

RECEIVED
CITY MANAGER

A G E N D A
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

FEB 05 1976

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

February 12, 1976

CALL TO ORDER:

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

ROLL CALL:

NEW BUSINESS:

1. Z-2-76
Application of the BANK OF NEVADA (TRUSTEE) AND RAE ANN TRITLE (CO-TRUSTEE) for reclassification of property located between Vegas Drive and West Washington Avenue and approximately 104.85 feet west of Pyramid Drive and having approximately 675 feet of frontage on Vegas Drive and West Washington Avenue, from R-E to R-1.
Proposed Use: Single Family Homes
2. Z-3-76
Application of LOUIS MACK AND HARRY MACK for reclassification of property located on the east side of McLeod Street between Sahara Avenue and Holly Hill Avenue beginning 230 feet north of East Sahara Avenue and extending north along McLeod Street 413 feet, from R-1 to C-2.
Proposed Use: Motor Pool Facility for the Federal Government consisting of Vehicle Storage, Limited Automotive Repair, Laundering and Servicing.
3. Z-4-76
Application of JOHN PAPPAS AND CAROL J. PAPPAS for reclassification of property located on the east side of North Rancho Drive between West Washington Avenue and Ernest May Lane at 840 North Rancho Drive, from C-1 to C-2.
Proposed Use: Used Car Sales
4. Tentative Map
Charleston Heights
Tract No. 53
Property generally located south of Cheyenne Road between Jones Boulevard and Michael Way in Zoning District R-E.
Owner/Subdivider: Becker & Sons
No. of Lots: 158
5. Final Map
Charleston Heights
Tract No. 53-A
Property generally located south of Cheyenne Road between Jones Boulevard and Michael Way in Zoning District R-E.
Owner/Subdivider: Becker & Sons
No. of Lots: 43
6. Tentative Map
Charleston Rainbow #14
Property generally located south of Westcliff Drive and east of Buffalo Drive in Zoning District R-1.
Owner/Subdivider: Sproul Homes of Nevada
No. of Lots: 152
7. Tentative Map
Lewis Homes Sahara #1
Property generally located south of Oakey Boulevard and west of Jones Boulevard in Zoning District R-PD 5.
Owner/Subdivider: Lewis Homes
No. of Lots: 32
8. Final Map
Lewis Homes Sahara #1
Property generally located south of Oakey Boulevard and west of Jones Boulevard in Zoning District R-PD 5.
Owner/Subdivider: Lewis Homes
No. of Lots: 32

9. SO-1-76

Request submitted by WATKINS DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION for temporary sales offices at 801 and 805 Watkins Drive and a construction office at 713 Watkins Drive in conjunction with the Watkins Manor No. 1 Subdivision in Zoning District R-1.

10. AR-3-76

Aesthetic Review on the application submitted by D. K. SEYMOUR CONSTRUCTION & DEVELOPMENT, INC. for a proposed commercial storage unit complex concerning property generally located southeast of North "A" Street and West Owens Avenue in Zoning District M.

11. A-1-76

Annexation Petition submitted by MARTIN F. & ZERNA BRODKIN, ET AL, for approximately 150 acres of land located northwest of Vegas Drive and Jones Boulevard.

12. AR-4-76

Aesthetic Review submitted by TOTO PURCHASING AND SUPPLY CO., INC. concerning property located at 275 South Highland Drive in Zoning District M.

13. Z-13-74
Plot Plan Review

Submitted by CLIFFORD MILLER to allow a temporary trailer to be used for security purposes in connection with the Carpenters Training Center on property located at 4150 East Bonanza Road in Zoning District C-1.

DIRECTOR'S BUSINESS:

1. Discussion
ABEYANCE from 1/27/76
Meeting
2. Discussion

Proposed amendment to Zoning Ordinance relative to ambulance facilities.

Street Planting for Eastern Avenue

MINUTES

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

February 12, 1976

Chairman Jenkins called the regular meeting of the Las Vegas 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. Tiberti, Miller and Mrs. Coleman.

ABSENT: Vice-Chairman Parker, Mr. Busch and Mr. Ward.

STAFF PRESENT: Don J. Saylor, AIP, Director of Community Development
Harold P. Foster, Deputy Director of Community Development
Howard A. 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 December 11, 1975, be APPROVED as mailed. The motion carried by unanimous vote.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. Z-2-76

APPROVED

Application of the BANK OF NEVADA (TRUSTEE) AND RAE ANN TRITLE (CO-TRUSTEE) for reclassification of property legally described as the West Half ($W\frac{1}{2}$) of the East Half ($E\frac{1}{2}$) of the Northeast Quarter ($NE\frac{1}{4}$) of Section 30, Township 20 South, Range 61 East, MDB&M, excepting therefrom the following described parcels. Parcel A: A portion of the Southwest Quarter ($SW\frac{1}{4}$) of the Southeast Quarter ($SE\frac{1}{4}$) of the Northeast Quarter ($NE\frac{1}{4}$) of Section 30, Township 20 South, Range 61 EAST, MDB&M, more particularly described as follows: Commencing at a point in the north property line of Washington Avenue which coincides with the southeast corner of the Twin Lakes Country Club Estates Subdivision No. 1; thence N.00°02'40" West, 170.00 feet to the TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING; thence N.00°02'40" West, 210.00 feet; thence N.88°58'40" East, 311.02 feet; thence S.00°02'40" East, 210.00 feet; thence S.88°58'40" West, 311.02 feet to the TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING. Parcel B: A portion of the Northwest Quarter ($NW\frac{1}{4}$) of the Northeast Quarter ($NE\frac{1}{4}$) of the Northeast Quarter ($NE\frac{1}{4}$) of Section 30, Township 20 South, Range 61 East, MDB&M, more particularly described as follows: Commencing at the northwest corner of the Northeast Quarter ($NE\frac{1}{4}$) of the Northeast Quarter ($NE\frac{1}{4}$) of said Section 30; thence N.88°37'10" East, 200.00 feet; thence S.00°02'40" East, 40.01 feet to the TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING; thence continuing S.00°02'40" East, 200.00 feet; thence N.88°37'10" East, 100.00 feet; thence N.00°02'40" West, 200.00 feet; thence S.88°37'10" West, 100.00 feet to the TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING. Located between Vegas Drive and West Washington Avenue and approximately 104.85 feet west of Pyramid Drive and having approximately 675 feet of frontage on Vegas Drive and West Washington Avenue, from R-E to R-1.

Proposed Use: Single Family Homes.

MR. SAYLOR pointed out the location of the property in question and stated the parcel runs south from Vegas Drive to Washington Avenue with the Twin Lakes Shopping Center and other commercial development to the east and single family development to the west and south. There is also a portion of The Municipal Golf Course abutting this property to the west. This application is bordered on the north by Vegas Drive, which is a major street, and on the south by Washington Avenue, which is a secondary major. He stated the existing zoning pattern is R-1, and this proposed rezoning is an appropriate zone and is in accord with the surrounding zoning and development patterns with the exception of property on the north of Vegas Drive which is ranch estates and is located in the County. He stated that staff recommends approval because of the obvious compatibility with the existing

zoning pattern in the area. He stated staff has one letter of approval and three letters of protest on record. He stated one of these letters was from a property owner on the Vegas Drive side of the property which is all single family, one-story homes. He added that in any residential zoning, two-story homes are permitted. He stated there is a stub street access to the east and one to the west in subdivisions which are not before the Planning Commission at this time. He stated that he felt it was appropriate in design and it will not provide a straight through access from Vegas Drive to Washington; this would reduce the possibility of people using this street as a shortcut. He stated there is a parcel to the north, which is not a part of this proposal, which is about an acre in size with a new home on it; and there is a parcel further south which is at least 3-4 acres in size and also not a part of this development with this subdivision having to be designed around it.

MRS. COLEMAN asked if the area to the south was all Twin Lakes houses?

