

SPECIAL MEETING

AGENDA

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

July 19, 1976

RECEIVED
CITY MANAGER

JUL 13 1976

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

CALL TO ORDER:

3:00 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,
June 8, 1976.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. Z-48-76

Application of NEVADA ESCROW SERVICE, INC. for re-
classification of property generally located on the
east side of Brush Street from Alpine Place north
to a point 120 feet south of Evergreen, from R-1 to
R-3.

Proposed Use: A 324-Unit, One and Two-Story
Garden Type Apartment Complex

2. VAC-2-76

Petition of Vacation submitted by NEVADA ESCROW
SERVICE, INC., TRUSTEE, ET AL, to vacate property
located in that portion of Cory Place extending east
a distance of 300 feet from Brush Street and that por-
tion of Vulcan Lane running north from Cory Place a
distance of 524 feet.

3. Z-18-76
Plot Plan Review

Submitted by NEVADA ESCROW SERVICE, INC. for a Plot
Plan Review concerning property located on the east
side of Brush Street between Alpine Place and Evergreen
Avenue extending north from Alpine Place 940 feet in
Zoning District R-1 (Resolution of Intent to R-3).

AUG 5 1976

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

MINUTES

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

SPECIAL MEETING

JULY 19, 1976

CALL TO ORDER: A Special Meeting of the City Planning Commission was called to order by Chairman Jenkins at 3:00 P.M. in the Commission Chambers of City Hall, 400 East Stewart Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada.

PRESENT: Chairman Jenkins, Messrs. Tiberti, Miller, Busch and Ward.

EXCUSED: Mrs. Coleman and Dr. Parker.

STAFF PRESENT: Don J. Saylor, AIP, Director, Department of Community Planning and Development.
Howard A. Null, Supervisor of Planning and Zoning.
Ira Gardner, Planning Assistant.
Kathleen M. Tighe, Recording Secretary.

MINUTES: MR. MILLER made a Motion for APPROVAL of the Minutes of the regular Planning Commission meeting held June 8, 1976. Motion carried unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. Z-48-76 Application of NEVADA ESCROW SERVICE, INC. for reclassification of property legally described as Government Lots 30, 31 and 35, Section 36, Township 20 South, Range 60 East, MDB&M, generally located on the east side of Brush Street from Alpine Place north to a point 120 ft. south of Evergreen, from R-1 to R-3.

Proposed Use: A 324-unit, one and two story, garden type apartment complex.

2. VAC-2-76 Petition of Vacation submitted by NEVADA ESCROW SERVICE, INC. TRUSTEE, ET AL, to vacate property located in that portion of Cory Place extending east a distance of 300 feet from Brush Street and that portion of Vulcan Lane running north from Cory Place a distance of 524 feet.

3. Z-18-76 A Plot Plan Review submitted by NEVADA ESCROW SERVICE, INC. concerning property located on the east side of Brush Street between Alpine Place and Evergreen Avenue extending north from Alpine Place 940 feet in zoning district R-1 (ROI to R-3).

ITEMS 1 thru 3

APPROVED

MR. NULL pointed out the area in question on the screen indicating the general area was bounded by Decatur on the east, Evergreen on the north, Brush Street on the west and Charleston on the south. He stated the area was generally vacant but zoned R-1 with commercial to the south and east. He pointed out that in the general area was a future library site and City park. He stated staff felt that the area east of Brush Street would be compatible for multi-family development, but it would like to hold the line there to keep the single family to the west of Brush Street. Mr. Null stated he would present all three of these items at one time since they were the same applicant and the same general property. He stated the reason for the plot plan review under Z-18-76 was that the applicant wished to include additional area by means of the new zoning; however, this constituted a change in the plot plan approved under Z-18-76. He stated in 1957 the Planning Commission passed a Resolution outlining a proposed street system between Jones and Decatur. These were blocks of proposed streets which would allow for the subdivision of BLM land into logical single family lots. This entire area is now being brought together into this large parcel for development; there is no need for many of those streets approved previously, which is the reason for the vacation request. Staff feels that Italy, Appian Way, Vulcan and Cory could probably be incorporated

into this project. If the zoning is approved, there would be no need for these streets on this plan. He stated the utility companies have no need to retain any easements and the power line on Cory would be moved toward Evergreen. He said on the zoning request, there were single family homes that would back up to the north line of this project and when the previous zoning was approved by the Planning Commission, it was conditioned upon there being a 50 ft. building setback from the north property line, a 6 ft. block wall on the north property line adjacent to the residences and no windows on the north side of the second story portion of the buildings on the north portion of the property. Staff would suggest if approved, that these conditions also apply plus some others such as a 12 month Resolution of Intent, a landscaped planter with trees along the north portion of the property, submittal of a landscaping plan, minor design changes such as location of trash areas, conformance to the plot plan as amended, screening of all roof mechanical equipment, dedication of radius corners and half-street improvements as required by the Department of Public Services and conformance to the code requirements and design standards of City departments. He stated it should also be conditioned upon approval of the Vacation.

MR. MILLER asked about landscaping.

