

RECEIVED
CITY MANAGER

MAR 3 1 1976

A G E N D A
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

AM 7.8.9.10.11.12.1.2.3.4.5.6 PM

April 8, 1976

CALL TO ORDER:

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

ROLL CALL:

MINUTES:

Approval of the Minutes of the regular meeting
of February 12, 1976.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. Z-21-76

Application of CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT for reclassification of property located on the east side of North Page Street between East Bonanza Road and East Stewart Avenue beginning 660 feet south of East Bonanza Road and extending south along North Page Street approximately 660 feet and east approximately 660 feet, from R-E to C-V.
Proposed Use: Elementary School

2. Z-22-76

Application of VALLEY BANK OF NEVADA for reclassification of property located on the northwest corner of Bruce Street and Circle Drive at 200 Circle Drive, from R-1 to C-2.
Proposed Use: Retail Sales and Display of Greenhouses

3. Z-23-76

Application of CLAYTON O. GWIN for reclassification of property located on the southwest corner of East Bonanza Road and North 16th Street, from R-1 to R-3.
Proposed Use: Four-Unit Apartment Project

4. Z-24-76

Application of STEWART L. BELL, K. MICHAEL LEAVITT AND JEFFREY G. GREEN dba B. L. & G. for reclassification of property located on the southeast corner of South Sixth Street and East Bridger Avenue at 600 East Bridger Avenue, from R-4 to C-1.
Proposed Use: Office Building

5. Z-25-76

Application of GERMAIN HOULE for reclassification of property generally located on the southwest corner of West Charleston Boulevard and South Jones Boulevard, from C-1 to C-2.
Proposed Use: Swimming Pool Sales & Sporting Equipment Sales and Rental

6. Tentative Map
THE MEADOWS

Property located on the northeast corner of Decatur Boulevard and Michael Way in Zoning District C-1.
Owner/Subdivider: Dayton Development Company
Commercial Subdivision - 121 acres

7. Final Map
THE MEADOWS

Property located on the northeast corner of Decatur Boulevard and Michael Way in Zoning District C-1.
Owner/Subdivider: Dayton Development Company
Commercial Subdivision - 121 acres

8. Tentative Map
LEWIS HOMES
CHARLESTON NO. 11

Property located on the southeast corner of Lorenzi Street and the Las Vegas Expressway in Zoning District R-1.
Owner/Subdivider: Lewis Homes of Nevada
No. of Acres: 9.22
No. of Lots: 35

9. Z-45-75
Use Review
(C-V Zone)

Request submitted by the CITY OF LAS VEGAS to allow a police substation to be located on property generally located on the north side of Hargrove Avenue between Elton Avenue and Garwood Avenue at 6208 Hargrove Avenue in Zoning District C-V.

MINUTES

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

April 8, 1976

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

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

ABSENT: Vice-Chairman Parker, and Messrs. Tiberti and Busch.

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 February 12, 1976, be APPROVED as mailed. The motion carried by unanimous vote.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. Z-21-76

APPROVED

Application of CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT for reclassification of property legally described as the Southwest Quarter (SW $\frac{1}{4}$) of the Northeast Quarter (NE $\frac{1}{4}$) of the Northwest Quarter (NW $\frac{1}{4}$) of Section 32, Township 20 South, Range 62 East, MDB&M, located on the east side of North Page Street between East Bonanza Road and East Stewart Avenue beginning 660 feet south of East Bonanza Road and extending south along North Page Street approximately 660 feet and east approximately 660 feet, from R-E to C-V.

Proposed Use: Elementary School

MR. SAYLOR indicated this area was in the eastern end of the City in a relatively undeveloped area. He stated they are asking for a C-V zone to allow the development of an elementary school. He pointed out the location of this property on the plot plan. He indicated the only access from this property is to Bonanza Road; Stewart Avenue is improved at this point but there is no bridge across the Cedar Avenue Drainage Channel and it will be quite some time before there is sufficient development to warrant a bridge. He stated staff recommends approval and there were no protests on file. The conditions attached to this recommendation would be the provision of temporary access along Page Street to Bonanza Road, signing an Assessment District Agreement for participation in the construction of Page Street for the bridge over the Cedar Avenue Drainage Channel. He stated this would necessitate a relatively simple bridge structure. He stated half-street improvements would be required on Page Street and the unnamed street on the north side of the property. He pointed out the location of the unnamed street and stated at this time it will not be necessary for access to the school. He stated the usual conditions of approval shall apply such as conformance to code requirements and design standards of City Departments, etc.

MRS. COLEMAN asked regarding the drainage ditch.

MR. SAYLOR pointed out the location of the open drainage channel and stated in order for Page Street to continue there will have to be a bridge; he indicated it is not needed at this time but will be needed in the future. He estimated the School District would have to pay one-quarter the cost of the bridge construction.

MRS. COLEMAN asked if this would remain an open drainage ditch and she questioned whether this would be a safe situation for the children going to and from school.

RECEIVED
CITY MANAGER

MAY - 6 1976

AM 7.8.9.10.11.12.1.2.3.4.5.6 PM

MR. SAYLOR replied this channel will remain open.

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

MR. RICHARD BYERS, Clark County School District, 2832 East Flamingo Road, appeared and stated he was the Real Estate Buyer for the School District.

CHAIRMAN JENKINS asked if he had anything further to add?

MR. BYERS indicated they did concur with staff's recommendations. He stated this is the first time he has heard part of the conditions, but he stated they could comply. He stated they anticipate immediate development and plan to start construction on May 13. He stated they expect completion by December.

MR. WARD asked how many students were they anticipating that would attend this school?

MR. BYERS replied 650 students.

MRS. COLEMAN asked regarding the open drainage channel.

MR. BYERS stated it will be fenced and there will be no direct access from the play area or field area to the ditch. He indicated the sides of the school will be fenced but what happens beyond that point they have no control over.

MR. WARD asked how tall was the fence going to be?

MR. BYERS replied 6' or 8'.

CHAIRMAN JENKINS declared the public hearing closed.