MR. SAYLOR stated "no", that this was going to be part of this development.

There was further discussion regarding the location of the Tritle house, and Mr. Herbert pointed out its location on the screen.

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

MR. HAROLD SHYDLER, President of the Crestmont Corporation, appeared representing the applicant. He stated he has had several conferences with the neighbors on the Ironwood side of this development, and they have agreed with them on several things. He stated that some of the points that were agreed to were that they would build only one-story homes on those lots which abut the Twin Lakes Country Club Estates subdivision and they agreed to maintain the line of sight of the homes built on the second tier of lots with this line of sight being 5' above the floor level. He stated that this sight line will go across the ridge of the one-story homes that they are building and any construction that is done on the opposite side of the street will be within that height limit. He explained further agreements regarding the sight restrictions on the lots adjacent to the Twin Lakes Country Club Estates. He stated the plan before the Planning Commission now calls for a street to come in from the west off Gold Lane and turn north and run parallel to the west line of the subdivision, then it is proposed to turn to the east and cross the subdivision into a street running back to the south parallel to the east line of the subdivision. He stated there will be no access provided to Vegas Drive. Based on the arrangement, they have agreed to establish lots at a minimum width of 90' along the west side of their north/south street adjacent to Ironwood, extending to a point approximately 600' from the south line of the golf course and on the east side of that street he stated they will maintain the 90' width on the lots until they reach a point one lot north of the Twin Lakes residences. He stated that based on those considerations and they agreed to meet the requests from the property owners on Ironwood.

MRS. COLEMAN asked if they intended to keep the same grade on the land?

MR. SHYDLER stated that about half way from Washington the property slopes from Ironwood. It is about 4' below the level of Ironwood. Going south he stated that there is a little different situation and the ground is fairly close to the same level as Ironwood. He stated that they don't intend to raise the level of the property.

MRS. COLEMAN asked about the drainage situation, stating that a resident on Pyramid had his backyard washed out in the last rain.

MR. SHYDLER stated that the streets in their subdivision should carry most of that water. He stated the water that caused that problem came off Vegas Drive, and there was a lot of water moving across the golf course during the flood. He added that these problems will be worked out.

MR. CHARLES JOHNSON appeared and stated there has been an agreement made between a group of people who met with Mr. Shydler last week and they discussed such concerns as lot sizes, two-story homes, through traffic through the development, etc. He stated that Mr. Shydler, who is the proposed developer, has met these objections to their satisfaction, and he has set forth in a letter dated February 10, 1976, in detail, these agreements. He added that staff has been supplied a copy of this letter. He stated they would have no objection to the approval of the zoning subject to the conditions of this letter.

MS. ELLEN OTTOSEN, 1352 Pyramid, appeared in protest stating she felt these houses proposed for development would depreciate their homes.

MRS. COLEMAN asked what the size of their lots were.

MS. OTTOSEN stated 95' wide and about 120' in depth.

CHAIRMAN JENKINS stated that normally in a R-1 subdivision a lot is 65' wide. He added that he felt this development was going to be basically the same type of development.

MR. SAYLOR stated that the minimum lot size in a R-1 development is 65' X 100' lots and he added to the west are large lots which are R-1 zoned. He stated there would be no guarantee as to the cost of the housing.

MS. OTTOSEN stated they have spent a lot of money in their home and they didn't want cheaper houses built in their area.

MR. SAYLOR asked Mr. Shydler what the approximate price range would be of his houses?

MR. SHYDLER stated at this time he wouldn't like to commit himself on the type of home. He stated the lowest price at this particular point, unless something drastically changes, will be higher than house values in that general area.

MRS. COLEMAN asked what the approximate square footage would be in those houses abutting the Twin Lakes Country Club Estates?

MR. SHYDLER indicated they will be of a comparable size to the Twin Lakes houses or larger. He stated that they wouldn't do anything that would be detrimental to the Twin Lakes Country Club Estates.

MR. MILLER asked how many lots are involved?

MR. SHYDLER replied approximately 147, more or less. There are 37½ acres of land, and there could be 148 lots.

CHAIRMAN JENKINS asked if there were any complete plans drawn? He further asked if there were any footage figures, total costs and breakdowns?

MR. SHYDLER stated there were no plans at this time, but he added that the least expensive house would be in excess of \$30,000.

CHAIRMAN JENKINS asked how long would it be before they would start construction if this rezoning was granted?

MR. SHYDLER indicated they would start in June. He stated they would have to get approval of their tentative map plans and environmental impact items; they would have to have time to put it together.

CHAIRMAN JENKINS stated at the time of the plot plan review the Commission could re-evaluate the lot size.

MR. SAYLOR informed the Commission that the only thing before them was a change in zoning from R-E to R-1. He added that somewhere in the future the applicant will come in with a subdivision map. He added, in reference to the letter submitted, that staff would hesitate to recommend all the conditions in the letter being attached to the rezoning. He stated that he felt that this was more in the form of a private agreement between the private property owners and the developer. He stated there is R-1 development on three sides and all the Commission has before them is the request for R-1. He added that this is in consonance with the zoning pattern.

MRS. COLEMAN asked if the agreement could be taken into consideration at the time the subdivision comes in.

MR. SAYLOR stated "yes".

MS. MARY B. GARDNER, 3916 Vegas Drive, appeared and stated that she does approve of this rezoning application request, but she wanted the Commission to realize that the approximately 200' deep lots between Mountain Trail to Sunset Avenue are zoned C-2 commercial and have been for several years. She stated that a few weeks ago she was informed that no new living quarters could be there, only stores.

MR. SAYLOR stated that was accurate, and they couldn't build homes in a commercial zone.

MR. HERBERT stated that area is in the County and is zoned C-2 commercial.

MS. GARDNER stated that one street is partly in the City and zoned commercial and everything else is zoned R-E.

MR. DAVE SIEGEL, 1201 Pyramid, appeared and asked if the brown line on the map was the street proposed through the center of the development?

CHAIRMAN JENKINS stated that the street into the project will be in the center of the project and enter from Washington. He stated there will be no exit to Vegas Drive.

MR. SAYLOR stated there will be a row of lots backing up to the lots on Pyramid.

MR. SIEGEL stated that he didn't want to back up to a street.

CHAIRMAN JENKINS informed him there will be a row of lots between his property and the street.

MR. SIEGEL added, with regard to the letter, the developer has agreed to it; and their consent for not protesting this development is based on the approval being made subject to the letter.

MR. SAYLOR pointed out that as far as the zoning is concerned the Ordinance of the City of Las Vegas states that anyone in a subdivision to the west or south could build two-story homes in the R-1 zone. He stated that this seems like a private agreement; and the people to the west, from a zoning viewpoint, would not be restricted on this piece of property from building

two-story homes. He added that he felt there shouldn't be any restriction on this piece of property when the same right could be enjoyed by other developers in the area. He added that this developer stated this was okay, but that is this developer's language and it couldn't be interpreted until they construct the subdivision.

MR. JOHNSON appeared and stated that the entire development of Twin Lakes Country Club Estates is entirely single family residences; and in order to make this development compatible with our development we would like to see this agreement carried through, and the applicant is agreeable.

CHAIRMAN JENKINS stated that there are certain items in the agreement with the applicant that would not be in accord with the Ordinance if the zoning would remain the same. You are putting stipulations upon his rezoning that he has already gotten approval for on the original zoning. He added that if Mr. Shydler didn't develop the tract someone else would come in and be bound by these stipulations unless he came before the Commission to have these stipulations removed.

MRS. COLEMAN asked if this area was developed as R-E would they want the same stipulations?

MR. SAYLOR stated that they could have two-story homes in this zone. He stated that he was suggesting to the Commission that it is unrealistic to put that type of restriction in a zoning action.

MR. JOHNSON stated that the restrictions are not on the entire piece of land, only on the lots that abut the Twin Lakes Country Club Estates.

