

A G E N D A

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

January 27, 1976

RECEIVED
CITY MANAGER

01076

JAN 28 10 11 12 1 2 3 4 5 6 PM

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 meeting
of November 25, 1975.

OLD BUSINESS:

1. Z-61-75

(Abeyance from
January 8, 1976)

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

2. Z-82-71

Plot Plan Review

(Abeyance from
January 8, 1976)

Submitted by RON RUDIN REALTY AND CONSTRUCTION
COMPANY ON BEHALF OF CHARLESTON CONTINENTAL VILLAGE,
INC. to allow a major revision to the approved
development plan concerning property generally located
on the west side of Lamb Boulevard between East
Charleston Boulevard and east of Stewart Avenue in
Zoning District R-2 PUD (Resolution of Intent).

3. Tentative Map
Stewart Arms #2

(Abeyance from
January 8, 1976)

Property generally located on the west side of Lamb
Boulevard 200 feet south of Stewart Avenue in Zoning
District R-2 PUD (Resolution of Intent).

Owner/Subdivider: Charleston Continental
Village, Inc.

No. of Lots: 208

NEW BUSINESS:

1. Z-67-75

Application of NIMROD SMITH for reclassification of
property generally located on the northeast corner of
"B" Street and McWilliams Avenue, from R-4 to M.

Proposed Use: Bus Storage and Maintenance Yard
for a Private Travel Club

2. Z-68-75

Application of FIRST WESTERN SAVINGS ASSOCIATION
for reclassification of property:

Parcel 1: Generally located on the east side of
South Lamb Boulevard 700 feet north of East Charleston
Boulevard, from C-1 to R-1.

Proposed Use: Single Family Residential

Parcel 2: Generally located on the north side of
East Charleston Boulevard 1,100 feet east of South
Lamb Boulevard, from R-1 to C-1.

Proposed Use: Shopping Center

Parcel 3: Generally located on the north side of
East Charleston Boulevard 1,500 feet east of South
Lamb Boulevard, from R-3 to C-1.

Proposed Use: Shopping Center

3. Z-1-76

Application of LEWIS HOMES OF NEVADA for reclassifi-
cation of property located on the southeast corner of
Lorenzi Boulevard and the Las Vegas Expressway extending
south along Lorenzi Boulevard 380 feet and east along
the Las Vegas Expressway 1,339 feet, from R-1 to R-3.

Proposed Use: 126-Unit Two-Story Apartment Complex

4. Final Map
Charleston Rainbow
Unit No. 12-D

Property generally located south of Westcliff Drive
and west of Antelope Way in Zoning District R-1.

Owner/Subdivider: Sproul Homes of Nevada

No. of Lots: 34

5. Final Map
Charleston Rainbow
Unit No. 12-E
Property generally located south of Westcliff Drive
and west of Antelope Way in Zoning District R-1.
Owner/Subdivider: Sproul Homes of Nevada
No. of Lots: 32
6. Z-83-70
Plot Plan Review
Submitted by RICHARD SHENBERGER concerning property
located on the south side of Pennwood Avenue between
Valley View Boulevard and Arville Street at 3154
Blackford Court, R-3 PUD Zone, to allow a portion
of a carport to be enclosed for a storage room.
7. Z-21-75
Request for
Extension of Time
Submitted by GERALD MOFFITT concerning property
generally located on the southeast corner of East
Charleston Boulevard and South Sixth Street at 1001
South Sixth Street and 622 East Charleston Boulevard,
from R-1 and P-R to C-1.
No Previous Extensions
8. Tentative Map
Robarts Estates
Property generally located on the northeast corner
of Oakey Boulevard and Hinson Street in Zoning District
R-1.
Owner/Subdivider: Paul Robarts
No. of Lots: 14
9. Amended Final Map
Spanish Oaks #2
Property generally located on the north side of
El Camino Avenue east of Valley View Boulevard in
Zoning District R-PD 6.
Owner/Subdivider: Royal Crest, Inc.
No. of Lots: 27
10. Z-100-64
Plot Plan Review
Submitted by RICHARD A. DAVIS concerning property
legally described as Lots 16, 17 and 18, Block 6,
Clarks Las Vegas Townsite, located at 428 South
First Street, in Zoning District R-4 (under Resolution
of Intent to C-2).
11. Final Map
Park Bonanza East 5C
Property generally located on the east side of
Honolulu Street south of Bonanza Road in Zoning
District R-1.
Owner/Subdivider: John Kenney, Jr.
No. of Lots: 27

ML33-P69
5:976-127

MAR 22 1976

M I N U T E S
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Nevada State Library
Documents Section

January 27, 1976

Chairman Jenkins called the regular meeting of the City Planning Commission to order at 7:30 P.M. in the Commission Chambers of City Hall, 400 East Stewart Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada.

PRESENT: Chairman Jenkins, Messrs. Ward, Miller, Dr. Parker, and Mrs. Coleman.

ABSENT: Mr. Busch and Mr. Tiberti.

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

MINUTES: MRS. COLEMAN moved the minutes of the regular meeting of November 25, 1975, be APPROVED as mailed. The motion carried by unanimous vote.

OLD BUSINESS:

1. Z-61-75 Application of LAURA KELLY, DOROTHY CULLEY AND THOMAS AND
ABEYANCE 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, and generally located south-east 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

MR. FOSTER stated the applicant has submitted a letter requesting that this item be held in abeyance; and it will be placed back on the agenda when the applicant advises staff when they wish it to be considered.

