brien stated they would front to the interior and back up to Lamb Boulevard.

A man from the audience asked what would happen to Stewart Street.

A lady from the audience indicated that on the property on Lamb, closest to Treasure Park, the people just put up block walls, and she asked if they are going to plan on putting up another block wall or would they receive reimbursement for their block wall or would there be two block walls on their property.

Mr. O'Brien stated that would be something that we will have to work out.

A lady from the audience questioned the quality and unit size of these proposed houses, and Mr. O'Brien informed her they would range from \$28,500 to \$33,000.

A man in the audience expressed concern regarding the portion of the property that abuts Treasure Park, stating that the property is going to be elevated approximately 3 feet.

Mr. O'Brien informed the people in the audience that these people have a great stake in this property, and they are not going to build something that they cannot sell.

A lady from the audience stated that this development will cut off their view, and she also questioned the maintenance of these units.

A lady from the audience asked whether she will have to look down the alley at garbage cans, etc.

Mr. O'Brien stated the alley would be run 130' parallel and south of Stewart Street.

A lady from the audience questioned why they were asking for R-3 to go back to back and also have a high fence all around the area developed.

Mr. O'Brien stated they felt it was a sound way to go, and we saw that we could sell them. We felt it was compatible and feasible.

A lady asked where this development would border and asked if it would go as far down as Charleston Village.

Another lady asked if they would go as far down as Wales Green.

Mr. O'Brien stated "no".

MR. MORTE MORRIS, appeared in protest. He presented a petition containing 34 names. He stated there are several reasons why the Commission should adhere to the recommendation of staff, and they have been explained by staff. This is a low density neighborhood with single family to the east and west and a planned unit development to the south. There are churches in the neighborhood. He stated they would want to maintain the integrity of the neighborhood and the balance of the neighborhood and not have this rezoning allowed. He stated there would be a traffic problem in the area if this rezoning were allowed. It would cause entrance and exist problems. He stated he was advised by staff that the area required for the R-3 zoning is logically connected with the R-2 PUD development. He stated that he felt the integrity, as far as the density, should be maintained.

MS. KELLY HAMILTON, appeared in protest, stating that she was opposed to the type of ownership proposed, a quadplex type of ownership, with no homeowners association.

MS. JAN COX, 204 Prince Lane, appeared in protest. She stated her main concern was privacy and the raising of the level of the property which would invade their privacy.

R. J. LOONEY, 125 Prince Lane, appeared in protest, stating he was concerned about the elevated property and the depletion of their property values with the construction of the quadraplexes at a price of \$63,000.

A lady asked regarding the property to the south and the problems connected with it, how would they keep the weeds away from us.

Mr. O'Brien stated they are putting in a 3.2 acre park.

A lady from the audience asked regarding the utility and sewer connections and if that will affect them.

Mr. O'Brien stated that they are going to have to make provisions for that.

A lady from the audience asked if they had a building permit.

Mr. O'Brien informed her that they could not get a building permit until they get through the Planning Commission.

Chairman Busch stated he was concerned about the property south of the R-3.

A lady from the audience asked if there were any renderings or elevations.

The engineer for this development appeared and stated there were no plans for the property, and it slopes gently to the east.

A lady from the audience stated if it is higher are you going to lower it.

A lady from the audience asked where the parking was going to be for the duplexes.

Mr. O'Brien stated they are proposing 1.5 spaces per unit for the cars along the backs of the units.

Chairman Busch declared the public hearing closed.

Mr. Jenkins moved Z-65-75 be DENIED.

The motion carried by the following vote:

"AYES": Miller, Tiberti, Jenkins, Busch, Coleman.

"NOES": None.

This item will be heard by the City Commission on February 4, 1976.

8. Z-66-75

DENIED

Application of BANK OF NEVADA, Executor of the Estate of Archie C. Grant, deceased, and Trustee U/W of Zora Faye Grant for reclassification of property legally described as Lots 17, 18, 19 and 20, Block 30, South Addition. Located on the northwest corner of South 7th Street and Gass Avenue.

FROM: R-1 (Single Family Residence)

TO: R-4 (Apartment Residence)

PROPOSED USE: APARTMENTS (16 UNITS)

Mr. Saylor pointed out the location of the property on the screen stating it was at the corner of 7th and Gass. He stated the property to the South was R-4 and the property to the north and east is essentially still single family. He stated as the Commission knows it is still a fairly well-preserved single family area. He stated that staff recognized that this area will transition into other uses, other than single family, but staff does not believe that it is necessarily

advisable to allow a R-4 density. Staff has no objection to apartment use; however, we would recommend that the application be amended and approved to R-3 rather than R-4. He pointed out the location of the property on the plot plan; he stated they propose two 8-plexes with parking in the rear. He stated the elevation showed a two-story building. He stated staff recommended approval of the R-3 and denial of the R-4. He stated there were 6 protests on record and one approval.