MR. SAYLOR stated they are allowed under the Zoning Ordinance to have two-story homes.

MR. JOHNSON stated he failed to see that if the parties are in agreement why this can't be approved.

CHAIRMAN JENKINS asked if they were opposed to two-story in either type of development.

MR. JOHNSON said they would be opposed if two-story homes backed up to Twin Lakes Country Club Estates.

CHAIRMAN JENKINS declared the public hearing closed.

MR. TIBERTI moved Z-2-76 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. This land be subdivided in accordance with the stipulations set forth in a letter dated February 10, 1976, to Charles W. Johnson from the developer Harold Shydler.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

"NOES": None

This item will be heard by the City Commission on March 3, 1976.

2. Z-3-76

APPROVED

Application of LOUIS MACK AND HARRY MACK for reclassification of property legally described as a portion of the Southwest Quarter (SW $\frac{1}{4}$) of the Southeast Quarter (SE $\frac{1}{4}$) of Section 1, Township 21 South, Range 61 East, MDB&M, more particularly described as follows: Commencing at the southwest corner of the Southwest Quarter (SW $\frac{1}{4}$) of the Southeast Quarter (SE $\frac{1}{4}$) of said Section 1; thence N.09 $^{\circ}$ 10'43" West, 75.01 feet; thence N.008'25" West, 230 feet to the TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING; thence

continuing N.0°8'25" West, 413.26 feet; thence S.89°41'45" East, 227 feet; thence S.01°07'00" East, 407.73 feet; thence S.88°53'00" West, 228.3 feet more or less to the TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING. Located on the east side of McLeod Street between Sahara Avenue and Holly Hill Avenue beginning 230 feet north of East Sahara Avenue and extending north along McLeod Street 413 feet, from R-1 to C-2.

Proposed Use: Motor Pool Facility for the Federal Government consisting of Vehicle Storage, limited Automotive Repair, Laundering and Servicing.

MR. SAYLOR pointed out the location of the property on the screen. To the east is all commercial and occupied with a new car franchise; to the south of this property is a vacant corner piece; to the west is federal property and a large State complex which is partially constructed, with further development to take place. The proposed use on this parcel fronts and has access only to McLeod siding up to single family homes on Holly Hill. He pointed out the proposed development on the plot plan. He stated that it is a relatively nice appearing building from the front elevation. He pointed out the parking and landscaping on the property and he stated that staff recommends that a block wall be constructed along the north line. He stated that service, in terms of gas, etc., are completely in the rear of the building. Staff suggests that any servicing or mechanical work being done on the vehicles be done within an enclosed building. He stated that staff recommends approval subject to certain conditions such as the Resolution of Intent, and he added that staff feels that the driveway should be relocated to a point further south from where it is proposed which would bring it further away from the single family homes. He further stated approval should be subject to the stipulation of a block wall along the north line, all repair work done within an enclosed building, no major repair work and other standard conditions including installation of off-site improvements and street lights as required by the Department of Public Works. There were no protests or approvals on record.

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

MR. TITO TIBERTI, appeared representing the applicant. He stated they accept the stipulations recommended by the Community Development Department.

MR. RAY KELLY, 2912 Holly Hill, appeared and stated that his home is directly north of the proposed building. He said they have had problems in the past with commercial property belonging to Fairway Chevrolet and Lincoln Mercury which comes mostly from the high intensity lights used for security purposes. He stated there is a noise factor problem with their paging systems and noise from the service areas. He said recently he has spent over \$3,000 in landscaping to eliminate this lighting condition, and he stated he is concerned about this problem with this new development and wondered if he would have more of a problem with this proposed building. He asked who was going to occupy the facility; he stated he was told it was the Federal Government.

MR. SAYLOR stated he assumed it would be the GSA (General Services Administration) of the Federal Government.

MR. TITO TIBERTI stated it would be the GSA for a Federal motor pool; cars will be kept there, gassed and oiled.

MR. KELLY asked if this would include all agencies of the Federal Government including the National Guard, etc. He asked if there could be something more to the statement rather than just the Federal Government; he asked if the use could be limited to certain types of vehicles.

MR. TITO TIBERTI indicated it would be limited to motor pool vehicle storage.

MR. SAYLOR asked if this would include any heavy equipment or just passenger vehicles?

MR. TITO TIBERTI stated there might be pickup trucks and passenger cars stored there.

MR. SAYLOR stated that would limit it as far as Mr. Kelly was concerned.

MR. KELLY said he didn't object but he needed something a little more firm.

MR. SAYLOR suggested to the Commission that they could put as one of the conditions that no lights shall extend into the residential area to the north. He added that Mr. Kelly's property is the fourth lot from the corner on the south side of Holly Hill backing up to this property.

MR. KELLY stated he would like to have some insurance regarding the security lights so they will be mounted facing in toward the facility being toward the south and west and away from the residential area.

CHAIRMAN JENKINS stated this could be entered into the stipulations.

MR. KELLY also asked for some assurance that there would not be large trucks and tanks on this property.

CHAIRMAN JENKINS stated that another stipulation would be that only light duty trucks and light passenger vehicles be allowed on this facility.

MR. KELLY added that he was also concerned about activity possibly on the weekends at this facility as the Army Reserve facility across the street creates a minor problem, but he stated if the stipulations were added to limit the vehicles to light duty vehicles and something regarding security lighting he would be happy.

CHAIRMAN JENKINS asked if there would be access to Sahara.

MR. SAYLOR replied there is only access to McLeod.

CHAIRMAN JENKINS declared the public hearing closed.

MRS. COLEMAN moved Z-3-76 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. Resolution of Intent be restricted to a twelve (12) month time limit.
2. Relocate the north driveway to McLeod approximately 40' to the south.
3. A 6' masonry wall be constructed along the north property line except where provided.
4. All repair work to be conducted in an enclosed building and no major repair work shall be allowed.
5. All vehicles using or being parked at this facility shall not exceed a maximum of one (1) ton in size.
6. The lighting from this development shall be directed away from the residential area to the north.
7. Conformance to the plot plan as amended to reflect the above conditions.

8. 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.
9. Submittal of a landscaping plan prior to or at the same time application is made for a building permit.
10. All mechanical equipment, air conditioners and trash areas shall be screened from view from the abutting streets.
11. Installation of sidewalks and street lights along McLeod Street as required by the Department of Public Works.
12. Conformance to code requirements and design standards of City Departments.

The motion carried by the following vote:

"AYES": Miller, Jenkins, Coleman

"NOES": None

"ABSTENTIONS": Tiberti

This item will be heard by the City Commission on March 3, 1976.

3. Z-4-76
DENIED

Application of JOHN PAPPAS AND CAROL J. PAPPAS for reclassification of property legally described as a portion of the Northwest Quarter (NW $\frac{1}{4}$) of the Southeast Quarter (SE $\frac{1}{4}$) of Section 29, Township 20 South, Range 61 East, MDB&M, commencing at the intersection of the south line of Washington Avenue (80' wide) with the easterly line of North Rancho Drive (Tonopah Highway - U.S. 95 - 175 feet wide); thence southeasterly along the easterly right-of-way line of North Rancho Drive 150 feet to the TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING; thence continuing southeasterly along the easterly right-of-way line of North Rancho Drive 230.69 feet; thence northeasterly along a line perpendicular to the easterly right-of-way line of North Rancho Drive 110 feet; thence South 88°58'10" East, 58 feet; thence North 00°02'40" West, 234.08 feet; thence North 88°58'10" West, 172.91 feet; thence South 00°02'40" West, 118.72 feet; thence North 88°58'10" West, 108.32 feet to the TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING. Located on the east side of North Rancho Drive between West Washington Avenue and Ernest May Lane at 840 North Rancho Drive, from C-1 to C-2.