2. Z-82-71 Submitted by RON RUDIN REALTY AND CONSTRUCTION COMPANY ON BEHALF
Plot Plan OF CHARLESTON CONTINENTAL VILLAGE, INC. to allow a major revision
Review to the approved development plan concerning property generally located on the west side of Lamb Boulevard between East Charleston Boulevard and east of Stewart Avenue in Zoning District R-2 P.U.D. (Under Resolution of Intent).
APPROVED

MR. FOSTER indicated this item was held in abeyance from the last meeting because it required a mandatory public hearing due to the fact the applicants were proposing a major revision to the approved development plan. The property is 30 acres in size located west of Lamb Boulevard. He pointed out the location on the screen. At the last meeting, on the strip to the north, they requested R-3 zoning because they did have R-3 zoning on the south side of Stewart to the north. The Commission recommended denial of that request, and it will go to the City Commission on the February 4 meeting. They have included that proposed R-3 strip and the balance of it in their development plan. There is an existing townhouse development to the south, some single family south of that; and to the west are single family homes all along the westerly portion of this development. There are two resolutions on the property, one for R-3 zoning; and then they came in for the townhouse development under a new application, so there is a second resolution on top of the R-3 resolution. Staff felt it should be modified or in the case of the first request, staff recommended that be rescinded. The proposed development plan submitted indicated a layout similar to a single family development. It was proposed on lots from 38' to 40' wide by 100'. They are proposing to sell the lots in fee simple. There would be a single family residence on each lot with a common wall between each two units and an open space on the opposite sides of the lots, the pattern being similar to a duplex development. It is called a zero lot line concept. They were proposing to dedicate the streets, and

the additional area you would normally find in an R-1 area for a park of approximately 2-1/2 to 3 acres in size. There were a number of adjustments staff felt should be applied as a condition if the request is approved. One was the streets which were laid out as 60' rights-of-way; they should be 51' wide since they are local streets on the interior. Staff felt the additional land could better be utilized in the lots, and possibly the area of the park could be expanded somewhat. Staff recommended the streets be reduced from 60' right-of-way to 51'. There was a condition of approval on the last resolution that covered this area and the portion developed to the south. He pointed out there was one parcel immediately to the south and west of Lamb that had not been developed yet, but it was of sufficient size so it could be developed in the future. Under that resolution there was a requirement there be a block wall along the west property line, and that would include this portion that was vacant to the south. That condition should be altered so only the block wall is applicable to this development, and when development occurs on the small parcel to the south, the 6' block wall be put in at that time. Also, there was a 25' building setback required from the R-1 lots to the west which was imposed so there would be a similar backyard from the R-1 to the townhouse concept. They propose a 20' setback, and staff felt due to the reduction of the right-of-way they would be able to pick up the 5' addition in area; and this area should be included in the rear yards which would then give them a 25' setback. Staff felt they should have the 25' setback at least along that west line. Staff also recommended the area picked up from the reduced right-of-way be placed in the rear yard areas because this would allow them to possibly have a patio cover and a little more rear yard area. Along that line of accessory buildings and patio covers, normally any change in a planned development has to come before the Planning Commission for approval. Staff recommended a condition that they allow accessory buildings, patio covers, etc. as presently provided in the Zoning Ordinance under the general provisions and the provisions in the R-1 zone. This permits a patio cover within 15' of the rear property line provided the sides are open. On the park area, staff felt if the development was constructed on a phased basis at least half of the park should be constructed with the initial phase and upon completion of the entire park area that it be dedicated to the City and meet the requirements of the Parks Director. He presented street layout designs which staff felt should be changed since the Traffic Engineer recommended they be altered. He felt staff could work it out with the developer and he recommended the driveways be worked out with staff. Since this area was initially approved as a R-2 planned development and since there is a planned development zoning district which gave them an R-PD zoning designation, staff felt this request should be given a designation of R-PD 8. The standard conditions would also apply such as conformance to the plot plan with changes staff recommended, landscaping on the park area, and possibly a typical layout of what would be proposed on the individual lots, screening of air conditioners, etc. There was no response from the property owners for the advertised public hearing. The tentative map is Item #3 on the agenda, and the Commission could take those two items as one action by placing a condition on the tentative map applying to the items covered under the zoning action. There could be a condition the map conform to the zoning action under item #2 so that it would take care of any design changes, etc. Also, there would be a requirement there be no access from the rear of the lots that abut Lamb Boulevard, and that a restriction would be placed on the plat when the final map came in.

MRS. COLEMAN asked how many exits would be on Lamb. Mr. Foster replied there were two exits. He pointed out the circulation pattern.

There was discussion concerning the R-3 proposed to the north.

MR. FOSTER indicated the request did not include the R-3, and the request was directed towards the development plan on the area south of Stewart Arms Unit I.

CHAIRMAN JENKINS declared the public hearing open.

MR. ROBERT O'BRIEN, representing Ron Rudin, appeared and indicated they were the owners and developers of the property under consideration. They had no objections to the restrictions recommended by staff. They felt this was a good design, and the modifications would make it better. They felt it was a good use of the land.

There was discussion concerning the power poles and the easement along Stewart.

VICTOR SHAW, 1444 North Lamb, appeared and asked a question concerning development of the park. He asked if they would deed the park to the City at this time, or if they would apply some time in the future to build on it.

MR. O'BRIEN indicated the only stipulations were that they had to finish the park according to City requirements, and then they would dedicate it to the City.

CHAIRMAN JENKINS indicated they were approving the plot plan as proposed at this time which included the park, and they would not be able to build on it anything other than a park.

MRS. WILLIAM FOUTZ, 4205 East Ogden, appeared in protest. She indicated the objections she and her neighbors had were the duplex concept and the sharing of a common wall between two homes. She stated they would prefer single family homes and would welcome the homes and park in the area.

MR. FOSTER explained the zero lot line concept and indicated it was similar to the development to the south.

A show of hands indicated there were eight persons protesting.

MR. EVERETT MOORE, 315 Lamb, appeared and indicated he would like to see this property developed. He expressed approval of the park development, and he felt this would improve the area.

An unidentified gentleman appeared and indicated objection because of the small lot size since he felt there was not enough parking. He felt this development would cheapen the area.

MR. FOSTER indicated they proposed two on-site parking spaces and one on-street parking space.

CHAIRMAN JENKINS declared the public hearing closed.

MRS. COLEMAN moved Z-82-71 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. The 60' streets shall be reduced to 51' and the additional land area shall be incorporated into the rear yards of the lots and into the proposed park area.
2. A twenty-five foot (25') building setback shall be provided on the lots abutting the R-1 development to the west.
3. A 6' masonry wall along the west property line shall be required on the portion of the development involved in this request only and the required block wall to the south of this development shall be constructed when that portion of the property is developed.
4. The street and lot layout and curb cut openings shall be revised as required by the Department of Community Development.
5. The overlying Resolution of Intent under Z-52-69 shall be rescinded in its entirety and the requirement for a masonry wall along the south line of this development under Z-82-71 shall be rescinded.