MRS. COLEMAN moved Z-21-76 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. Conformance to the plot plan.
2. Temporary paved access from East Bonanza Road to the school site shall be provided as required by the Department of Public Works.
3. Signing an Assessment District Agreement for participation in the construction of the Page Street bridge structure over the Cedar Avenue Drainage Channel.
4. Dedication and construction of half-street improvements on Page Street and the unnamed street on the north side of the property. Dedication of the radius corner at the intersection of Page Street and the unnamed street 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": Miller, Jenkins, Coleman.

"NOES": None

"ABSTENTIONS": Ward

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

2. Z-22-76

DENIED

Application of VALLEY BANK OF NEVADA for reclassification of property legally described as Lot 35 and the East One-Half (E 1/2) of Lot 34, Block 8, Amended Mayfair Tract #2, located on the northwest corner of Bruce Street and Circle Drive at 200 Circle Drive, from R-1 to C-2.

Proposed Use: Retail Sales and Display of Greenhouses

MR. SAYLOR stated this property is located at Bruce and Circle Drive on the corner and the remainder of the area around it is occupied with single family homes. He stated there is commercial zoning to the north of this property which has Fremont Street frontage. He stated there have been other applications for zone changes in this area one being immediately across the street for P-R which was denied, and the other requests have been denied. He stated staff doesn't feel it is advisable to extend the commercial zoning any further south into the residential area. He stated they realize there is considerable vacant land which may pose a problem, but there would be a possibility to use it for single family homes. He stated staff didn't feel the only solution would be C-2. He stated the reason for this zone change is to allow an outdoor display type of business for greenhouses and an office building type of operation. He stated staff recommends denial, and there are letters and a petition on file with some 19 signatures on it, most, if not all, on Circle Drive.

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

MR. LAMAR WEBSTER, 4915 Nevada Street, appeared representing the applicant. He stated their business would be the outdoor display of greenhouses. He indicated down the street about a block there is zoning for a fried chicken restaurant on the same side of Bruce Street and there is a 7-11 store next door on the corner of Fremont and Bruce. He indicated they propose to have this corner more of a garden area with a children's play area. He stated they needed the C-2 zoning for the outside display and their building would be 40' X 32' and they would have off-street parking.

MRS. COLEMAN asked if they would be selling greenhouses or plants?

MR. WEBSTER stated greenhouses. He stated they are now located on East Charleston; and they cannot put any structures outside and that is why they are asking for this zoning for display purposes. He stated that on this property many trees exist, and he pointed out their location on the plot plan.

MRS. COLEMAN asked regarding the houses that would abut this property.

MR. WEBSTER indicated the house next door is owned by Vera Love and is about two or three years old.

MRS. GRANT, 210 Circle Drive, appeared in protest. She stated Circle Drive is a very narrow street and two cars cannot pass if there is a car parked on it. She stated there are no sidewalks, and the children have to walk in the street and in order to cross the street they have to pass between the cars and this is a hazard. She stated that she felt this business would increase the traffic on this small residential street, and she was strongly opposed to this application. She stated there are 13 small children in this area and they use the street a lot; and she indicated this street is used as a cutoff to avoid the light at Bruce and Charleston.

CHAIRMAN JENKINS asked how the children go to school?

MRS. GRANT indicated they go up Circle Drive and across Charleston.

CHAIRMAN JENKINS stated the applicants don't orient themselves toward Circle Drive or the property in question. He stated the ingress and egress for this proposal is oriented to Bruce Street which would eliminate traffic on Circle Drive.

MRS. GRANT informed the Commission the new 7-11 store is on Fremont and Bruce and not on Circle Drive, and this is one block from their street.

MRS. ELMS, 205 Circle Drive, appeared in protest. She stated their property is right across the street from the lots in question. She stated her main objection was that the street is too narrow, and she wouldn't welcome any business that would increase noise and traffic in this area. She stated she doubted that all the customers would park on Bruce or on the parking lot at the place of business; she felt some would park on Circle Drive. She stated that she understood that when this residential area was designed, FHA required that the streets be made very narrow to slow traffic down, and now they have to live with this condition; and she stated this neighborhood was never designed for anything but private one-family residences. She stated she felt this would create a hazardous condition in front of all the houses and would cause increased traffic and parking problems.

CHAIRMAN JENKINS asked what Mrs. Elms would recommend as a feasible use of this property?

MRS. ELMS stated private residences.

CHAIRMAN JENKINS asked if she would build on the vacant property?

MRS. ELMS replied "yes". She stated there are 4 or 5 families in the 200 block of Bruce who have lived there for years and years and have lived with the traffic.

MRS. VIRGINIA EMMERT, 204 Circle Drive, appeared in protest. She stated she objected because they live right next to where the playground is proposed and she and her husband are night workers and sleep during the day; she felt with the children playing they wouldn't get any rest. She added she also felt the street was too narrow.

MR. WAHLGRAN, 210 South Bruce Street, appeared in protest. He stated he has lived there for 28 years and has protested everything that has been requested. He stated he was opposed to this application for the same reasons as the others.

CHAIRMAN JENKINS stated the property owner is trying to find a feasible use.

MR. WAHLGRAN suggested a home be built there.

MS. VERA LOVE, 228 Circle Drive, appeared in protest. She stated that she built on 204 Circle Drive, and she still owns half a lot in this area and if she could get the other half she would build another home. She stated there are nice homes in this area, and she did feel the people would be disturbed by a commercial use; this area should remain residential.

MR. PAUL STONE, 632 Billyjack, Nevada Realty, appeared. He stated he didn't feel this business would increase the traffic on Bruce Street as it is already a heavily traveled street. He stated the parking for the business would be away on the other side of the residences. He stated any traffic would come out on Bruce and Circle Drive shouldn't be affected.

CHAIRMAN JENKINS asked what the anticipated amount of traffic would be?

MR. LAMAR WEBSTER reappeared. He stated the type of traffic they now have at 1904 East Charleston is too fast for his particular type of business. He stated by the time they see his sign they are by the business. He stated he wanted a slow traffic area. He stated Bruce is four lanes, but the traffic is not fast. He pointed out the location of the sidewalks on

Bruce and the location of the entrances on the Fremont-Bruce side away from the Circle Drive side.

MRS. COLEMAN asked regarding the location of the alley.

MR. WEBSTER pointed out the location of the alley and the other commercial areas on the plot plan. He stated abutting the Circle Drive property is a big warehouse. He stated the hours of operation would be 9-5 and 9-8, and this business will be designed to enhance the area as far as looks; and he felt the traffic problem is already there.