Proposed Use: Used Car Sales

MR. SAYLOR stated this property is located slightly southeast of the corner of Washington and Rancho. The zoning all around is C-1, and most of it is developed for C-1 uses. Immediately to the north a parcel of land was recently approved for C-1 zoning for a relatively large office-commercial complex. The senior citizens housing facility is located immediately to the east of this proposed location; and further south is commercial development containing the Thriftmart and K-Mart, and to the west are single family homes and Lorenzi Park. He stated that several years ago an application of this same nature was before the Commission for a change to allow a used car lot. There are no used car lots in that immediate area, and at that time staff felt that it would not be compatible and recommended denial. At that point in time there was a substantial protest factor from property owners in the area and a 100% objection from the senior citizens project. He stated that the picture before the Commission now is essentially the same, and staff recommends denial because they don't feel a used car lot will be compatible. He added the occupants of the Harry Levy Gardens presented a petition of approximately 100 signatures, and there are seven or eight letters from other single family homeowners in the area.

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

MS. CAROL PAPPAS, 1224 Cashman Drive, appeared stating that she couldn't see why the Commission wouldn't approve this for a used car lot. She stated there was a Standard Oil Station on the corner, and she added that she didn't feel that it would create any more mess than a service station. She indicated they would be dealing with good used cars and not junk. She stated they have had this property for several years and have never been able to do anything with it; they couldn't afford to keep it because the upkeep and taxes are too high. She stated they didn't know what else to do; they can't build apartments, and she stated that she felt there was no demand for any other type of commercial development in that area. She added there are all kinds of businesses around, and she felt the senior citizens project was far away from them with a lot of property between them. She pointed out their property goes up to the corner and contains 1½ acres, and they are losing money on it.

MR. SAYLOR stated they do own the 1½ acres of land; but the only piece before the Commission is what the legal description describes, and he pointed to the map showing the location of the land in question.

MS. PAPPAS stated this car lot will be landscaped and provided with lights and will have good used cars. She added she couldn't understand why they couldn't go general commercial on this piece of property.

MR. TIBERTI asked if it was zoned C-1 now?

MR. SAYLOR informed the Commission that at this time she could put on the site the same type of business that is all around her property.

MS. PAPPAS stated that all the businesses are already in the area; they would have to put in something else. She stated they have had tenants that stay 2 or 3 months; and then they leave and there is a problem with the kids breaking the building up, and this is costing them a lot of money.

MRS. COLEMAN asked if they were renting the building.

MS. PAPPAS stated when it is not rented the kids break it up; and it costs between \$300 and \$600 to fix it up, and they are losing money on it.

MR. JAMES TOLAR, 1401 Mespah, appeared in favor of this application stating he felt this rezoning should be granted because the existing building was an eyesore; and he was present at the meeting when the parcel down the street was zoned C-1, and there were no complaints at that time. He stated he would like to see something come in and stabilize that area; he added he didn't know if it would increase traffic; but if something was put in the C-1 zone there would also be traffic.

CHAIRMAN JENKINS said this is a C-1 lot, and they are asking for a change to C-2 which is not compatible with the area.

A gentleman residing at 1400 Tonopah Drive, appeared in favor of this application stating he couldn't see the reason why it couldn't be changed to C-2.

CHAIRMAN JENKINS stated the feeling is to keep the same use within the immediate area, and the neighbors prefer to keep C-1 zoning in there.

The gentleman stated a used car lot would have to be in a C-2 zone, and he felt with this use you would have less traffic than with a service station which brings in quite a bit of traffic.

MS. ETHEL WOODBURY, 911 Oasis Avenue, appeared in protest. She stated she felt this use that is one block away from nice homes on large lots selling from \$45,000 to \$49,000 would create too much traffic and there is too much traffic in there now. She added that the Las Vegas Housing Authority tried to pick an area for elderly people to live; and this site would be directly by Harry Levy Gardens, and it would be very bad for these people.

MR. TIBERTI stated he felt a used car lot wouldn't bring a lot of traffic to the neighborhood or any more than a store.

MS. WOODBURY indicated she felt it would; she said it would also have more noise associated with it, and she stated that these uses should be on the Boulder Highway.

MS. MARY WALKER, a resident in the Harry Levy Gardens, appeared in protest stating the people of this senior citizens project feel the same way now as they did before. The people living on the west side of the building would be affected by the lights and much noise and too much traffic. These people have a lot to contend with, and it is very bad for them.

MS. MAY COLLIE, a resident in the Harry Levy Gardens, appeared in protest stating she was very disappointed they wanted to put a used car lot in there. She stated it would cause many problems and she didn't feel this was the right place for it and they would need 24-hour security because they have had some incidents in the past.

MS. JEAN CARRIGAN, 905 Oasis Avenue, appeared in protest stating that she has lived in this area for 16 years and has on numerous occasions fought gas stations being put in the area and now a used car lot. She stated that she understood that a portion of the property was to be zoned C-2 but not all of the property they own.

MR. SAYLOR replied "yes".

MS. CARRIGAN stated once a portion is zoned C-2 the whole area could go C-2. She stated a used car lot would be incompatible with the area; she stated they would like to keep some assemblance of a residential neighborhood in this area. If this property is zoned C-1 it should be developed under that zone.

MR. BUD WEEKS, 4467 Springdale, appeared stating he is an employee of the Las Vegas Housing Authority, and he was here on the instruction of Mr. Art Sartini, to respectfully relay to this Commission the Authority's objection to this rezoning application on behalf of the Harry C. Levy Gardens.

MS. MILDREN CANTOR, resident in the Harry Levy Gardens, appeared in protest stating her reasons for protesting were basically the same as the others, that it would create a traffic problem and there is already a problem now for people trying to get across the street to the K-Mart and the bank. She stated she also objects to the possibility of having lights shining into their residences in the apartments.

MS. PAPPAS reappeared and stated the senior citizens didn't want the car lot there because it would create too much traffic; and there is already traffic there, and it is there because of the markets around. She compared this situation to the senior citizens housing project on Alta near Fletcher Jones Chevrolet and the shopping center nearby, stating the situation would be similar.

MRS. COLEMAN stated she would like to see this property developed, but she indicated she couldn't see a used car lot in this area with their attendant flags, banners, lights and loud speakers.

CHAIRMAN JENKINS declared the public hearing closed.

MRS. COLEMAN moved Z-4-76 be DENIED.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

"NOES": None

This item will be heard by the City Commission on March 3, 1976.

4. Tentative Map Charleston Heights No. 53 Property generally located south of Cheyenne Road between Jones Boulevard and Michael Way in Zoning District R-E.
Owner/Subdivider: Becker & Sons
No. of Lots: 158

APPROVED

5. Final Map Charleston Heights No. 53A Property generally located south of Cheyenne Road between Jones Boulevard and Michael Way in Zoning District R-E.
Owner/Subdivider: Becker & Sons
No. of Lots: 43

APPROVED

MR. FOSTER informed the Commission this involves a tentative map in an area just annexed into the City as of this month which is one-quarter mile north of Cheyenne. He pointed out the location of this tentative map stating it is almost an 80-acre parcel. He indicated the area to the west and north is in the County and to the south there is a R-E zoned subdivision. The land to the east is in the City and the portion to the north is R-E and vacant. Mr. Foster pointed out the location of the proposed subdivision and layout of the development which was approved in the County. In the City the approved plan is submitted and has approval as a planned development on the basis of one-quarter acre lots (11,000 sq. ft.) and no more than two horses per lot, common riding trails, and bridle paths throughout the development. He stated they will also have two arena areas, and there will be a central recreational area. Regarding their street pattern, they do have lots that now front on Michael Way and Jones. The developer is requesting that certain conditions of approval imposed by the County be altered. These consist of a half-street that was required along the north portion of the development named Brooks Avenue be deleted. Staff does not feel there is a need for this street; and, therefore, has no objection that it be deleted. He stated the layout as proposed is very compact in itself, and the street to the north would not serve any purpose to this particular development; the lots are oriented toward the interior streets. One of the conditions from the County indicates there be a 6' masonry wall around the entire development, and staff feels that should be restricted to the south property line only. The applicant has requested that no block wall be required because he proposes to fence the area with a rail-type fence around the development and in the riding area. Staff feels the block wall is needed along the south property line and should be constructed. When this application was before the County the property owners on the south side of this property went away from that meeting thinking a block wall would be constructed on the north side of their properties. Further, staff felt that the zoning on the property should be designated as R-PD 2 which is two units per gross acre. In the County there was a different zoning classification than the City's and the Ordinance requires that a comparable zoning classification be given to the property and this is what is recommended. They have submitted six typical

elevations along with floor plans, etc. They are proposing corrals and tack rooms and sheds on the rear portion of each individual lot and they want these structures at the edge of the bridle paths; staff has no objection to them next to the property lines.