6. A minimum of fifty percent (50%) of the proposed park area shall be improved under the first phase of development as required by the Park Department. Upon complete improvement of the park, it shall be dedicated to the City.
7. Fences and accessory structures shall be allowed as required under the General Provisions and R-1 District regulations in the Zoning Ordinance.
8. This application shall be redesignated as a R-PD 8 development.
9. Conformance to the plot plan as amended to reflect the above conditions.
10. All mechanical equipment, air conditioners and utility meters shall be screened from view from the abutting streets.
11. Landscaping shall be provided on the individual lots as required by the Department of Community Development.
12. Conformance to code requirements and design standards of City Departments.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

"NOES": None

This item will be heard by the City Commission on February 4, 1976. Mr. Saylor indicated this was a morning meeting at 9:00 A.M.

3. Tentative Map
Stewart Arms
#2

APPROVED

MRS. COLEMAN moved the Tentative Map of Stewart Arms #2 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. Conformance to the conditions of approval under zoning action Z-82-71.
2. No access shall be allowed to Lamb Boulevard from the abutting lots.
3. Street names to be provided in accord with the Street Name Policy.
4. Approval of the tentative map shall be for no more than twelve (12) months. If a final map is not recorded on all or a portion of the area embraced by the tentative map within twelve months of approval of the tentative map, a new tentative map must be filed. If a final map is recorded within twelve months of the approval of the tentative map for only a portion of the area embraced by the tentative map, the Planning Commission may require that a new tentative map be filed and approved prior to any further final maps being approved.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

"NOES": None

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

NEW BUSINESS:

1. Z-67-75

APPROVED

Application of NIMROD SMITH for reclassification of property legally described as Lots 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12, Block 15, Original Las Vegas Townsite, generally located on the northeast corner of "B" Street and McWilliams Avenue, from R-4 to M.

Proposed Use: Bus Storage and Maintenance Yard for a Private Travel Club

MR. SAYLOR pointed out the location of the proposed development, and he indicated this area was recommended under the General Plan to transition to industrial zoning. He stated each application should be considered, however, depending on the circumstances in the vicinity. He pointed out the land uses in the area. The proposed use was for a bus storage and maintenance yard for a private travel club. He pointed out the plot plan, and he indicated they proposed a building, surfaced parking, and the storage area for the vehicles. There were no protests or approvals on record. Staff recommended approval in that it was in accord with the recommendations of the General Plan. However, staff felt some conditions should be set forth. They proposed some maintenance and also fueling at that location; and staff felt any maintenance on the vehicles should be restricted to an enclosed building, and they should not be allowed to store any junk vehicles, etc. on the outside. The normal landscaping requirements would also apply.

MR. WARD asked if they proposed a fence to shield the area.

MR. SAYLOR indicated they did not propose a fence; but the Commission could put it in as a condition, either a fence or block wall.

CHAIRMAN JENKINS declared the public hearing open.

LON CHANEY, President of Sunrise Travel Club, appeared and indicated they were proposing to put the maintenance and bus terminal there. They did intend to use a metal structure building, and they planned to fence the area. He felt this would upgrade the area. He stated they did not intend any major maintenance. They would only be parking the buses and keeping them clean, and any maintenance would be done inside. The building would be 50' X 50'. He indicated they were not familiar with the landscaping requirements. He felt they could meet the requirements.

MRS. COLEMAN asked how many buses they would have. Mr. Chaney replied presently they had four.

DR. PARKER asked if he owned the property? Mr. Chaney replied they were purchasing the property now.

DR. PARKER asked the size of the property, and Mr. Saylor indicated it was 130' X 175'.

ELMER CODLIN, 711 "C" Street, appeared in protest. He objected on the basis there were senior citizens in this area and, if this created a problem, the people would not be able to move. He pointed out the recycling plant was a problem.

CHAIRMAN JENKINS asked how much traffic would be generated from the buses.

MR. CHANEY replied they did tours for the members, mainly on weekends; and they had a bus that went out every day and came back. He didn't think it would be a problem traffic-wise. He did not feel there would be a noise problem.

MR. MILLER asked what type of fencing was proposed?

MR. CHANEY indicated he hoped they could go block. He indicated they would comply with City recommendations.

MR. SAYLOR indicated chain link fencing would be acceptable; but he would recommend it be slatted, but this could create a security problem.

CHAIRMAN JENKINS declared the public hearing closed.

DR. PARKER moved Z-67-75 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. Resolution of Intent be restricted to a twelve (12) month time limit.
2. The entire property shall be fenced to a minimum height of 6' as required by the Department of Community Development.
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 system 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 repair work shall be conducted within an enclosed building.
6. All mechanical equipment, air conditioners and trash areas shall be screened from view from the abutting streets.
7. Installation of sidewalks and street lights along "B" Street and McWilliams Avenue as required by the Department of Public Works.
8. Conformance to code requirements and design standards of City Departments.
9. Conformance to the plot plan as amended to reflect the above conditions.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

"NOES": None

This item will be heard by the City Commission on February 18, 1976.

2. Z-68-75

APPROVED

Application of FIRST WESTERN SAVINGS ASSOCIATION for reclassification of property legally described as: Parcel 1: Being a portion of the Southwest Quarter (SW $\frac{1}{4}$) of Section 32, Township 20 South, Range 62 East, MDM, more particularly described as follows: Commencing at the southwest corner of the Southwest Quarter (SW $\frac{1}{4}$) of said Section 32; thence N.01⁰47'42" West, 737.61 feet to the True Point of Beginning; thence continuing N.01⁰47'42" West, 232.81 feet; thence N.89⁰53'18" East, 730.50 feet; thence S.31⁰28'47" East, 256.84 feet; thence S.88⁰59'34" West, 857.46 feet to the True Point of Beginning, generally located on the east side of South Lamb Boulevard 700 feet north of East Charleston Boulevard, from C-1 to R-1.