Chairman Busch declared the public hearing open and asked to hear from the applicant.

MR. ROBERT O'BRIEN, 5112 West Charleston Boulevard, appeared and stated he was the construction supervisor. He stated Ron Rudin Realty and Construction Company are the developers of this proposed development. He stated the apartments that have been proposed to be built are all one bedroom units. He stated this particular corner is a high traffic area, and they felt that no one would purchase this property for a single family dwelling. He stated he was connected with the development of the two story eight-plex halfway down the block to the west on the same side of the street on 7th Street. He stated this would be a similar development. He stated that eight-plex was an asset to the neighborhood, and it has not caused any problems.

Mrs. Coleman asked why this proposed development was going to front on 7th instead of Gass with parking between the units and the existing house.

Mr. O'Brien stated they were placed on the lots as the plot plan indicates - one eight-plex on each lot.

Mrs. Coleman asked if they couldn't use the 25' lots without going to a high density.

Mr. O'Brien stated it is an east-west subdivision with four 25' lots.

Mrs. Martha Hunsaker, 725 South 6th Street, appeared in protest. She questioned whether this was going to be landscaped and beautified and if it was going to be built right up to the fence, to where the fence is now. She stated that corner has been a garden place. She stated he is going to remove the vines and the rose garden and the trees and shrubs. She stated that she and her husband owned apartments in 1943, and when we built we bought land zoned for apartments. She stated the area proposed for rezoning is already a busy area and for 16 cars or more using that alley entrance in and out for 24 hours a day it is going to be quite hazardous. She stated the people in the neighborhood are not very happy with this proposed rezoning, and we are the ones in the neighborhood who have had the experience with apartments. We are not saying that this will not be a very nice apartment house, but we feel the land could be put to better use rather than more apartments in that neighborhood.

MR. H. STEPHENSON, 714 South 7th Street, appeared in protest. He stated that he lives next to the property in question. He stated he has lived there 26 years, and he felt apartments were not conducive to this area. He stated if these apartments were allowed to go in he would only be able to sell his property for half of its value today. He stated he does not have too many more years to live, and there would be people going in and out all the time.

MS. MARION RUHL, appeared in protest and stated her house is across Gass, the second house on 7th Street. The existing apartment that was mentioned previously is only two doors from her property. She stated that property was supposed to have 12 parking spaces for the

eight units. She stated she is opposed to this development on the grounds that there would not be sufficient parking. She stated there is a medical center across the street, and there is a great deal of traffic and need for parking spaces. She stated the people who live in the front apartments use the street for their parking, and she stated that she could not see that this development would be that much different. She stated the parking spaces in this area are at a premium at all times. She stated there is never a time when she can park in front of her house, except on Sunday.

MR. BILL RICE, 800 South 7th Street, appeared in protest. He stated that he agreed with all the protests brought up so far, but he added that since these apartments have been built he has had to keep everything under lock and key. He stated he also objected because of the amount of traffic that would be generated.

MR. PAUL WYMER, 700 South 7th Street, appeared in protest. He stated that he objected mainly to the parking problem in the area.

MR. BOB JACKSON, 717 South 7th Street, appeared in protest stating he opposed this proposed development for the same reasons as his neighbors.

Mr. Tiberti stated we all know this cannot continue as a garden spot, and the will left it to someone else and no one is going to build a single family residence on that property. He asked what it could be, what would the neighbors think would be the right use of this property.

Mrs. Hunsaker reappeared and stated there are medical buildings and doctor's offices right across the street from Mr. Rice's home. She stated they had no objection to the traffic during the day. We object to all day and all night traffic.

Mr. Tiberti asked if they would prefer professional offices rather than apartments.

Mrs. Hunsacker stated "yes".

Mrs. Coleman stated that she went along with staff, that this is too dense a use, and she stated frankly she could not approve this particular plot plan because it was all laid out wrong.

Chairman declared the public hearing closed.

Mrs. Coleman moved Z-66-75 be DENIED.

The motion carried by the following vote:

"AYES": Miller, Tiberti, Jenkins, Busch, Coleman.

"NOES": None.