Mr. Foster stated they have submitted the final map portion on this plan that shows the building layouts, and the same pattern would exist on the south side and would remain the same on the remainder of the property. He pointed out where they are constructing the sales office and models which are approved for the sale of this development. Regarding variances for fences and accessory structures, staff feels they should be allowed as a general provision of the ordinance including minor additions to the residences in the rear yard area. The applicant is also requesting a waiver from the existing Subdivision Ordinance concerning street improvements asking that the interior streets of the project have a 28' wide paved strip and that no sidewalks or curbs and gutters be required. The subdivider would be putting in street lights and does propose full half-street dedications on Michael Way and Jones Boulevard. In the County this deviation was approved with roll-type curb and gutter and 40' pavement. On the approved County plan they did have a frontage road along Jones and Michael Way. The developer is asking that the frontage street be eliminated on both ends of the subdivision. They are proposing direct access to these major streets and if houses front on major streets they must have a secondary access. Staff feels basically they should adhere to the Subdivision Regulations; however, there are a couple of factors that are different from other situations. These are larger lots in an undeveloped area, and the developer is proposing circular drives that will help minimize the problem of lots fronting on the major streets. Staff also recommends the normal conditions of approval in terms of time period on tentative maps and conformance to the street name policy, etc. The final map is the next item on the agenda and it covers about 20% of the development, and if that map is approved staff feels there should be a temporary service turn-around area provided at each end of the future loop street because the proposed street does not continue around and connect up. These temporary turn-arounds should be provided and the map also be subject to the conditions of the tentative map.

MRS. COLEMAN asked the location of the bridle paths and arena.

MR. FOSTER stated it looked like there will be arenas on the east and west and bridle paths throughout the development.

MR. TIBERTI commented that there are developed homes immediately to the south abutting the bridle paths without a block wall.

MRS. COLEMAN indicated she felt there should be no access to Jones Boulevard, which is proposed to be a major arterial but is not developed now.

MR. ERNEST A. BECKER, SR. appeared stating there are eight lots proposed to front on Jones Boulevard and they are proposing to put in U-shaped drives. There will only be 9 openings on Jones Boulevard; and the cars will drive out rather than back out.

MRS. COLEMAN asked what the setback would be on these lots?

MR. BECKER stated the map shows 20' and some go back 30' plus on the Jones Boulevard section. He stated they are proposing the same design on Michael Way, but he stated he understood the Ordinance states it would be allowed on Michael Way. He commented regarding the block wall along the bridle path stating there are several problems with spirited horses; a horse needs to see what is on both sides of him.

MR. TIBERTI commented that there are people living there already, and they would have a bridle path and horses in their backyards.

MR. BECKER indicated they have talked to about three people regarding this and they want to join onto their bridle paths.

MR. TIBERTI asked if Mr. Becker could get all the people that back up to the bridle path to agree to eliminate the wall?

MR. BECKER stated they would contact these people and added the bridle path would be 20' wide.

MRS. COLEMAN stated if the bridle path is 20' wide, the horse riders don't have to ride next to the block wall.

MR. BECKER commented that he was informed by people owning horses that this would be a problem so they would like to eliminate the block wall.

MRS. COLEMAN asked if there would be bridle paths around the whole development?

MR. BECKER indicated that is the way it is developed, and it has to be done this way for access within the tract where traffic isn't heavy. This plan has been thought out to create an area where a person can have horses.

MR. MILLER asked if Mr. Becker wants to get approval to start work on the project; he suggested that Mr. Becker get approval of the property owners on the property line to find out if they would be opposed to the wall or lack of it.

MR. BECKER stated they would talk to them. They have half-acre lots, and we have one-quarter acre lots in our subdivision.

MRS. COLEMAN stated she felt this was a great idea for moderate income families and a nice way of life. She stated she felt there should be no access to Jones Boulevard, and something should be rearranged to conform to the Subdivision Ordinance.

MR. BECKER stated the final map is on the east end and later we could see what to do on Jones. He stated it might be possible to put in an alley behind the houses or work out something else.

MR. TIBERTI raised one question with regard to no curbs and gutters stating that in Bonanza Village there is a problem with gravel on the pavement.

MR. BECKER stated that he has talked with Public Works regarding street improvements; and we feel it will work out, but if it doesn't we will go back and put in roll-type curbs.

MRS. COLEMAN asked if the street would be wider than 28' or if the pavement was going to be 28' wide?

MR. BECKER stated the pavement would be 28' wide, and there would be an additional 2' which would be used for bridle paths.

MR. TIBERTI stated it sounds nice but 80% will take care of the space and for the other 20% there is a possibility of weeds growing, etc.

MR. BECKER stated this area will be kept up, and when you drive by it it will look nice to you. He added if they haven't solved all the problems, he thought the rest could be worked out.

CHAIRMAN JENKINS asked regarding the surfacing of the turn-arounds.

MR. BECKER replied they would be rough graded and paved.

MRS. COLEMAN asked if there would be underground utilities?

MR. BECKER pointed out the area to contain underground utilities.

MRS. COLEMAN stated she felt the Commission could approve the tentative map as far as the Michael Way end of it. She asked if they could do that without waiving the original subdivision requirement for the access street.

MR. FOSTER stated they could amend the tentative map to any portion they want but on the final map only to the area submitted.

MRS. COLEMAN asked how they would approve each section.

MR. BECKER indicated he would come back in on each section.

MR. TIBERTI asked if Mr. Becker had any objections to that?

MR. BECKER stated he would like to have the same tentative map.

MRS. COLEMAN stated she would like to see the plan with no access to Jones.

MR. SAYLOR stated the Commission could approve the tentative map in concept as an overall development plan and approve the final map as the tentative map.

MR. TIBERTI stated the approval should be based on the understanding there will be some changes on the tentative map.

MRS. COLEMAN commented, such as an agreement with the residents that back up to this area.

MR. FOSTER stated the final map would be subject to the conditions of the tentative map provided it is approved.

MRS. COLEMAN stated she would approve the whole map in concept but she didn't want to waive the block wall on the south unless the residents abutting it agreed to it. The final map should be approved just to that easterly portion on Michael Way.

Tentative Map
Motion

MR. TIBERTI moved the tentative map of CHARLESTON HEIGHTS 53 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. The approval of the tentative map be limited to the area as shown on the final map of this subdivision (Charleston Heights Tract #53A) and the remainder of the tentative map be approved in concept.
2. The zoning on this property be designated R-PD 2.
3. All lots shall be a minimum of one-quarter (1/4) acre (10,890 sq. ft.).
4. A maximum of two (2) horses be allowed per lot.
5. Brooks Avenue shall not be required along the north property lines.
6. A 6' masonry wall shall be constructed along the south property line unless the abutting property owners to the south indicate in writing they do not wish to have the

wall or would like some other type of fence between their properties and this development.