Proposed Use: Single Family Residential

Parcel 2: Being a portion of the Southwest Quarter (SW $\frac{1}{4}$) of Section 32, Township 20 South, Range 62 East, MDM, more particularly described as follows: Commencing at the southwest corner of the Southwest Quarter (SW $\frac{1}{4}$) of said Section 32; thence N.89⁰53'18" East, 1,165.50 feet to the True Point of Beginning; thence continuing N.89⁰53'18" East, 377.60 feet; thence N.00⁰00'47" West, 200.00 feet; thence N.89⁰53'18" East, 168.16 feet; thence N.00⁰06'00" West, 287.39 feet to a point of curvature; thence tangent to the last named bearing, curving to the right along a curve concave

to the southeast having a radius of 571.96 feet through a central angle of $16^{\circ}44'56''$ an arc distance of 167.20 feet; thence $N.73^{\circ}21'03''$ West, 40.00 feet; thence $N.61^{\circ}05'09''$ West, 31.99 feet to a point of curvature; thence tangent to the last named bearing, curving to the left along a curve concave to the southwest having a radius of 633.70 feet through a central angle of $29^{\circ}55'17''$ an arc distance of 330.94 feet; thence $S.88^{\circ}59'34''$ West, 516.68 feet; thence $S.31^{\circ}28'47''$ East, 621.16 feet; thence $S.01^{\circ}47'42''$ East, 220.42 feet to the True Point of Beginning, generally located on the north side of East Charleston Boulevard 1,100 feet east of South Lamb Boulevard, from R-1 to C-1.

Proposed Use: Shopping Center

Parcel 3: Being a portion of the Southwest Quarter ($SW\frac{1}{4}$) of Section 32, Township 20 South, Range 62 East, MDM, more particularly described as follows: Commencing at the southeast corner of the Southwest Quarter ($SW\frac{1}{4}$) of said Section 32; thence $S.89^{\circ}53'18''$ West, 931.54 feet to the True Point of Beginning; thence continuing $S.89^{\circ}53'18''$ West, 168.46 feet; thence $N.00^{\circ}00'47''$ West, 200.00 feet; thence $N.89^{\circ}53'18''$ East, 168.16 feet; thence $S.00^{\circ}06'00''$ East, 200.00 feet to the True Point of Beginning, generally located on the north side of East Charleston Boulevard 1,500 feet east of South Lamb Boulevard, from R-3 to C-1.

Proposed Use: Shopping Center

MR. SAYLOR pointed out the location of the property and the land uses in the area. He indicated the proposed zoning pattern on this property, and he indicated they proposed immediately to go ahead with the single family home development. He indicated at this point in time there were no development plans for the commercial; however, staff felt rearranging the pattern as proposed made for better land use. The lots would back up to the commercial. The eastern boundary would be a secondary major street. The single family would back up to existing single family. A later phase would have a school site and hopefully a park site. The School District had agreed on the location of the elementary school. Staff recommended approval of the proposed pattern and felt they could also discuss the subdivision which was item #2 on the Supplemental Agenda. There were no protests or approvals on the zoning action. Staff felt there should be a block wall provided along the northern boundary of the commercial. The timing on the wall was somewhat perplexing in that the commercial development would not take place now whereas the homes were going to be built now. It was conceivable they could tie the condition in that as the commercial development took place they would have to put the wall in because by that time some of the homeowners would have gone to that expense. The Commission might wish to tie that condition into the single family development, but that would raise the price of the houses and there is a problem with the cost of houses. Staff suggested they bring in a development plan for the commercial prior to construction. He stated the alignment of Marion Drive should be worked out in conformance to the precise requirements of Public Works. Approval of the subdivision should be attached to approval of the zoning. Access should not be allowed from Lamb to these lots which do not front on Lamb. There should be a block wall along Lamb Boulevard as part of the subdivision development.

MRS. COLEMAN asked the depth of the commercial from Charleston.

MR. SAYLOR indicated it was 680'. He stated under the General Plan this was more than a general neighborhood facility. It was a district facility since staff felt the whole general area would justify a larger development than a neighborhood shopping center.

MRS. COLEMAN expressed concern about the landscaping on the LaVicio development at Charleston and Lamb.

CHAIRMAN JENKINS declared the public hearing open.

MR. DAVID WIER, VTN-Nevada, appeared representing First Western and the developer, Dasco, Inc., who would be immediately developing the subdivision. He stated they were in accord with the recommendations of staff.

MRS. COLEMAN asked if this subdivision would have the standard R-1 lots?

MR. WIER replied affirmatively.

CHAIRMAN JENKINS declared the public hearing closed.

MRS. COLEMAN moved Z-68-75 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to commencing construction on the shopping center the development plan shall be approved by the Planning Commission.
2. The dedication (40') and alignment of Marion Drive shall conform to the requirements of the Department of Public Works.
3. Dedication of an additional 10' of right-of-way on the east half of Lamb Boulevard as required by the Department of Public Works.
4. Street lighting, sidewalk improvements and 42' of street improvements shall be required on the Lamb Boulevard and Marion Drive frontages as well as curb, gutter, parking lane and street lighting improvements on East Charleston Boulevard, as required by the Department of Public Works.
5. Conformance to code requirements and design standards of City Departments.

The motion carried by the following vote:

"AYES": Parker, Jenkins, Coleman, Ward.

"NOES": None

Mr. Miller was absent for this vote.

This item will be heard by the City Commission on February 18, 1976. The Tentative Map of Stewart Place will also be heard with this item on February 18, 1976, at 7:00 P.M.

3. Z-1-76

DENIED

Application of LEWIS HOMES OF NEVADA for reclassification of property legally described as that portion of the Northwest Quarter (NW $\frac{1}{4}$) of Section 35, Township 20 South, Range 60 East, MDM, described as follows: Beginning at the northwest corner (NW Cor.) of said Section 35; thence South 01 $^{\circ}$ 17'15" East, 380.78 feet; thence North 89 $^{\circ}$ 57'32" East, 1,339.35 feet; thence North 01 $^{\circ}$ 13'00" West, 380.77 feet; thence South 89 $^{\circ}$ 57'32" West, 1,339.82 feet to the Point of Beginning; located on the southeast corner of Lorenzi Boulevard and the Las Vegas Expressway extending south along Lorenzi Boulevard 380 feet and east along the Las Vegas Expressway 1,339 feet, from R-1 to R-3.