This item will be heard by the City Commission on February 4, 1976.

9. Z-66-73
USE REVIEW
APPROVED

Submitted by ROYAL CREST, INC. to allow an engineering company, Kraemer Engineering, to be located in their administrative offices at 3300 West Sahara Avenue, C-1 Zone (under Resolution of Intent).

Mr. Foster stated this property is under Resolution of Intent to commercial, and staff has no objection to this proposed use.

Mr. Tiberti moved Z-66-73 be APPROVED subject to the following condition :

10. FINAL MAP
SPANISH OAKS #3

APPROVED

1. Conformance to the plot plan.

Property generally located on the north side of El Camino Avenue east of Valley View Boulevard.
Owner/Subdivider: Collins Brothers.
NO. OF LOTS: 19

Mr. Foster stated staff recommended approval of this submitted final map as being in accord with the approved tentative map.

Mr. Jenkins moved the Final Map of Spanish Oaks #3 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. Conformance to the conditions of approval of the tentative map.
2. Street names shall be provided in accord with the Street Name Policy.
3. Conformance to code requirements and design standards of City Departments.

The motion carried by the following vote:

"AYES": Miller, Tiberti, Jenkins, Busch, Coleman.

"NOES": None.

11. Z-82-71
PLOT PLAN REVIEW

ABEYANCE

Submitted by RON RUDIN REALTY AND CONSTRUCTION COMPANY on behalf of CHARLESTON CONTINENTAL VILLAGE concerning property generally located on the west side of Lamb Boulevard between East Charleston Boulevard and East Stewart Avenue.

12. Tentative Map
Stewart Arms #2

ABEYANCE

Property generally located on the west side of Lamb Boulevard 200 feet south of Stewart Avenue.
Owner/Subdivider: Charleston Continental Village, Inc.
NO. OF LOTS: 208

Mr. Foster stated it is necessary that these two items be held in abeyance pending notification of surrounding property owners because this application is considered a major change in the proposed development plan.

Mr. Jenkins moved Z-82-71, Plot Plan Review and Stewart Arms #2, Tentative Map be held in ABEYANCE pending notification of surrounding property owners.

The motion carried by the following vote:

"AYES": Miller, Tiberti, Jenkins, Busch, Coleman, Ward, Parker.

"NOES": None.

This item will be heard by the City Planning Commission on January 27, 1976.

13. PM-32-75
Street Dedication

APPROVED

Street Dedication submitted by UNION PACIFIC LAND RESOURCES CORPORATION for Mineral Avenue generally located on the east side of Highland Avenue between Alta Drive and Bonanza Road.

Mr. Foster stated this proposed street is off Highland Drive and will provide access to two parcels to the east that are being created under a parcel map. It is a short cul-de-sac street, and staff recommends approval.

Mr. Jenkins moved PM-32-75, Street Dedication, be APPROVED subject to the street dedication as shown on the submitted parcel map.

The motion carried by the following vote:

"AYES": Miller, Tiberti, Jenkins, Busch, Coleman.

"NOES": None.

14. AV-19-75

APPROVED

Administrative Variance request submitted by FRANK F. DIXON to allow a deviation in the rear yard setback on an irregular shaped lot located at 1213 Stout Way.

Mr. Foster stated this request is to allow an addition 16' from the rear property line where 35' is required. He stated this is a five-sided lot, and staff recommends approval as submitted.

Mr. Jenkins moved AV-19-75 be APPROVED subject to the following condition:

1. Conformance to the plot plan.

The motion carried by the following vote:

"AYES": Miller, Tiberti, Jenkins, Busch, Coleman.

"NOES": None.

15. Tentative Map
Jade Park #3

APPROVED

Property generally located on the west side of Torrey Pines Drive south of Craig Road.

Owner/Subdivider: Home Savings Association
NO. OF LOTS: 40

Mr. Foster stated that this tentative map is in connection with the zoning item Z-60-75 that was approved previously in this meeting. He stated there are some revisions that need to be made with regard to the tier of lots that were approved under the zoning action. Staff sees no problems with this tentative map and recommends approval subject to the normal conditions. Any revisions to this tentative map should conform to the zoning application that has been approved.

Mrs. Coleman asked if the block wall would completely surround Mrs. LaFond's property.

Mr. Foster pointed out the property in question and stated the block wall would go around her property except along Torrey Pines.

Mr. Coleman asked if that wall will be constructed before construction starts on the mobile home park.

Mr. Foster stated it will be done in connection with the development of the units. He added that this map should be approved subject to the R-MH zoning.