7. Conformance to the development plans on the building locations. All proposed corrals and tack rooms shall be allowed to be constructed to the side and rear property lines in the rear yard area except on corner lots abutting Michael Way there shall be a ten foot (10') setback.
8. Fences and all other accessory buildings shall conform to the General Provisions of the Zoning Ordinance.
9. Model homes and sales office shall be allowed on Lots 6-11, Block 6 and shall be limited to a two (2) year time limit or completion of the tract, whichever is sooner. The sales office shall be limited to sales within this development.
10. The street improvements on the interior streets shall be waived from the standard designs to a revised design providing for the installation of street lights and a twenty-eight foot (28') wide paved street section as required by the Department of Public Works. Full half-street improvements shall be constructed along Michael Way.
11. 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.
12. Street names be provided in accord with the Street Name Policy.

The motion carried by the following vote:

"AYES": Miller, Tiberti, Jenkins, Coleman.
"NOES": None

This item will be heard by the City Commission on March 3, 1976.

Final Map
Motion

MR. TIBERTI moved the final map of CHARLESTON HEIGHTS 53A be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. Approval of the tentative map of Charleston Heights No. 53.
2. Surface turn-around area provided at the west end of Avenida Caballo and Avenida Vaquero as required by the Department of Public Works.
3. Street names shall be provided in accord with the Street Name Policy.
4. Conformance to code requirements and design standards of City Departments.

The motion carried by the following vote:

"AYES": Miller, Tiberti, Jenkins, Coleman.
"NOES": None

6. Tentative Map
Charleston
Rainbow #14

Property generally located south of Westcliff Drive and east of Buffalo Drive in Zoning District R-1.
Owner/Subdivider: Sproul Homes of Nevada
No. of Lots: 152

APPROVED

MR. FOSTER stated this tentative map is located in the westerly portion of the City. The County is to the north and west, and this proposal involves almost 40 acres. He pointed out the location of the tentative map and the layout of this subdivision. Buffalo Drive, which is a major street, is proposed to back up to this subdivision. He stated they have left off a row of lots along Westcliff Drive and Raincloud, and it appears this pattern will continue. He stated he has brought this to the Commission's attention because that row of lots along Westcliff would be excluded subject to street improvements being constructed on Westcliff. He pointed out the pattern on the screen and commented the pattern is continuing. He stated in terms of the portion that has been submitted there does not appear to be any problems. There is one access street out to Buffalo Drive which will probably be from Wandercloud which would tie into Pinedale and Huntly. This opening should be provided as required by staff. Staff also recommends the normal conditions of approval for tentative maps be applied such as time period and street names.

MR. TIBERTI asked if the street furthest to the north would be a complete street?

MR. FOSTER indicated it is proposed as a half-street, and there is room for one row of lots.

MRS. COLEMAN asked where the traffic would be emptying into mostly?

MR. FOSTER replied to the east and south of Antelope and south to Alta, and most of the traffic will be going east and north. There is a temporary segment constructed east to Lorenzi and Rancho going east.

MRS. COLEMAN asked how near Westcliff was developed to this subdivision?

MR. FOSTER stated it is developed almost one-half mile away to the east. The area on Westcliff was not included as part of a previous tentative map and it was 40 acres to the west. There is a 3/4 mile strip being left out with no improvements.

MR. TIBERTI asked when they would get to putting in the improvements?

MR. FOSTER stated when they come in with a map for that portion on the strip next to Westcliff they would be required to put in the improvements. Staff pointed out on the last development that they felt that this area could logically be developed with single family homes, and this area left out could certainly be used as an argument for higher density. Staff felt it should be included with these developments and worked into the cost of the overall development.

MRS. COLEMAN asked how many lots were there on the strip that is undeveloped?

MR. FOSTER stated it would be the same pattern that exists, and there would be somewhere between 17 and 18 homes.

MRS. COLEMAN stated on the next subdivision it would also be the same.

MR. TIBERTI stated that the precedent has been started, and it is a bad one.

MRS. COLEMAN suggested they develop the lots along Westcliff before starting this development.

MR. CHARLIE JOHNSON, VTN-Nevada, appeared representing the applicant. He stated that one of the reasons Westcliff is being left out is because Rainbow is proposed by the State Highway Department to connect with the freeway. Westcliff isn't proposed in the extension of the Fremont Expressway. He stated no one really knows what is going to happen out there, they don't know how wide this street is going to be. Buffalo Drive, which is proposed to be on the back of this development, is proposed to be a divided roadway with a drainage channel down the center. It is proposed to go north 5½ miles and into Vegas Wash. He stated he has talked with William Purvis, Public Works Department, regarding the development of Buffalo Drive because the drainage in this area is an important point. Antelope is the next street down from this development, and it is proposed to be a 100' wide street, Alta is next at 80' and Charleston next at 100'. Many of the people and traffic will go to Antelope; this area will all be remodeled when Rainbow is tied into the freeway. Alta deadends out there and will tie into Rainbow when it is built. Rancho is designed to be a major north/south street. The State now has this under design, and they have had hearings on it. All the traffic going in this direction and from these units will go to the east to Rancho or Antelope or to Charleston or the Expressway. He added this project has been under design since 1971. He pointed out the location of a 60' wide road to empty out to Westcliff. He informed the Commission that Buffalo Drive is not being developed right now. Sproul provided \$30,000 to \$40,000 to build Buffalo, and we don't want to put a road through to Buffalo. Public Works is not really firm on what the plans are for Westcliff Drive.

MRS. COLEMAN suggested this item be held in abeyance until this can be resolved. The City and State should be made to make a design at this point; this situation is just getting worse and worse.

MR. FOSTER stated this street is proposed to be a 60' half-street on the Major Street Plan. This design is fairly well-established except possibly how it will connect with the Las Vegas Expressway.

MRS. COLEMAN asked if that would be their concern, and she asked if the other portion could be developed at some later date?

MR. TIBERTI stated it should be approved under this subdivision and add a statement that the City or County should do it in segments; otherwise, it should be done now. He stated they are not putting in Westcliff because they don't know what they are going to do. He asked who should come up with the design?

MR. FOSTER suggested they could hold this item in abeyance and have Public Works address itself to this specific point.

MRS. COLEMAN asked if there would be other problems with the design of this street with regard to drainage.

MR. JOHNSON stated the land is all dedicated.

MR. TIBERTI asked who would be in charge of putting in these improvements?

MR. JOHNSON stated they would, but they are not asking for that under this map.

MR. TIBERTI commented that everyone else is required to put lots in next to the street, and he asked why did they do it this way?

MR. JOHNSON stated their subdivision was approved in accord with City Planning and Public Works Department requirements.

MRS. COLEMAN asked why in each development was there a piece of land left vacant on Westcliff and not developed up to Westcliff? Would they come in the future with apartments or commercial?

MR. JOHNSON commented they were left vacant because they don't know what type of street they want on Westcliff. It would not be an economical way to develop it, and it is zoned R-1.

MRS. COLEMAN suggested they find out right now about Westcliff and finish what has already been started.

MR. JOHNSON stated everybody knows about this problem and avoids it. He informed the Commission that you can build a subdivision street without a Master Plan but you have to have a master plan for a major thoroughfare.

MR. TIBERTI stated that Public Works should be able to make a determination on the design.

MR. TIBERTI moved the tentative map of CHARLESTON RAINBOW #14 be DENIED.

The motion did not carry with the following vote:

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

MR. JOHNSON stated they would like approval or denial of this request without it being held in abeyance.

MR. FOSTER stated the Commission could approve this map with the stipulation that Westcliff be constructed after it is determined by Public Works what type of street it will be.

CHAIRMAN JENKINS suggested this item be APPROVED subject to some recommendations by Public Works regarding this street.

MR. TIBERTI moved the tentative map of CHARLESTON RAINBOW #14 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. Half-street improvements be constructed on Westcliff Drive on the portion immediately north of the proposed subdivision if a street design has been approved by the Department of Public Works.
2. 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.
3. Street names be provided in accord with the Street Name Policy.