Proposed Use: 126-Unit Two-Story Apartment Complex

MR. SAYLOR pointed out the location of the property and the land uses in the area. There were two schools in the area, O. K. Adcock Elementary School and Garside Junior High School. He indicated the Lewis Homes development in the area was subdivided but undeveloped as yet. He stated even though they requested apartment zoning on the entire piece, they proposed to develop the eastern end as single family. In 1973 the rezoning on the entire 160 acres was brought before the Commission with a request from R-E to R-1. On the northern part, from the church north, a request was submitted for apartments. Staff recommended at that time the apartment house development not be allowed but that they be granted R-1 zoning on the entire piece. There was a protest factor to the apartments. Subsequently they did accept the R-1 zoning but indicated they would request a planned unit townhouse development on the portion they had requested the apartment zoning

on previously. They did come in with a planned unit development proposal which was approved; however, it has not been developed. They indicated FHA had taken a very dim view or negative attitude of mortgage insurance on the homes immediately abutting the freeway. He thought it was FHA's position that before they would sanction a proposed FHA project, they would require that a noise impact study be made and the result of that study would dictate what would be necessary in order to make it compatible for single family homes. Staff did not feel it was fair or completely honest to say FHA would not provide mortgage insurance to homes along the freeway. Certain things could be done to obtain approval. It would delay the project because of the time involved for a noise impact statement, and the end result could put the housing out of the limits of competition. However, the applicant's position was because of the freeway and the required study and the possible ramifications, he did not feel it was feasible to develop single family. He stated from a planning viewpoint the proposal was acceptable. It was in accord with the recommendations of the General Plan in terms of density and was in accord with the recommendations of the General Plan which indicated that a mixture of different types of housing was acceptable. However, staff felt from a zoning viewpoint it was not acceptable. Staff recommended denial of the first application for apartment house zoning and felt its position was still valid, although he pointed out from a planning viewpoint it was in accord with the General Plan. He indicated there was a protest factor from many of the single family home owners in the area, and one from the LDS Church. He indicated staff found the townhouse development acceptable due to the fact that it represented a home ownership occupancy as opposed to apartments which was completely a rental type of development.

There was discussion concerning the freeway and Lorenzi Drive, and its relation to the property.

CHAIRMAN JENKINS declared the public hearing open.

MR. ROBERT LEWIS, 4701 East Monroe, appeared and indicated they felt single family homes would not be the best use of the property, and they would have difficulty selling homes next to the freeway. He indicated townhouse projects had been having problems, and they abandoned their plans for a townhouse project and proposed an apartment project. They were proposing less dwelling units than they proposed for the townhouses. He stated they felt people who would rent there would be the same type of people who would live in the houses. They planned to build middle income apartment units. They would retain ownership themselves. They would also be selling houses adjacent to the apartment development. He indicated the architect was present if the Commission had any questions. He indicated there would be one, two and three bedroom units. The one bedroom would rent for \$200 to \$225 per month.

MRS. COLEMAN asked when he planned to finish the R-1 development.

MR. LEWIS indicated hopefully within a year they would finish the property. They were building units 30 to 50 at a time depending on financing and sales. He stated they would have four tiers of houses and two streets between this project and their existing R-1 development.

SID LEVY, Maxwell Starkman, AIA & Associates, appeared and indicated the one bedroom unit would have approximately 750 sq. ft. The one bedroom and den would be 900 sq. ft., the two bedroom would be 1,050 sq. ft., and the three bedroom would be 1,250 sq. ft. Their basic concept was to come in with a split project where in this case the right half would be a family oriented area, two and three bedrooms, and the front portion would be a young adult kind of project, where no kids would be allowed, which would consist of the one bedroom, one bedroom and den, and some two bedroom units. He stated because the developer was building houses in this area, he would have to build an apartment complex that would be equivalent to his houses. He indicated the apartments would be a buffer from the freeway for the single family homes.

MRS. COLEMAN asked the breakdown on the units.

MR. LEVY indicated there were primarily two and three bedroom units. There were 40 one-bedroom and 86 two and three bedroom units. He indicated the three bedrooms would top out at \$350 to \$375 per month.

MR. MILLER asked how they intended to separate the two parcels.

MR. LEWIS indicated they intended to put in a block wall between the apartment project and the houses that would be built. They were not proposing that any traffic from the apartment project would go into the subdivision.

There was discussion concerning traffic between the two parcels. It was pointed out there would be a block wall and a landscaped buffer. The main access would be off the freeway.

ATTY. LAMAR MILLS, representing homeowners in the area, appeared and submitted a petition of 160 signatures opposing the application. He indicated not all the homeowners received notice. He indicated the homeowners, when they purchased their homes, were advised the area which was not developed would be single family units comparable to their own or a nice form of townhouse. He indicated the basic motivation of Lewis Homes was based on economic reasons. He stated the people were concerned with economic changes, having an apartment complex in their neighborhood and what it would do to their property values. He stated they were also concerned about the crime factor that often accompanied apartments. He did not feel the wall would avoid the overspill from the apartment complex. He indicated the people were concerned about traffic congestion. They were also concerned of the effect on the schools and the utilities. He pointed out some alternatives, one of which was to build a barrier or wall along the freeway and build homes. He indicated they could put in the smaller home next to the freeway with the wall. Another alternative was to put a small park along the wall that the entire neighborhood could use. This would benefit the neighborhood and Lewis Homes.

BISHOP DARWIN ALLEN, representing Las Vegas 21st Ward of the LDS Church, appeared in protest. He agreed with Mr. Mills and indicated he represented 688 people who lived and resided in the area. He indicated they were opposed to apartments. Their concern was apartments in the area would cause problems as far as vandalism to their Church which represented a great investment. They were opposed on the basis it would degrade their investment.

KEN BROWN, 6712 Copper Street, appeared in protest. He stated one of their main concerns was the quality of the neighborhood. He felt apartment complexes detract from such an area. He didn't feel there would be any difference in purchasing a home near a freeway and purchasing a home near an apartment complex. They were concerned about congestion in the area. They were also concerned with the impact on the area schools.