CHAIRMAN JENKINS asked how many patrons did they expect daily?

MR. WEBSTER stated 25 to 30 people.

CHAIRMAN JENKINS asked why a playground was being provided?

MR. WEBSTER stated to keep the children in the fenced play area while their parents looked at the greenhouses.

CHAIRMAN JENKINS asked how this play area was going to be policed and if the neighborhood children would play in it?

MR. WEBSTER stated this area will be fenced and only open during business hours.

MRS. COLEMAN asked if there would be a curb cut at Bruce and if they would use the alley?

MR. WEBSTER stated there will be a curb cut on their property.

CHAIRMAN JENKINS declared the public hearing closed.

MRS. COLEMAN moved this application be denied because she didn't think the C-2 zoning should extend past the alley to the southwest of Fremont Street.

MR. SAYLOR commented to the Planning Commission that they should not take their action on the basis of the argument by the applicant that the street his present operation is on has traffic too fast for his business. He stated if that position was taken they would have to put residential uses on major streets and commercial uses on residential streets.

MRS. COLEMAN suggested that large street numbers could solve the problem of the identification of the business on major streets.

MRS. COLEMAN moved Z-22-76 be DENIED.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

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

3. Z-23-76
ABEYANCE

Application of CLAYTON O. GWIN for reclassification of property legally described as the South 61.91 feet of Lot 14, Block 16, Fourteenth Street Addition, located on the southwest corner of East Bonanza Road and North 16th Street, from R-1 to R-3.

Proposed Use: Four-Unit Apartment Project

MR. SAYLOR stated this lot fronts on a north/south interior street (16th Street) and sides on Bonanza Road which is a major or primary street. He stated the property to the north is single family and immediately to the east is single family, and then there is R-3 zoning to the west and on the east side of Bruce a block further to the east. He stated

immediately to the south of this particular lot is R-2. He stated the applicant is asking for R-3 zoning on this lot to allow the construction of a four-plex. He stated the zoning pattern in this area is somewhat mixed in that there is some R-3 and some single family, but staff feels that there is an obligation to protect the single family development which has been there for a number of years; although the residences side on Bonanza Road, they are well maintained. He stated staff would recommend denial of the R-3 and recommend R-2 be allowed so as to conform to the lot to the south. He pointed out the location on the plot plan. He added that 20' of the lot will be necessary for the future widening of Bonanza Road which means this lot will be 42' wide. He stated sufficient parking is shown on the plot plan and added a four-plex would require six spaces. He stated staff felt a duplex is the most density that should be allowed. He stated there is one letter of protest and one letter of approval on record.

MRS. COLEMAN asked the size of the buildable lot.

MR. SAYLOR stated 42' X 130'.

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

Neither the applicant nor his representative were present to appear before the Commission.

MRS. COLEMAN suggested this item be held in abeyance until the applicant can make an appearance. She stated they could either deny or agree to the R-2 amendment at this time.

MRS. COLEMAN moved Z-23-76 be HELD IN ABEYANCE until the applicant can make an appearance.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

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

4. Z-24-76
APPROVED

Application of STEWART L. BELL, K. MICHAEL LEAVITT AND JEFFREY G. GREEN dba B. L. & G. for reclassification of property legally described as Lots 1 and 2, Block 6, Wardie Addition, located on the southeast corner of South Sixth Street and East Bridger Avenue at 600 East Bridger Avenue, from R-4 to C-1.

Proposed Use: Office Building

MR. SAYLOR stated this property is located on the southeast corner of Bridger and 6th Street. He stated the northeast and northwest corners are presently zoned C-2, and the southwest corner is zoned C-1. The request, staff feels, is in keeping with the existing zoning pattern. He pointed out the location of the property on the plot plan. He stated the main reason for the C-1 zone instead of P-R is because there is a little more buildable area involved in C-1 with no setback requirements. He pointed out the location of the landscaping at the entrance, along Bridger, and in the parking area. He stated there are two letters of approval on record; and the conditions that would be attached to this recommendation would be revision of the parking layout, landscaping requirements, screening provisions and the repair of the damaged sidewalk on Bridger and 6th as required by the Department of Public Works.

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

MR. K. MICHAEL LEAVITT, appeared and stated he was also representing his two partners. He stated they purchased the parcel in question in hopes the existing structure could be used as an office building. He stated there is a duplex which was built in 1941 on this parcel. He indicated after considering the cost to renovate the duplex they decided to remove the structure and build the office building in question. He stated their concern for an aesthetic structure is the same as the City's concern that it be aesthetic. He stated this will be a first-class building. He stated 6th Street is going more and more to professional attorney's offices.

MRS. COLEMAN asked the depth of the lot on the 6th Street side?

MR. LEAVITT replied 50'.

MRS. COLEMAN asked if this rezoning would include the house in back of this property on the 6th Street side?

MR. LEAVITT stated "no".

MR. MILLER asked if this operation would house just their office or other offices?

MR. LEAVITT stated the only other consideration would be a commercial real estate firm that might possibly buy a share of their partnership to locate offices in the most eastern part of the building. He stated this would essentially be a one-man operation and mainly deal in commercial insurance, and his work would be done mainly outside of the office.

CHAIRMAN JENKINS declared the public hearing closed.

MR. WARD moved Z-24-76 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. Resolution of Intent be restricted to a twelve (12) month time limit.
2. The parking layout shall be revised as required by the Department of Community Development.
3. Conformance to the plot plan as amended to reflect the above conditions.
4. 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.
5. Submittal of a landscaping plan prior to or at the same time application is made for a building permit.
6. All mechanical equipment, air conditioners and trash areas shall be screened from view from the abutting streets.
7. Repair the damaged sidewalk along Sixth Street and Bridger Avenue as required by the Department of Public Works.
8. Conformance to code requirements and design standards of City Departments.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

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

5. Z-25-76

APPROVED

Application of GERMAIN HOULE for reclassification of property legally described as the Easterly 92.51 feet of the Westerly 193.55 feet of the Northerly 200.00 feet of Government Lot 11 in Section 1, Township 21 South, Range 60 East, MDB&M, generally located on the southwest corner of West Charleston Boulevard and South Jones Boulevard, from C-1 to C-2.