Mrs. Coleman moved Jade Park #3, Tentative Map, be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. Approval of the R-MH zoning.
2. Satisfaction of the conditions of approval under Z-60-75.
3. Subdivision be redesigned as required by staff to conform to the zoning requirements under Z-60-75.
4. Street names be provided in accord with the Street Name Policy.
5. 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 carried by the following vote:

"AYES": Miller, Tiberti, Jenkins, Busch, Coleman.

"NOES": None.

This item will be heard by the City Commission on February 4, 1976.

16. Z-49-73
PLOT PLAN REVIEW

APPROVED

Submitted by VALLEY HOSPITAL MEDICAL BUILDING concerning property generally located on the northwest corner of Goldring Avenue and Shadow Lane, extending west along Goldring Avenue 101 feet and north along Shadow Lane 301 feet at 700, 716, 716½ Shadow Lane, C-1 Zone.

Mr. Foster stated that the applicant agreed to a condition that on this addition to the medical building, south of Valley Hospital, that he obtain a letter of approval from the owner adjacent to this property approving this proposed addition. The applicant cannot obtain this letter, and the application is being considered by the Board again to delete this condition. Staff sent a certified letter to Mrs. Ann Greta Jones regarding this plot plan review and received no response.

Mr. Jenkins asked Mr. Foster what staff was asking the Board to do.

Mr. Foster stated the General Plan calls for this general area to be a special activity area, and it is transitioning to quasi-public uses.

Mrs. Coleman stated on the original approval Mrs. Jones was present, and there was a great deal of discussion about this addition; she stated there was some discussion regarding a block wall.

MR. BOB RISHLING appeared and stated on the other zoning they agreed to put in evergreen trees 15' high, and they are now up to 6'-7'; this was done at the request of the lady in back of this property, and there was no objection to what we are adding.

MR. TIBERTI moved the Plot Plan Review of Z-49-73 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. Conformance to the plot plan.
2. Landscaping and a permanent underground sprinkler system shall be provided as required by the Planning Commission and shall be permanently maintained in a satisfactory manner. Failure to properly maintain required landscaping and underground sprinkler systems shall be cause for revocation of a business license.
3. Submittal of a landscaping plan prior to or at the same time application is made for a building permit.
4. All previous conditions under Z-49-73 shall be applicable.

The motion carried by the following vote:

"AYES": Miller, Tiberti, Jenkins, Busch, Coleman.

"NOES": None.

This item will be heard by the City Commission on January 21, 1976.

17. Z-100-64
PLOT PLAN REVIEW

APPROVED

Plot Plan Review submitted by DONALD L. FAIR concerning property generally located on the west side of South First Street between Lewis Avenue and Clark Avenue at 410 South First Street (under Resolution of Intent to C-2).

Mr. Foster stated that his plot plan review is in the same block as Robert Bigelow's application. He stated they propose a three-story structure with the top two floors to contain apartment-type units and the bottom floor to be used for off-street parking. He pointed out the proposed parking layout plan to the Commission. He indicated the elevation of the three-story building and pointed out its location on the screen. He stated they propose to construct the building to the property line, and in the right-of-way they will put in planters between the building and the sidewalk; he stated there is adequate right-of-way there. Staff has no objections to that type of arrangement. There is a possible 48 units and 30 off-street parking spaces which appears sufficient. Staff recommends approval subject to the usual conditions and proper landscaping being installed.

Mr. Jenkins moved the Plot Plan Review of Z-100-64 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. Conformance to the plot plan.
2. Landscaping and a permanent underground sprinkler system shall be provided as required by the Planning Commission and shall be permanently maintained in a satisfactory manner. Failure to properly maintain required landscaping and underground sprinkler systems shall be cause for revocation of a business license.
3. Submittal of a landscaping plan prior to or at the same time application is made for a building permit.
4. All mechanical equipment, air conditioners and trash areas shall be screened from view from the abutting streets.
5. Conformance to code requirements and design standards of City Departments.

The motion carried by the following vote:

"AYES": Miller, Jenkins, Busch, Coleman.

"NOES": None.

"ABSTAIN": Tiberti

This item will be heard by the City Commission on January 21, 1976.

18. AV-1-76

APPROVED

Administrative Variance request submitted by CHEQER, INC. to allow deviations in the rear yard setback on an irregular shaped lot legally described as Lot 20, Block 1, Valley West Unit #3.