ART TAYLOR, appeared in protest and stated in 1973 an attorney for the School District was also protesting the application. The proposed expressway would start its turn at the corner of Torrey Pines which would not be adjacent to the property in question. He indicated at the corner they planned to put R-1 houses, which would be adjacent to the expressway.

MR. LEWIS indicated in their opinion there was not a difference between the people who would live in townhouses and those who would live in apartments.

MRS. COLEMAN asked if it was represented to the buyers when they bought the homes that this was to be a single family development or townhouse development.

MR. LEWIS indicated at that point that was what was approved there.

CHAIRMAN JENKINS declared the public hearing closed.

DR. PARKER moved Z-1-76 be DENIED. The motion carried by the following vote:

"AYES": Parker, Miller, Jenkins, Coleman, Ward.
"NOES": None

This item will be heard by the City Commission on February 18, 1976.

MR. SAYLOR indicated the attorney for the protestants did a capable job representing the position of the protestants. He stated the attorney did point out all of the property owners in the area were not notified and staff pointed out normally we go at least 400' and in this case we went as far as 700' in an attempt to make sure adequate home ownership did get represented. In areas of new development sometimes the Tax Assessor's books do not keep up to date on the transactions and we get our list from the Assessor. He indicated some of the notices were hand-delivered.

4. Final Map Property generally located south of Westcliff Drive and west
Charleston of Antelope Way in Zoning District R-1.
Rainbow Owner/Subdivider: Sproul Homes of Nevada
#12D No. of Lots: 34

APPROVED

and

5. Final Map Property generally located south of Westcliff Drive and
Charleston west of Antelope Way in Zoning District R-1.
Rainbow Owner/Subdivider: Sproul Homes of Nevada
#12E No. of Lots: 32

APPROVED MR. FOSTER indicated these two final maps were in accord with the approved tentative maps and staff recommended approval subject to the normal conditions.

MRS. COLEMAN moved the Final Maps of Charleston Rainbow #12D and Charleston Rainbow #12E be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. Street names to be provided in accord with the Street Name Policy.
2. Conformance to code requirements and design standards of City Departments.

The motion carried by the following vote:

"AYES": Miller, Parker, Jenkins, Coleman, Ward.
"NOES": None

6. Z-83-70 Submitted by RICHARD SHENBERGER concerning property located on
Plot Plan the south side of Pennwood Avenue between Valley View Boulevard
Review and Arville Street at 3154 Blackford Court, R-3 P.U.D. Zone,
to allow a portion of the carport to be enclosed for a storage
room.

APPROVED

MR. FOSTER indicated this was a minor change to the approved plot plan in Bradford Place Subdivision. He pointed out the location and indicated the applicant was requesting he be allowed to reduce the size of his parking space under the carport area. He pointed out the plot plan. He stated a fire destroyed some carports in this subdivision and the contractor rebuilt the carports. Prior to the fire, the applicant had a storage unit that was fastened to the wall, and it was a sufficient distance above the ground that he could drive a vehicle underneath it. When the carport was rebuilt, after the fire, he constructed a storage room to the floor which meant a large

vehicle would not be able to pull fully into the carport area. A portion of the car would protrude into the common driveway. As a result of that construction, there was a complaint to the City that this building had occurred; and the Building Department put a stop to the development, and he is requesting he be allowed to retain that storage facility. He indicated his two vehicles could pull fully into the carport area and would not protrude into the driveway area because one was a compact car. Staff, in evaluating the request, realized it was a minor type item but staff felt because of the trend of vehicle manufacturers towards compact cars more than likely there will be more compact cars in the future, and possibly staff may make adjustments in the parking spaces in apartment complexes, planned developments, etc. to accommodate compact cars in spaces that would be somewhat smaller than the 9' X 20' size that is now required. Staff has no objection to the request.

MRS. COLEMAN indicated she thought the homeowners association would take care of problems like this.

MR. FOSTER indicated the applicant had taken it to the homeowners association and obtained approval from them. Because the approved plot plan under the zoning action requires two full stalls, he could not alter that requirement without approval of the City.

MRS. COLEMAN asked if they could make it a condition he could keep the storage place as long as no car obstructed the driveway.

MR. RICHARD SHENBERGER, 3154 Blackford Court, appeared and indicated he did submit the plans for the storage facility to the architectural committee of the homeowners association for their review and approval. He indicated he was a member of that committee. He stated they did approve this on the condition the vehicles did not block the driveway.

MRS. COLEMAN indicated there should be a condition that the car parked in this space not protrude into the driveway.

MR. MILLER moved Z-83-70 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. Conformance to the plot plan.
2. No vehicle parked in front of the storage room facility shall protrude into the driveway.

The motion carried by the following vote:

"AYES": Miller, Parker, Jenkins, Coleman, Ward.
"NOES": None

7. Z-21-75 Extension of Time Submitted by GERALD MOFFITT concerning property located on the southeast corner of East Charleston Boulevard and South Sixth Street at 1001 South Sixth Street and 622 East Charleston Boulevard, C-1 Zone.

APPROVED
6 Months

MR. FOSTER pointed out the location and indicated they had a development plan submitted for an office building. He pointed out the layout of the development. They had a six month time limit on the approval, and they were requesting an additional six month time period. They indicated they were about ready to proceed on the development. He stated they had requested a plot plan review; but he indicated there possibly would be some other adjustments so rather than acting on the plot plan change, the applicant asked it be held and action be taken only on the extension of time.

MRS. COLEMAN asked if they had built the block wall yet.

MR. FOSTER indicated that would go in when the development commenced on the property. He indicated the City Commission requested a six month time limit be placed on the overall zoning action.

MR. JOE JOHNSTON, appeared and indicated they would like a year extension. They were presently negotiating with Nevada National Bank and they presented the building plans, etc.

There was discussion concerning the fence.

MRS. COLEMAN moved a six month extension of time on Z-21-75 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, Parker, Jenkins, Coleman, Ward.