The motion carried by the following vote:

"AYES": Miller, Tiberti, Jenkins, Coleman.
"NOES": None

This item will be heard by the City Commission on March 3, 1976.

7. Tentative Map
Lewis Homes
Sahara #1
- Property generally located south of Oakey Boulevard and west of Jones Boulevard in Zoning District R-PD 5.
Owner/Subdivider: Lewis Homes
No. of Lots: 32

APPROVED

8. Final Map
Lewis Homes
Sahara #1
- Property generally located south of Oakey Boulevard and west of Jones Boulevard in Zoning District R-PD 5.
Owner/Subdivider: Lewis Homes
No. of Lots: 32

APPROVED

MR. FOSTER stated this was a small subdivision approved as a planned development located south of an existing portion of a developed subdivision generally located west of Jones and south of Oakey. Staff pointed out that under a plot plan review they were allowed to continue the street pattern as a single family development. He pointed out the developed portion on the map. They constructed a row of lots on the south side of the development, and under the plot plan review there were conditions regarding a radius corner at the corner of Verde Jardin and Vista Verde. Staff feels that more than likely Verde Jardin will extend south, and there should be a radius corner on this lot and half-street dedication should be shown and included as part of this tentative map. Staff recommends approval both of the tentative map and final map. The final map covers the entire area of the tentative map and should be approved subject to the approval of the tentative map.

MR. WALLACE asked for a clarification of staff's recommendation regarding the radius corner.

MR. FOSTER stated it would be required on Lot 27 and half-street dedication adjacent to this.

MR. WALLACE commented regarding the situation of the half-street stating the location of this street and showing the Commission where the City has dedication at this time. He added that they weren't planning on extending this street any further south. He stated the tentative map before the Commission is the balance of the property, and this portion is not in conformance to it.

MR. TIBERTI agreed since the street did not tie into any existing street.

MR. FOSTER stated staff would have no objection to that change.

MRS. COLEMAN moved the tentative map and final map of LEWIS HOMES SAHARA #1 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

Tentative Map

1. A property line radius be provided on the southwest corner of Verde Circado and Vista Verde North as required by the Department of Public Works.
2. A 30' half-street dedication shall be provided on Verde Jardin Way to the south side of Vista Verde North as required by the Department of Public Works.
3. Conformance to the conditions of approval under Z-67-72.
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 be provided in accord with the Street Name Policy.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

"NOES": None

This item will be heard by the City Commission on March 3, 1976.

Final Map

1. Approval of the tentative map.
2. Conditions of approval as set forth under the tentative map.
3. Street names shall be provided in accord with the Street Name Policy.
4. Conformance to code requirements and design standards of City Departments.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

"NOES": None

9. SO-1-76

APPROVED

Request submitted by WATKINS DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION for temporary sales offices at 801 and 805 Watkins Drive and a construction office at 713 Watkins Drive in conjunction with the Watkins Manor No. 1 Subdivision in Zoning District R-1.

MR. FOSTER stated this was actually a planned unit development rather than a R-1 development. The layout of this development appears to be the same as a R-1 development. They are proposing three lots to be utilized as model homes and sales offices. Staff recommends approval subject to the normal conditions such as the use be limited to a two-year time limit, etc.

MRS. COLEMAN moved SO-1-76 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. The use be limited to sales within Watkins Manor No. 1 Subdivision.
2. The use be limited to a two-year time limit or completion of the sales in the tract, whichever is sooner.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

"NOES": None

10. AR-3-76

APPROVED

Aesthetic Review on the application submitted by D. K. SEYMOUR CONSTRUCTION & DEVELOPMENT, INC. for a proposed commercial storage unit complex concerning property generally located southeast of North "A" Street and West Owens Avenue in Zoning District M.

MR. FOSTER pointed out the location of this area on the plot plan stating the subject property is zoned M. The Interstate Freeway is to the west and Owens Avenue is several hundred feet to the north. "A" Street is on the west side of the property. They are proposing a commercial storage unit development, mini warehouses. He stated the railroad tracks are to the east adjacent to "A" Street and Interstate 15. Since this area is adjacent to Interstate 15, under the Industrial Zone of the Zoning Ordinance, it is required that they have an aesthetic review before this Commission. Mr. Foster pointed out the storage units and the proposed landscaping stating staff recommended approval subject to the submitted plot plan and the landscaping being worked out with staff.

MRS. COLEMAN asked if it should be required they plant Arizona Cypress along the property next to the Freeway?

MR. FOSTER stated they are proposing trees and low shrubs along the office and main building, and he stated they could require that Arizona Cypress be planted along the rear of this property but this property backs up to the railroad tracks.

MR. RICHARD SEYMOUR, the applicant, appeared and stated they have been working with a local architect. These units will be approximately 5' X 5' and 15' X 20'. He stated he could see no problems with staff's recommendations.

MRS. COLEMAN moved AR-3-76 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. Landscaping and a permanent underground sprinkler system shall be provided as required by the Planning Commission. Failure to properly maintain required landscaping and underground sprinkler systems shall be cause for revocation of a business license.
2. Submittal of a landscaping plan prior to or at the same time application is made for a building permit.

The motion carried by the following vote:

"AYES": Miller, Tiberti, Jenkins, Coleman.
"NOES": None

11. A-1-76

Annexation Petition submitted by MARTIN F. & ZERNA BRODKIN, ET AL, for approximately 150 acres of land located northwest of Vegas Drive and Jones Boulevard.

MR. FOSTER pointed out the location of this property on the screen. He stated this parcel has City property abutting it on three sides; south, east and north. He stated this application doesn't include the small parcel in the southwest corner, there are two separately owned parcels on the southwest portion. Vegas Drive is to the south of this area. The proposal is to develop single family homes on a portion of this parcel if annexed into the City. He stated this parcel, as well as the small piece of land, is included in Senate Bill 601; however, they wish to commence development as soon as possible. Staff recommended approval.

MR. TIBERTI moved Z-1-76 be APPROVED as submitted.

The motion carried by the following vote:

"AYES": Miller, Tiberti, Jenkins, Coleman.
"NOES": None

12. M-5-74

APPROVED

Aesthetic Review submitted by TOTO PURCHASING AND SUPPLY CO., INC. concerning property located at 275 South Highland Drive in Zoning District M.

MR. FOSTER stated this property is located on the east side of Highland Drive and the Interstate Freeway. It is all industrial property to the east of Highland. There have been some previous plot plan approvals on this property for some minor additions to the existing development. About one-quarter of a mile to the south staff has started a pattern of Arizona Cypress; but it was never continued along this portion of the Freeway and staff felt it was something that should be asked for at this time, and it could be imposed as a condition of approval.

MR. JOHN GOODWILL, the applicant, appeared and stated he couldn't understand why the Arizona Cypress was being required along the rear of this property. He stated the Freeway is 50' to 55' above their property, and he felt that the trees wouldn't be seen until 30 or 40 years from now.

MRS. COLEMAN stated they are being required to be put in along Highland to hide the junk.

MR. TIBERTI asked what the building was in front of this building?

MR. GOODWILL stated it will be an addition out in front, and you will not be able to see anything from Highland; there are already plans approved for it.

MR. TIBERTI asked if the Freeway was 50' above this area?

MRS. COLEMAN stated several other companies have been required to install these Arizona Cypress, and she felt it was a policy that the Commission has started; in the long run it will make everything look better.

MR. GOODWILL asked who will maintain these plants? He stated he has no water or sewer on this property.

MRS. COLEMAN stated they must have water; they have a fire hydrant.

MR. GOODWILL stated they do have a fire hydrant; he indicated they have leased this land on a five-year lease from the Union Pacific Railroad, and they are negotiating with them to buy this property. The price agreed upon was too high; he stated their operation works on a small margin of profit, and in order for them to buy this piece of property they have to take an additional piece of property. He stated they have made a second proposal and within a week or so it will be taken care of. He stated at present they do not own any of this property.