MR. NULL stated landscaping would have to be provided along the north part of the project adjacent to the single family homes. He stated with these conditions, staff would recommend approval on the zoning as well as the Vacation and the plot plan review. He stated Z-18-76 would have to be conditioned to conform with the plot plan and conditions under Z-48-76.

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

MR. RICHARD G. CROSSLEY, JR. 3355 W. Spring Road, appeared representing the applicant and developer. He stated the developer was Mr. H. Spanos. He stated the proposal was for a 324-unit, one and two story, garden type apartment complex. He pointed out on the plot plan where the swimming pools, tennis courts, recreation area, etc. would be including sun covers which would be an integral part of the buildings. He stated there would also be fireplaces and covered parking and patios.

MR. TIBERTI asked how many covered parking areas there would be.

MR. CROSSLEY stated there would be one for each unit. He stated he felt this was a unique design and would be completely fenced with a 6 ft. wall, and there would be landscaping provided. He stated the parking areas were designed so that they were visible from Brush or Alpine. They felt this would add to a residential feeling when viewing the project from the street. He stated they would meet all of the City's requirements; however, they would ask for consideration on the windows. He pointed out on this particular design there would be approximately 80 feet from the edge of the buildings that were two-stories in height to the property line of the adjacent properties and then another approximately 20 ft. to their homes. He stated he could appreciate the Board's concern for the privacy of the home owners, but felt with almost 100 ft. distance between these buildings and the homes, this would be no problem and asked for consideration on this. He stated they would be glad to answer any further questions the Board might have.

CHAIRMAN JENKINS asked if there was an elevation.

MR. CROSSLEY presented an elevation and a rendering of the project.

CHAIRMAN JENKINS asked where the main entrance would be.

MR. CROSSLEY stated there would be four entrances using both Alpine and Brush.

MR. TIBERTI stated he did not feel they could eliminate the requirement placed on the previous approval regarding the windows. He stated there was a public hearing at that time and the surrounding neighbors were told there would be no windows on the north side of the second

story of these buildings. He felt to eliminate this requirement, the applicant would have to bring in letters of approval from the property owners.

MR. CROSSLEY stated he could appreciate what Mr. Tiberti was saying, but he felt the appearance of the project would be more attractive with the windows. He stated it was the feeling of their architect that these would be much more desirable units with the windows.

MR. MILLER asked if this would be a problem since no construction had been started, and he asked if one-story units could be used in place of the two story units.

MR. CROSSLEY stated possibly they could overcome this by turning the buildings sideways to where the buildings would be exposed on the side to the properties on the north.

CHAIRMAN JENKINS stated he did not feel with a 100 ft. distance between these buildings and the houses that the line of sight would be that great. He asked when the project would start.

MR. CROSSLEY stated they would be breaking ground about September 15th. He stated they had tentative financing, but they needed the zoning to actually get a commitment.

MR. TIBERTI stated he would have no objection regarding the windows if the applicant could obtain letters of approval from the people to the north; however, the condition would have to stand as it was for this approval.

MR. CROSSLEY presented 14 letters of approval from property owners in the area approving of the project. He stated between this meeting and the City Commission meeting, he would try and obtain letters of approval regarding the windows.

MR. NULL indicated on the map where the homes were located that indicated their approval of the project.

CHAIRMAN JENKINS asked if anyone else wished to be heard and there being no one, he declared the public hearing closed.

MR. BUSCH stated he would make a Motion for APPROVAL of these three items (Z-48-76 - VAC-2-76 - Z-18-76) subject to conditions on each application as follows:

Conditions on Z-48-76:

1. Resolution of Intent be restricted to a twelve (12) month time limit.
2. A 6 ft. block wall be provided along the north property line adjacent to the residences.
3. A landscaped planter with trees shall be provided along the north portion of the property as required by the Department of Community Planning and Development.
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. Approval of this zoning subject to approval of the Vacation VAC-2-76.

7. There shall be no windows on the north side of the second story portions of the buildings on the north portion of the property.
8. A 50 ft. building setback shall be provided from the north property line.
9. Minor design changes as required by the Department of Community Planning and Development.
10. Dedication of a radius corner at Alpine Place and Brush Street and the dedication and installation of half-street improvements along Brush Street and Alpine Place.
11. Conformance to the plot plan as amended to reflect the above conditions.
12. All mechanical equipment, air conditioners and trash areas shall be screened from view from the abutting streets.
13. Conformance to code requirements and design standards of City departments.

Conditions on VAC-2-76:

1. Satisfaction of the requirements of the various utility companies.
2. Conformance to the requirements of the Department of Public Services and the Fire Department.
3. Conformance to the code requirements of City departments.
4. Vacation shall not be recorded until all of the above conditions have been met.

Condition on Z-18-76:

1. Conformance to the plot plan and the conditions of approval under Z-48-76.

Voting was as follows:

"AYES" - Busch, Tiberti, Miller, Jenkins and Ward.
"NOES" - None.


Motion for APPROVAL of Z-48-76, VAC-2-76 and Z-18-76 carried unanimously.

CHAIRMAN JENKINS announced these items would be considered by the City Commission at their meeting of August 4, 1976, at 9:00 A.M.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business before the City Planning Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 3:25 P.M.

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION



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

kt