Mr. Foster stated they proposed to construct this house within 23½' of the rear property line where 25' is required. Staff feels there is an adequate rear yard setback and recommends approval.

Mrs. Coleman moved AV-1-76 be APPROVED subject to the following condition:

1. Conformance to the Plot Plan.

The motion carried by the following vote:

"AYES": Miller, Tiberti, Jenkins, Busch, Coleman.

"NOES": None.

19. AR-1-76

APPROVED

Aesthetic Review submitted by AD-ART on behalf of FOXY'S concerning property located on the northeast corner of Las Vegas Boulevard South and Sahara Avenue.

Mr. Foster stated this application was approved subject to the signing being approved by the Commission. He pointed out the location and position of the signs on the building. He stated staff has no particular objections and sees no particular problems with the signs. He stated the sign on Sahara is relatively close to the curb with a 2½' setback and 3' is required. Staff recommends that one of the conditions be that they meet the setback requirement as required by the Building Department.

Mr. Tiberti moved AR-1-76 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. Conformance to the submitted sign elevations.
2. The sign shall be setback from the curb as required by the Department of Building and Safety.
3. Conformance to code requirements and design standards of City Departments.

The motion carried by the following vote:

"AYES": Miller, Tiberti, Jenkins, Busch, Coleman.

"NOES": None.

20. Z-54-74
Request for
Extension of Time

APPROVED

Request submitted by GRANT E. PARRY concerning property generally located on the southwest corner of Alta Drive and Shadow Lane at 500 South Shadow Lane.

Mr. Foster stated this property is located on the southwest corner of Alta in a P-R zone and is a request for an extension of time. The applicant has indicated in his letter he is unable to develop the property because of ill health. Mr. Foster read a portion of the letter to the Commission. Mr. Foster stated the original request allowed a twelve month time limit.

MR. GRANT E. PARRY, 500 Shadow Lane, appeared and asked if it would be possible to lift that zoning and have general P-R as has been done across the street.

Mr. Jenkins stated it would take a new application to change it.

Mr. Foster stated this would constitute a major change to the plan and would require a new public hearing. He stated this was approved for one office use only with 10 parking spaces being required. Staff did not want to extend the P-R zoning along Alta.

Mr. Parry asked if he could have a real estate office in this building with several different people.

Mr. Foster stated the condition called for one professional office in this one building, and this intent would fall within the requirement of the approval. He informed Mr. Parry he could have an insurance office and a real estate office in the building.

Mr. Parry stated that he anticipated selling this building to an accountant.

Mr. Foster informed Mr. Parry that would be permitted as long as he comes under the criteria of zoning approval.

Mrs. Coleman moved the request for Extension of Time for Z-54-74 for twelve months be APPROVED subject to the following condition :

1. All requirements imposed by Ordinances adopted subsequent to the initial approval of this application shall be adhered to.

The motion carried by the following vote:

"AYES": Miller, Tiberti, Jenkins, Busch, Coleman.

"NOES": None.

This item will be heard by the City Commission on January 21, 1976.

21. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Mr. Tiberti moved that Mr. Norm Jenkins be appointed as the new Chairman and Dr. Robert H. Parker be appointed Vice-Chairman for the Las Vegas City Planning Commission. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Coleman.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Las Vegas City Planning Commission the meeting was adjourned at 11:45 P.M.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT


DON J. SAYLOR, AIP, DIRECTOR

DJS:pdm:jp

CR
UP

Plan
Comm

January 12, 1976

CITY CLERK

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
DON J. SAYLOR, AIP, DIRECTOR

By: Harold P. Foster, Deputy Director

ELECTIONS

✓ City Manager

At a regular meeting of the City Planning Commission held January 8, 1976, the members appointed Norm Jenkins as Chairman and Dr. Robert H. Parker as Vice-Chairman.

HPF:pdm

RECEIVED
CITY MANAGER

JAN 13 1976

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

5A

CITY OF LAS VEGAS

Plan Comm

Date

INTER-OFFICE MEMORANDUM

January 12, 1976

TO: CITY CLERK	FROM: DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DON J. SAYLOR, AIP, DIRECTOR By: <i>Harold P. Foster, Deputy Director</i>
SUBJECT: ELECTIONS	COPIES TO: City Manager

*Noted on Kardex
1-13-76
mpe*

At a regular meeting of the City Planning Commission held January 8, 1976, the members appointed Norm Jenkins as Chairman and Dr. Robert H. Parker as Vice-Chairman.

HPF:pdm

RECEIVED
JAN 13 11 48 AM '76
CITY CLERK