Proposed Use: Swimming Pool Sales & Sporting Equipment Sales and Rental

MR. SAYLOR pointed out the location of the property on the map; and he stated the property immediately to the west is occupied by a veterinary clinic, and to the east there is a cycle shop, and immediately south is a plant nursery. He stated the property to the northeast is under Resolution of Intent to C-1 and although the vacant piece immediately west of Jones is not under Resolution of Intent it is susceptible to being changed to commercial in accord with the policy established by the Commission. He stated to the west is a church, and further west of that is the mental health center. He stated the property is presently zoned C-1, and the request is for C-2 to allow outdoor display of swimming pools and sporting equipment. He pointed out the location of the proposed development on the plot plan. He stated staff doesn't like to encourage the C-2 use in this area; however, in recognition of the fact that there is a cycle shop across Jones Boulevard and a nursery to the south and a veterinary clinic to the west, and the fact that this is not a dense C-2 type of use, staff would recommend approval; but staff wouldn't recommend approval of any C-2 use in this area. There were no protests or approvals on record. The conditions attached to this recommendation would be a 12-month Resolution of Intent, revision of the parking area, conformance to the fence design as submitted, plot plan approval, the normal landscaping conditions, the screening provision and half-street improvements along Jones and construction of sidewalk on West Charleston as required by the Department of Public Works.

MRS. COLEMAN asked since C-2 is not desirable zoning out in this area, she would be concerned if they zoned this C-2, and the business didn't make it, would they have control over what would be put in there?

MR. SAYLOR stated this rezoning item would be restricted to this use, and they would have to come back before this Commission for another use.

MRS. COLEMAN asked if they would have this protection?

MR. SAYLOR stated if there was a proposed C-2 use that would be objectionable they could review it to make their recommendation.

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

RANDY BLACK, 1700 Desert Inn Road, appeared representing the applicant. He stated they concur with staff's feelings but would take exception to one condition. He stated they have provided four off-street parking spaces and staff is requesting they provide four more, and in a C-2 zone they are not required to provide off-street parking spaces. He stated the reason they would like the condition eliminated regarding the parking spaces was because they need the area for outside display of these pools because that is the nature of the business. He stated they felt confident the four parking spaces will be enough. He stated in a one-hour period they would be dealing with only one or two families, and he stated the employees would be utilizing the offsite parking.

MRS. COLEMAN asked what the parking provisions were on Charleston and Jones?

MR. SAYLOR stated there is no prohibition of curb parking, there are parking lanes provided.

MR. BLACK stated the cycle shop has no on-site parking.

There was discussion regarding the location of the pools for display with regard to the parking spaces provided.

MR. BLACK pointed out the location of the decorative fence. He stated it will be made out of block pillars and lights with wrought iron inserts. He stated if they were to provide the additional parking spaces they would have to eliminate the display of two pools.

MR. SAYLOR presented a design of the elevation of the fence.

MR. MILLER asked if the pools would be permanently placed?

MR. BLACK stated the pools would be 16' X 32' and 92' X 150'.

CHAIRMAN JENKINS asked if they would be above-ground pools?

MR. BLACK stated they were above-ground pools and they would have redwood decking between the pools for display. He stated they need all the area they can get, and he stated they would really like to stick with the four spaces instead of the eight required by staff. He stated if wanting four instead of eight spaces would run the risk of them not getting approved, they would work out the problem.

There was more discussion regarding the parking spaces.

MR. BLACK stated he noticed staff recommended the building be moved to the property line to allow the additional parking spaces, and he stated they will adjust the parking to whatever parking requirements staff would require. He stated they would like the business to be allowed and they do not feel eight spaces would be necessary.

MRS. COLEMAN stated she felt it would be wise to have enough on-site parking as they could comfortably get.

MR. BLACK stated he agreed with that point, and he pointed out the location of the fence stating if additional parking is needed they could move the fence.

CHAIRMAN JENKINS stated if they find in the future they need parking they could relocate the pools to provide for the additional parking as recommended by staff. They could change it at a later date.

MR. BLACK stated they would be the first ones to do that if they needed additional parking.

CHAIRMAN JENKINS declared the public hearing closed.

MRS. COLEMAN stated if the Commission approved this plan with only four parking spaces provided and they move the building to the lot line, she asked if this could be done in a commercial zone?

MR. BLACK stated the reason the building was offset was because the same people own the lot that the veterinary clinic is on, and they are selling the veterinary clinic and they wanted us to build our building as far away as we could.

MRS. COLEMAN asked if Mr. Black wanted to go with the original plan with the side setback and four parking spaces?

MR. BLACK stated "yes".

MR. MILLER moved Z-25-76 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. Resolution of Intent be restricted to a twelve (12) month time limit.
2. Conformance to the fence design as submitted and the location of the fence at the intersection of Charleston Boulevard and Jones Boulevard shall be constructed as required by the Traffic Engineer.
3. Conformance to the plot plan.
4. 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.
5. Submittal of a landscaping plan prior to or at the same time application is made for a building permit.
6. All mechanical equipment, air conditioners and trash areas shall be screened from view from the abutting streets.
7. Construction of half-street improvements along Jones Boulevard and construction of the sidewalk on West Charleston Boulevard as required by the Department of Public Works.
8. Conformance to code requirements and design standards of City Departments.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

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

- | | |
|---|---|
| 6. Tentative Map
THE MEADOWS

APPROVED | Property located on the northeast corner of Decatur Boulevard and Michael Way in Zoning District C-1.
Owner/Subdivider: Dayton Development Co.
Commercial Subdivision - 121 acres |
| 7. Final Map
THE MEADOWS

APPROVED | Property located on the northeast corner of Decatur Boulevard and Michael Way in Zoning District C-1.
Owner/Subdivider: Dayton Development Co.
Commercial Subdivision - 121 acres |

MR. FOSTER stated this request involves the site where the new regional shopping center will be built in the westerly portion of the City. He pointed out the location of the property stating West Fremont is to the north and Decatur to the west, and this property is owned by Dayton Hudson. He stated the property is zoned commercial, and they are proceeding under the statutory provisions under the subdivision portion, wherein they would basically have a boundary map and would not be obligated to show individual lots. They propose to subdivide the area later which will be done without any map. He stated this later division will be necessary to have major tenants in the shopping center, and they will have a portion of the site. He stated this map does meet the Subdivision Ordinance and State Statutes. He stated that both maps, Items 6 and 7, go together, and the final map should be subject to the approval of the tentative map. He stated that the route of Michael Way is proposed along the south portion of the property, but Michael Way goes west and it is a north/south street. Staff would recommend that this proposed street be renamed,

as one of the conditions of approval of the tentative and final map along with the normal conditions.