"NOES": None

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

8. Tentative Map
Robarts Estates
- Property generally located on the northeast corner of Oakey Boulevard and Hinson Street in Zoning District R-1.
Owner/Subdivider: Paul Robarts
No. of Lots: 14

APPROVED

MR. FOSTER pointed out the location of the property and stated the zoning was R-1. The proposed map was to divide the land. There was one cul-de-sac coming off Hinson, and the zoning action required a block wall along Oakey. They were proposing a planter in the center of the cul-de-sac street. This would have to meet the Park Department requirements. The cul-de-sac was 425' long. The Ordinance required a maximum of 400'. The Commission could waive the provision and allow a greater length. Staff felt in this case it was justified and would recommend approval of that variance and the normal conditions of the tentative map.

MRS. COLEMAN asked if there was a condition there be no access from Hinson and all access be from Oakey?

MR. FOSTER indicated it was the opposite situation that all access come from Hinson. Staff felt this was preferable.

DR. PARKER moved the Tentative Map of Robarts Estates be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. Waiver of the 400' cul-de-sac length.
2. Construction of a 6' masonry wall along Oakey Boulevard.
3. The proposed median planter in the cul-de-sac street shall conform to the requirements of the Park Department and the Public Works Department.
4. Approval of the tentative map shall be for no more than twelve (12) months. If a final map is not recorded on all or a portion of the area embraced by the tentative map within twelve months of approval of the tentative map, a new tentative map must be filed. If a final map is recorded within twelve months of the approval of the tentative map for only a portion of the area embraced by the tentative map, the Planning Commission may require that a new tentative map be filed and approved prior to any further final maps being approved.
5. Street names to be provided in accord with the Street Name Policy.

The motion carried by the following vote:

"AYES": Miller, Parker, Jenkins, Coleman, Ward.
"NOES": None

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

9. Amended Final Map Spanish Oaks #2
Property generally located on the north side of El Camino Avenue east of Valley View Boulevard in Zoning District R-PD 6.
Owner/Subdivider: Royal Crest, Inc.
No. of Lots: 27

APPROVED

MR. FOSTER indicated this was an adjustment to the lot lines to make some lots a little larger in the Spanish Oaks development. It conforms to the approved tentative map and staff recommended approval subject to the normal conditions.

MRS. COLEMAN asked how much bigger the lots would be.

MR. FOSTER indicated 5' or 6' wider.

MR. MILLER moved the Final Map of Spanish Oaks #2 (Amended) be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. Street names to be provided in accord with the Street Name Policy.
2. Conformance to code requirements and design standards of City Departments.

The motion carried by the following vote:

"AYES": Miller, Parker, Jenkins, Coleman, Ward.
"NOES": None

10. Z-100-64 Plot Plan Review
Submitted by RICHARD A. DAVIS concerning property legally described as Lots 16, 17 and 18, Block 6, Clarks Las Vegas Townsite, located at 428 South First Street, in Zoning District R-4 (under Resolution of Intent to C-2).

APPROVED

MR. FOSTER indicated this applicant was before the Commission at the last meeting for the same type of development to the north of this property. He pointed out the location of this property. He stated it was for a three-story apartment development that had the ground floor containing 30 spaces for parking and the top two floors for apartment units. This building is proposed to extend to the front property line. There is sufficient area in the public right-of-way for landscaping. That was what was required on the previous one. Staff recommended it on this one. There was a setback area along the Clark Avenue side of the property, and staff recommended landscaping along that side.

MRS. COLEMAN asked if they would remove the existing building?

MR. FOSTER replied affirmatively. It would extend to the alley.

MRS. COLEMAN moved Z-100-64 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. Landscaping shall be provided along the South First Street and Clark Avenue sides of the property as required by the Department of Community Development.
2. Submittal of a landscaping plan prior to or at the same time application is made for a building permit.
3. All mechanical equipment, air conditioners and trash areas shall be screened from view from the abutting streets.
4. Conformance to the plot plan to reflect the above conditions.

5. Conformance to code requirements and design standards of City Departments.

The motion carried by the following vote:

"AYES": Miller, Parker, Jenkins, Coleman, Ward.
"NOES": None

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

11. Final Map
Park
Bonanza
East 5C
- Property generally located on the east side of Honolulu Street south of Bonanza Road in Zoning District R-1.
Owner/Subdivider: John Kenney, Jr.
No. of Lots: 27

APPROVED

MR. FOSTER indicated this map conformed to the approved tentative map. He pointed out the location. He stated the lots were relatively shallow along the north tier having a depth of 87'. They had a strip of land 300' to 400' wide between the parcel of land owned by the School District and the Cedar Avenue drainage channel. They worked out the best depth they could on the development. He stated the north tier was 87' and the south tier was 95' by 69' to 70' wide. They have sufficient area to meet the Ordinance of 6,500 sq. ft. However, the applicant had submitted a plot plan showing the position of the homes on the property, and there were 12 to 13 homes along the north side which did not meet the required rear yard setback. This type of a deviation from the Ordinance cannot be allowed under the subdivision approval; and if there is to be any deviation in the rear setback, it would have to be by means of a variance application. Staff recommended approval of the submitted map, but he indicated the approval did not constitute approval in terms of setback deviations.

There was discussion about the depth of the lots and the setbacks.

MRS. COLEMAN moved the Final Map of Park Bonanza East 5C be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. The subdivision approval does not constitute approval of any required building setback variations.
2. Street names to 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, Parker, Jenkins, Coleman, Ward.
"NOES": None

12. Z-5-66
Plot Plan
Review
- Submitted by ROBERT W. COX, JR. concerning property legally described as Lot 346, Block 17, Hyde Park #3, located at 4516 West Charleston Boulevard in Zoning District R-1 (under Resolution of Intent to P-R).

APPROVED

MR. FOSTER indicated this property was under Resolution of Intent to P-R. They wished to convert to an office use. He pointed out the location and the plot plan which showed the existing building. There was an existing circular driveway and adequate landscaping. Staff would like to preserve the existing landscaping as much as possible. The building size dictated a minimum of three off-street parking spaces and it was felt these could be provided on the existing surfaced area. Staff recommended approval subject to retention of the existing landscaping and the parking layout being satisfactory to the Department of Community Development and the normal P-R requirements.

MRS. COLEMAN moved Z-5-66 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. All required off-street parking shall be provided as required by the Department of Community Development.
2. The existing landscaping shall be preserved in the front yard area except for minor adjustments necessary for the required off-street parking.
3. Submittal of a landscaping plan prior to or at the same time application is made for a building permit or prior to a business license being approved on the property.
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.
6. Conformance to the plot plan as amended to reflect the above conditions.