MR. TIBERTI commented that they were negotiating now, and it appears that they will acquire it.

MRS. COLEMAN asked if they were putting up a building on property they don't own?

MR. GOODWILL stated "yes".

MRS. COLEMAN commented that if they could afford to put up the building, they could afford to put up trees.

MR. GOODWILL stated his business operates on a small margin of profit, and he felt they couldn't afford to put in the trees. He added he didn't feel 100 trees would do much along the Freeway because the Freeway banks the other way and unless you stop and look over the guard rail, you can't see the back of the building.

MRS. COLEMAN asked where the north entrance to the Freeway was going to be.

MR. FOSTER indicated it would be along the east side of the Freeway at Charleston Boulevard.

CHAIRMAN JENKINS suggested that maybe someone from staff could determine if the landscaping was necessary and able to be seen from the Freeway.

MR. TIBERTI stated he couldn't see any reason to put in the trees; the Freeway banks to a point where you can't see down there.

MR. TIBERTI moved for APPROVAL of M-5-74 subject to the following condition:

1. Arizona Cypress shall be installed along the east property line abutting the Interstate Freeway unless a field inspection by staff indicates this landscaping could not be seen by motorists on the Freeway.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

"NOES": None

13. Z-13-74
Plot Plan
Review

APPROVED

Submitted by CLIFFORD MILLER to allow a temporary trailer to be used for security purposes in connection with the Carpenters Training Center on property located at 4150 East Bonanza Road in Zoning District C-1.

MR. FOSTER stated this site is located in the easterly section of the City with Bonanza Road to the north. The Carpenters Training Center feels it wants a mobile home trailer, to be parked on the front portion of the property, to be used for security purposes. This is going to be a temporary trailer which has not been indicated on the agenda; however, we have talked with the applicant and if it is to be a permanent use it will have to go before the Board of Zoning Adjustment for a variance. They informed us if it is required they will pursue it through applying for a variance. This could be approved on a temporary basis until they secure an application for a variance. This center is located in a relatively undeveloped area and security is a prime factor.

MRS. COLEMAN asked if this is to be approved on a temporary basis?

MR. FOSTER stated that was staff's assumption.

MR. MC KENNA, appeared representing the applicant and pointed out the area where they intend to park the trailer on a temporary basis until they find out what security measures are needed.

MRS. COLEMAN asked how temporary is temporary?

MR. FOSTER stated they would apply and could probably obtain a variance within 30-60 days.

MRS. COLEMAN asked how long it would take before they would decide if they wanted it on a temporary or permanent basis?

MR. MC KENNA stated after discussing this today, their variance would be applied for and heard by the first of March.

MR. TIBERTI suggested approving this for a six (6) month time period.

MR. MC KENNA stated they want this trailer for a custodian and security housing, and in the future one of the offices will be used for security measures. He stated their custodian has a trailer, and they would like to park it on the property and have made the provisions for water, phone and electrical services.

MR. TIBERTI commented this trailer won't be seen from the road anyway.

MR. MC KENNA stated you would have to pull into the property to see it.

MR. TIBERTI asked how far the street would be from the trailer?

MR. MC KENNA stated about 500' or 600' is where the trailer would sit off Bonanza. There will be a block wall along the rear of the property.

MR. TIBERTI moved the Plot Plan Review for Z-13-74 be APPROVED subject to a six (6) month time limit.

DIRECTOR'S BUSINESS:

Discussion

Proposed amendment to the Zoning Ordinance relative to ambulance facilities.

MR. FOSTER stated at the last meeting the Commission reviewed a letter from Mercy Ambulance and requested this item be held in abeyance until this meeting.

MRS. COLEMAN stated the letter did point out a legitimate fact that if they were dispatching from hospitals that there would have to be care taken in writing the Ordinance.

MR. FOSTER stated it was the recommendation of the Commission to require these facilities to be in a C-M zone, light industrial; and before they proceeded on it the Commission asked staff to contact various ambulance agencies; staff found out Mercy was the only ground emergency ambulance facility. In their letter they indicated they were going to have to move to another location, and they indicated they were looking at a site on the west side of Highland, south of Charleston which is presently zoned P-R. Their service would require C-1 zoning, and we have informed them of that. If they apply for a rezoning the Commission would have the discretion of restricting all access to Highland.

MRS. COLEMAN stated that the fact they are dispatching from the hospitals is taken into consideration, but we are concerned about them dispatching from their business location. She stated that since this problem has been brought up there hasn't been as much siren noise as they go out onto Charleston Boulevard. She commented if they are going to continue dispatching backup units from the service area, she questioned how they would get their supplies and quarters for deliveries and backup units on the Highland piece. She reiterated that she didn't feel that an ambulance operation should be anywhere within a C-1 zone. If they propose to separate the office function from the dispatching operation now, then there would be nothing to say that later they won't go back to their original way of operation.

MR. FOSTER stated staff looks at the dispatching the same as for a 24-hour TV repair service facility that would be classified along those lines or a similar type operation. The ambulance operation would not create a nuisance on the maintenance portion but there would be a noise factor and sirens.

MRS. COLEMAN indicated she felt there would be the same problems associated with the new location with regard to sirens, etc.

There was more discussion regarding the location of this type of facility with regard to major arterials and traffic lights, etc.

MR. FOSTER suggested that one thing they could do would be to require a use permit in a C-1 zone, and the Commission would have control and take a look at all types of operations and attach whatever stipulations are necessary.

MR. TIBERTI suggested these facilities backup to businesses that are closed at night.

MRS. COLEMAN stated there should be requirements concerning the loud speaker systems and paging systems associated with these uses.

MR. FOSTER stated they could approve these applications with an initial time limit and with stipulations they would have to adhere to all requirements.

CHAIRMAN JENKINS asked if this use were approved subject to a use permit, would there be a review period?

MR. FOSTER stated "no" unless the Commission stipulated that a review be conducted within a one-year time period.

MRS. COLEMAN asked if they would be located in a C-1 zone then?

MR. FOSTER said they are allowed in a C-1 zone as a matter of right.

MRS. COLEMAN commented we could allow them in a C-1 zone with a use permit and separate the dispatching from the business offices. The garage and maintenance operation should not be on this property.

MR. FOSTER stated the Ordinance includes provisions when rezoning on property. The advertised use won't be by a use permit; it would be handled under the zoning action, and they would come before the Commission otherwise they would go before the Board of Zoning Adjustment.

MRS. COLEMAN commented that now that the problems were understood regarding this facility, she asked staff if it would recommend ambulance facilities in a C-1 only with a use permit?

CHAIRMAN JENKINS commented that we have to think what the ambulance is used for and watch what we impose in Ordinance form so that it won't be detrimental to this type of operation.

MR. MILLER commented they are offering a service.

CHAIRMAN JENKINS stated he didn't feel the ambulance companies were going to look for a feasible place in terms of zoning.

MR. FOSTER stated the C-2 zone is somewhat limited to the downtown area. C-M and M zoning are along Main Street and Highland and the Freeway and that area in the central portion of the City. He added they could go in a C-1 as a matter of right.

MR. TIBERTI stated they could be in a residential zone as a matter of right.

CHAIRMAN JENKINS stated that is what they have now.

MR. FOSTER stated they are in a C-1 zone as a matter of right.

CHAIRMAN JENKINS asked if these ambulances were equipped with a signal system to trigger lights.

A representative from the City Fire Department stated only fire trucks have this equipment, and the ambulance companies do not have them.

MR. FOSTER stated the ambulances would still need emergency lights and sirens.

MOTION

MRS. COLEMAN moved that ambulance facilities be allowed in a C-1 zone by means of a use permit.

The motion carried by the following vote:

"AYES": Miller, Tiberti, Jenkins, Coleman.
"NOES": None

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting adjourned at 10:20 P.M.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT


DON J. SAYLOR, AIP, DIRECTOR

DJS:pdm