MR. DAVID WEIR, VTN-Nevada, appeared representing Dayton Hudson. He stated that Al Nelson and Tom Bonneville were also present to answer any questions the Commission may have.

MRS. COLEMAN commented she felt this development had been considered enough time that there wasn't anything left to hash out.

MR. WARD asked when construction would start?

MR. WEIR stated construction would start the latter part of May.

MRS. COLEMAN moved the Tentative and Final Maps of THE MEADOWS be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

Tentative Map

1. Michael Way be renamed as required by the Department of Community Development.
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 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.

Final Map

1. Approval of the tentative map.
2. Michael Way be renamed as required by the Department of Community Development.
3. Conformance to code requirements and design standards of City Departments.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

"NOES": None

The Tentative Map of THE MEADOWS will be heard by the City Commission on April 21, 1976.

8. Tentative Map
LEWIS HOMES
CHARLESTON
NO. 11

Property located on the southeast corner of Lorenzi Street and the Las Vegas Expressway in Zoning District R-1.

Owner/Subdivider: Lewis Homes of Nevada

No. of Acres: 9.22

No. of Lots: 35

APPROVED

MR. FOSTER stated this site was recently before the Commission for R-3 zoning and was denied by this Commission and the City Commission. Since that time the developers have decided to subdivide for R-1 single family homes. He stated the Expressway is to the north, and midway on the property the Expressway transitions northwest. He pointed out the location of the property on the map. He stated there are existing maps approved to the south of the proposed development, and they plan to tie into the existing street pattern out to Lorenzi Boulevard. One of the conditions of approval would be that a 6' block wall be provided adjacent to the school at the request of the School District, and staff would recommend continuation of the wall along the easterly portion of the site. He stated that staff also feels that because the Expressway is on the north portion of this proposed development that a noise wall should be constructed, and staff would recommend an 8' block wall along the north portion. He stated

they might wish to construct a dirt berm and a block wall but it should be a minimum height of 8'. He stated it could be either solid block wall or the berm/wall combination. He stated this map should also conform to the Subdivision Ordinance and with the wall requirements; staff would recommend approval.

MR. EARL MUNSON, 1405 Golddust, appeared. He stated the State Highway Department made an extensive study regarding the affect of the sound on this property; the freeway starts turning to the north at the school property so their feeling and their studies show that a wall wouldn't be required in that area. He stated they are putting a chain link fence on the north boundary.

MR. SAYLOR stated that further east from Rancho Road where houses back immediately to the Freeway, block walls have been constructed.

CHAIRMAN JENKINS asked Mr. Saylor if he was familiar with the study?

MR. SAYLOR replied he hadn't seen it.

MRS. COLEMAN stated when the applicants applied for apartment zoning they stated there was a noise factor, and they didn't feel it would be suitable for single family homes.

MR. MUNSON stated at one time FHA made studies that stated we couldn't build in this area, but now the State stated we could get building permission because the freeway turns to the north in this area.

MRS. COLEMAN asked why does FHA now state there is no problem?

CHAIRMAN JENKINS asked if they were in accord with building the block wall?

MR. MUNSON stated they didn't see any reason for it, but if it is required they will do it.

MRS. COLEMAN asked the depth of the lots that back up to this wall?

MR. MUNSON stated they are 139' deep.

MRS. COLEMAN asked if the land was above the freeway, or level with it.

MR. MUNSON replied they are both just flat.

CHAIRMAN JENKINS asked if they could comply with staff's recommendations and go with a 6' block wall?

MR. MUNSON stated "yes".

MRS. COLEMAN stated she could see staff was trying to protect the homeowners, but she didn't feel there was that much traffic yet; but if there is a problem later they could add 2' to the wall. She stated the block wall on the north should be approved to a maximum of 6'.

MRS. COLEMAN moved the Tentative Map of LEWIS HOMES - CHARLESTON NO. 11 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. A 6' masonry wall be constructed along the north and east property lines.
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 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 shall be provided in accord with the Street Name Policy.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

"NOES": None

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

9. Z-45-75
Use Review
(C-V Zone)

APPROVED

Request submitted by the CITY OF LAS VEGAS to allow a police substation to be located on property generally located on the north side of Hargrove Avenue between Elton Avenue and Garwood Avenue at 6208 Hargrove Avenue in Zoning District C-V.

MR. SAYLOR stated this property is located on the north side of Hargrove and it recently came before the Commission as a proposed park and met with strong opposition in the neighborhood. He stated the teen center is on the eastern end, and there is vacant land in between and then the church building. He stated this property has been zoned for civic use, and in the previous approach it had been discussed that this property be used as a community center type of operation. He stated there was a protest factor in terms of the problems in the neighborhood, primarily caused by teenagers. This property was zoned C-V; and since that time in response to the problems pointed out by the property owners in the area, the City is now in conjunction with the Sheriff's Department proposing that the church be used as a substation. He pointed out the location of the existing church building, and the parking lot in front and the existing parking lot to the west and the landscaping on Hargrove. He stated the area between this site and the teen center will be used as a park. He stated this will be a 24-hour operation. He stated there would be units going out on duty, but after discussion with Metro they have indicated checking of sirens would not be permitted at this location. He stated the checking of sirens would be done at the central police facility. He stated that all vehicle servicing would also be done at the central service facility on Stewart and 9th. He stated notices were sent out to the property owners in the area, and we have received no letters of protest and one letter of approval from a person living on Factor Avenue.

MR. WARD commented this would be more or less a business.

MR. SAYLOR stated there would be no holding facilities at this location. He stated there will be cars and officers assigned that would operate out of the station, and there would be clerical personnel. He stated that this is part of the overall plan, which is relatively long-range, to provide precinct stations in locations around the City. He informed the Commission there are three stations in existence at the present time, and there is some indication three more are needed.