The motion carried by the following vote:

"AYES": Miller, Parker, Jenkins, Coleman, Ward.
"NOES": None

13. Tentative
Map
Stewart
Place

MRS. COLEMAN moved the Tentative Map of Stewart Place be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

- APPROVED
1. Subject to R-1 zoning.
 2. Conformance to the requirements of the Department of Public Works relative to the alignment and dedication of Marion Drive.
 3. No access shall be allowed to Lamb Boulevard from the abutting lots.
 4. Construction of a 6' masonry wall along Lamb Boulevard and along the south line abutting the commercial zoning as required by the Department of Community Development.
 5. Street names to be provided in accord with the Street Name Policy.
 6. 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": Parker, Jenkins, Coleman, Ward.
"NOES": None

Mr. Miller was absent for this vote.

This item will be heard by the City Commission on February 18, 1976.

See item #2 under New Business for discussion regarding this item.

14. Final Map Request by BECKER AND SONS to delete the sidewalks and to allow a roll-type curb on the approved final map on property generally located on the south side of Smoke Ranch Road east of Torrey Pines Boulevard, in Zoning District R-PD 8 (Resolution of Intent).

APPROVED Owner/Subdivider: Becker & Sons
No. of Lots: 36

MR. FOSTER indicated this was a waiver of the subdivision requirements. He pointed out the location of the subdivision. He indicated the lots were 35' X 100'. The applicant was requesting they be allowed to waive the sidewalk requirements under the Subdivision Ordinance and were requesting to alter the curb from the "L"-type curb to a roll-type curb. Staff contacted Public Works on this matter. They recommended there be no waiver granted. Staff had no objection to the roll-type curb; however, they felt the sidewalk should be constructed to the full width on both sides.

MRS. COLEMAN asked the reason for the roll-type curb.

MR. ERNEST BECKER, SR., appeared and explained the reason for the roll-type curb. He indicated it would give more parking space.

MRS. COLEMAN asked if the sidewalk requirement were waived, would that area be included in the lots.

MR. BECKER indicated it would still be dedicated to the City, and it would be a dedicated street.

There was discussion concerning the additional property gained by eliminating the sidewalks. This would only apply to the cul-de-sac areas.

There was also discussion concerning the parking and fencing and landscaping.

MR. BECKER indicated they were trying to keep the cost of the houses down, and he would not mind putting the money away to put the sidewalk in; but he would like to see if it were feasible.

MRS. COLEMAN expressed concern about the roll-type curb with people driving vehicles into the front yards.

DR. PARKER moved the request concerning Final Map Charleston Heights Unit #51-A, Unit 1, be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. Posting a bond for the installation of the sidewalks.
2. A review be conducted by the Planning Commission within one (1) year to determine if sidewalks should be installed in the cul-de-sac and if it was found that sidewalks are needed the developer will be required to install them. If it was found there is no need for the sidewalks after this review period the bond posted for the sidewalks shall be released.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

"NOES": None

15. AV-2-76 Administrative Variance request submitted by EDMUND WARREN to allow an addition to a nonconforming residential structure in a C-2 zone on property located at 615 Willow Trail.
- APPROVED

MR. FOSTER indicated this was in the commercial area west of Rancho Drive. There was residential on both sides of Willow Trail. Residential use is not allowed in a commercial zone. The applicant wished to construct a small addition to the

existing residence. Staff recommended approval.

MR. MILLER moved AV-2-76 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. Conformance to the submitted plot plan.
2. Conformance to code requirements and design standards of City Departments.

The motion carried by the following vote:

"AYES": Miller, Parker, Jenkins, Coleman, Ward.
"NOES": None

DIRECTOR'S
BUSINESS:

1. Discussion Proposed amendment to Zoning Ordinance relative to ambulance facilities.

MR. FOSTER indicated staff had a request from the Commission to determine if there should be an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance requiring that ambulance facilities be located in a C-M zone. Prior to proceeding, the Commission requested that staff contact the ambulance operators and obtain their comments on the proposed amendment. Staff contacted two companies. Mercy was the only ambulance service in the Las Vegas area that provided emergency service, and there was a non-emergency type ambulance service. The non-emergency type indicated since the proposed amendment did not apply to their operation they had no feelings one way or the other. Staff did receive a letter from Mercy which was distributed to the Commission which in essence objected to the proposed amendment. He indicated in the letter they would be obligated to move to another location within a year, and he was entering into some type of lease negotiations for property on Highland Drive, south of Charleston. Staff informed him the property he was negotiating on was presently zoned P-R; however, there was commercial zoning to the north and to the south. It was more than likely destined for C-1 zoning. The on-ramp to the freeway was just south of the proposed location. He indicated there was a plot plan review to make changes on the property they were speaking of; and if the property were rezoned to commercial, it could be controlled under the zoning action. Basically, staff put this item on the agenda to bring the Commission up to date on the position of the main ambulance operation which provided emergency service in the area. There was some residential zoning and development west of Desert Lane. Staff did not feel the new location would be a problem as far as noise.

MRS. COLEMAN indicated since she brought this up they had not been dispatching from the West Charleston location. She questioned if the property they were proposing to use was large enough. She indicated the location on Highland would be easier for them to exit from. She indicated she would like to hold this item in abeyance until the next meeting to review the letter from Mercy Ambulance.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 9:45 P.M.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT


DON J. SAYLOR, AIP, DIRECTOR

DJS:bjw:pdm

AK

Alman
Com

January 27, 1976

JOE MAST
REPRO-GRAPHICS DEPARTMENT

RECEIVED
CITY MANAGER
JAN 27 1976

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
Harold P. Foster, Deputy Director

VOTING SIGN IN
COMMISSION CHAMBERS

City Manager

AM
7.8.9.10.11.12.1.2.3.4

Would you please change the sign in the Commission Chambers
which shows the vote of an action to the public to read as
follows:

- Miller
- Tiberti
- Parker
- Jenkins - Chairman
- Busch
- Coleman
- Ward

HPF:pdm