MRS. COLEMAN asked when a precinct station would be placed on the property?

MR. SAYLOR replied they plan to go ahead immediately on this facility. He stated they are not sure regarding the purchase of this property; but more than likely they will get \$1 a year lease from the State, and they have money budgeted to make the necessary renovations for additional parking and landscaping. He stated there will be no added

cost in terms of manpower; it would simply be a movement of people from the central facility out to this facility.

MR. WARD asked if the City felt this facility was more important than hiring more men?

MR. SAYLOR commented they plan to get the building for \$1 a year; and some funds will be necessary to renovate the building, and they would simply transfer some of the people from the downtown station.

MS. JAN CAMP, 6120 Elton Avenue, appeared in favor of this request. She stated she felt this was better than the park that was planned, but she felt the small park was a better idea. She stated she didn't feel there was going to be a noise factor, and she thought it was a very good thing and was needed in this area.

MR. KEN SAUNDERS, 6217 Factor Avenue, appeared in favor of this request. He stated he lived five doors from the teen center; and he felt it was great to have this facility in and he stated he was happy to see the park going in there at that location. He also was happy to see the church utilized because he had helped build it, and he would like to see it used. He indicated the land to the west was zoned for a higher residential density, and he felt having this sub-station in this location would help eliminate some of the problems associated with having high density residential near single family residential property. He asked that street improvements be put in at this location because the street was very narrow where the park is going to be.

MR. SAYLOR stated it is anticipated as part of this operation that the north half of this street would be constructed to the regular street standards.

MRS. COLEMAN moved the Use Review (C-V Zone) under Z-45-75 be APPROVED.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

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

1. CV-1-74
APPROVED

Status review of the overnight accommodations on the ECHOES OF FAITH MINISTRIES operation on property located at 1401 East Washington Avenue in Zoning District C-V.

MR. FOSTER stated this property was formerly the Jeep Posse property on Washington east of Fantasy Park. He indicated this operation was approved on this site some time ago, and they came in approximately six months ago with a request that overnight accommodations be provided for persons who may be alcoholics or possibly addicted to drugs and other types of problems; and they felt they could assist these persons better if they stayed on the site. This request was approved subject to a maximum of 20 persons allowed on the property at any one time, and the City Commission requested that a review be conducted within six months and that is what is before the Commission tonight. He indicated staff has contacted the agency and they indicate currently they have eight people on the premises, and the existing capacity is 12 which is a little over half of the maximum allowed. He stated staff has checked with the Metropolitan Police Department, Parks and Recreation, and the Housing Authority regarding any complaints concerning this use. There is a public housing project to the north and a City park to the west and none of these agencies indicated any problems with this operation. He stated staff feels that there should probably continue to be reviews in the future and staff would recommend that another

review be conducted one year from this date. He stated there appears to be no problems with the operation they are conducting.

MRS. COLEMAN suggested they follow the recommendation of staff and have another review in one year.

MR. FOSTER informed the Commission they do have a mobile home that counselors use as they stay on the property. He indicated this could be allowed on a temporary basis to the rear of their existing building. He stated the Commission should take this into consideration and possibly sanction this if they are going to allow it or have it removed. He indicated there were some representatives present that could give some indication why this mobile home is on the site.

MRS. COLEMAN asked why the mobile home was present without permission?

MR. EARL OWEN appeared, representing the applicant, and he stated the mobile home has been there since they have been on the property and is used for caretakers and counselors.

MRS. COLEMAN asked why it wasn't shown on the plot plan?

MR. OWEN indicated it was not going to be there forever. He stated it would be there until the construction of the buildings they plan to have at this location.

CHAIRMAN JENKINS asked how long they plan to continue the use of the mobile home?

MS. BETTY MORRIS, 2724 Alcoa, appeared representing the applicant. She stated the mobile home was approved with the original approval of the first application.

MRS. COLEMAN asked if it was temporarily approved?

MR. FOSTER indicated the only question regarding this application at that time was a concern about off-street parking and a six-month review period.

MRS. COLEMAN asked if they approve another review in six months, could they at the same time allow the caretaker's trailer that long until they review it again?

MR. FOSTER stated there was no problem as far as staff was concerned.

MS. MORRIS stated this trailer is very important to their business.

MR. FOSTER indicated it should be sanctioned.

MRS. COLEMAN moved that the Commission review the status of the property in one (1) year and allow the caretaker's trailer until they finish the building.

MRS. COLEMAN moved CV-1-74 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. A review being conducted within one (1) year of the overnight accommodations.
2. The temporary mobile home occupancy on the property shall be allowed until the new facility is constructed.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

"NOES": None

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

2. Z-18-68
Plot Plan Review
APPROVED

Request by W. BRUCE BECKLEY, WILLIAM SINGLETON, HARRY M. REID, MARK C. SCOTT AND KIRBY R. WELLS for a plot plan review to allow law offices on property at 3501 West Charleston Boulevard, generally located on the southwest corner of West Charleston Boulevard and Douglas Drive in Zoning District C-D.

MR. FOSTER indicated this site is located in the West Charleston area on the south side of West Charleston Boulevard and is a home that is presently zoned C-D, and this requires Planning Commission review before each property can be converted. He stated Douglas Drive is to the east of this property. He stated the plan is to keep the existing landscaping that is now in front. He indicated all access would be from the alley to the rear of the residence. He stated there will be no on-street parking. He stated the plan is to renovate the building in the immediate future, and they plan to go in now as it is. He stated the sign for the business is indicated on the plot plan as being 3' X 6' and it would be 18 square feet; and he indicated the maximum size allowed by the Sign Ordinance is 15 square feet so staff would recommend that the sign conform to the Sign Ordinance. Also, staff would recommend that the building conform to the submitted plot plan and that the screening and landscaping provisions be part of the conditions of approval. He stated staff would like them to maintain the existing landscaping and bring in new landscaping plans, and this would be worked out with staff. He stated staff recommends approval of this request.

MRS. COLEMAN asked when the signs are placed, are the residences on Douglas Drive considered?

MR. FOSTER indicated generally staff observes this on the sign permit.

MR. MARK C. SCOTT, 1620 South 20th Street, appeared. He stated he had nothing to add.

MR. WARD moved the Plot Plan Review of Z-18-68 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. Conformance to the plot plan.
2. The proposed free-standing sign shall not exceed fifteen (15) sq. ft. and shall be no higher than five (5) feet. The sign location shall be located on the property to preclude any traffic sight restriction at the intersection of Douglas Drive and West Charleston Boulevard.
3. Landscaping and a permanent underground sprinkler system shall be provided as required by the Planning Commission and shall be permanently maintained in a satisfactory manner. Failure to properly maintain required landscaping and underground sprinkler systems shall be cause for revocation of a business license.
4. Submittal of a landscaping plan prior to or at the same time application is made for a building permit.
5. All mechanical equipment, air conditioners and trash areas shall be screened from view from the abutting streets.
6. Conformance to code requirements and design standards of City Departments.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

3. Z-74-71
Review of
Condition

APPROVED.

Request by STANSBERRY CONSTRUCTION to reduce the required 25' building setback from West Bonanza Road on property located on the south side of West Bonanza Road between Tonopah Drive and Clarkway Drive at 2029 West Bonanza Road in Zoning District C-2.

MR. FOSTER indicated this site was before the Commission not long ago as a plot plan review to allow construction of a building, and they have an existing building on the south portion. The Commission placed a stipulation that they place a 25' building setback from the front property line, and the original plot plan indicates a 12' setback. He stated at the time this request was before the Commission, staff was not aware they were required to dedicate 15' for the widening of Bonanza Road, and with a 25' setback there would be a 40' setback from the existing roadway. He stated Bonanza Road is on the Major Street Plan and may be widened in the future. The applicant indicated there is a problem other than moving the building back. He stated there is an existing building to the west and south of this one, and if they have to move it back 40' it would come to the side of the existing building so that the proposed building would block the entrance of the other building. He stated the applicant is requesting that they be allowed to set back the building 15' from the new right-of-way line which results in a 30' setback from the existing right-of-way line rather than a 25' setback from the new property line.

CHAIRMAN JENKINS asked if staff could see any problems with this?

MRS. COLEMAN stated the reason this 25' setback was required is to set the building back far enough so that cars going out onto Bonanza Road would have visibility past the building to the west which is the direction the traffic is coming from. She stated she felt the problem would remain the same.

MR. BRUCE MEAD, 2013 Granite, appeared and stated the placement of the new building would allow visibility with the 30' setback from the right-of-way line.

MRS. COLEMAN indicated she felt it would be alright as long as there is still enough space for cars to get past the building.

MR. MEAD stated they felt this would be adequate.

MR. MILLER moved the Review of Condition under Z-74-71 be APPROVED as requested (15' building setback).

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

"NOES": None

4. Z-5-66
Plot Plan Review

APPROVED

Request by ROBERT W. COX, JR. for a Revised Plot Plan Review which alters the landscaping and parking areas on property legally described as Lot 346, Block 17, Hyde Park #3, located at 4516 West Charleston Boulevard in Zoning District R-1 (Resolution of Intent to P-R).

MR. FOSTER stated this property and plot plan were approved a meeting or two ago; and now the applicant is coming back to revise the plan which is essentially to pave the rear portion of the lot to utilize it for parking. He pointed out the location of the property on the plot plan. He stated the original plan provided for parking in front and in the driveway area and he pointed out the location of the existing landscaping. He stated the new plan has substantially more asphalt; and this will allow a driveway on the westerly portion of the building and it

will have more parking for employees in the rear. He stated there will be three spaces in the front on the easterly portion, but there is no indication of landscaping. Staff would recommend more landscaping or a planter on the southwest portion. They have an existing curb cut and staff would recommend it be closed and a planter be constructed in this area; it is not needed for ingress and egress, and there would be one driveway to serve the rear area and the spaces in the front.

MR. ROBERT W. COX, 1815 Monticello Drive, appeared.

CHAIRMAN JENKINS asked if the applicant felt he could comply with the recommendation of the staff with a planter across the front and on the most westerly side?

MR. COX stated he felt this would improve the appearance of the place and he understood the recommendations of staff.

MR. WARD moved the Plot Plan Review under Z-5-66 be APPROVED subject to the following condition:

1. Additional landscaping be provided along the southwest portion of the property and that the easterly driveway be discontinued and a landscaped planter be constructed along the front property line in this area as required by the Department of Community Development.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

"NOES": None

5. Z-44-59 Request by CLAUDE I. HOWARD for a Plot Plan Review to allow a health spa on property located on the east side of Las Verdes Street between El Camino Avenue and West Sahara Avenue in Zoning District C-C.
APPROVED

MR. FOSTER stated this is on Las Verdes Street north of Sahara Avenue with the WonderWorld Shopping Center being on the site. He stated this is one of two sites in the City with C-C zoning and this zoning classification is planned to be removed from the Ordinance in the future. This zoning classification does have special provisions but essentially it is the same as the C-1 zoning. He stated the applicant was before the Commission at the last meeting for an apartment development on the site; and he withdrew the application at the City Commission meeting, and he is now proposing a health spa on the very south portion of the site and the balance will be used for off-street parking. He stated the applicant does indicate a future sports facility on the site but any more building would have to come before the Planning Commission. He stated there is a provision in the C-C zoning classification that the request can cover no more than 25% of the site and this request is at 23%. He stated they are using the existing building and they proposed an addition and the balance of the site for parking. He stated there is adequate landscaping proposed in the parking area as well as in the front of the building. He pointed out the location of the common driveway into the shopping center and he stated this parcel will function as one parcel of land. Staff recommends approval of the submitted plot plan subject to the landscaping meeting the requirements of the Department of Community Development and all mechanical equipment and trash areas being screened. He stated this request will go to the City Commission at their next regular meeting.

MRS. COLEMAN asked if the plot plan shows the signs painted on the existing health center?

MR. FOSTER informed the Commission they could restrict the amount of advertising, but the Sign Ordinance does not have a restriction on the number of wall signs allowed.

MR. MILLER asked if they could make this a restriction?

MR. FOSTER stated "yes" it could perhaps be a condition of approval of this review. He added that all signs could be subject to Planning Commission review.

CHAIRMAN JENKINS stated a condition should state that advertising be displayed on his own building. He asked how they could make him comply with this because other businesses are not restricted?

MR. FOSTER stated the Commission could state they feel it may be necessary to make the proposed development compatible with the surrounding area.

MRS. COLEMAN asked how that could be worked?

MR. FOSTER stated all existing wall signs could be removed and any new ones be subject to Planning Commission review and approval. He stated the signs could be restricted from the Las Verdes side of the property. He informed the Commission that the existing signs do not constitute any violations because in the proper zoning they can have wall signs unless they are considered off-premise.

MR. MILLER asked how they can paint signs when the request is not approved yet?

MRS. COLEMAN stated since he isn't supposed to be using the building for this purpose at this time he shouldn't have any signs out yet.

MR. FOSTER stated he is putting the signs there now because he wants identity now and may wish to retain those that are there.

MRS. COLEMAN stated she felt the signs should come off. She added she felt no one should be allowed to paint on buildings without approval.

MR. FOSTER stated that type of wall sign would be allowed under the Ordinance, and he added there is no specific guidelines on it with regard to size and type of lettering; it is a matter of taste.

MRS. COLEMAN asked regarding the air conditioners being screened?

MR. FOSTER indicated staff would recommend that. He stated this request will go before the City Commission for their review because they referred it back to the Planning Commission.

MRS. COLEMAN stated she didn't object to the use but she didn't feel that type of signing was compatible with the area. She made a motion for approval with the condition that the old building conform to the restrictions on the new building and no wall signs be present on the Las Verdes Street side of the property.

CHAIRMAN JENKINS stated signs would be allowed on the south and east sides of the property.

MRS. COLEMAN moved the Plot Plan Review under Z-44-59 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

1. Conformance to the plot plan.
2. No signs shall be allowed on the Las Verdes Street side of the building.

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

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

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

6. AV-5-76
 APPROVED

Request of HARRY M. REID for an Administrative Variance to allow a proposed residence with minor setback deviations on an irregular shaped lot on property located at 313 Lacy Lane in Zoning District R-E.

MR. FOSTER stated this is a new subdivision. He stated the applicant had an odd-shaped lot and proposes a building that is difficult to place on the property and meet the setback requirements in the front and rear yards. He stated he is asking for a 10' deviation on the north portion of the lot frontage and a 1' deviation on the south, and there will still be ample yard area after that. He stated this request falls within the criteria for an Administrative Variance, and staff recommends approval subject to conformance to the submitted plot plan.

MRS. COLEMAN moved AV-5-76 be APPROVED subject to conformance to the submitted plot plan.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

7. Z-23-73
 Extension of
 Time
 APPROVED
 1 Year

Request submitted by HOME SAVINGS ASSOCIATION for an Extension of Time concerning property generally located on the southeast corner of Craig Road and Lorenzi Boulevard, extending south along Lorenzi Boulevard 1,776 feet and east along Craig Road 1,056 feet, R-MH zone.

Original Approval: April 11, 1973
 12-month extension granted: April 3, 1974
 12-month extension granted: February 5, 1975

MR. FOSTER pointed out the location of the property stating the Commission has considered an application for R-MH zoning south of the Jade Park development which met with a lot of protest. He stated the westerly portion is under Resolution of Intent to R-MH. He stated when the rezoning application on the south portion of the property was considered by the Planning Commission it was the feeling of the Commission and later the City Commission that the developers should commence development on the land to the west before considering any rezoning on the south portion. He stated the applicant has proceeded to subdivide a portion of the westerly area immediately contiguous to the developed portion. He stated the map has been recorded, but they have just about run out of time on the zoning approval; and the applicant is in the

process of getting things squared away with the State and Federal Government with land sales requirements. Before they continue with the development they want to make sure they have the clearance by the State and Federal Government. He stated the applicant indicated he wanted an extension of time, but staff has received a letter from the applicant asking that the zoning become permanent on the property and asking that it go to ordinance. He stated that at the rezoning request to the south for the additional area, when the public hearing was held, the property owners were not aware the northwest area was under Resolution of Intent. At that time many of them asked how long the Resolution of Intent would remain active and staff informed them it would expire on April 11 so these people will be watching very closely to make sure something is taking place. He stated staff feels the City would be criticized if we go to ordinance or remove the time limit, because many of the protestants would just as soon have the resolution expire. Staff feels since the applicants do have a recorded subdivision for 6500 sq. ft. lots it would be preferable the zoning not revert back to R-E. Staff recommends that rather than permanent zoning just grant an extension of time, for example, one (1) year then if they do not conform in one year take another look to see if they intend to develop.

MR. CLAY LYNCH, 3451 Losee Road, appeared representing the applicant. He stated they originally requested an extension of time but at a management meeting the President of the Board felt since we had gone ahead with the map to construct 20% of the development that we should ask for the resolution to become permanent zoning. He stated they had no objection to a one year extension.

CHAIRMAN JENKINS asked if Mr. Lynch felt one year would be enough time to get things underway?

MR. LYNCH stated they were already under construction with the first 40 lots. He stated on April 7 they will be approved for interstate sales and it will be 60 days to get something ready to sell so the Federal requirements of HUD can be met.

MRS. COLEMAN moved the Extension of Time under Z-23-73 be APPROVED for a one (1) year time limit.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

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

8. Z-100-64
Plot Plan Review
APPROVED

Request submitted by NEIL GALATZ to allow law offices on property located at 710 South 4th Street, generally located on the west side of South 4th Street between Garces Avenue and Gass Avenue in Zoning District R-4. (Resolution of Intent to C-2).

MR. FOSTER stated this property is on the west side of South 4th Street and is part of the downtown area which is under Resolution of Intent to C-2. He pointed out the location of the property on the plot plan. He stated five off-street parking spaces are provided off the alley to the rear, and there is a 10' setback in front. There is no landscaping indicated, and staff would recommend the front portion be landscaped and there be conformance to the plot plan as conditions of approval. Staff recommends approval.

MR. ALLEN EARL, appeared representing the applicant. He stated they plan to have the front of the property landscaped.

MRS. COLEMAN asked regarding the 10' front setback.

MR. EARL stated the building is very narrow, and they wanted it to stand out against the other buildings in the area.

MR. MILLER moved the Plot Plan Review under Z-100-64 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

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

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

"NOES": None

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 9:35 P.M.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT


DON J. SAYLOR, AIP, DIRECTOR

DJS:pdm